



Architectural Review Board Certified Record

September 17, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:00pm.

1. Roll Call

Members present: Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members absent: Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen Howle, and Stephen McNair

2. Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2025

Abby Davis moved to approve the minutes from the September 3, 2025 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** RATA Investments
Property Address: 1350 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 08/25/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
2. **Applicant:** Pressley Roofing and Construction
Property Address: 20 S Hallett
Date of Approval: 08/29/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black
3. **Applicant:** Douglas Kearley
Date of Approval: 09/04/2025
Property Address: 962 Government Street
Project: Enclose and secure structure. Complete any remaining removal of demolished storefront additions to allow for securing structure.

4. **Applicant:** New Hand Signs LLC
Property Address: 659 Conti St
Date of Approval: 09/04/2025
Project: Install a double-faced 3'Wx6'H diagonal corner sign mounted with steel corner bracket with threaded concrete anchors.
The sign is a TV Icon with flames.
The sign will consist of a painted black aluminum base with hand painted rust patina.
The sign will be halo lit.
5. **Applicant:** Southern Pride Contracting
Property Address: 162 Macy Place
Date of Approval: 09/05/2025
Project: Reroof existing shingle roof with new asphalt shingles. Color: Charcoal.
6. **Applicant:** Rellim Contracting LLS
Property Address: 1003 New St Francis
Date of Approval: 09/08/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weatherwood
7. **Applicant:** Chad E Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 304 Indian Creek
Date of Approval: 09/08/25
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
9. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC
Property Address: 112 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 09/08/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal black

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-38-CA

Address: NW corner of Congress & N. Claiborne Streets
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant/Agent: GAI Consultants, Inc. on behalf of Figures Construction & Development
Project: Construct 4-story mixed-use building and related site improvements

2. 2025-39-CA

Address: 1008 Elmira Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: GeeGee Watt on behalf of Jesse Burks
Project: Demolish historic dwelling

3. 2025-40-CA

Address: 356 Dunham Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent GeeGee Watt on behalf of Jesse Burks
Project: Demolish historic dwelling

4. 2025-41-CA

Address: 1558 Luling Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent Dennis Carlisle on behalf of Patrick and Kelly Patten
Project: Construct a two-story wood-frame carriage house

5. 2025-42-CA

Address: 201 St. Joseph Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant/Agent Element 3 Engineering LLC on behalf on behalf of St. Joseph Street Project LLC
Project: Remove existing windows on west elevation and replace with 'blind' windows

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 1, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Application 2024-38-CA

DETAILS

Location:

NW Corner of N. Claiborne and Congress Streets

Summary of Request:

Construct a four-story mixed-use building and related site improvements

Applicant (as applicable):

GAI Consultants, Inc.

Property Owner:

City of Mobile/Figures Construction & Development

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Vacant lot

- The massing and scale of the proposed structure is not compatible with surrounding historic structures.
- The application has undergone review by the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC).

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	5
Attachments	7

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed design is intended for the southernmost lot on parcel R022906400003036.
- The proposed materials are appropriate for the district and approvable for new construction under the *Guidelines*.
- The submitted plans incorporate the traditional design elements seen in the surrounding district.

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

According to Historic Development survey records and the City's Geographical Information System, the projected parcel proposed for the subject project, on the northwest corner of Congress and N. Claiborne Street streets, straddles what was once 350 and 352 Congress Street. Both lots were occupied by c. 1897 one-and-a-half-stories raised cottages fitted out in the Queen Anne Style. Both facades consisted of a bay window projecting from the eastern end, and a front porch extending westward across the remainder of the elevation.

Detailed plans to fully rehabilitate the historic house at 352 Congress under the supervision of the Mobile Housing Board and the Architectural Review Board were drawn up in the early 1980s. Records show that 352 Congress was demolished in 1997. It is likely that 350 Congress was destroyed around the same time, along with all remaining historic structures along the west side of the block of N. Claiborne Street north of Congress Street.

This subject parcel has appeared before the Architectural Review Board twice. In February 2025, an application to construct a new dwelling came before the ARB and was withdrawn. In May 2025, an application for three new residential construction projects were granted conceptual approval and were shortly afterwards issued COAs.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a four-story mixed-use building.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented to the east with a 2'-2" setback from the ROW. The south (secondary façade) elevation would be setback approximately 6'-0".
 - b. The proposed four-story structure would measure 79'-11 5/8" wide by 140'-0" deep.
 - c. The foundation would be slab on grade with a horizontal element running across the east and south elevations at 2'-0" from grade to create the appearance of a raised slab. First floor finished floor to second floor finished floor (ff) would measure 16'-0". Finished floor to finished floor measurements for second through fourth floor would be 12'-0" high.
 - d. The building height from grade to roof peak would measure 77'-2".
 - e. The structure would sit under a cross-gabled roof with the main gable running parallel to N. Claiborne Street and the cross gable running parallel to Congress Street. The main gable would measure approximately 20'-0" high and the second gable would measure approximately 9'-0" high. The roof would be clad in galvalume standing-seam metal.
 - f. The exterior walls of the structure would be clad in STO products. The veneers would be applied as follows:
 - East façade and south elevation: A sand finished stucco would rise above the second story finished floor level, and a brick veneer would cover the upper-floor levels.

