



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

August 19, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

### Roll Call

---

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Ms. Jennifer Roselius, at 3:03 pm.

#### 1. Roll Call

Annie Sawyer Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

**Members Present:** Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, and Steve Stone

**Members Absent:** Abby Davis, Cameron Pfeffer-Traylor, and Barja Wilson

**Staff Members Present:** Annie Sawyer Allen, Douglas Fink, Kimberly Thomas, Hannon Falls, and Matthew Sanford

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from August 5, 2026

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the minutes of the August 5, 2026 meeting.

Mr. Steve Stone seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

#### 3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Ms. Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

Ms. Barja Wilson seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS

---

1. **Applicant:** Russel Perkins  
**Property Address:** 307 N Jackson Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/27/2026  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind to replace existing shingle roof with slate gray architectural shingles.
2. **Applicant:** Steve Allen  
**Property Address:** 75 S Lafayette Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/29/2026  
**Project:** Reroof to replace existing shingles with pewter architectural shingles.
3. **Applicant:** Robert Bronstein  
**Property Address:** 462 Dauphin Street  
**Date of:** 07/29/2026

- Project:** Replace two non-original wood windows that have experienced termite damage that are located on the south facade of the second floor with double hung aluminum clad windows to match lite design and dimensions (38" W x 78 3/4" H) of existing windows. Aluminum cladding will be SW6994 Greenblack to match trim.
4. **Applicant:** Robert Bronstein  
**Property Address:** 462 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/29/2026  
**Project:** Replace four existing wall sconces (two on the first floor of the south facade that are flanking the primary entrance and two on the south facade of the second floor that are flanking the doors to the gallery). Sconces will  
- be stainless steel that is textured black with a central candelabra that has three lighting elements.  
- each measure 9.5" W x 19" H
5. **Applicant:** Heyer Enterprises d/b/a Go Pro Home Services  
**Property Address:** 255 Roper Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/29/2026  
**Project:** Replace existing decking with KDAT tongue-and-groove decking boards on the front porch of the existing dwelling. Decking will be painted Bellingrath green.
6. **Applicant:** David T. McConnell General Contractor  
**Property Address:** 150 Government Street Unit 1000  
**Date of Approval:** 07/30/2026  
**Project:** Reroof the flat section of the roof in-kind using a white modified bitumen roofing system.
7. **Applicant:** Robert Duiett Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 1004 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/30/2026  
**Project:**  
1. Rebuild front porch handrail in-kind to match existing.  
2. Repair in-kind wood rot around windows and replace any wood trim that is not in repairable condition in-kind to match existing.  
3. Replace rotten siding on the east elevation in-kind to match existing.  
4. Repair existing door on the north/rear elevation in-kind and install new hardware to make door functional.  
5. Paint exterior to match existing colors using Sherwin Williams paint.
8. **Applicant:** Michael Dier  
**Property Address:** 1223 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/31/2026  
**Project:**  
1. Remove existing ridge caps and ridge vents on roof and replace with new ridge vent and ridge cap to match existing.  
2. Install 22 aluminum soffit vents measuring 4" H x 16" L to be evenly spaced 8' apart around the 2nd story soffit.
9. **Applicant:** Thom Thomas  
**Property Address:** 1744 Hunter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 08/04/2026

