



Architectural Review Board Minutes

May 20, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Barja Wilson, Jennifer Roselius, and Karrie Maurin.

Members Absent: Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Abby Davis, Cartledge Blackwell, and Stephen McNair

Staff Members Present: Annie Sawyer Allen, Bruce McGowin, Kimberly Thomas, Hannon Falls, and Matthew Sanford

2. Approval of Minutes from May 6, 2026

Mr. Stephen Howle moved to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2026, meeting.

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

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Ms. Barja Wilson moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant:** Bill Webb
Property Address: 950 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 04/07/2026
Project: Paint the ceiling of the first and second story front porches on the south facade of residence SW 6505 "atmospheric".
- 2. Applicant:** Kim Hall
Property Address: 55 Hallett Street
Date of Approval: 04/08/2026
Project:
 1. Repair and replace porch decking with in-kind materials.
 2. Repair and replace (where necessary) brick front porch steps.
 3. Paint exterior to match existing.
 4. Repair window in-kind on the north elevation of the residence.
- 3. Applicant:** Southern Bay Construction
Property Address: 211 Lanier Street
Date of Approval: 04/08/2026

- Project:** -Repair in-kind and extend existing concrete driveway 15' west.
 -Install walking path leading from the north edge of the driveway west.
 -The walking path will measure 3' W x 40' D and will either be constructed from pavers or poured concrete.
4. **Applicant:** City of Mobile
Property Address: 155 Church Street
Date of Approval: 04/09/2026
Project: 1. Remove existing pole and parking signage located at the entrance to Church Street parking lot.
 2. Install Standard City of Mobile Black Decorative Downtown Signpost with single sided metal sign measuring 5.2 SQFT to say "PARKING" and "CITY OF MOBILE".
5. **Applicant:** Lucy Barr
Property Address: 1306 Chamberlain Ave
Date of Approval: 04/09/2026
Project: Remove existing deck on the north/rear elevation of residence.
 Build new covered porch measuring 23'4" W x 12'0" D on the north/rear elevation of the residence.
 -The new covered porch will be a replica of the existing covered porch on the south facade to include:
 -Finished floor height to match existing residence.
 -Foundation infill to match existing front porch.
 -Six 8"x8" boxed columns to match existing columns on the front porch.
 -Three wood steps north of the newly covered porch.
 -Porch decking, metal roof, and handrail to match existing front porch.
 -Paint to match existing front porch.
 -Outdoor cabinetry with sink to abut the north/rear elevation of residence (would not be visible from ROW).
6. **Applicant:** RyeCo Enterprises LLC
Property Address: 1255 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 04/09/26
Project: 1. Repair in kind chimney cap, window trim, wood siding.
 2. Replace in kind any siding that is beyond repair.
 3. Reroof in-kind the detached garage located to the south of the residence using black architectural shingles.
7. **Applicant:** Michael Cox
Property Address: 510 S Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: 04/09/26
Project: -Repair in-kind four windows on the north elevation of the building, and three windows on the south elevation of the building.
 -Build and install three wood windows on the south elevation to match the dimensions and profile of the original windows on the east facade.
8. **Applicant:** John Dooley
Property Address: 1119 Selma St
Date of Approval: 04/10/26

- Project:** Reroof in kind with TAMKO® Titan XT® shingles. Color: Rustic Black
9. **Applicant:** Travell Williams
- Property Address:** 107 Hallett Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/01/26
- Project:**
1. Repair in-kind or replace in-kind with any existing siding to match existing in material and profile.
 2. Remove non-original iron porch posts on the east facade and install four wood columns to match the profile of the columns seen on 103 N Hallett Street.
 3. Construct a deck measuring 18'3" W x 9'8" D on the west/rear elevation of the existing residence. Deck will be constructed from wood composite materials and will have:
 - Finished floor height to match existing residence.
 - Tongue and groove decking boards.
 - Vertical handrails using wood composite materials.
 - Three stairs to abut the west portion of the deck.
 - Pour a concrete landing at the base of deck stairs measuring approximately 6' W x 5' D.
 4. Paint exterior (BLP Mobile Paints) as follows:
 - Main Body Color: Chatham Street Blue
 - Trim or Decorative Feature Colors: Church Street East Gray
 - Porch Deck Color: Church Street East Gray
 - Accent Area Colors: Church Street East Gray
 - Other Area Colors: Church Street East Gray
10. **Applicant:** Hugh Sovik
- Property Address:** 113 S Dearborn Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:** Repaint exterior to match existing. Paint front door on west facade Claiborne St. Red.
11. **Applicant:** Pro Roofing Solutions Inc
- Property Address:** 256 Joachim Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:** Reroof DAR carriage house in-kind using Modified Bitumen roofing system.
12. **Applicant:** CAN Construction Inc.
- Property Address:** 806 Government Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:**
1. Reroof in-kind replacing existing shingles with charcoal architectural shingles on the sanctuary building.
 2. Coat existing TPO flat roof with Everest systems roof coating on building north of the sanctuary.
13. **Applicant:** Rudy Auerbach
- Property Address:** 1752 Dauphin Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:** Install 6' wood privacy fence along the west and north property line running 185'.