- The sand finished stucco would cover the north and west elevations.
- g. All windows would consist of the following across the elevations:
 - Aluminum-clad wood double casement window with side lights and arched transom measuring approximately 10'-0" wide by 9'-8" high.
 - Vinyl-clad wood fixed four-over-four sash window measuring 2'-7 ½" wide by 7'-0" high.
 - Vinyl-clad wood one-over-one window measuring 1'-6" wide by 3'-7 ¼" high.
- h. Doors will be a mix of aluminum-clad and vinyl-clad wood and would consist of the following arrangements along the first floor across the elevations:
 - Multi-light glass doors with stucco bulkhead, fixed sidelights and transoms measuring approximately 10'-0" wide by 12'-1" high.
 - Double multi-light glass doors with sidelights and transoms measuring approximately 8'-0" wide by 12'-1" high.
 - Single multi-light glass doors and transom measuring 3'-2 ¾" wide by 12'-0" high.
 - Double multi-light doors measuring 6'-4" wide by 8'-0" high.
 - Single multi-light door measuring 3'-2" wide by 8'-0" high.
- i. Steel decorative balconies will project from all double windows along the east and south elevations on floors 2-4. Matching steel handrail will be installed on single open recesses located on the south elevation at floors 2-4.
- j. The east façade and south elevation will consist of multiple entry door arrangements along the first floor that access commercial spaces. The second through fourth floors will consist of double and single windows arranged in a symmetrical pattern. The double windows would be accentuated by decorative steel balconies.
- k. The west half of the north elevation would consist of a blank stucco wall (with a louvered vent located in the main gable). The east half of the elevation would include three recessed galleries on floors 2-4. The galleries would be enclosed by balustrades set between posts.
- l. The west elevation would consist of a blank stucco wall.
- m. A parking lot would be located to the north of the parcel at the rear of the proposed building. The lot would sit 70'-0" west of the ROW on N. Claiborne Street. The lot would be enclosed by a 6'-0" high wood privacy fence and door, painted white. Parking islands consisting of lights would be located along the east and west sides of the parking lot at regular intervals.
- n. Landscaping would include jasmine ground cover along N. Claiborne and Congress Streets and red maple trees planted at the rear of the parcel to screen parking area.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*)

1. **7.30** Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.
 - Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.
 - Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.

- Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.
 - Face primary building entries toward the public street.
 - Screen ancillary buildings or place them behind the primary building.
2. **7.33** Place and orient new commercial construction at interior neighborhood locations to be compatible with that of nearby historic residential structures.
 - Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.
 - Locate any ancillary buildings to the rear of the primary commercial building.
 - If off-street parking is required, provide it behind the building where possible.
 - Provide landscaping around a driveway to off-street parking to mimic a driveway for a historic residential building.
 - Orient façades to be parallel with the street.
 3. **7.34** Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.
 - Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures.
 - Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.
 - Limit the height or the perceived height of buildings to be similar to heights of nearby historic structures.
 - Use vertical and horizontal articulation design techniques to reduce the apparent scale of a larger building mass.
 - Incorporate changes in color, texture and materials.
 - Use architectural details to create visual interest.
 - Use materials that help to convey scale in their proportion, detail and form.
 4. **7.35** Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.
 - Incorporate floor-to-floor heights that appear similar to those of traditional commercial buildings in Mobile.
 - Design a new structure to incorporate a traditional base, middle and cap.
 5. **7.36** Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.
 - Proportion a new façade to reflect the established range of traditional building widths seen in Mobile.
 - Where a structure must exceed a traditional building width, use changes in building configuration, articulation or design features such as materials, window design, façade height or decorative details to break the façade into modules that suggest traditional building widths.
 6. **7.39** Design the massing and scale of a new commercial building to be compatible with the district. »
 - Use massing that is similar to that of nearby historic residential structures. »
 - Where larger building volumes are desired, break down the massing near the street to present components with similar massing to that of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.
 - Limit the height of a building to be equal or less to that of historic residential structures in the district.
 7. **7.40** Maintain the distinction between the street level and upper floor on multi-story structures.

- Incorporate a high percentage of transparent glass into the first floor of the primary façade.
 - Design upper floors to appear more opaque than the street level.
 - Express the distinction in floor heights between street levels and upper levels through detailing, materials and fenestration. The presence of a belt course is an important feature in this relationship.
 - Do not use highly reflective or darkly tinted glass.
8. **7.41** Maintain the traditional spacing pattern created by upper story windows.
- Use traditional proportions of windows, individually or in groups.
 - Maintain the traditional placement of window headers and sills relative to cornices and belt courses.
9. **7.48** Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding historic residential context.
- Use a material that is compatible with the surrounding historic residential structures. Use wood siding for a commercial structure where the majority of the surrounding historic residential structures use wood siding.
10. **10.6** Install a new sidewalk to be compatible with historic ones in the area.
- Maintain the existing width of neighboring sidewalks.
 - Use a traditional sidewalk material as seen in the district if permitted by the City Code. Consult Staff if necessary.
11. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances. Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
12. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
- Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
 - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
 - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
 - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
 - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is part of a vacant parcel located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application proposes the construction of a four-story mixed-use building which would be located on the northwest corner of N. Claiborne and Congress streets. The location of the proposed construction is associated with the Interior Neighborhood Context which is described in the *Guidelines* as follows (the applicable guidelines used to review the project are associated with this context):

This context is more rare in Mobile's historic districts than the two contexts discussed above. This refers to new commercial construction that develops in the interior of a predominantly residential historic district. This context refers specifically to new, small scale commercial construction for corner stores or other neighborhood-serving retail uses that are completely surrounded by residential structures. In most cases, commercial infill in this context is likely to develop on corner lots; however, interior commercial infill is also possible, and particularly in DeTonti Square the northern edge of Church Street East. For this context, new commercial construction should strongly consider massing, scale, and orientation to ensure compatibility with nearby historic residential buildings. This context is potentially relevant to DeTonti Square, Oakleigh Garden, Leinkauf, and portions of Old Dauphin Way and Church Street East.