- Project:** 1. Remove existing asphalt driveway that is to north/rear of the dwelling and connects Hannon Avenue and the existing carport.  
2. Install crushed stone/river rock driveway in the same footprint as the asphalt driveway with an additional 20' W x 20'D parking area to be attached to the north of the driveway and west of the existing carport.
10. **Applicant:** Wendy McRae  
**Property Address:** 6 St. Joseph Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/04/2026  
**Project:** 1. Install six arched green fabric awnings to be positioned above the six existing windows on the west facade.  
2. Replace existing awnings in-kind on second floor balcony above the garage on the north elevation.  
3. Install 18'0" W x 10'0" H wood shaker panel door to fit the existing opening on the east end of the north elevation.  
4. Remove existing wood arbor on the north elevation and replace it with a covered walkway to be built in the same location. The covered walkway will:  
- Be supported by nine evenly spaced 12' H columns with 4" steel pipe with Corinthian post cap and base.  
- Have a 3'9" H copper roof.  
5. Install offset hinged wood louvered shutters on the second-floor windows on the north elevation.  
- 8 lite windows will have single hinged shutters; 8/8 windows will have double hinged shutters.  
6. Exterior will be painted using the following Sherwin Williams colors:  
- Main Body Color: Simple Stone SW9521  
- Trim or Decorative Feature Color: Cheviot SW9503  
- Accent Area Colors: Vogue Green SW0065  
- Other Area Colors: Wood toned garage door
11. **Applicant:** Jason Impson  
**Property Address:** 1511 Church Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/04/2026  
**Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Oxford Grey
12. **Applicant:** Michael Dier  
**Property Address:** 12 Macy Place  
**Date of Approval:** 08/04/2026  
**Project:** Remove deteriorated skylight from late 20th-century rear addition. Deck over opening. Install asphalt shingles to match existing. Shingle color: Black
13. **Applicant:** Michael Dier  
**Property Address:** 1715 Conti Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/05/2026  
**Project:** Replace existing shingle roof to match existing. Shingle color: driftwood
14. **Applicant:** Ward Scott Morris Architecture

- Property Address:** 320 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/05/2026  
**Project:** Install two vinyl window decals to both say, "Ward Scott Morris Architecture".  
 - Main entry sign on south facade will measure 2'4" W x 4" H, the bottom of the sign will be 5'1" above grade.  
 - Storefront sign will be located on the west elevation and will measure 4' W x 4' H, the bottom of the sign will be 2'1" above grade.
15. **Applicant:** Robert Brown  
**Property Address:** 960 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/05/ 2026  
**Project:** Install a 24" W x 24" L x 49 1/2" H cast aluminum water fountain with an 8' diameter brick catch basin to be in the front yard, south of the existing dwelling and roughly centered between the front door and last window on the south facade of the dwelling.
16. **Applicant:** Geoffrey Anderson  
**Property Address:** 360 Dauphine Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/06/2026  
**Project:** Install a 33" diameter circle sign on facade.  
 Sign will be mounted to front plane by an existing metal bracket.  
 Signs will be constructed of marine grade plywood.  
 Restaurant logo will be hand painted on both faces and will read "De Maiz Taco Cantina)
17. **Applicant:** Pressley Roofing & Construction Inc  
**Property Address:** 17 Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/10/2026  
**Project:** Reroof with Atlas Pinnacle shingles. Color: Coastal Granite -Vertical smart siding (engineered wood)  
 -
18. **Applicant:** Russell Perkins  
**Property Address:** 118 N Ann Street  
**Date of Approval:** 08/10/2026  
**Project:** West (front) Facade:  
 - Repair upper porch deck flooring using 2x6 tongue-and-groove to match existing.  
 - Repair lower porch ceiling with 1x4 tongue-and-groove pine to match existing.  
 - Rebuild upper porch railing to meet code requirements, including raising height of railing and changing spacing of pickets. Style, dimensions, profile, and shape of handrail and pickets to remain the same.  
 - Repair upper joists as needed.  
 - Repair support columns on upper and lower porches as needed.

- Where replacement is necessary due to unsound condition, replace in-kind with wood.
- Any partial or full replacement of the second-floor columns are to match the existing column material, style, dimensions, profile, and shape.
- Any partial replacement of first-floor non-original columns are to match the existing first-floor columns in material, style, dimensions, profile, and shape.
- Any full replacement of first-floor non-original columns may match either the existing first-floor columns OR the second-floor columns in material, style, dimensions, profile, and shape.