-Fence will run along the west property line N/S, then turn to run W/E along the N property line (portion of fence will begin behind front plane of residence and end at NE corner of property)

14. **Applicant:** Johnathan Twilley
Property Address: 1059 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 04/20/26
Project: -Replace the deck boards on the front and rear porches using treated wood tongue and groove deck boards.
15. **Applicant:** McCalman Construction LLC
Property Address: 1161 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 04/23/26
Project: - Install wood furring strips to the existing front door on the north facade to improve the seal between the door and the frame.
16. **Applicant:** Devereaux Bemis
Property Address: 167 State Street
Date of Approval: 04/28/26
Project:
1. Repair existing fences in kind, repaint to match existing.
2. Replace steps in kind on west elevation, repaint to match existing.
3. Remove, repair in kind, and reinstall four existing damaged windows. Repaint all windows to match existing.
4. Sand and stain or paint to match existing doors on north and west elevations.
5. Replace existing door on west elevation of second story with a four-panel wood door.
17. **Applicant:** Mack Lewis Contractor Inc
Property Address: 158 S Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: 04/28/26
Project: Repair front porch decking and railings in-kind where needed
Repaint exterior to match existing
18. **Applicant:** Adams Painting and Repairs
Property Address: 157 S Warren Street
Date of Approval: 04/28/26
Project: Repaint exterior on three elevations in off-white with white trim
Repair siding in-kind where needed
19. **Applicant:** Tom Thomas
Property Address: 1744 Hunter Ave
Date of Approval: 04/28/26
Project:
-Extend rear deck on west end of rear elevation per submitted plans.
-Deck size will increase from 13 ft. x 18 ft to 13 ft. x 26 ft.
-The existing 13 ft. x 18 ft. pergola will be extended to cover the new deck addition. Existing railings will be extended around the new deck addition.
-All materials will match existing.
20. **Applicant:** RyeCo Enterprises LLC
Property Address: 1254 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 04/30/26

- Project:**
1. Reroof in kind porch on south facade using grey slate tiles.
 2. Repair in-kind wood lap siding.
 3. Remove, repaint white, and reinstall 14 existing storm shutters.
 4. Replace six columns on the south facade with 6"x6" treated wood posts with trim capital and base.
 5. Replace in-kind soffit, fascia boards, and drip edge.
 6. Replace in-kind wood steps and handrails on south facade.
 7. Paint exterior using Sherwin Williams products
 - Main Body Color: Gray from Historic Paint Chart
 - Trim or decorative feature: White
 - Porch deck color: Gray from Historic Paint Chart
- 21. Applicant:** Chad E Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 254 Georgia Street
Date of Approval: 05/01/26
Project: Reroof in kind using GAF HDZ Timberline charcoal architectural shingles.
- 22. Applicant:** Poplar Home Waterproofing LLC
Property Address: 154 S Warren Street
Date of Approval: 05/04/26
Project: EAST FACADE
1. Replace damaged beams in-kind on the first-floor porch on east facade.
 2. Replace in-kind tongue and groove KDAT deck boards on the second-floor porch on east facade.
 3. Paint first and second floor east porch ceilings Selma Street Gray.
 4. Paint first and second floor east porch floors Government Street Olive.
- REAR/WEST ELEVATION
1. Remove and replace in-kind four columns on first floor of rear/west porch and paint columns to match existing.
 2. Remove and replace damaged header on the rear/west porch.
 3. Remove and replace the four KDAT deck boards on second floor rear porch.
 4. Install one missing baluster on second floor to match existing.
 5. Replace in-kind 8' section of handrail on the second-floor rear/east porch and paint to match existing.
 6. Paint first and second floor rear/west porch ceilings Selma Street Gray.
 7. Paint first and second floor rear/west porch floors Government Street Olive.
- CARPORT
1. Replace in-kind four columns and paint to match existing.
 2. Remove existing 2x4's, the existing lattice on the carport will remain.
- 23. Applicant:** Benhardt Roofing & General Contractors
Property Address: 1554 Luling Street
Date of Approval: 05/05/26
Project: Reroof in-kind with Certainteed Landmark Georgetown Grey architectural shingles.
- 24. Applicant:** Integrity Roofing & Contracting LLC
Property Address: 154 Roberts St
Date of Approval: 05/05/26