The *Guidelines* direct that the placement of a new structure should be similar to adjacent historic structures. Currently, there are no extant structures along the west side of N. Claiborne Street to the north. Across N. Claiborne Street, front setbacks of historic structures range from approximately 3'-6" to 7'-3". The only nearby historic structures across from Congress Street include 308 and 357 Congress Street, which sit back from the ROW approximately 10'-0" and 15'-0" respectively. Submitted plans demonstrate setbacks of approximately 6'-0" along Congress Street and 2'-0" along N. Claiborne Street, which do not veer far from the established range. These nearby historic structures are single-family cottage dwellings, which could be considered less-than-ideal references for more commercial type building placement and orientation. A look further afield within the district reveals that the placement and orientation of the proposed structure would be respectful of traditional placement patterns within the DeTonti Square Historic District, which historically lends itself to a more urban style of development. The off-street parking provided for the structure is orientated to the rear of the structure and sits 70'-0" back from the ROW along N. Claiborne Street. This placement does not conflict with the guidelines for commercial construction within the Interior Neighborhood Context. (7.30, 7.34, 10.7)

The *Guidelines* state that massing and scale of new commercial construction should be compatible with nearby historic structures. The volume of the proposed structure surpasses that of the closest historic dwellings, and of most structures in the district. In this case, the *Guidelines* instruct that massing be broken down into smaller components to create a more compatible appearance. Regarding scale, the *Guidelines* state that larger buildings should be designed such that the height or perceived height is like nearby historic structures. The design of the proposed structure attempts to break up the massing and scale (both height and width) with elements such as the arched open breezeway, the projecting balconies on the south and east elevations, the multi-floor galleries on the north elevation, and variations in the design of first-floor entry doors and windows on the upper floors. The change in roof form creates the appearance of two distinct sections of the building. Along the north elevation, the recessed galleries create depth and serve to further break up the volume of the structure. The design also calls for the use of stucco at the base (rising partially past the second-story floor height) of the building to differentiate it from the three upper floors, which are clad in a cast brick veneer. The blank walls along the north and west elevations, however, communicate a massive appearance which is not compatible with the district.

Although the above-mentioned elements contribute to visually lessening the mass and scale of the structure, they do not fully satisfy the Guideline's directive. The application of additional elements such as a vertical component between each of the "columns" of window types along the south elevation; or the incorporation of projections and recesses along the same demarcations may serve to further define distinct 'modules' and increase the compatibility of the proposed structure with the surrounding district. There is a lack of definition along the top of exterior walls on the east and south elevations. The *Guidelines* clarify that taller buildings should have a distinctive base, middle, and cap. The proposed design lacks a defined cap. Elements such as cornices, eaves, parapets, and coping are commonly seen on historic homes throughout the district. The integration of such features, interpreted in a manner that integrates with the more contemporary design, would create a more compatible appearance. The proposed structure maintains the distinction between the street level and upper floors and incorporates a high percentage of transparent glass into the first floor of the main south and east elevations, as directed by the *Guidelines*. (7.34-7.36, 7.40)

The height of the building does not fall into the established range of historic structure heights within the DeTonti Square district. There is no historic precedent for a four-story structure. In addition, the visual massing of the gable roof (parallel to N. Claiborne Street) in proportion to the structure is not compatible with historic structures in the district. (7.39)

The design generally incorporates traditional window placement and spacing patterns that reflect those seen in the district. However, as mentioned above, details such as the space between window head and top of exterior walls denote a departure from traditional proportions and design. (7.41)

All proposed materials are approvable for new commercial construction in Mobile's historic district and are compatible with the surrounding historic district. (7.48)

As discussed, a parking lot would be located to the rear of the structure, stretching north to south. A 6'-0" high privacy fence is proposed to enclose the parking lot. Landscaping will further shield and soften the parking area.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY - September 3, 2025

Christine Dawson of GAI Consultants, Inc., was present to discuss the application. Rashawn Figures of Figures Construction & Development and project architect Robert Maurin were also in attendance. Ms. Dawson had prepared a separate PowerPoint presentation from that typically provided by staff. The applicant also provided physical copies of a letter of support from the De Tonti Square Neighborhood Association, which staff distributed to the Board members in attendance.