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2026-42-CA

**Address:** 205 N Conception Street  
**Historic District:** DeTonti Square  
**Application/Agent:** Eric Droblyen on behalf of ECD State Street Properties, LLC  
**Project:** Renovate historic dwelling

### 2. 2026-43-CA

**Address:** 4 N Cedar Street  
**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin  
**Application/Agent:** Angela Montgomery (Mobile Arts Council, Inc) on behalf of Matt LeMond  
**Project:** Paint a 10 x 10 (or 10 x 12) mural

### 3. 2026-44-CA

**Address:** 59 Bradford Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Application/Agent:** Gregory B. Saad on behalf of AGOC Foundation Trust  
**Project:** Demolish accessory structure

### 4. 2026-45-CA

**Address:** 61 Bradford Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Application/Agent:** Gregory B. Saad on behalf of AGOC Foundation Trust  
**Project:** Demolish accessory structure

### 5. 2026-46-CA

**Address:** 67 Bradford Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Application/Agent:** Gregory B. Saad on behalf of AGOC Foundation Trust  
**Project:** Demolish dwelling

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for September 2, 2026.



## Agenda Item # 1

### Certified Record 2026-42-CA

---

#### DETAILS

##### Location:

205 N Conception Street

##### Summary of Request:

Restoration of existing two-story wood frame dwelling.

##### Applicant:

Eric Droblyen

##### Property Owner:

ECD State Street Properties, LLC

##### Historic District:

DeTonti Square

##### Classification:

Contributing

##### Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed in-kind repair or replacement of damaged materials of the subject property are compliant with the *Guidelines*.
- The location of the fencing and mechanical equipment is compliant with the *Guidelines*.
- The CRC and the Properties Committee of the MHDC have reviewed and approved the subject project.

##### Report Contents:

|                                        |   |
|----------------------------------------|---|
| Property and Application History ..... | 2 |
| Scope of Work .....                    | 2 |
| Applicable Standards .....             | 2 |
| Staff Analysis .....                   | 3 |
| Attachments .....                      | 5 |

## 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 structure at 205 N Conception, known also as Beal Cottage, is a frame one-story raised cottage with a rear brick projection consisting of a two-story south facing gallery. Originally constructed c. 1836, the cottage expresses the Greek Revival style with a temple front façade featuring a full-width front porch consisting of four fluted doric columns supporting a pedimented gable. The building has generally retained its original form. In 1993, the rear two-story gallery was enclosed with white anodized metal framing and glass.

According to Historic Development vertical files, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Remove non-original aluminum storefront enclosing the rear two-story gallery.
2. Remove and rebuild existing rear two-story gallery to match existing.
3. Construct a new wood stair and switchback ramp to allow for ADA access to the building.

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

---

- 5.6 Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
  - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
  - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
  - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
  - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
- 5.7 When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
  - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
  - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a nonprimary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
  - Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replace damaged non-primary building materials.

- Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
- 5.19 Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.
  - When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
  - A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.
  - Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure. For example, decorative mill work should not be added to a building if it was not an original feature. Doing so would convey a false history.
- 6.5 Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
- 6.6 If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
  - Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
  - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.
  - Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.
  - Match the balustrade of a historic porch to the design and materials of the porch.
  - When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.
  - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.
  - Do not use cast-iron columns or railing where no evidence exists that these elements were used historically.
  - Do not use a brick base for a wood column (exception is Craftsman styles).
  - Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).
  - Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property under review is a contributing property to the DeTonti Square Historic District. The subject application proposes comprehensive exterior repairs and alterations along all four elevations. Most proposed work is in-kind and can be approved at the administrative level. The repairs and alterations discussed in this report require ARB consideration and involve the removal and reconstruction of the rear two-story gallery, without the inclusion of the later-added aluminum and glass enclosure, and the construction of a new wood stair and ramp adjacent to the rear gallery.

The *Design Review Guidelines* prioritize preservation when discussing renovations to existing structures. They further stipulate that when repair is not possible, all replacement materials should match the original in composition, scale, and finish; and all replacement stylistic details should accurately match existing. (5.6, 5.7, 5.19). Likewise, for the replacement of porches specifically, the *Guidelines* refer to matching the materials, composition, proportions, stylistic elements, and decorative details. The subject proposal complies with this directive, apart from slight modifications of railing heights to meet current code. It should be considered that the gallery is located on a non-primary elevation, and the alterations are meant to create a more accessible entrance to the building. The new wood stair and switchback

ramp would be constructed from compliant materials (wood) and would be designed and placed to minimize impact to the architectural integrity of the original structure.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

---

Mr. Steven Stone, as the project architect, recused himself from the discussion. Mr. Stone left the dais for the entirety of the Public Testimony, Board Discussion, and the Decision on the Application.