- Project:** Reroof to replace existing shingle roof with 24-gauge Galvalume standing seam metal roof.
- 25. Applicant:** Clark Geer Latham and Associates
Property Address: 260 St Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 05/06/26
Project: 1. Demolish the Circa 1966 brick interior courtyard feature wall that currently runs N/S and sits to the west of 254 Saint Anthony Street.
 -Existing wooden gate flanked by brick columns on south end of the wall will remain.
 2. Construct new interior courtyard feature wall using matching bricks running W/E to begin at existing wooden gate that abuts 254 Saint Anthony Street, flanked by two existing brick columns, and will end at 260 St Anthony Street.
 -Height of wall to match existing.
 -12' W wood sliding gate will be installed centered on the feature wall.
 3. Construct matching chimney facing west to abut the existing chimney that is facing east.
 4. Install pavers in the entirety of open paved courtyard space, to cover 11,420 SQFT.
- 26. Applicant:** Adams Painting & Repairs
Property Address: 155 Warren Street
Date of Approval: 05/06/26
Project: 1. Repair and replace existing siding in-kind as needed.
 2. Paint exterior to match existing.
- 27. Applicant:** Pools on the Gulf LLC
Property Address: 9 Julia Street
Date of Approval: 04/06/26
Project: 1. Install a 27'3" W x 14'7" L in-ground Gunite kidney shaped pool 14' to the east/rear of the existing residence.
 2. Install an elevated circular pool with a diameter of 7' on the southeastern edge of the kidney shaped pool.
 3. Surround the pools with a 4' W paver pool deck with paver walkways leading to the existing deck, 9' W walkway, and the residence, 4'W walkway.
- 28. Applicant:** Volkert Inc
Property Address: 200 S Claiborne Street
Date of Approval: 05/06/26
Project: - Install a temporary 14' W x 36' H printed vinyl sheet banner to read as follows: REGIONS ARENA COMING IN 2027.
 -The banner will be hung from the top level of the Arena parking garage on the east elevation facing Claiborne St.
 -It will be secured to structure with ropes running through the banner gromets and the wall openings.
 *This is a temporary COA to expire 6 months after issue date.
- 29. Applicant:** I am roofing LLC
Property Address: 256 Rapier Ave

- Date of Approval:** 05/08/26
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 30. Applicant:** I am roofing LLC
Property Address: 254 Rapier Ave
Date of Approval: 05/08/26
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 31. Applicant:** Teague Construction Systems Inc
Property Address: 307 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 05/11/26
Project: 1. Reroof in-kind using Owens Architectural shingle. Color: Teak
 2. Paint roof of dormers grey to match existing.
- 32. Applicant:** Peak Roofing Solutions
Property Address: 1010 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 05/11/26
Project: Reroof in-kind with IKO Cambridge black architectural shingles.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-27-CA

Address: 107 S Dearborn Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Christopher Henken
Project: Construct small additions to rear and side elevations
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

2. 2026-28-CA

Address: 410 Charles Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: Jimmy Bonner
Project: Demolish historic dwelling
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

3. 2026-29-CA

Address: 205 Congress Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant/Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Derek Norman
Project: Construct a small pergola/summer house
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

4. 2026-30-CA

Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Robert Brown
Project: After-the-fact approval to remove original doors, transoms, and sidelights from the south façade and replace with new wood doors that do not match existing.
Tabled - **Certified Record Attached**

5. 2026-31-CA

Address: 961 Texas Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: Tracy Hunter
Project: Relocate house to a vacant lot on Texas Street, parcel number parcel number R022910380003193, and create a landscaped side-yard at vacant lot.
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for June 3, 2026.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-27-CA

DETAILS

Location:

107 S Dearborn Street

Summary of Request:

- Construct additions to south and rear elevations of dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Christopher Henken

Property Owner:

Christopher Henken

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed additions are in conformance with the *Guidelines'* standards for compatibility in massing, scale, and materials.
- The placement of the addition on the south elevation will be visible from the ROW.
- New windows will be custom built wood 6/6 windows to match existing.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History2
 Scope of Work.....2
 Applicable Standards.....3
 Staff Analysis.....5
 Attachments.....6

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

Historical Development records show that the contributing dwelling at 107 S Dearborn Street was constructed in 1895 by Virginia E Mitchell. The Victorian style shotgun home features a porch with three bays and a front gabled roof supported by four square posts with decorative scroll work and spindles. The existing post columns were installed sometime after 1979, replacing turned columns of unusual design with 5 sections displaying different designs.

Prior to the construction of the structure in 1895, a small shed occupied the lot as seen on the 1891 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The subject dwelling then appears on the 1904 Sanborn Map under the address 105 S Dearborn Street. On this map, the dwelling is a one-story rectangular structure with a full width porch on the west façade, a porch on the southeast elevation, and detached structure to the rear. The address then appears on the 1924 Sanborn map as 103/107 S Dearborn Street with the southeast porch enclosed. Sometime after 1955 a rear projection was added onto the back of 107 S Dearborn street to create a bathroom for the dwelling. Otherwise, the footprint appears to be largely unchanged.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a 6'6" W x 16'11" D addition on the south elevation
 - a. Addition will have
 - i. A steeply pitched hipped roof.
 1. Shingles to match existing roof
 2. With soffit and fascia boards to match existing.
 - ii. Pine siding to match existing in profile, lap, and dimensions.
 - iii. One custom built wood six-over-six window to match the dimensions of the original windows (applicant clarified lite design even though the elevation drawings depict one-over-one).
 - iv. Brick piers that match existing
 1. Foundation infill will match existing wood diagonal lattice
 - v. Floor height of addition will match existing structure
2. Construct addition along the east (rear) elevation of the existing structure that measures 15'0" W x 14'5" D.
 - b. Addition will have
 - i. Clipped gable roof clad in shingles to match existing.
 1. Soffit and fascia boards to match existing.
 - ii. Pine siding to match existing in profile, lap, and dimensions.