Ms. Dawson stated that the proposed apartment complex would be located on a corner lot at the western edge of the district. Ms. Dawson specifically noted that there were no historic structures surviving on the subject block. The proposed apartment complex would be mixed-use with commercial space on the first floor and 36 one- and two-bedroom apartment units on the upper three floors. While there are not extant historic 4-story structures in the district, Ms. Dawson noted that Sanborn maps establish historic precedent for structures in excess of three stories within the district. Ms. Dawson noted that a specific three-and-a-half-story structure shown on the Sanborn map is no longer extant.

However, the Federal Courthouse at the district's eastern edge is taller than four stories. Ms. Dawson cited this as a precedent for large landmark structures on corner lots, especially at the district's edges.

Residents of the De Tonti Historic District were also present to comment on the application. Paul Murden of 304 N. Claiborne Street stated that he was in favor of the development as long as it met historic district design guidelines. Mr. Murden also stated that it was his understanding that the letter from the De Tonti Square Neighborhood Association had been written in support of the development concept for the purposes of receiving funding. In his view, the letter should not be interpreted as a support of the specific design before the Board for consideration. Taylor Imel, also of 304 N. Claiborne Street, also spoke in support of the development concept. Mr. Imel stated that the developer had been communicative with the neighborhood. Mr. Imel stated that he believed the development would be a benefit to the community, as long as it complied with historic district design guidelines. Mr. Imel stated he would appreciate the Board's input on how to improve the design.

Linda Tressler spoke as a member of the public but did not provide an address for the record. Ms. Tressler stated that she was not expressly against the project but that she did have concerns. Most of Ms. Tressler's comments were in relation to traffic and the number of parking spaces, which are not under the purview of the Architectural Review Board. Ms. Tressler did state that many people in the neighborhood were considered with the overall scale and the location of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION - September 3, 2025

Stephen McNair asked Robert Maurin, project architect, to speak about the design process. Mr. Maurin responded that he had tried to address both street frontages in his design and that he pulled the material palette (stucco and veneer brick) from the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. McNair asked if the balconies were functional. Mr. Maurin responded that they were. Mr. McNair asked what the roof material would be. Mr. Maurin responded that it would be standing-seam metal with a galvalume finish.

Cart Blackwell asked why the transition between the stucco base and brick-clad middle portion happened halfway through the second-floor level instead of between the first- and second-floor levels. Mr. Blackwell stated the latter was more typical of historic buildings. Mr. Maurin stated that he felt the proportions of stucco base to brick middle appeared more appropriate for both the shorter and longer elevations if the break happened as shown on the elevations.

Jennifer Roselius asked for clarification on the rooftop area. Mr. Maurin explained that it was a useable covered rooftop deck.

Ms. Roselius expressed concerns about the blank north and west elevations. Mr. Maurin responded that these were left blank because it is expected that future development on neighboring lots would obscure any ornamentation on these elevations. Mr. McNair suggested adding faux windows to these elevations. Ms. Dawson interjected that since new development would eventually obscure these elevations, decoration was not needed. Ms. Dawson also cited historic precedent for large masonry buildings with blank secondary elevations.

Ms. Roselius agreed that the blank wall was less concerning on the north elevation. However, Ms. Roselius stated that the west elevation would present a 4-story blank wall at a gateway into the historic

district. Ms. Roselius asked if the owner would consider adding some details to alleviate the monotony of a massive masonry wall. Mr. Figures stated that the development would be affordable rather market rate housing. He indicated that adding details would make the development less economically feasible.

Catarina Echols, Board Chair, stated that the Board must review the project in the context of the Design Guidelines and not in the context of personal taste. Ms. Echols stated that historically it would be more customary to transition from stucco to brick between the first- and second-floor levels, in contrast to transitioning halfway through the second-floor level, as shown on the submitted elevations. Ms. Echols asked why this design choice was made. Ms. Echols also stated that the light fixtures appeared to be undersized for the scale of development. Ms. Echols also requested clarification on the color of the bricks and the design for the balcony railings.

Stephen Howle asked if the project had gone through CRC review. Ms. Dawson responded that it had. Mr. Howle asked if they needed to seek any other variances or approvals. Ms. Dawson stated that a height variance was required, given the two-story height limit in the Downtown Development District. Mr. Howle said that reviewing the design before receiving a height variance felt like putting the cart before the horse. If the zoning board denied the height variance, the project would have to reapply to the Architectural Review Board for design review.

Ms. Dawson and Mr. Figures responded to earlier comments on the number of parking spaces, which is outside the Board's purview.

Mr. McNair asked if the applicant would consider 6-inch-deep indentions to give the appearance of blocked up windows on the blank west elevation. Alternatively, Mr. McNair suggested using alternating cladding materials to create visual interest. Mr. McNair stated that neither change should add significant costs. Mr. McNair confirmed with Mr. Maurin that the proposed wall indentions would not take away from usable interior floorspace. Mr. Figures responded that the design focused on elevations than faced the neighborhood and that he had to cut costs somewhere. Mr. McNair commended the applicant for the work he had done so far.