Mr. Eric Droblyen was present to represent the application. He provided a summary of the project.

No one from the public came forward to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. No public comments were received.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

---

Mr. Stephen McNair asked why the project had not been approved at the staff level. Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen explained that the extent of demolition and reconstruction of the rear gallery was such that the review by the Board was necessary.

Mr. McNair and Mr. Cartledge Blackwell both commended the applicant on the project. Mr. McNair asked if the new ramp was necessary to meet code. The project architect confirmed that the existing ramp did not meet current accessibility codes.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

---

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff.

Ms. Karrie Maurin seconded the motion, and all approved.

Mr. Blackwell moved that the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA.

Ms. Barja Wilson seconded the motion, and all approved.



## Agenda Item # 2

### Certified Record 2026-43-CA

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

4 N Cedar Street

**Summary of Request:**

Paint a 10' x 10' mural to be located on the south elevation of 4 N Cedar Street, facing Dauphin Street

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Mobile Arts Council, Inc.

**Property Owner:**

Matt LeMond

**Historic District:**

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The wall sign/mural exceeds the 64-square-foot signage allowance for properties within a local historic district.
- The wall sign/ mural would cover a secondary elevation of previously painted brick and would not require painting unpainted historic brickwork.

**Report Contents:**

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Property and Application History..... | 2 |
| Scope of Work.....                    | 2 |
| Applicable Standards.....             | 2 |
| Staff Analysis.....                   | 2 |
| Discussion .....                      | 4 |

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile's nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

This contributing property was constructed sometime around 1930 and is a one-story commercial block brick building that has been previously painted and features board and batten doors and window coverings on the west façade. The parcel was previously occupied by a 1 ½ story cottage with a full width porch as seen on the 1885 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. A similar structure occupies the parcel through the 1924 Sanborn Map. The subject commercial building appears in the 1940 aerial.

According to Historic Development Department Records, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Paint a wall sign/mural on the south (Dauphin St.) elevation.
  - a. The sign consists of a stylized dragon meant to represent the mascot for the Mobile Mysticks.
  - b. The sign will measure 10'-0" W x 10'-0" H.

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

---

**11.3** Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.

**11.5** New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.

**11.6** Place a sign to be compatible with those in the district.

- When placing a new sign on a historic building, locate a sign to emphasize design elements of the historic building façade.
- Mount a sign to fit within existing architectural features.

**11.7** Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve

the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.
- Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District. This application involves the installation of a painted wall sign on the south facing (secondary) elevation.

The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)* direct that new signage in historic districts be "compatible with the character of a building and the district." (11.3, 11.6) The proposed sign materials and size – although outside the 64 square feet allowance - would be consistent with the established historic precedent of painting large commercial signage on secondary elevations of downtown commercial buildings in Mobile (fig. 7-10). (11.5, 11.7) Moreover, multiple brick commercial buildings in the immediate vicinity of the subject property feature extensive wall murals on their secondary elevations. The placement of the wall sign on existing painted brick will also not require painting of previously unpainted historic brick, which the *Guidelines* discourage. (5.8) The proposed wall sign would not result in a significant aesthetic change to the subject property or the surrounding streetscape.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Angela Montgomery of the Mobile Arts Council was present to represent the application. Ms. Montgomery explained that she was making the application on behalf of the owner in preparation for the upcoming mural festival in September.

No one from the public came forward to speak in favor or in opposition to the application. No public comments were received.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Mr. Steven Stone commended the applicant for the proposed work.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if staff had received other applications for murals associated with the festival. Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen stated that staff had not. Ms. Montgomery explained that this was the only mural planned for a historic district so far.

## DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

---

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff.

Ms. Karrie Maurin seconded the motion, and all approved.

Mr. Blackwell moved that the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA.

Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and all approved.



