



Architectural Review Board Minutes

November 19, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:02 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Catarina Echols, Jennifer Roselius, Stephen McNair, Stephen Howle, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, and Cartledge Blackwell

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Kimberly Branch-Thomas, Hannon Falls, Marion McElroy, Bruce McGowin, Matthew Sanford, and Meredith Wilson

2. Approval of Minutes from May October 15, 2025

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the October 15th, 2025, meeting.

The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

Approved

- Applicant:** WRICO Signs
Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 09/25/2025
Project: Install a 30" x 74" single-faced pan sign with flat cut lettering.
Letters will be mounted with angle brackets and attached to center of storefront transom.
Sign will read "Canfor" in black letters on white background.
- Applicant:** Old Shell Real Estate
Property Address: 1321 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 09/25/2025

- Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter
3. **Applicant:** Novare LLC
Property Address: 154 Davitt Ave
Date of Approval: 09/26/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black Shadow
4. **Applicant:** Morgan Harlan
Property Address: 310 Regina Ave
Date of Approval: 09/26/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
5. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors
Property Address: 358 Adler Ave
Date of Approval: 09/30/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal Black
6. **Applicant:** Porchlight LLC
Property Address: 413 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 9/30/25
Project: Temporary removal of projecting blade signage for repairs and renovations to the sign and historic structure. The sign will be replaced after renovations are complete.
7. **Applicant:** ASF Contracting LLC
Property Address: 153 S Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 10/01/25
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Old English Pewter
8. **Applicant:** Moore Housing Group
Property Address: 1719 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/01/25
Project: Install a low-sloping wood walkway to accommodate ADA compliance. Sidewalk will measure approximately 3'-0" wide and will extend from front entry door on east side of facade, westward for 33' -9 1/4" The walkway will sit behind (south) existing concrete walkway, minimally visible from ROW
9. **Applicant:** Big Moore Roofing
Property Address: 1358 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/02/25
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black
10. **Applicant:** Joseph Hartman
Property Address: 1169 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 10/06/25

Project: Stabilize and secure building with temporary exterior grade plywood to include windows, exterior walls, porch floor, etc. Open roof will be 'dried in' in anticipation of a reroof permit.
THIS TEMPORARY COA IS VALID FOR 60 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF ISSUANCE

11. **Applicant:** Jessica Muraro
Property Address: 1056 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 10/07/25
Project: Repair rotten clapboards where needed.
Repaint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
Main body: Classic Light Buff
Trim: Classic Sand Porch
Deck: Siberian Haze
Accent/Door colors: Roycroft Bronze Green
Porch ceiling: Haint Blue
Add pea gravel to the existing driveway area.
12. **Applicant:** John Robert Hunnicutt Jr. dba Extreme Roofing
Property Address: 157 Hannon Ave
Date of Approval: 10/07/25
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black
13. **Applicant:** Tracy Boyd
Property Address: 61 S Georgia Ave
Date of Approval: 10/08/25
Project: Replace damaged siding, porch railings, and decking in-kind where needed.
Repaint exterior in following BLP Mobile colors:
Body - DE Tonti Square Off White
Trim- Pure White
Porch and shutters - Chatham Street Blue
14. **Applicant:** The City of Mobile AE Department
Property Address: 6 S Joachim Street
Date of Approval: 10/13/25
Project: Reroof with PVC membrane system. Addition of overflow scuppers.
Replacement in kind of damaged terracotta coping. Existing wall mounted ladders will be replaced with OSHA approved ladders.
15. **Applicant:** Sarah Brock
Property Address: 302 George Street
Date of Approval: 10/15/2025
Project: 1). Remove non-historic rear door, metal stairs, and exterior wall of enclosed rear porch. 2). Construct a wood rear covered deck on west elevation. A. Deck will measure 20'-5" W x 15'-5" D. b. Deck will sit on a

raised elevation of brick piers with framed wood lattice infill panels. Foundation height will match that of existing houses. c. A gable roof will cover the deck, clad in shingles to match existing supported by 6 wood box columns, evenly spaced across the west and north elevations. d. A standard wood picket balustrade will enclose the deck between columns. e. A wood staircase and balustrade will project off the south elevation of the deck and descend southward to access an existing lower deck. f. Framed wood lattice foundation infill panels will be installed below the staircase. 3) Fenestration alterations: a. Install multi-lite wood French doors on west (rear) elevation to access the deck. -Doors will be located south of the existing double windows. -Each door will measure 3'-0" W x 8'-0" H and new door opening will be framed with wood trim. b. Remove one non-historic windows along the north elevation to accommodate kitchen renovation. c. Replace one existing non-historic window on north elevation with an aluminum-clad wood six-over-six window measuring 3'-0" W x 4'-0" H. The window opening will be slightly resized to accommodate the new window size. 4) Repaint exterior of house and rear deck in following colors: Main body and porch. Dior grey 40 Trim White Shutters - Mobile BLP Bellingrath Green 5). Reroof existing dwelling to match existing.

16. **Applicant:** Koch and Wilson Architects
Property Address: 110 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/14/2025
Project: Remove selective areas of exterior cladding to determine the location of original window openings for rehabilitation project.
17. **Applicant:** Fast Signs of Mobile
Property Address: 558 St Francis Street
Date of Approval: 10/14/25
Project: Install a Dibond wall sign on west elevation. The sign will measure 34" x 34". The sign will be black with white graphics and lettering to read: "The Residences of 558 ST. Francis at Temple Lodge, Downtown Mobile, A Alabama". The sign will be roughly centered on the business' west elevation.
18. **Applicant:** Stephen Goulet Roofing Inc.
Property Address: 1119 Church Street
Date of Approval: 10/14/2025
Project: Reroof with timberline shingles. Color: Oyster Grey.
19. **Applicant:** John Glover Construction LLC
Property Address: 110 Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 10/16/2025
Project: Replacement of porch ceiling with 1x6 v-grove, pine, and post to match Existing.
Paint new ceiling in Haint blue and the posts white, to match existing porch

colors.