Mr. Roselius echoed Mr. Howle's concern that it was pointless to review the design before the applicant received a height variance. Ms. Echols agreed, adding that other elements of the design were not currently before the Board, including the proposed brick and stucco colors. Bruce McGowin, attorney for the Architectural Review Board, interjected that the applicant had the right to ask for approval in whatever order they saw fit.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the applicant were amenable to transitioning from stucco to brick between the first and second-floor levels, instead of partway through the second-floor level. Both Mr. Figures and Mr. Maurin stated that they were. Mr. Blackwell asked if the Board could review a sample brick. Mr. Maurin responded that he was expecting to receive a sample brick the following week. Mr. Blackwell asked if Mr. Maurin was open to preparing a new west elevation showing some variety on the west elevation, such as blind window openings as recommended by Mr. McNair. Mr. McNair asked Mr. Maurin to confirm that the proposed faux window indentions would not take away from the useable interior floor space. Mr. Maurin stated that they would not.

Mr. McGowin suggested that the Board could table the application until the following Board meeting so that the applicant could provide additional drawings of the west elevation and a sample of the proposed brick and stucco. Mr. Figures agreed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION - September 3, 2025

Mr. Blackwell moved that the Board carry the application over to the next Board meeting on September 17. Mr. Howle seconded the motion, which the Board approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:48 pm.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY - September 17, 2025

Karrie Maurin recused herself from discussion and left the dais.

Christine Dawson of GAI Consultants, Inc., was present to discuss the application. Rashawn Figures of Figures Construction & Development and project architect Robert Maurin were also in attendance. Ms. Dawson had prepared a separate PowerPoint presentation from that typically provided by staff. The applicant also provided a scale model of the proposed building and material samples of the proposed brick, stucco, and metal roof.

Ms. Dawson presented the alterations made to the design at the Board's request. This included transitioning from stucco to brick at the second-story floor level rather than half-way up the second-story windows. The applicant also added window-sized recesses on the large blank west elevation to give the suggestion of windows that had been boarded up. Ms. Dawson also provided additional examples of buildings within the district that were over two stories in height, including 2-and-a-half story town homes on brick piers that were roughly the height of a modern four-story building.

Mr. Bob Isaackson of 157 N. Conception Street spoke in favor of the proposed design. Mr. Isaackson cited his own building – which is 3 stories over a 5-foot basement - as an example of a 19th-century townhome in the district that would be approximately as tall as a modern 4-story building. Mr. Isaackson also praised the applicant's endeavor to provide more affordable housing in Mobile and especially downtown.

Mr. Jaime Betbeze of 1210 Selma Street spoke in opposition to the proposed design. Mr. Betbeze indicated that he had attended the September 3rd meeting but had not spoken at that time. He stated that, while he appreciated the design revisions made by the applicant, the overall massing and scale were out of place in De Tonti Square. Mr. Betbeze cited a non-historic 2-story apartment building across the street as an example. Mr. Betbeze also stated that the multi-family development did not fulfill the applicant's agreement with the city to build only single-family houses. Bruce McGowin, attorney for the Board, advised the Board that the only matter before them was the building design. Whether or not the proposed development complied with the applicant's contract with the City was a separate issue between those two parties.

Mr. Dennis Carlisle, a local architect representing a separate application, spoke in favor of the design. He stated his professional opinion that the massing and detailing of the proposed development were excellent and that the Board would not find a better design.

BOARD DISCUSSION - September 17, 2025

Jennifer Roselius thanked the applicant for making the requested alterations to the design and for providing material samples. Ms. Roselius state that the color scheme would differentiate the modern building from its historic neighbors, which the Design Guidelines encourage.

Abby Davis asked the applicant to describe the detailing at the transition from the stucco to brick cladding. Robert Maurin, project architect, stated that the stucco would stand slightly proud of the brick cladding above.

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that she had concerns with the overall scale. In response to Ms. Dawson's reference to the 6-story Federal Courthouse building, Ms. Traylor stated her belief that the courthouse was in a unique context not exactly replicated at the subject lot. Ms. Traylor asked what the overall height would be and whether the applicant had considered three stories instead four. Ms. Dawson confirmed that the building would be 77 feet tall. Developer Rashawn Figures stated that the building had to be four stories to provide enough units to make the affordable housing project economically viable.

FINDING FACTS - September 17, 2025

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report as written.

Ms. Roselius seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION - September 17, 2025

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. Ms. Davis, Ms. Echols, Ms. Roselius, and Ms. Wilson all voted to grant a COA. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor voted against granting a COA.



Agenda Item #2

Application 2025-39-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1008 Elmira Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish historic dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

GeeGee Watt

Property Owner:

Jesse Burks

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject dwelling is an advanced state of deterioration.
- The application does not include redevelopment plans

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	2
Attachments	4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The property at 1008 Elmira is a c. 1895 one-story wood frame shotgun with Victorian detailing. It consists of a two-bay façade with full-width front porch incorporated under a gable roof and supported by turned posts with decorative brackets. A cross-gable projection extends from the west elevation. The house has been minimally altered from its original form. It is currently in a deteriorated state.

According to Historic Development records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish historic dwelling.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*)

1. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.
2. Impact on the Street and District
 - Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood. (12.0)
3. Nature of Proposed Development
 - Consider the future utilization of the site. (12.0)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The significance of the structure

The house at 1008 Elmira is listed as a contributing property in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The modest two-bay shotgun cottage with full-width front porch represents a vernacular form common throughout the Southeast. Permit history, along with aerial and street view photos demonstrate that the structure has been allowed to deteriorate significantly in the last ten years. A site visit revealed severe rot, collapsed walls, exposure to the elements, and overgrown vegetation

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* state that whether the building in question is “one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region” should be factored into any decision involving the removal of a structure within a historic district. As stated above, the shotgun form, such as the one located at 1008 Elmira Street, is common to this region, and the prevalence of its form is a defining feature of Mobile’s historic built environment. Although many can still be seen throughout Mobile’s historic districts and beyond, the numbers are declining due to demolition.