- iii. Four custom built wood six-over-six windows to match the dimensions of the original windows (applicant clarified lite design even though the elevation drawings depict one-over-one).
- iv. Brick piers that match existing
 - 1. Foundation infill will match existing wood diagonal lattice
- v. Floor height of addition will match existing structure

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 6.9 Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
 - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
 - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
- 6.10 Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
 - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
 - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
 - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
- 6.11 Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
- 6.12 Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
 - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
 - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
- 6.13 Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
 - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
 - Use a material with proven durability.
 - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
 - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
 - Do not use a faux stucco application.
- 6.14 Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.

- Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
- Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
- 6.15 Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
 - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
 - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
- 6.20 Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
 - Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.
- 6.21 Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
 - Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
 - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

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

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review proposes two one-story additions: a 6'6" W x 16'11" D addition on the south elevation; and a 15'0" W x 14'5" D rear addition on the east elevation.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to and compatible with the main structure in placement, massing, scale and rhythm. This application mostly achieves these objectives with the placement of the east addition to the rear of the property, which would not be visible from the ROW and would sit behind the primary massing of the structure. However, the placement of the addition on the south elevation would be visible from the ROW. Similar additions to traditional shotgun homes can be seen at surrounding homes such as 152 S Dearborn Street. Additionally, the roof proposed for the for the addition also sits subordinate to the height of the existing primary roof. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 – 6.11, 6.14, 6.15)

The *Guidelines* also say to clearly differentiate the exterior walls of the existing structure and the addition. The applicant has stated that corner boards would be added to the addition on the east elevation, distinguishing new construction from original. (6.12, 6.13) The two additions will also feature five new custom wood six-over-six windows that would match the existing windows in materials, profile, and design (6.21).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Christopher Henken, owner of property, presented the project to the Board.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Catarina Echols commended Mr. Henken for re-using existing materials and matching the new to the existing.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius agreed with Ms. Echols.

Ms. Karrie Maurin wanted the record to state that wood six-over-six windows will be used.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Karrie Maurin moved to find the facts as written.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stephen Howle moved that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2026-28-CA

DETAILS

Location:

410 Charles Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish historic dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Anthony Hayes of AA&A Demolition

Property Owner:

Jimmy Bonner

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The property has been cited by Municipal Enforcement
- The application includes a proposed redevelopment plan to maintain the cleared space.

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 410 Charles Street is a contributing circa 1928 shotgun dwelling that displays restrained craftsman detailing. The building first appears in the 1928 City Directory and later on the 1956 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The dwelling sits on raised brick piers, features a front gabled roof with exposed rafters, and wood siding. The structure has sustained significant damage including loss of the front porch and gable, and portion of its rear massing. The porch and gable were deleted sometime around 2014 with damage to the rear of the property occurring sometime after 2016.

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 410 Charles Street is listed as a contributing property in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The modest shotgun that previously displayed a full-width front porch represents a common form throughout Mobile's historic districts. However, with the loss of the gable and front porch around 2014, the integrity of the original restrained craftsman detailing has been compromised. The property has been cited by Municipal Enforcement as a public nuisance since 2019.

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 form expressed at 410 Charles Street is common to the local area and similar examples of the style can be seen at 407 and 409 Charles Street.

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 neighboring residence, 404 Charles Street, sits far back on the lot creating a break in the rhythm of development seen along Charles Street. The deletion of the dwelling at 410 Charles Street would create a larger void along that section of Charles Street, further disrupting the historic placement and setbacks along the street.

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 stated the intention for the cleared parcel will be to maintain the property as a cleared lot.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Catrina Bonner presented the project to the Board and explained that the house is in probate as her father passed without a will.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stephen Howle asked staff if the home had been cited by the city.

Mr. Matthew Sanford said there was a 30-day stay from Municipal Enforcement.

Mr. Bruce McGowin explained to the applicant what it means to have the property slated for demolition by the city.

Ms. Barja Wilson asked the applicant if there were plans for the property after demolition.

Ms. Robbins replied that the hope is to build a single-family home on the property eventually; however, the plan for now is to keep the lot clear.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Stephen Howle moved to find the facts as written.