20. **Applicant:** MLC Enterprises LLC
Property Address: 1664 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/17/2025
Project: Paint exterior of secondary structure/guest house
Main Body: Sherman Williams/Antique White
Trim or decorative feature: Wood Grain/Grayish Black
Replace front door of secondary structure/guest house with wooden door that is 32" wide
Install AC unit along the right side of the secondary structure/guest house with addition of wooden shelter over AC unit
Replace current porch decking on front porch of secondary structure/guest house with composite decking in gray
21. **Applicant:** Carnival Museum of Mobile
Property Address: 355 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/17/2025
Project: Reroof gallery to match existing
Repair or replace in-kind deteriorated woodwork to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.
Repair deteriorated ironwork to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
Repaint exterior in following Sherwin Williams colors:
All exterior (painted) brick - Greek Villa SW7551
Trim - Pure white SW7005
Ironwork and Shutters - Rockwood Shutter Green SW2809
All exterior doors - Dewberry SW6552
All porch ceilings - Atmospheric SW6505
22. **Applicant:** Evonik
Property Address: 204 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/22/2025
Project: Repair and replace damaged wood siding, porch decking, and lattice panels protecting the crawlspace. Materials and colors will match what is existing on the house:
Porch: 5/4" treated tongue & groove, painted with matching color
Siding: two types (5" scalloped and 4" rounded) as applicable, mostly south & west facing exterior walls.
Trim: west facing French doorways
Soffit boards and covers repair corners with like material and replace vent cover fabric and back with mesh (hidden)

Lattice panels: replace with like material, backed by fabric and hidden mesh, painted to match existing panel color.

23. **Applicant:** Lawrence Keating
Property Address: 959 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/23/25
Project: Install a wood prefabricated accessory storage structure.
1. The building will be located on the southeast corner of the lot to rear the property. The structure will sit 10 ft south of the historic dwelling. The rear setback will be 15ft. The structure will sit 6 ft off the east property line.
2. The structure will measure 8 ft wide x 10 ft deep. Height will be 8 ft 4in.
3. The structure will be clad in vertical cementitious siding.
4. Windows and doors will be wood.
5. Fenestrations consist of a double wood door and a square wood window; all located on the west facade.
6. The structure will be topped by a side gable roof clad in shingles.
24. **Applicant:** Complete Roofing LLC Escrow
Property Address: 12 Hannon Ave
Date of Approval: 10/29/25
Project: Re-roof with certain teed landmark architectural shingle in cobblestone gray.
Install new flashing on the chimney.
25. **Applicant:** Home Renovations and Remodeling
Property Address: 253 St Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 10/29/25
Project: Remove damaged/rotten wood siding on west elevation below the first-floor windows. Replace with wood to match existing in size, dimension, lap, and profile. Paint to match existing.
26. **Applicant:** Marsal Lesley
Property Address: 1600 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/30/25
Project: Remove existing non-historic deck on north (rear) elevation of structure. Construct a utility room and screened porch on north (rear) elevation per submitted plans
a. Utility room measures 9'-6" wide by 12'-0" deep.
b. Screened porch to measure 18'-6" wide by 12'-2" deep.
c. Side wall to measure 10'-1 1/8" high. Cross-gable roof to be 21'-5" in height.

d. Utility room to be clad in wood lap siding to match existing. Roof to be clad in architectural shingles to match existing. One wood 9-over-1 wood window to be centered on north (rear) elevation.

e. Screened porch to feature wood box columns with cap and base, wood balustrade with square pickets, and wood steps.

f. Foundation height to match that of existing structure.

g. Foundation at utility room to be continuous concrete block with brick veneer and 8" x 16" vents to match existing.

h. Foundation at porch to be concrete block piers with brick veneer and treated wood lattice panel infill.

Replace an existing window on the north (rear) elevation with a wood-frame glass entry door with transom

27. **Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction LLC
Property Address: 7 Common Street
Date of Approval: 10/31/25
Project: Rebuild rear (east) corner of house damaged by a tree. Reroof damaged roof area to match existing.
Reclad exterior wall at corner with wood siding, trim, and corner board to match existing. Repaint repaired exterior to match existing.
28. **Applicant:** Maye Properties LLC
Property Address: 1662 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/31/25
Project: Paint front doors Ashland Place Green.
Paint front porch deck.
Add 6 wood louvered shutters to 3 second-floor windows on south facade.
- Wood shutters: 14.5 in. W x 60 in. H
- Wood shutter paint color: Savannah Street Dark Brown
- Shutters to be hung on window frames so that they appear to be operable.
29. **Applicant:** SBPG LLC
Property Address: 1260 Government Street
Date of Approval: 11/03/25
Project: Install 6-foot wood privacy fence along east property line at 1260 Government Street. See attached drawing for extent of fence.
30. **Applicant:** Anthony Saybe
Property Address: 19 Gladys Street
Date of Approval: 11/05/25
Project: Remove existing metal roof. Replace with architectural shingle. Shingle color: black
31. **Applicant:** Elite Construction and Home Repair LLC
Property Address: 156 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 11/05/25