The *Guidelines* further instruct that the impact of a structure's demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be considered. The historic rhythm of development along the north side of the subject block along Elmira Street remains intact, with all structures represented on the 1956 Sanborn Insurance Map still extant. The deletion of the historic cottage at 1008 Elmira would be the first disruption of the historic development along the north side of the subject block. Along the south side of the block, the historic dwelling at 1005 Elmira has been removed, creating a vacant lot. The loss of a structure along the north side of Elmira Street would contribute to the emergence of a gap-toothed appearance along this part of the street.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. No plans for development of the lot post demolition have been submitted with the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Gerlinde Watt and Ellen Thomas were present to represent the application.

No members of the public spoke for or against the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

Catarina Echols stated that demolition applications typically included a structural engineering report and plans for future development, neither of which were submitted in this case. Jennifer Roselius asked if the Board could make approval conditional on receiving plans for future development in future. Ms. Roselius clarified that she would not support demolition without a structural assessment. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor concurred that the board did not have sufficient information before them to show that demolition was the only viable path forward.

Ms. Watt stated that her employer was considering purchasing the property from the current owner but would only do so if able to demolish the existing house. Ms. Watt's employer did not want to spend money drawing up new construction plans before knowing that demolition would be allowed. Ms. Watt stated that her employer planned to construct a single-family home on the property.

Ms. Traylor asked if Ms. Watt had experience evaluating the condition of historic properties. Ms. Watt responded that she had some experience evaluating housing with the South Alabama Regional Planning Society. Ms. Watt stated that, in her opinion, rehabilitation of the existing structure would not be economically viable. Abby Davis recommended that the applicant engage a structural engineer to complete a building condition assessment. Ms. Davis also stated that the Board had to have a plan for the future of the sight to review. This could be as simple as plans to clear debris and then sod and mow the empty lot.

Ellen Thomas, also representing the application, stated that the City of Mobile's Code Enforcement Division had been in the process of recording a lis pendens on the property. However, the division had delayed issuing the lis pendens on the understanding that the applicant would purchase and demolish the property. Ms. Echols asked if there was any formal documentation of this. Annie Allen confirmed that the city had delayed officially condemning the building to allow the owner time to either secure or demolish the building or to sell the property.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius moved that the Board table the application for discussion in the future when the applicant was able to provide proper documentation that the building so structurally unsound as to be beyond rehabilitation.

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #3

Application 2025-40-CA

DETAILS

Location:

356 Dunham Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish historic dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Jesse Burks

Property Owner:

GeeGee Watt

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden (Local Only)

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject dwelling is an advanced state of deterioration which presents a public danger
- The property has been cited by Municipal Enforcement
- The application does not include redevelopment plans

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	2
Attachments	4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The property at 356 Dunham is a c. 1900 one-story raised frame dwelling with hipped roof and a full-width front porch. A small side wing projects off the south elevation. The 1904 Sanborn map shows that originally both the façade and the side projection were accentuated by full-width porches. At some point, the side porch was removed, and the front porch was rebuilt with masonry in the Craftsman style and screened in.

According to Historic Development records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish historic dwelling.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*)

1. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.
2. Impact on the Street and District
 - Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood. (12.0)
3. Nature of Proposed Development
 - Consider the future utilization of the site. (12.0)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The significance of the structure

The house at 365 Dunham is listed as a contributing property in the local only portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The modest raised cottage with full-width front porch and small side projection represents a vernacular form common throughout Mobile's historic districts. Permit history, along with aerial and street view photos demonstrate that the structure has been allowed to deteriorate significantly. A site visit revealed that the dwelling appears structurally compromised. Of note were a collapsed rear end wall and extensive rot to exterior elevations. The property was cited by Municipal Enforcement as a public nuisance in May of this year.

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* state that whether the building in question is "one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region" should be factored into any decision involving the removal of a structure within a historic district. As stated above, the vernacular form such as the one located at 356 Dunham Street, is common to the local area, and the prevalence of its form is a defining feature of Mobile's historic built environment. Although many can still be seen throughout Mobile's historic districts and beyond, the numbers are declining due to demolition.

The *Guidelines* further instruct that the impact of a structure's demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be considered. The historic rhythm of development along the west side of the subject block along Dunham Street remains mostly intact, with all but one of the structures represented on the 1904 Sanborn Insurance Map still extant. The deletion of the historic cottage at 356 Dunham would further disrupt this largely preserved historic development along this side of the street. The east side of this block of Dunham Street had experienced more significant loss of its original structures, leaving multiple vacant lots. The loss of a structure along the west side of Dunham Street would further contribute to the street's loss of integrity.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. No plans for development of the lot post demolition have been submitted with the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Gerlinde Watt and Ellen Thomas were present to represent the application. Ms. Watt explained that the City had formally condemned the subject property. Ms. Watt stated that her employer intended to demolish the structure, maintain the lot, and make plans to construct a new single-family home.