## Agenda Item #3

### Certified Record 2026-44-CA

---

**Location:**

59 Bradford Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

Demolish accessory structure

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Gregory B Saad

**Property Owner:**

59 Bradford LLC

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Not Listed

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The accessory structure is not listed in the nomination for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- While of sufficient age and architectural integrity to be eligible for listing on the National Register, the property was constructed after the district's period of significance, which is 1827 to 1941.
- The accessory structure is not the last of its kind in the area and is not easily visible from the public right-of-way.

**Report Contents:**

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

## 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 20<sup>th</sup>-century apartments.”

The primary dwelling at 59 Bradford Avenue is a single-story wood-frame bungalow constructed in 1927. It is Minimal Traditional in style and clad in a red brick veneer. A wood-frame 2-car garage with a secondary dwelling unit above sits at the rear of the lot. The date of this structure is unknown. City Directories first list 59-1/2 Bradford as a separate residential address in 1944. However, the 1956 Sanborn Map shows a much smaller single-story garage structure instead of the two-story structure that is extant today. Based on this information and the minimal traditional detailing of the extant structure, the construction date is estimated to be c. 1960.

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

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

Demolish c. 1960 garage/apartment structure at rear of lot.

## 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

There is no entry for 59 Bradford Avenue in the building inventory for the nomination for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. This appears to be a clerical error, as neighboring properties on either side of the dwelling are included, and the structure certainly existed when the district was first created in 1984. The primary dwelling is clearly of sufficient age and integrity to be considered contributing to the district. The accessory structure is not original to the property and would not have been old enough to be considered contributing when the district was created in 1984 or when it was last updated in 2006. If the district were resurveyed today, the accessory structure would meet the 50-year requirement for contributing status, and it maintains sufficient architectural integrity to be a record of its period of construction. However, this would require broadening the period of significance for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, which is currently 1827 to 1941. Additionally, accessory structures have not typically been included in the inventory list for Old Dauphin Way, either in 1984 or as part of the 2006 update.

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. Garage apartments were a frequent addition to residential lots in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, especially in response to the population boom of the 1940s and 1950s, when blue-collar workers flocked to well-paying jobs at Brookley Airforce Base. The structure type is common in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, and many well-preserved examples remain. The same sheet (238) of the 1956 Sanborn Map that depicts 59 Bradford Street shows an additional 16 two-story garage/apartment accessory structures (not including 61 Bradford). In August 2026, 9 of these remain.

#### Condition

According to the *Guidelines*, “demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” Overall, the exterior envelope of the accessory structure at 59 Bradford Avenue appears to be sound.

#### Impact on the Street and District

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 accessory structure in question is not easily visible from the street. Its demolition therefore would not have a significant impact on the streetscape.

#### Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. The applicant has begun the process of subdividing the lot into two distinct parcels with the option to sell the western parcel, including the primary dwelling that dates to 1927. If sold, this property would continue to function as a single-family dwelling. The Church is also considering retaining the property for a church use that would not alter the appearance of the dwelling. Following demolition of the accessory structure, the applicant intends to fence, sod, and maintain the empty east parcel. In the long term, the Church proposes paving a portion of this parcel to provide overflow parking for worship services and other church events. Based on the submitted parking plan, more than half of the eastern parcel would remain landscaped greenspace.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

---

Mr. Greg Saad was present to represent the application. Mr. Saad explained that, as a member of the Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church (AGOC), he intended to purchase the property from AGOC, subdivide the lot, demolish the accessory structure, and donate the now vacant parcel back to AGOC. Mr. Saad would then sell or rent the dwelling on the front portion of the lot as a single-family residence. Mr. Saad stated that he plans to donate any profits from the sell or rental back to the church. Mr. Saad further explained that AGOC needed the land from the rear parcel for additional parking. As Mr. Saad explained, AGOC had recently seen an influx of new membership. Mr. Saad stated that their parking issues were further complicated by the development of a parking lot across the street which the parking lot owner, the Alabama School of Math and Science, had previously allowed the congregation to use on Sundays.

Mr. Charles McLeod, a resident of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, stated that he had no issue with the proposal to demolish the accessory structure if the primary dwelling remained intact. The Board also reviewed a public comment that staff received via email expressing broad disapproval of any alterations to primary dwellings or the introduction of a curb cut onto Bradford Avenue.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

---

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell commended the application as progress, since the demolition of the accessory structure would allow a vacant single-family residence to be occupied once again.