- Project:** Repair/replace in kind tongue & groove ceiling, beam, and trim to porch along front elevation and paint to match existing.
32. **Applicant:** Frances Garcia
Property Address: 1204 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 11/06/25
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Green to match existing
 Repair wood siding and trim in-kind were needed. Repaint to match existing
33. **Applicant:** Katherine Flowers
Property Address: 922 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 11/07/25
Project: Install 6-foot wood fence between 920 and 922 Conti Street. Fence to be behind the front plane of both dwellings. Fence to be painted dark green.
34. **Applicant:** Poplar Home Waterproofing LLC
Property Address: 58 Bradford Ave
Date of Approval: 11/07/25
Project: Remove and replace elevated 8x8 deck of secondary structure to right of garage in backyard
 -Replacement deck will keep the same footprint.
 New deck to have
 -42" handrails (due to elevation) with 2x2 balusters
 -5/4" Prime Pressure Treated decking
 -6x6 posts
 Install awning to doorway off the elevated deck of secondary structure on the North elevation
 -Awning to match roof
35. **Applicant:** Precision Restoration LLC
Property Address: 122 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 11/07/25
Project: Repair/replace rotten siding along the East elevation in kind and paint to match existing.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-48-CA

Address: 1717 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Window World
Project: Replace 18 steel frame windows with impact-rated vinyl windows
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2025-49-CA

Address: 1055 New St. Francis Steet
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Applicant/Agent Window World
Project: Replace two existing wood windows and one transom with impact-rated vinyl Windows
PARTIALLY APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2025-50-CA

Address: 1212 Government Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent Window World
Project: Replace twelve existing windows with impact-rate vinyl windows
TABLED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2025-47-CA

Address: 360 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Applicant/Agent Geoff Anderson on behalf of Deas Construction, Inc.
Project: Install new storefront and bulkhead in existing opening on south façade (updates to tabled application from October 15th)
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. 2025-51-CA

Address: 1567 Fearnway Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent Amanda Edwards of Poplar Home Waterproofing on behalf of Sarah and Chad Jones
Project: Install an 8'0" wood privacy fence along the south (rear) property line
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

6. 2025-52-CA

Address: 555 Government Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent Paul Davis/PCDA
Project: Alterations to the façade including a new storefront, windows, balcony, and roof deck
TABLED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

7. 2025-53-CA

Address: 853 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Applicant/Agent Don Bowden/Bowden Architecture
Project: Alter entry along Broad Street; paint original exterior brick
PARTIALLY APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

8. 2025-54-CA

Address: 612 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street

Applicant/Agent Paul Davis/PCDA
Project: Replace two deteriorated garage doors on west elevation with glazed overhead doors

PARTIALLY APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

9. 2025-55-CA

Address: 255 Rapier Avenue
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent Tall Architects
Project: Construct a rear addition and porch

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

10.2025-56-CA

Address: 959 Church Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent Complete Roofing LLC
Project: Remove two historic chimneys

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for December 3, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2025-48-CA

DETAIL

Location:

1717 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Replace 18 metal clad louvered windows with vinyl windows

Applicant (as applicable):

Henry Santilices

Property Owner:

Senior Citizens Services

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Vinyl is not an approved material for replacement windows according to the *Guidelines*. However, the location of the subject project is in an interior courtyard and out of sight from the pedestrian right of way.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History2

Scope of Work.....2

Applicable Standards.....2

Staff Analysis.....3

Discussion.....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. 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 twentieth-century apartments.

The building at 1717 Dauphin Street was constructed in 1958 as the former Ahavas Chesed Synagogue. In 1990, an addition was made to the north facade of the structure creating a new facade facing Dauphin Street. Another addition was made in 2005 to the south of the building which created a new primary entrance from the parking lot to the south.

According to Historic Development Department Records, this property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board. In 2005, an addition was approved to the rear of the building. This property also appeared before the ARB in 2007 when existing shutters were replaced by hurricane shutters.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing 18 metal clad windows along south wall of interior courtyard.
 - a. Existing window opening is: 77' 4" L
 - b. Existing windows each measure approximately: 48 ¾" W x 81 ¾" H
2. Install 18 vinyl windows within the existing opening, between existing dividers
 - a. Measurement of replacement windows are 45 ¾" W x 77 ¾" H
 - b. Steel frame dividers will remain. Install stacked 3 2x6's for framing to compensate for structural weight of wall and to fill space created by replacement sashes.
3. Install metal cladding over existing dividers

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

1. 5.20 Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - a) Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - b) Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - c) Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - d) For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
2. 5.21 When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
 - a) 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.
 - b) Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.

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 1717 Dauphin Street is currently the Via Health, Fitness and Enrichment Center and is located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves the removal of the metal clad louvered windows that were original to the 1958 structure which originally housed the Ahavas Chesed Synagogue. The windows would be replaced by vinyl windows.

The proposed wall of windows is approximately 78 feet long and was the original facade of the 1958 structure. However, in 1990 the first addition was made to the front elevation of the structure, creating a new facade that faces Dauphin Street. It was with this addition that the bay of windows being discussed were encapsulated and a central courtyard area was created. In 2005 an addition was made to the south of the property that included a gymnasium, activities room, exercise room, toilet facilities, covered drive-thru, and entrance lobby. The picture included below is from a survey done on April 10, 1984, and shows the windows and the front elevation prior to the expansion of the structure when the was addition made.