Ms. Karrie Maurin seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Barja Wilson moved that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a demolition COA.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2026-29-CA

DETAILS

Location:

205 Congress Street

Summary of Request:

- Construct a 6' x 12' wood frame open pavilion with hipped roof.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Derek Norman

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The property is within the Downtown Development District. An application has been submitted and was approved by the Consolidated Review Committee.
- The proposed new construction is subordinate to the primary structure and will be placed to the west.
- The proposed materials are compliant with the *Guidelines* except for the polymer copula.
- Application only to include the summer house, not any landscaping or water features.

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 structure at 205 Congress Street is a frame five-bay central hall raised cottage with a full-width front porch. This house originally sat at the southwest corner of St. Anthony and N. Hamilton streets (orientated to St. Anthony Street), where it was constructed c. 1886. It's representation on the 1891 Sanborn Map shows a rear projecting wing on the east end of the south elevation. The structure was moved to its current location in 1985. In 1985, the structure underwent an extensive restoration project. At this time, physical evidence was found to indicate that the rear projecting wing was not original to the house, which originally had a full-width open rear porch similar to that on the front. During the renovation, the rear wing was removed and a glass vestibule housing a spiral staircase was added to the center of the rear elevation. The open porch was rebuilt to the east of the vestibule, supported by columns modeled from those on the front porch. The porch floor to the west of the vestibule was eliminated, but the columns were retained.

According to Historic Development files, this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board twice. The first time it appeared was in 1985, when plans for the restoration of the property were approved. The second time was on July 17, 2024 where plans were presented to rebuild the rear porch and were approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a 6' W x 12' D x 8'8" H summer house to the west of existing structure. The structure will have:
 - a. Eight 6" square support columns.
 - b. A gabled standing seam copper metal roof with a central 24"W x 24"D x 39"H polymer cupola with acrylic clear light and external muntins and crown molding.
 - c. Framed wood lattice detailing with arched openings on the north, south, and east elevations.
 - d. Hardie clapboard siding on the west elevation.
 - e. Slate flooring on the interior.

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

- 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.
- 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)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject application proposes constructing a new 6' W x 12' D x 8'8" H pavilion to be located west of the existing structure. The pavilion will feature a standing seam copper roof with a polymer cupola, eight square columns, framed wood lattice panels, and Hardie clapboard siding.

The *Design Review Guidelines* state that accessory structures should be subordinate in scale to the primary structure and that they should be located in-line with other visible accessory structures (9.1 and 9.2). The scale of the proposed accessory structure would be subordinate to the primary structure. Although its proposed location in the west side yard is a slight departure from the pattern of rear placement of accessory structures observed along the street, the pavilion remains visibly inferior and reads more as a landscape feature than an accessory structure. Rear placement would be a challenge given the main dwelling's slight setback from the rear property line.

The *Guidelines* instruct that new accessory structures be constructed from materials that are compatible with the historic district. The proposed materials for the pavilion are approved by the *Guidelines*, with the exception of the proposed polymer cupola.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley, architect, presented the project to the Board.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked the applicant about the intended roofing material for the proposed structure.

Mr. Kearley responded that they will either use shingles to match the existing structure or copper standing seam.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Karrie Maurin moved to find the facts as written.

Ms. Catarina Echols seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Karrie Maurin moved that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2026-30-CA

DETAILS

Location:

960 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact approval to remove original doors, transoms, and sidelights from the south façade and replace with new wood doors that do not match existing.

Applicant (as applicable):

Robert Brown

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The *Guidelines* do not allow for removal of original features that can be repaired. If original features must be replaced due to damage or deterioration, the *Guidelines* explicitly state that the new feature must match existing in material, placement, dimension, style, and molding profiles.
- The historic doors, transoms, and sidelights had been fully repaired, painted, and fitted with new hardware immediately prior to their removal.
- All materials remain on site and are in repairable condition.
- The new multi-light wood doors do not replicate the appearance of the historic features and are not compatible with the Italianate-style c. 1860 residence.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 4

Staff Analysis 6

Attachments 9

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 two-story, wood-frame, side-hall house with rear service wing was constructed c. 1860. The 1878 Hopkins map shows the original side-hall plan with offset rear service wing and one outbuilding located at the northwest corner of the property. The 1904 Sanborn map shows the historic footprint of the house with a porch wrapping the east and north elevations of the service wing. Four outbuildings were present. Representations on the 1925 and 1956 Sanborn maps are identical. The historic porches along the east and north elevations were removed and a rear addition constructed sometime after 1956. The property is protected by a façade easement held by the Mobile Historic Development Commission, who approved the changes proposed in this application on May 6, 2024.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property has appeared five times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

In 2003, the ARB approved the addition of a screened porch at the northwest corner of the house, the enclosure with glass of the existing two-story gallery on the east elevation of the rear service wing, installation of a 6’ privacy fence, and the construction of a porte-cochere. It appears the screened porch and porte-cochere were never constructed. In November 2020, the ARB approved the construction of a two-story addition on the east side of the rear wing; construction of a free-standing two-car garage; construction of a porte-cochere; fenestration changes to an apparent 20th-century rear addition, east elevation, and south elevation; and construction of a gate beside the driveway. Before this work could be completed, the ARB reviewed and approved another application in April 2021 to complete similar work, including construction of a two-story porch on the east elevation of the rear wing; construction of a two-car attached garage; and fenestration changes to the east and south elevations and to a rear addition. It appears that these projects were stalled during the selective demolition phase and were never completed.