Mr. Steven Stone stated that he was against the demolition of the accessory structures since their loss would lead to a loss of density on that block of Bradford Avenue. Mr. Stone asked if there would be a curb cut onto Bradford. Mr. Saad stated that there would not be.

Mr. Stephen Howle stated that he was not opposed to the application to demolish the accessory structure.

Mr. Stephen McNair asked if there were plans to screen any new parking areas with a fence or vegetation. Mr. Saad stated that there would be a fence and vegetation, but that AGOC had not yet developed a detailed plan. Mr. Saad added that the parish would provide whatever screening the Board required. Mr. McNair asked staff if approval could include a caveat that demolition would not occur until a final plan for fencing and landscaping was approved. Mr. Bruce McGowin, attorney for the Board, explained the process for issuing an approval on those conditions.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that while she was generally opposed to demolition, she supported demolition of the accessory structure because it was not visible from the street.

## DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

---

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

Mr. Blackwell moved that the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA, with the caveat that no demolition permit would be issued until a site plan for appropriate fencing and landscaping had been approved.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion. Mr. Steven Stone dissented. All others approved.



## Agenda Item #4

### Certified Record 2026-45-CA

---

**Location:**

61 Bradford Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

Demolish historic accessory structure

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Gregory B Saad

**Property Owner:**

AGOC Foundation Trust

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Not Listed

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The accessory structure is not listed in the nomination for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- While of sufficient age to be eligible for listing on the National Register, the property was constructed after the district's period of significance, which is 1827 to 1941.
- The structure has undergone significant alterations in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, most recently in 1994.
- The structure is not easily visible from the public right-of-way, and better-preserved examples of this building type are extant in the area.

**Report Contents:**

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

## 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 20<sup>th</sup>-century apartments.”

The primary dwelling at 61 Bradford Avenue is a single-story wood-frame Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1927. The structure is clad in a blond brick veneer. A two-story wood-frame accessory dwelling unit sits at the rear of the lot. This structure likely dates to 1947, the first year City Directories first list 61-A Bradford as a separate residential address. The 1956 shows a two-story garage/apartment structure with the same footprint as that seen today. The garage was enclosed sometime in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. In 1994, permits were issued to reside the building and replace all second-floor windows with new wood windows.

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

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

Demolish c. 1947 garage/apartment structure at rear of lot.

## 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 primary dwelling at 61 Bradford Avenue is listed as contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The associated accessory dwelling is not mentioned in the property entry on the nomination form for the District. The accessory structure is not original to the property and would not have been old enough to be considered contributing when the district was created in 1984. It had reached the 50-year age requirement when the district was updated in 2006, but it then fell outside the period of significance for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, which was determined to be 1827 to 1941. Additionally, accessory structures have not typically been included in the inventory list for Old Dauphin Way, either in 1984 or as part of the 2006 update. Sometime in the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the first floor of the structure was converted from automobile storage to an additional dwelling unit. This resulted in significant alterations to the façade fenestration, although the structure is still recognizable as a record of its period of construction.

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. Garage apartments were a frequent addition to residential lots in the Old

Dauphin Way Historic District, especially in response to the population boom of the 1940s and 1950s, when workers flocked to well-paying jobs at Brookley Airforce Base. The structure type is common in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, and many well-preserved examples remain. Many of these still retain their original dwelling-over-garage configuration, whereas the accessory structure at 61 Bradford Avenue does not. The same sheet (238) of the 1956 Sanborn Map that depicts 61 Bradford Street shows an additional 16 two-story garage/apartment accessory structures (not including 59 Bradford). In August 2026, 9 of these remain.

#### Condition

According to the *Guidelines*, “demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” Overall, the exterior envelope of the accessory structure at 61 Bradford Avenue appears to be sound.

#### Impact on the Street and District

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 accessory structure in question is not easily visible from the street. Its demolition therefore would not have a significant impact on the streetscape.

#### Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. The applicant has begun the process of subdividing the lot into two distinct parcels with the option to sell the western parcel, including the primary dwelling that dates to 1927. If sold, this property would continue to function as a single-family dwelling. The applicant is also considering retaining the property for a programmatic use that would not alter the appearance of the dwelling. Following demolition of the accessory structure, the applicant intends to fence, sod, and maintain the empty east parcel. In the long term, the Church proposes paving most of the eastern parcel to provide overflow parking for worship services and other church events.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

---

Mr. Greg Saad was present to represent the application. Mr. Saad explained that, as a member of the Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church (AGOC), he intended to purchase the property from AGOC, subdivide the lot, demolish the accessory structure, and donate the now vacant parcel back to AGOC. Mr. Saad would then sell or rent the dwelling on the front portion of the lot as a single-family residence. Mr. Saad stated that he plans to donate any profits from the sell or rental back to the church. Mr. Saad further explained that AGOC needed the land from the rear parcel for additional parking. As Mr. Saad explained, AGOC had recently seen an influx of new membership. Mr. Saad stated that their parking issues were further complicated by the development of a parking lot across the street which the parking lot owner, the Alabama School of Math and Science, had previously allowed the congregation to use on Sundays.

Mr. Charles McLeod, a resident of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, stated that he had no issue with the proposal to demolish the accessory structure if the primary dwelling remained intact. The Board also reviewed a public comment that staff received via email expressing broad disapproval of any alterations to primary dwellings or the introduction of a curb cut onto Bradford Avenue.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

---

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell commended the application as progress, since the demolition of the accessory structure would allow a vacant single-family residence to be occupied once again.

Mr. Steven Stone stated that he was against the demolition of the accessory structures since their loss would lead to a loss of density on that block of Bradford Avenue. Mr. Stone asked if there would be a curb cut onto Bradford. Mr. Saad stated that there would not be.

Mr. Steven Howle stated that he was not opposed to the application to demolish the accessory structure.

Mr. Stephen McNair asked if there were plans to screen any new parking areas with a fence or vegetation. Mr. Saad stated that there would be a fence and vegetation, but that AGOC had not yet developed a detailed plan. Mr. Saad added that the parish would provide whatever screening the Board required. Mr. McNair asked staff if approval could include a caveat that demolition would not occur until a final plan for fencing and landscaping was approved. Mr. Bruce McGowin, attorney for the Board, explained the process for issuing an approval on those conditions.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that while she was generally opposed to demolition, she supported demolition of the accessory structure because it was not visible from the street.

## DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

---

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

Mr. Blackwell moved that the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA, with the caveat that no demolition permit would be issued until a site plan for appropriate fencing and landscaping had been approved.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion. Mr. Steven Stone dissented. All others approved.



## Agenda Item #5

### Certified Record 2026-46-CA

---

**Location:**

67 Bradford Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

Demolish a single-family dwelling.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Gregory B Saad

**Property Owner:**

AGOC Foundation Trust

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Non-Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The subject dwelling is listed as non-contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- While of sufficient age and architectural integrity to be eligible for listing on the National Register, the property was constructed after the district's period of significance, which is 1827 to 1941.
- The overall condition of the structure appears to be sound. However, bowing of the interior floor indicates there may be some condition issues with the slab-on-grade foundation.

**Report Contents:**

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

## 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 20<sup>th</sup>-century apartments.”

The property at 67 Bradford Avenue is a one-story slab-on-grade masonry structure. The ranch type dwelling was completed in 1952 and combines both traditional and contemporary design elements typical of the Bankers’ Modern style. The gable-on-hip roof and multi-light aluminum windows are typical of Mid-20<sup>th</sup>-Century Contemporary dwellings, while the wood cornice and ornamental iron details are more consistent with Minimal Tradition buildings of the Post-War era. The attached garage is original to the structure. A permit to replace the garage door was issued in 1983.

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

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

Demolish c. 1952 ranch-type dwelling listed as non-contributing to the district.