The *Guidelines* state in 5.20 that, “where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.” A staff site visit revealed the existing windows had cracked windowpanes, flaking paint, and significant amounts of rust. Section 5.21 of the *Guidelines* says, “when historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.” The proposed window replacements are not of the same design or material, and it is unclear whether the deterioration noted renders the subject windows unrepairable. However, it should be noted that the location of the proposed window replacements is no longer visible from any location outside of the structure. Additionally, the property owners have expressed concerns regarding the safety of their clientele given the condition of the windows and the lack of insulation. They also feel that the condition of the windows has impaired their ability to use the courtyard for gardening classes and other activities.

A meeting was held at the site with a representative from Window World to discuss questions regarding measurements of the existing windows (48 ¾" W x 81 ¾" H), and the measurements of the proposed replacement windows (45 ¾" W x 77 ¾" H) as there was an unaccounted discrepancy between the two. The applicant subsequently submitted a rough sketch of the proposed new window installation which includes the mitigative measure of installing a 3 stack of 2"x6"s that will build out the framing to compensate for the structural weight of the wall.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Blake Harvell was present to represent Window World as the applicant. He proposed removal and replacement of the steel framed windows in the building with vinyl windows to meet all codes and that the replacement windows would be up to EPA specifications.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair questioned staff about which elevation this window is on.

Meredith Wilson clarified that the windows face an interior courtyard.

Mr. Harvell interjected that their main concern in this project is safety for the community at VIA.

Ms. Echols questioned if Window World has considered aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Harvell responded that they are also concerned with cost to VIA as they are a non-profit. He added that Window World only supplies and sells vinyl windows.

Ms. Roselius then stated that vinyl is not an approvable material per the *Guidelines*. However, she said that she is less concerned as the windows are in an interior courtyard of a non-contributing structure. She then reiterated that the material is not approved for use in historic districts.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked again if VIA had considered any other material.

Mr. Harvell stated the vinyl windows will last “as long as the building will be there” and that the vinyl looks like a wood window.

Ms. Echols asked staff about the longevity of vinyl windows

Meredith Wilson responded that typically vinyl windows last 15-20 years. She added that she does not know the contents of the warranty as Window World does not post their warranty on their website.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor reiterated that the Board makes decisions based on the guidelines and then asks how many applications Window World has submitted for review.

Henry Santilices, the owner of franchise, answered that Window World has presented 3 applications, of which only 1 was approved. He continued to advocate for using vinyl windows.

Ms. Roselius reiterated the vinyl does not look like steel framed windows and that vinyl is not an acceptable material for use in historic districts as per the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Harvell said that Window World employees have guidelines to decipher where they can and can't sell vinyl windows.

Ms. Roselius then questioned this as vinyl is not approvable within Mobile's local historic districts.

Bruce McGowin interjected and presented the options for moving the application forward. These included a vote on the application, and the option to table.

Deana Murphy, Executive Director of Via Health and Fitness Enrichment Center (1717 Dauphin St.), came to the podium to request approval for inner courtyard windows. She also stated that they received several quotes, but Window World was the most cost effective.

Mr. McNair said that it is a non-contributing structure and will likely never be considered contributing. He added that the location of the proposed replacement windows is out of the view shed. Therefore, he stated that he did not have an issue with approving this application. He then asked staff if more details about measurements of windows and fit of replacement windows were submitted, could the application be reviewed at the staff level.

Annie Allen said that approval of vinyl windows must be made by the ARB, but staff could review windows of compliant materials and other aspects of the application with the applicant's cooperation.

Mr. Howle said that he agrees with Mr. McNair comments.

Annie Allen asked if the application is approved, that a condition should be included that allow staff to verify that the windows fit the existing opening appropriately.

Ms. Echols asked if any other options were submitted to staff.

Meredith Wilso responded that no, none were submitted.

Ms. Murphy responded that other quotes were given but they were cost-restrictive.

Ms. Echols explained that the ARB is reluctant to veer from the *Guidelines* because there is a concern that an exception made could be seen as a new precedent.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor again said that vinyl is unacceptable by the *Guidelines*. She also stated concern about the departure from the design of the original windows to the proposed design.

After finding the facts as written, Mr. McNair made a motion that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property and or the historic district and further encourage the applicant to work with staff in terms of the final cut sheets and details to ensure they fit into the current openings.

This was seconded by Mr. Howle.

The vote resulted in a split vote of 3:3

Mr. McGowin clarified that the ARB only has purview over the exterior of building, and this window could be argued to be on the interior as it is in an interior courtyard.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor commented that if the windows more closely matched the design of the original window design, she would be more likely to approve the application.

Ms. Roselius said that if the applicant came back with a more comprehensive design and drawings, she would be inclined to approve because of this very unusual location.

Meredith Wilson commented that when staff made a site visit to VIA to meet with Window World staff, they said these were being custom ordered and there could be an option to include horizontal dividers on the top and bottom sashes.

Mr. Harvell stated that horizontal dividers would be an option.

Mr. Santilices stated that the current windows do not meet egress and there is no way to replace them with like windows for them to meet egress. He then says it would be a failed inspection by the City of Mobile.

Meredith Wilson questioned this information, stating that egress through a window is only required in bedrooms.

Mr. Santilices responded that a Fire Marshall told them that they needed egress on that location. (Staff later followed up with the city Fire Marshall, confirming that egress through a window is only required in a bedroom.)

Ms. Roselius moved to table and for the applicant to come back with final layout of windows and show exactly what the replacement windows will look like with the horizontal dividers.

Mr. McGowin presents the option that the Board can reconsider their previous decision instead of tabling as the earliest it can be presented again would be December 17th.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the applicant could send the requested materials on November 19th.

Mr. Harvell asked for clarification that the Board was asking for the width of each individual window and the width of the entire existing window opening.

Ms. Echols clarified that the Board also wants to see an updated proposed design which includes the horizontal dividers.