In May 2024, the Board approved the construction of a two-story porch and a deck on the east side elevation of a 19th-century addition, minor changes to the fenestration pattern, and wholesale replacement of existing windows. In November 2024, the Board agreed to amend the previous to allow the applicant to alter window sizes to allow installation of stock instead of custom windows. At the same time, the Board approved replacing the wood siding on sides and rear with fiber cement siding and some minor alterations to the design of the previously approved two-story side porch. At both hearings in 2024, the scope of work included repairing and preserving in place the historic doors, sidelights, and transoms on the south façade.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace original wood paneled doors and surrounds with new multi-light doors.
 - a. Remove both historic doors – including associated historic trim, sidelights, and transoms – from the south street-facing façade.
 - b. Replace the original main entry door and sidelights with double-leaf multi-light wood doors with no sidelights and a simple rectangular transom.
 - c. Replace the historic center door on the second-floor gallery with a single multi-light wood door with a simple rectangular transom.
2. Remove existing square tile porch deck and replace with rectangular ceramic tiles.

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
2. **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.
 - 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.
3. **5.14** Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.
4. **5.15** Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacement should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
5. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.
 - Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
6. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately
 - When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
8. **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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review proposes removing the original Italianate door and surround from the main entry. The two façade doors and their surrounds are some of the last remaining elements original to the c. 1860 structure. The main entry door especially is highly indicative of the Italianate style, and its survival over the last 165 years are a testament to its excellent craftsmanship and material integrity. The application proposes replacing both the main entry and the second-floor gallery door with modern multi-light wood doors that are incompatible with the period and style of the c. 1860 Italianate-style residence. The property owner has also replaced a non-original tile floor with a modern tile floor that is not compatible in style with the dwelling.

Incompatible Replacement of Façade Doors

The *Design Guidelines* clearly state original building materials be retained and repaired wherever possible (5.4). The *Guidelines* dictate that character-defining features, and especially primary entrances,

are to be preserved in their original condition wherever possible (5.4, 5.14, 5.15, 5.17). If repair of these features is not possible, the *Guidelines* stipulate that any replacements match the original in material, location, dimension, and proportions. Decorative moldings and ornaments are to be replicated as closely as possible (5.19).

While staff agree that the main entry showed considerable signs of wear, onsite inspections during the construction process indicated that the paneled wood door, sidelights, transom, and decorative trim could be repaired. Staff received no communication during the construction process that repair of the either of the two façade door assemblies was not possible. To the contrary, prior to their removal, both façade doors and their surrounds had been repaired and painted in the white and black color scheme used on the rest of the residence. New hardware had been installed on the main entry door, suggesting it was operable. Upon receiving a 311 complaint that both doors had been replaced, staff visited the site and found that the contractor had salvaged both doors as well as their decorative surrounds, transoms, and sidelights. Workmen onsite assured staff that the doors and surrounds could be reinstalled in their original location and condition.

If for any reason the doors and surrounds could not be reinstalled, the *Guidelines* specify that a new door and surrounds would need to match the original as closely as possible. Since the original door and trim survive, it would be possible to have them replicated exactly in an insect-resistant wood such as mahogany. In contrast, the current replacement doors do not replicate any detail of the original. The original single-leaf entry door with transoms has been replaced with a double-leaf door without transoms. The new trim is lacking in the characteristic detail and depth of the original Italianate door surrounds. The new multi-light doors are themselves a significant departure from the historic solid wood paneled doors.

Ceramic Floor Tiles at Porch

Where the original porch floor is no longer extant, the *Guidelines* support installing a porch material that might have existed at the time the home was constructed (6.5, 6.6). When the home was constructed in about 1860, the most common porch type for the period would have been tongue-and-groove wood planks. Some high-style dwellings from the period featured mosaic floors made with either terra cotta or stone tiles. These were typically di- or polychromatic mosaics using square, hexagonal, or octagonal tiles made of either terra cotta or stone (see images 11 and 12).

Prior to this most recent renovation, the porch floor at 960 Dauphin was clad in a square ceramic tile that did not appear to be original. The original porch material is unknown. The newly installed tile floor features rectangular tiles of a single color in a simple running bond. This gives the tile floor a much more modern appearance than what would be expected of a c. 1860 dwelling. However, the material itself is one that would have been historically available, and the tile floor is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Brown, owner of the subject property, presented the project to the Board.

Charles McLeod came forward to speak against the application. He stated the home was constructed by his great grandparents and that if the door had to be replaced due to damage, the replacement door should match the original main entry door.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked the applicant what porch materials have been used.