## 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.
3. Nature of Proposed Development
  - Consider the future utilization of the site.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

### The significance of the structure

The *Guidelines* state that determining the significance of a property should be the initial step in considering a demolition application. The dwelling at 67 Bradford Avenue was listed as non-contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District in 1984 and 2006. The property was not old enough to qualify for contributing in 1984. While it had reached the 50-year requirement for listing when the district was updated in 2006, it fell outside the period of significance for Old Dauphin Way Historic District, which was determined to be 1827 to 1941. The dwelling retains sufficient architectural integrity to be a record of its historic period of construction. If the district were resurveyed today and the period of significance broadened, the structure could potentially qualify as contributing. However, its slab-on-grade construction is out of sync with the raised Craftsman bungalows that line Bradford Street. Under the current *Guidelines*, slab-on-grade construction is considered inappropriate for new residential properties in the local historic districts.

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. Post-war ranch-type dwellings are relatively rare in Old Dauphin Way

neighborhood, which was fully developed with few vacant lots by 1950. The lack of many ranch-type dwellings therefore stems from the fact that few were ever constructed, rather than that many were lost to demolition. The properties at 1306 Azalea Street and 10 S Julia Street are both ranch-type dwellings of the same period as 67 Bradford Avenue, though both are smaller with less architectural detailing. Ranch type dwellings at 1351 and 1650 Dauphin Street feature more singular architectural detailing than 67 Bradford Avenue.

#### Condition

According to the *Guidelines*, “demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” Overall, the exterior envelope of 67 Bradford Avenue appears to be sound. However, bowing of the interior floor may warrant additional scrutiny, especially given the slab-on-grade foundation.

#### Impact on the Street and District

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 two lots north of 67 Bradford Avenue have never been developed since the street was first laid out in the 1920s. The demolition of the subject property would widen this existing blank space. However, disruption of an established rhythm of regularly spaced buildings is not a primary concern in this instance. A more significant impact of demolition would be that on neighboring properties – most notably 69 Bradford Avenue and 1312 Brown Street. The dwelling at 69 Bradford Avenue would be left as the lone structure on the northeast corner of Bradford Avenue and Brown Street. Both 69 Bradford and 1312 Brown would have new sightlines across a vacant lot rather than of a neighboring property.

#### Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. After demolition, the applicant proposes fencing, sodding, and maintaining the vacant lot. In the long term, the applicant would like to pave most of this lot to provide parking for worship services and other church events.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

---

Mr. Greg Saad was present to represent the application on behalf of the Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church (AGOC). Mr. Saad explained that in the short term AGOC plans to demolish the residence, clear all debris, cap utilities, and grass and maintain the lot. In the long term, the AGOC planned to fence in the property, which would be paved to provide additional parking. As Mr. Saad explained, AGOC had recently seen an influx of new membership. Mr. Saad stated that their parking issues were further complicated by recent construction on a parking lot across the street. The lot owner, the Alabama School of Math and Science, had previously allowed the congregation to use the lot for overflow parking on Sundays.

Mr. Charles McLeod, a resident of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, stated that he was opposed to the demolition of the single-family residence at 67 Bradford Avenue. He also expressed concerns that the proposed parking lot would create additional stormwater run-off that would inundate nearby streets. The Board also reviewed a public comment that staff received via email expressing broad disapproval of any alterations to primary dwellings or the introduction of a curb cut onto Bradford Avenue.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

---

Mr. Steven Stone stated that he was against the demolition of the single-family dwelling since its loss would lead to a loss of density on that block of Bradford Avenue. Mr. Stone asked if there would be a curb cut onto Bradford. Mr. Saad stated that there would not be.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that she was also against demolition of the single-family residence.

Mr. Stephen McNair and Mr. Stephen Howle stated that the lack of a detailed site plan, including fencing and landscaping, made them hesitant to approve demolition of the single-family residence. They recommended that the applicant ask to table the application and return to the Board with a more detailed site plan at a later date. Mr. Saad asked the parish council, who were present in the audience, if they would agree to table. They stated that they would.

## DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

---

Mr. Stephen McNair made a motion that the Board table the application until the applicant could present more detailed redevelopment plans.

Ms. Barja Wilson seconded, and all approved.