Tim McCollum, in purchasing at Window World, said that he could get the drawings with the horizontal bars.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICAITON

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the facts found by the Board and subject to the condition that the applicant submits elevation drawings and specifications for the windows and the existing window

opening so that staff can confirm final spacing and design of the windows, that the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item 2

Certified Record 2025-49-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1055 New St. Francis Street

Summary of Request:

Replace two double-hung wood windows with vinyl sash windows. Replace fixed wood transom over rear door with fixed vinyl transom.

Applicant (as applicable):

Window World, LLC

Property Owner:

Andrew and Heather Fabianich

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing two-over-two wood windows are likely original to the 1867 construction.
- The *Design Guidelines* list vinyl as an unacceptable window material for Mobile’s historic districts.
- The proposed replacement windows replicate the two-over-two light configuration, but the flat vinyl surface grids will not recreate the depth and dimension of the existing wood windows.
- The transom over the rear door is not original to the building and is not visible from the public right-of-way.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Discussion 5

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 dwelling at 1055 New Saint Francis Street is a two-story frame dwelling on brick piers constructed in 1867. The Italianate-style side-hall residence features a full-width two-story gallery porch under a front gable roof. Overall ornamentation is minimal, including a substantial but simple cornice, chamfered box columns, and square picket railings. The tall, narrow two-over-two sash windows are highly indicative of the Italianate style. The simple corner brackets at the porch columns appear to be an early example of Stick style architecture, which came into popular use in the 1870s.

The main block of the subject property appears to have undergone few alterations since the 19th century. Sanborn maps from 1924 and 1956 show a similar building footprint to what exists today, including the front gallery porch and the smaller entry porch on the rear ell. Both maps do show a rear two story porch that it no longer extant. It appears that an addition was constructed to the rear of the property sometime after 1956. The rear porch was likely removed or enclosed at this time. As there is no record of this alteration in the property file, it is likely this alteration occurred before 1982.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove two historic wood windows and replace them with vinyl windows.
 - a. Remove two historic wood windows from the west elevation, first-floor (see photos for exact locations)
 - b. Replacement windows:
 - i. Proposed replacement windows are vinyl 2-over-2 double-hung sash
 - ii. Dimensions: 3' 5/8" in wide by 6' 11-1/2" in height
 - iii. Muntins: Flat vinyl grids on exterior with grids between glass
2. Remove one non-original wood transom over a rear door and replace it with a vinyl transom.
 - a. Replacement transom:
 - i. Proposed replacement transom is a 5-light fixed vinyl transom.
 - ii. Dimensions: 4' 11-1/2" in width by 1' 3-3/8" in height
 - iii. Muntins: Flat vinyl grids on exterior with grids between glass

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. 5.7 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.
3. 5.20 Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
- Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
4. 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.
5. 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 resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval of the replacement of two double-hung wood windows with vinyl sash windows. The two-over-two double-hung wood windows are original to the c. 1867 residence and are highly indicative of the Italianate style. The application also seeks approval to replace a wood transom over a rear door with a vinyl transom. Neither the French doors nor the transom light is original to the structure.

The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and light configuration. (5.20, 5.21)

The proposed two-over-two vinyl replacement windows would have the same light configuration as the existing windows. HDD staff were able to take measurements of window width on site and determined that the proposed

windows would fit the existing window opening width. HDD staff was not able to measure the existing window height, and this information was not provided by the applicant. The application does propose a simulated divided light with grids on the exterior and between the double-paned glass. However, the flat exterior muntins do not replicate the depth and dimensionality of the original. The *Guidelines* further note that vinyl is not an acceptable window material for contributing properties within Mobile's historic districts. (5.21) The proposed vinyl window will be white in color. All existing windows are painted a dark green. The proposed vinyl windows would be easily visible from the public right-of-way.

The rear door and transom are not original to the building and are not visible from the public right-of-way. The application proposes replacing the non-original wood transom with a vinyl transom having the same number of lights. As previously noted, the *Guidelines* list vinyl windows as an unacceptable material for contributing properties within Mobile's historic districts. However, any negative impact would be mitigated by the location of the proposed transom out of sight of the public right-of-way and the fact that no original building material would be lost.

Assessment of Window Condition

Having reviewed the applicant's window survey and examined the windows on site, Historic Development Department staff find the existing historic wood windows to be in repairable condition. For both windows, the lower rail of the upper window sash has rotted to the point of requiring replacement. The appropriate repair would be to remove the rotten rail and replace it with a new wood rail. Minor rot and damage at the bottom of the side stiles of each window may also require repair. It may be possible to consolidate decayed stile ends using a wood epoxy product. If rot is more significant, it will be necessary to remove the rotten wood and install a wood dutchman repair. Glazing putty should be removed and new putty installed to stabilize any loose glass panes and prevent air leakage.

To restore operability, the sash cords and pullies may require repair. This can be as simple as replacing a broken sash cord. Another repair option is to install a metal v-spring on the inside of the window jamb in line with the window sash. This will allow the window to open and remain open without an external support. An interior or exterior storm window can be installed to increase energy efficiency.