No members of the public spoke for or against the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

Abby Davis stated that the official condemnation by the city made approving demolition more likely. Ms. Davis explained to the applicant that the Board would still need to see a more concrete plan for the future use of the site. Ms. Watt responded that her employer intended to remove all debris, sod, and maintain the lot.

Catarina Echols echoed Ms. Davis's concern that the Board had not been presented with a clear plan for the future use of the site. Ms. Echols wondered why the applicant did not simply develop one of the nearby vacant lots. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the application presented too many unknowns to allow the Board to review it.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that the Board table the application for discussion in the future when the applicant was able to provide clear plans for the future use of the site.

Ms. Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Items #4

Certified Record 2025-41-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1558 Luling Street

Summary of Request:

Construct a two-story wood-frame carriage house

Applicant:

Dennis Carlisle

Property Owner:

Patrick and Kelly Patten

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The scale and placement of the proposed carriage house are in keeping with the *Design Guidelines* for new accessory structures.
- The overall design is in keeping with the Craftsman-style primary structure.
- The proposed materials are all approvable under the *Design Guidelines*.
- The *Guidelines* allows for the placement of solar panels on secondary structures, especially new construction.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	3

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

The primary structure is a frame Craftsman-style bungalow constructed between 1925 and 1956. The wrap-around front porch was fully enclosed sometime between 1956 and 1984. The porch was partially reopened across the south façade in 1997.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2004, a COA was granted to install a 6-foot wood privacy fence enclosing the rear yard.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct two-story wood-frame slab-on-grade carriage house structure with garage on first floor and living space above.
 - a. The proposed structure would be located to the north (rear) of the main structure. It would measure 34'-0" wide by 64'-0" deep. The structure would sit 17'-0" east of the west property line.
 - b. The enclosed garage portion would measure 30'-0" wide by 33'-0" deep.
 - c. The roof height will be approximately 34'-5".
 - d. The carriage would rest on a concrete slab foundation.
 - e. The carriage house will feature a side gable roof with shed roof projections over the south gallery porch and a small dormer window on the north elevation. Gable ends feature Craftsman style wood bracketing. Roof eaves feature exposed end beams. Roofs will be clad in a standing seam terne metal roof. Solar panels will be mounted on the south gallery roof.
 - f. Exterior walls will be clad in smooth fiber cement siding with a 6" lap to match existing siding on the main house. A wider siding board and trim piece create a belt course around all elevations approximately 14'-10" above the ground level. Siding will feature a flared skirt just above the concrete slab.
 - g. The south elevation will feature a centered two-story gallery porch that is three bays wide. Porch columns on both levels are simple square wood columns. End columns are paired while a single column divides each bay. First-floor columns feature simple box bases and capitals. Craftsman style wood brackets extend from the first-floor columns to support a low-sloped shed roof. Second floor columns are plain, without base, capital, or decorative brackets. A wood railing with roman lattice panels encloses the upper level. The lower gallery level has no railings. A framed opening with a sliding louvered barn door is centered on the south façade. A second wood paneled door to the west of the gallery leads into the carriage house. Three sets of French doors with transoms lead out onto the second-floor gallery.
 - h. The north elevation features a single centered casement window at the second-floor level.
 - i. A garage entrance with roll-up door is centered on the east elevation. A three-bay bump-out is centered on the second-floor level. Three full-light doors with transoms lead out to a small balcony. The balcony railing features the same roman lattice motif as the gallery railing. Decorative wood brackets appear to support the bump-out and the shed balcony roof.
 - j. The west elevation features a single centered case window shaded by a shed roof over decorative wood brackets.
 - k. All windows will be impact rated aluminum-clad wood casement windows. The stair window on the west elevation will have low-e glass panes.
 - l. Exterior doors are mahogany with glass lights.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*)

1. **9.1** Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
 - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
2. **9.2** Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
 - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood frame
- » Masonry
- » Cement-based fiber siding
- » Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Metal (except for a greenhouse)
- » Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
- » Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)

3. **A.7** Locate energy-generating technology to minimize impacts to the historic character of the site and structure.
 - » Install collectors on an addition or secondary structure.
 - » Minimize visual impacts by locating collectors back from the front façade.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The dwelling at 1558 Luling is a contributing resource to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to construct a new freestanding carriage house structure at the rear of the property.

The *Guidelines* state that new accessory structures should be subordinate in scale to the primary structure and, when possible, located at the rear of the subject property. While the two-story carriage house would likely be several feet taller than the primary residence, there is considerable precedent for two-story accessory structures behind one- and one-and-one-half-story residences in Old Dauphin Way. Moreover, the placement of the structure at the rear of the subject lot would minimize the visual impact from the public right-of-way. The overall footprint of the proposed carriage house is approximately half that of the main residence. (9.1, 9.2)

The proposed structure employs materials considered approvable under the *Guidelines*. These include fiber cement siding, aluminum-clad windows, wood doors with glass lights, and a standing seam terne metal roof. Porch supports, railings, and decorative wood brackets would be painted wood. The design also replicates details and trim profiles found on the primary structure, including the decorative wood brackets, simple box columns, and window and door casings. (9.2) The proposed casement windows are more modern in appearance, in keeping with the *Guidelines* directive that new construction should be clearly distinguishable as new.