Mr. Brown replied that the porch needed to be rebuilt and is poured concrete to match the previous porch with a different tiled surface.

Mr. Brown claimed he misread the original scope of work on the COA that was issued and that the front door has sustained significant damage.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that the front door, if approved for replacement, should have been replaced in-kind with a similar door to the original.

Mr. Brown stated that replacing the door to match existing or repairing the door in-kind was cost prohibitive.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked the applicant if he consulted an architect about the doors.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen provided that staff advised the applicant to repair the doors if necessary. She added during a site visit, staff observed the first-floor front door and surround. The door, casing, and surround had been sanded, painted and adorned with new hardware. They did not appear to be in need of repairs.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant who fabricated the door.

Mr. Brown responded Jemison Window and Doors.

Ms. Roselius asked staff and fellow board members if they believe the original door is repairable.

Ms. Allen replied that no professional assessment of the condition of the door had been provided, but reiterated that during the site visit, it did not seem that the door was beyond repair.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant why a similar door to the original was not procured from Jennison.

Ms. Roselius stated that the replacement door on the second floor and the tile on the front porch could be approved. However, consideration of the first-floor primary door should be tabled, to give the applicant time to propose an alternative to the newly installed first-floor door.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stephen Howle motioned to table the application.

Ms. Karrie Maurin seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2026-31-CA

DETAILS

Locations:

961 Texas Street/parcel #R022910380003193

Summary of Request:

Relocate house to a vacant lot on Texas Street, parcel number parcel number R022910380003193, and create a landscaped side-yard at vacant lot.

Applicant (as applicable):

Tracy Hunter

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The receiving property is located two lots to the east of 961 Texas Street, on the same side of the street.
- The areas surrounding both the current and proposed receiving lots have witnessed loss of historic fabric. The relocation of the structure would not change the building-to-vacant lot ratio on the street or in the district.
- The application proposes repairs, replacements, and site improvements at the receiving lot once the structure has been relocated.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
 Scope of Work 2
 Applicable Standards 3
 Staff Analysis 4
 Attachments 6

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 structure at 961 Texas Street is a frame, hipped roof raised cottage with full-width front porch. Its earliest representation on the 1904 Sanborn map shows a square main block with a rectangular projection on the rear. This form remained consistent through the 1956 overlay. At some point after 1956, the recessed area created by the rear projection was filled in, creating a single long rectangular form. The dwelling currently has two seemingly identical front entry doors, each topped by a three-light transom. Due to a lack of photographic evidence or access to the interior, it is unknown if this is an original feature of the house or a later alteration. From the exterior, it appears to be original. Historically, there is precedent for this type of vernacular raised cottage to have two entry doors, which would have aligned with a four-room floorplan with no hallway and the front two rooms opening directly onto the porch. Later alterations are also apparent on the front porch, which is missing its original supports and railing. A dividing wall has been added between the two entry doors, as it appears the house was divided into a duplex at some point in time.

The proposed receiving lot, parcel R022910380003193, is currently vacant. On the 1904 Sanborn map, the lot, represented as 757 Texas, is occupied by a one-story frame cottage dwelling with a projecting façade and ell projection off the east elevation. Aerial photos show that the dwelling was deleted between 1980 and 1985, and the lot has been vacant since that time.

According to Historic Development records, 961 Texas Street has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2024, an application to move the structure to 505 Charles Street was withdrawn. The proposed receiving lot has never appeared before the ARB. An earlier iteration of this project was presented before the Board on October 2, 2024. The proposal to move the house was approved, with updated plans needing to be submitted for the renovation of the structure. The COA expired before work commenced.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Relocate frame house at 961 Texas Street to the vacant lot located two lots to the east, parcel number R022910380003193, and carry out repairs and replacements to the structure as follows:
 - a. The house would sit on the site 10'-0" south of the Texas Street ROW. Side yard setbacks on the east and west would be 5'-0" and 11'-0" respectively.
 - b. The building would be placed on a foundation of brick piers at the height of 3'-3". Framed wood lattice screening panels would be installed between the piers as infill.
 - c. The existing metal roof would be replaced with dimensional asphalt shingles.
 - d. On the front porch on the north façade: new wood railings to match existing; install four new 8" square columns with base and capital; new concrete steps measuring approximately 12' W; and the new concrete foundation would be parged in stucco.
 - e. Conduct in-kind repairs to all doors and transoms.
 - f. Repair existing window openings in-kind on north façade and south elevation, restore original window openings on west and east elevations.
 - g. Replace all windows with six-over-six aluminum-clad windows to fit the existing openings.
 - h. Paint exterior in approved color.
2. Carry out landscaping and site improvements at receiving lot.