Windows and Energy Efficiency

A common claim to support replacing historic wood windows is the savings on energy costs, with many window companies claiming that the owner will eventually recover the initial installation cost in savings on their heating and cooling bills. The US Department of Energy estimates that, on average, homeowners in Mobile, Alabama who replace all existing single-pane windows with ENERGY STAR rated windows may save \$120 on their annual heating and cooling costs (Energy Star, "Cost and Energy Savings," 2005). Assuming a window replacement cost of approximately \$1,500 per window, total replacement of windows in a house with 12 windows would cost \$18,000. With a savings of \$120 per year, the homeowner could expect to earn back the \$18,000 installation cost in 150 years. Even assuming higher energy saving claims made by some window manufacturers of 12% a year (which on average would equal approximately \$350 in Mobile), it would take 50 years to earn back the cost of window replacement. Given the typical window warranty does not exceed 20 years, it is unlikely that the homeowner would see a return on investment greater than 40% before needing to replace their replacement windows.

In contrast, installation of interior or exterior storm windows over existing single-pane windows sees a significantly quicker return on initial investment than total window replacement. The US Department of Energy (DOE) states that Low-e Storm Windows achieve "similar energy savings as full window replacement, but at about one-third the cost" ("Storm Windows" and "Do-It-Yourself Savings Project," *U.S. Department of Energy*, energy.gov). Specifically, a 2015 study by the DOE found that installation of a low-E storm window over a single-

pane wood window in climate zone 2 (where Mobile, AL, is located) resulted in energy savings of 24%. Given an estimated per-window installation cost between \$60 and \$200 per window, the DOE report estimates that homeowner will earn back the initial installation costs in 14 years on average.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Josh Holland presented as a representative of Window World. He discussed the attempt that was made to mimic the current wood windows in the window replacement design by using simulated dividing lights in the replacement windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius stated that there are alternative materials available and that vinyl is not an approved material to use according to the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Holland asked for the Board to consider the vinyl transom above the non-original French doors on the rear elevation.

Meredith Wilson said that the French doors have already received approval to be replaced.

Mr. Drew Fabianich, homeowner, came to the podium. He stated that the current windows are rotten and he is trying to maintain the design of the current windows.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor and Ms. Echols said that approving one vinyl window replacement is a slippery slope to replacing all the windows with vinyl.

Ms. Roselius said that she doesn't have an issue with the replacement transom over the non-original French door.

Mr. McNair asked for clarification if staff could approve the transom as a mid-month review.

Annie Allen responded that staff does not have the authority to approve vinyl windows.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report, as written, with the amendment that the applicant is withdrawing the replacement of the two double-hung windows, and the Board is only voting on the rear fixed transom.

Mr. McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2025-50-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1212 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Replace 6 windows and 6 transoms with vinyl replacements

Applicant (as applicable):

Window World, LLC

Property Owner:

Deborah Anthony

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The current windows match the original window openings and are of an appropriate light configuration.
- The *Design Guidelines* list vinyl as an unacceptable window material for Mobile’s historic districts.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

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 1212 Government is a two-story brick and stucco Tudor Revival dwelling with a cross jerkin head roof, four bay façade, and twelve-light windows with transoms, and exposed rafters. Two wings project off the central mass facing southwest and northwest. The first story is clad in brick, with the second story stuccoed between half-timbering. The subject lot was previously two parcels at 1212 and 1214 Government. The

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove six casement wood windows and replace with vinyl windows.
 - a. Remove 4 wood casement windows from the southwest elevation, second floor (see photos for exact locations)
 - i. Dimensions for 2nd floor southwest elevation: 30 5/8" W x 50 1/2" H
 - b. Remove 2 wood casement windows from first floor southeast elevation
 - i. Dimensions for 1st floor southeast elevation 26 5/8" width x 70 1/2" Height
 - c. Replacement windows:
 - i. Proposed replacement windows are vinyl single hung sash with white interior and bronze exterior
2. Remove six wood transom windows and replace with vinyl
 - a. Remove 4 wood picture windows from the southwest elevation, second floor (see photos for exact locations)
 - i. Dimensions for 2nd floor southwest elevation: 30 5/8: width x 15 5/8" height
 - b. Remove 2 wood picture windows from first floor southeast elevation
 - i. Dimensions for 1st floor southeast elevation: 26 1/2" width x 15 1/2" Height
 - ii. Muntins: four vinyl grid to match existing

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. 6.33 Design window alterations and windows on new additions to nonhistoric structures to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Use a material and window type that is similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood. Tempered glass will be considered when required by the Mobile Code of Ordinances.

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 non-contributing resource within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The subject project proposes the removal of 12 wooden windows that include 6 casement windows and 6 transoms located along the southeast and southwest elevations.

The applicant proposes replacing 12 wooden windows with vinyl windows of the same style. Section 5.4 of the *Guidelines* say to preserve original building materials and to, “repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.” A window survey conducted by the applicant, along with a staff site visit did not conclude whether the subject windows were beyond repair.

The subject property was constructed in 1980 and would therefore be outside the 50-year qualification of historic structures dictated by the National Park Service. However, the *Guidelines* list vinyl as an unacceptable material for use in locally designated historic districts. The Guidelines direct that alterations to windows on non-historic structures be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The subject non-historic dwelling is situated along Government Street, a prominent thoroughfare in the Oakleigh Garden District. This streetscape is considered a significant representation of Mobile’s historic development. All proposed windows are visible from the pedestrian right of way and are located on two highly visible elevations which could both be considered primary.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Tim McCollum from Window World was present to discuss the application. He made the argument that the subject property was constructed in 1979 and therefore is not a historic home.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius acknowledged that while the home is currently listed as non-contributing, it is currently 46 years old and due to its location and significant residence she sees no reason not to treat it as if it were contributing.

Ms. Echols agreed and then continued to say that while the home is not currently historic in age, it does read as historic in profile. She then stated that vinyl windows look like vinyl windows.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor agreed and further stated that the subject windows would be considered character defining.