The *Guidelines* state that solar panels should be located to minimize impacts on historic buildings and visibility from the public right-of-way. The proposed panels will not be located on a historic building. Given the placement of the carriage house at the rear of the subject property, the panels will be minimally visible from the street. (A.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dennis Carlisle, architect, represented the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Catarina Echols commended the applicant on a beautiful design. Abby Davis concurred and asked for clarification on the siding material. Mr. Carlisle responded that he would use artisan Hardie board with mitered corners. The metal roof would be standing seam. Mr. Carlisle hoped to useterne metal, but a different metal roof material might be necessary.

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if there were any zoning issues with including a full kitchen in a secondary structure. Mr. Carlisle responded that zoning had commented on this. He would remove the stove from the kitchen design if required.

FINDING FACTS

Jennifer Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report as written.

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Ms. Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #5

Application 2025-42-CA

DETAILS

Location:

201 St. Joseph Street

Summary of Request:

Remove existing windows on west elevation and replace with 'blind' windows

Applicant (as applicable):

Element 3 Engineering LLC

Property Owner:

St. Joseph Street Project LLC

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Not listed

Summary of Analysis:

- A survey was completed of the windows proposed for replacement. They were found to be significantly deteriorated
- The proposed replacement 'blind' windows fit the existing openings and match the existing in dimension, profile, and configuration
- All proposed materials are approved for window replacement in local historic districts
- The property is located in the DDD and has undergone CRC review

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	3
Attachments	4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

The present parcel at 201 St. Joseph Street stretches from State Street to the north to St. Anthony to the south and consists of two one-story masonry structures which were originally automotive businesses. The parcel as it exists today was once made up of three lots facing St. Joseph Street and one lot fronting State Street. 1885 Sanborn Insurance Map shows the three St. Joseph Street lots occupied by four large one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half story frame and masonry dwellings. Most had full-width front porches and off-set rear projections. The State Street lot contained five two-story masonry terrace homes and one one-and-a-half story frame home. These dwellings appear on the two subsequent overlays from 1891 and 1904. The southernmost dwelling facing St. Joseph Street is not present on the 1924 map. By the time of the 1955 Sanborn survey, the dwellings are all gone and the present buildings are extant. Aerial photography reveals that these structures were built between 1940 and 1952.

According to Historic Development records, this property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2013, an application was approved to demolish a two-bay vehicular wind on the northeast corner of the property's northernmost building.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing metal windows on west elevation and replace with 'blind' windows.
 - a. The replacement blind windows would consist of wood muntins of similar profile to original, painted white. Existing metal grilles would remain. Glazing would be opaque.
 - b. The replacement blind windows would fit the existing opening and would match the existing in lite configuration. Existing brick sill would remain.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*)

1. **5.20** Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
2. **5.21** When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
 - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
3. **5.22** When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.
 - Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design.

- A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal. A reveal is the part of the side of a window opening that is between the outer surface of the wall and the window.
- A double-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows.
- For increased efficiency, storm windows can be installed. A storm window shall fit within the window reveal and avoid damaging window casings. Operable storm windows are encouraged.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood sash
- » Steel, if original to structure
- » Custom extruded aluminum
- » Aluminum clad wood
- » Windows approved by the National Park Service

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Vinyl
- » Mill-finished aluminum
- » Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)

STAFF ANALYSIS

A portion of the parcel under review is located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The submitted application proposes replacing the existing windows with blind windows that are similar in profile to the original.

The *Guidelines* prioritize preservation of an original window over replacement. However, when original or historic windows are not repairable, selected replacement design should match that of the original. (5.21) The submitted window survey reveals failing window components along the west elevation due to significant deterioration. The proposed replacements are similar to the original in dimension, profile, and configuration. The proposed project has made every attempt to retain all original material that is still structurally sound, such as the brick sills and metal grilles. The proposed wood muntins resemble the original in profile and will be painted white to further match what is there now. All materials are approved for replacement windows in historic districts. The windows proposed for replacement are located on the west elevation; a rear elevation which is minimally visible to the ROW. The windows on the north end of the west elevation have been replaced previously.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Allen Williams represented the application.

No members of the public spoke for or against the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

Catarina Echols stated that she did not see sufficient evidence to show that the entire window could not be restored and kept in place.

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor asked why the entire window could not remain in place, considering the application proposed retaining the steel mullions and much of the steel trim. Mr. Williams responded that the mullions were

anchored into the concrete structure above and below the window openings, making removal almost impossible. Mr. Williams stated that a structural engineer had determined the vertical mullions were close to failing. To address this, Mr. Williams explained that new steel would be installed behind the failed steel mullions.

Ms. Traylor asked if the damage was localized anywhere and if any of the window sash could be salvaged. Mr. Williams stated that it was hit or miss.

Abby Davis asked why the applicant had gone to so much trouble to recreate the appearance of a window instead of simply replacing with new windows. Mr. Williams explained that the blind windows were proposed to avoid the cost and long lead times associated with ordering new custom windows. Mr. Williams stated that the owner was open to installing windows in future.

After more discussion along the same lines, Board members reached a consensus that additional information was needed to show that the existing windows could not be repaired.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Barja Wilson moved that the Board table the application for discussion in the future when the applicant was able to provide documentation showing that the windows were beyond repair.

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:42 pm.