- a. Install a new 10'-0" wide concrete driveway on the west side of the structure which would extend south approximately 50'-0" from the ROW.
 - b. Install a new 4'-4" wide walkway connecting the existing sidewalk to the house
 - c. Plant shrubs, small trees, flowers, and grass as needed.
3. Create a landscaped yard and outdoor living area at 961 Texas Street, to be used as a side yard for 963 Texas Street.
 - a. Retain existing fence on east and south property lines.
 - b. Install landscaping to include trees and planted beds.
 - c. Create a patio seating area.

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)
4. Relocation Guidelines
 - New Location: Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.
 - Building Placement: When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and historical character of the streetscape and district.
 - Where possible, relocate a building to a site that is similar in size as perceived from the street. (12.0)
5. **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.
6. **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)

7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
8. **6.6** If [porch] 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.
9. **6.8** Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations and foundation infill to reflect historic character.
 - Maintain the original rhythm of a foundation.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building.
 - If used, hang lattice below the skirts board or siding between piers and frame with trim.
 - Recess foundation screening from the front of the foundation piers.
 - Use a construction that results in screening that respects the historic character of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves relocating the historic structure at 961 Texas Street to a vacant lot located on two properties to the east on the same side of Texas Street. Both properties are located in the locally-only designated portion of Oakleigh Garden District. The applicant owns both lots and has plans to carry out improvements to the structure and property once relocated.

The Code of the City of Mobile (Chapter 44, Article IV, Sec. 44-80) requires that the ARB not grant a Certificate of Appropriateness “for the demolition or relocation of any Historic Property or property within a local Historic District unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historic or architectural character of the District.”

The structure to be moved is located in the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The house would be removed from its current site, subsequently producing an end result for Texas Street identical to a demolition. Therefore, when relocation is considered, the *Guidelines* direct consideration of the following: the significance of the structure, the impact on the street and district, the nature of proposed development at the origination property, the new location, and the building placement of the relocated building. (12.0)

The significance of the structure

The house at 961 Texas is listed as a contributing property in the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The modest raised Creole cottage with full-width front porch and two front doors represents a vernacular form common throughout the Southeast. The subject property is a hipped-roof structure with a later enclosed rear portion, intended to create more living space. Although quite a bit of alterations have been carried out on the property, especially to the front porch, most of the alterations are superficial and do not compromise the historic integrity of the structure.

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 raised Creole cottage form, such as the one located at 961 Texas 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, a substantial number have been and continue to be lost.

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 taken into account. Approximately half of the historic dwellings once extant on the portion of Texas Street where the house now sits have been lost. The 1956 Sanborn map shows fourteen homes on the block, five sitting on the north side of Texas and nine sitting on the south side (including 961 Texas). Three out of five have been lost on the north side of the street, and four out of nine on the south side. With the applicant’s intent to move the dwelling to a lot on the same block and side of the street, the empty lot to historic building ratio will remain unchanged.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. Conceptual plans for a landscaped side yard that would relate to the house at 963 Texas Street have been submitted with the application. The applicant intends to create an outdoor space which would include retaining the existing fence that runs along the east and south lot lines, the installation of flowering trees and raised beds, and the creation of a patio seating area. Although the *Guidelines* do not specifically address creating a side yard at an adjacent property, there is precedent for this scenario in Mobile’s historic districts. One such example is 603 Church Street, which has incorporated the adjacent lot to the west into a fenced side yard.

Relocation Guidelines: New location

In regard to the receiving location, the *Guidelines* state, “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.” The receiving site is located two lots to the east of 961 Texas and is also within the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. As discussed above, the historic dwelling which originated on the lot was demolished in the 1980s and has been vacant since that time.

All repairs proposed for the structure are in-kind and are compliant with the *Guidelines*. (5.4, 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11, 5.13 – 5.15, 5.17)

Of note on the front porch is the proposed replacement of the extant metal posts with four 8" square columns. The *Guidelines* stipulate that if replacement of a porch element is required, the replacement must match the original. The extant metal posts are not original to the structure. Replacing the metal posts with the proposed columns better reflect the historic character of the dwelling. (6.5, 6.6)

The proposed replacement windows would fit the existing openings and employ a historically accurate light configuration, which is appropriate to the dwelling's style and period of construction. The aluminum-clad material is approved for installation in contributing residences in Mobile's historic districts. (5.21, 5.22)

The application's proposed site improvements comply with the *Guidelines'* standards for walks, driveways, and landscaping. (10.5, 10.7, 10.10)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Tracy Hunter, owner of the properties, and her son Mr. Joshua Hunter presented the project to the Board.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked staff if the application is the same as it was previously presented to the Board.

Mr. Matthew Sanford clarified that the relocation of the previous structure was approved and the renovation had been tabled last time. He continued that the current application includes updated changes from comments made previously by the Board.

Ms. Karrie Maurin appreciated the number of details provided by the applicant for the renovation.

Ms. Roselius and Mr. Stephen Howle agreed with Ms. Maurin's comments.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Stephen Howle moved to find the facts as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Barja Wilson moved that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.