Mr. McCollum said that the vinyl windows would be covered with wood trim.

Ms. Traylor said either way, vinyl is not an acceptable material.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius made the motion to table the application.

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



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2025-47-CA

DETAILS

Location:

360 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Alterations to south facade

Applicant (as applicable):

Deas Construction Inc.

Property Owner:

Propiedades Downtown, LLC

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject structure is a facade remnant of a building listed as non-contributing in the original district nomination in 1982. The building roof, interior, and storefront were demolished in 1981.
- The *Guidelines* allow the ARB to consider alternative designs where a traditional storefront display window is not needed.
- In response to requests from the ARB at the October 15 meeting, the applicant has updated the application to include wood storefront surround, including a wood paneled bulkhead and transom lights above.
- The application proposes applying a low-e film. The *Guidelines* direct that applied window films should not be opaque or reflective.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 3

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 4

Discussion 5

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.

360 Dauphin Street is three-story commercial building constructed in stages between 1994 and 2013 and tied into the c. 1919 facade of the former Wilkins-Higgins Candy Company. The three-story building was initially listed as contributing to the Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic District in 1982 but was reclassified as non-contributing in 2008 due to a loss of original building elements including the full interior and all windows and storefronts. A one-story masonry facade abuts the west exterior wall of the main three-story structure. The one-story facade currently does not have a roof structure or any interior walls or finishes. Both properties are parceled as 360 Dauphin Street. The current application concerns proposed alterations to the one-story facade only.

What remains of the one-story facade dates to sometime between 1924 and 1956. From 1885 to 1924, Sanborn maps show a two-story masonry structure in this location. By 1956, Sanborn maps show the same building footprint but only one-story in height. The façade was likely reconstructed or significantly altered during this time. The existing facade is clad in a brick that closely matches the ca. 1919 facade of the adjoining 3-story Wilkins-Higgins building. This new cladding likely occurred when the second story of the subject structure was removed. A cold joint between the two claddings supports the conclusion that the facade of the one-story structure postdates the 1919 construction of the Wilkins-Higgins building.

A photograph taken in 1981 shows the one-story structure with its existing brick cladding and a recessed plateglass storefront over a bulkhead of unknown material. In 1981, a Federal Historic Tax Credit application was submitted for both properties. Construction progress photos taken between 1981 and 1985 show that all existing windows and storefronts were removed from both buildings during this period. By 1985, the one-story building had also lost its roof and full interior. In 1994, a fire reportedly gutted what remained of the interior of the neighboring Wilkins-Higgins building. Both facades were stabilized and shortly thereafter a one-story interior constructed behind the Wilkins-Higgins facade. This space operated as a restaurant throughout much of the 2000s and 2010s. During this period, the shell of the one-story structure was used as an outdoor courtyard dining area. The second and third floors of the Wilkins-Higgins building were reconstructed in 2015.

This property has appeared seven times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 1989, the ARB approved an application to install awnings over entrances across both facades. In May 1994, the ARB issued concept approval for a rehabilitation project with instructions to return with more detailed plans. In October 1994, the ARB approved installation of fencing across the storefront openings for both facades and denied a request to replace existing balconies on the Wilkins-Higgins buildings with more decorative wrought iron balconies. In 2006, the ARB denied an application to demolish and later reconstruct the upper third of the Wilkins-Higgins facade. The façade wall was later stabilized. The ARB approved substantial alterations in September 2013, including relocating an existing stair, constructing a new exterior stair, constructing tiered decks behind the façade wall, and constructing an elevator shaft. In October 2015, the ARB approved replacing non-original windows, doors, and balcony railings as part

of the full rehabilitation of the second and third floors. In September 2016, the ARB approved enclosing the shell of the single-story building, including constructing a new roof and installing a flush wood-and-glass storefront in the opening on the south façade. This work was never completed.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Infill existing rough opening
 - a. The existing storefront opening would be infilled with a wood storefront surround with a paneled wood bulkhead.
2. Install 4 aluminum-and-plate-glass windows
 - a. Each window would be a single large pane of plate glass set in an aluminum frame with a clear anodized finish. Each window would measure 6'-0" in height by approximately 3'-10.5" wide, for a total combined width of 15'-6".
 - b. Apply a low-e film to window glass.
 - c. The proposed bi-fold windows could be opened in good weather to create an open-air dining area for the adjoining restaurant.
3. Install 4 fixed aluminum transom windows in wood framed openings above the four bi-fold windows.

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

1. **7.2** Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.
 - Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront. Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
2. **7.3** Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.
 - If the original bulkhead is missing, develop a sympathetic replacement design that is similar in profile, texture and durability to the original.
3. **7.6** Replace a historic storefront to be consistent with the historic location.
 - Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.
5. **7.8** If replacement of some material is required, use a material that is similar to that of the original.
6. **7.17** If replacement is required, design a detail or ornamentation element to be compatible with the existing historic building and the district.
 - Where a detail has been removed, use photographic evidence to recreate it.
 - Where exact reconstruction is not possible, use a simplified interpretation of the original design detail that maintains the scale and character of original or similar detailing used on buildings of the same period.
 - Use a replacement material that is visually compatible with the original.
7. **7.18**
 - Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a

bulkhead below and a transom above.

8. **7.19** If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.

- Use large panes of glass that fit the original opening for a display window. Where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.
- Do not use opaque treatments for a window, including black plexiglass. Do not paint a window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Where a storefront is no longer extant, the *Design Review Guidelines* call for an altered storefront be repaired to its original design using photographic or other documentary evidence. Where evidence does not exist, the Guidelines encourage creating a “contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.” When constructing a new storefront, the Guidelines prioritize maintaining the storefront’s original plane (i.e., not recessing a storefront where the original was flush and vice versa) as well as the “original space patterns and locations of windows.” The Guidelines further specify that most display windows include a bulkhead and a transom and that windows should not have opaque or reflective glass treatments. Finally, while the Guidelines prefer maintaining or recreating an original storefront window and entry, it does allow that “where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.” (7.2, 7.3, 7.6, 7.18, 7.19)

There is no storefront extant on the facade in question, and photographic evidence is insufficient for replicating the form, orientation, or details of an original or historic storefront in this location. Photographic evidence shows that a chamfered recessed glass-and-aluminum storefront existed in 1981, but the storefront shown is clearly not original. The photograph shows that a transom window had been either painted over or boarded. The transom is flush with the facade, suggesting that an earlier storefront may have been flush rather than recessed. At least one panel of a semi-reflective cladding material has been removed or fallen away, revealing brick that appears to have been painted. In short, existing photographic evidence does not provide one specific original or historic design to emulate.

The proposed wood storefront and bank of windows with transoms will imitate the proportions and fenestration patterns of storefronts on adjacent buildings, especially at 362 Dauphin Street. The proposed design meets the Guidelines requirements in that it includes a bulkhead below the window, uses a high proportion of transparent glass, and uses replacement materials that are visually compatible with the original. The banded windows will emulate the proportions and transparency of a traditional storefront and, when open, will encourage interaction between the building interior and the public realm at least as much as a storefront entrance would have done. The aluminum windows are also visually compatible with the Wilkins-Higgins and other neighboring buildings. (7.3, 7.8, 7.18, 7.19)

The application also proposes installing a low-e film on the windows. The Guidelines discourage the use of opaque window treatments, so any applied window films should maintain an appropriate level of transparency. (7.19)

The updated scope of work has received approval from the Consolidated Review committee.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Geoff Anderson presented an updated drawing from the previous meeting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius complimented the applicant's resubmission, noting that it satisfied all criteria asked for by the Board.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about film transparency

Mr. Anderson responded that the store front windows are argon-filled safety glass, but the glass will be perfectly clear.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor seconded the motion; it was approved unanimously.



Architectural Review Board
November 5, 2025

Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2025-51-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1567 Fearnway Street

Summary of Request:

Install 8' section of fence along south elevation of property

Applicant (as applicable):

Amanda Edwards /Poplar Home Waterproofing

Property Owner:

Sarah and Chad Jones

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The house at 1567 Fearnway is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- The lots surrounding the home are all classified as having single family residences, which *Guidelines* dictate that fences up to 6' are approvable by staff
- The proposed 8' fence is outside of the *Guidelines*. However, it would match the height of existing adjacent fences to the east and west

Report Contents:

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

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. 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 twentieth-century apartments.

Oral tradition and documentary evidence prove this wood-framed dwelling to be the oldest house located on Fearnway. One of the oldest suburban developments in Mobile, the lands comprising Fearnway were purchased, platted, developed, promoted, and named in honor of real estate mogul George Fearn. Other Fearn projects include the following: Ashland Place, Florence Place, Monterey Place, North Monterey Street (the northernmost block), Bayshore, and Country Club Estates. The house underwent a full renovation in 2013.

The property at 1567 Fearnway Street appeared before the Board in 2013 resulting in the approval of a full renovation of the residence.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Install 8' section of fence across south (rear) property line.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 10.2 Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
 - Install a painted wood picket fence.
 - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36”. Consideration for up to 48,” depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36,” or in some cases 48”.
 - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48” in height.
 - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48” in height if located in the front yard.
 - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
 - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way. » Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.
 - REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)
 - Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.

- An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
- ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS
 - Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
 - Wood picket
 - Wood slat
 - Wood lattice
 - Iron or steel
 - Historically appropriate wire fences
 - Aluminum that appears similar to iron
- UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS
 - Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Chain link
 - Stockade
 - Post and rail
 - Masonite
 - PVC
 - Plywood or asbestos paneling
 - Razor wire
 - Barbed wire

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1567 Fearnway, is classified as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The subject project is the installation of an 8' high section of fence along to the south property line. Adding this section would join the other two previously installed sections of fencing, enclosing the perimeter of the back yard by an 8' fence.

Section 10.2 of the *Design Guidelines* state, "Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered." The subject property does not abut a commercial property nor is it classified as a multi-family residence. However, the proposed fence would be in alignment with the existing sections of fence. Its location to the rear of the property would be out of the view of the pedestrian right of way.

The proposed fence section would be wood construction matching the other 2 existing sections. This is in compliance with the accepted fence materials list in the *Guidelines*.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Amanda Edwards presented the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked what the subject property backs up to.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked staff why the other 2 sections of fence are 8 feet.

Annie Allen responded that the fence was either installed prior to the guidelines or without permission at some point.

Ms. Allen clarified that the application is part of wider project, however the rest of the project can be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Echols suggested using lattice work on top of a 6-foot fence.

Ms. Edwards stated that the condition of the current fence would require it to be removed regardless, requiring the construction of a new 8' high fence. Additionally, she stated that the homeowner would be opposed to this option.

Ms. Roselius saw no issue with the 8-foot fence.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. McNair moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report, as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Architectural Review Board
November 19, 2025

Agenda Item #6

Certified Record 2025-52-CA

DETAILS

Location:

555 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Alterations to existing fenestration, construction of new metal galleries, and paint all exterior brickwork white

Applicant (as applicable):

Paul Davis

Property Owner:

Varsha Patel

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Painting exterior brick is not in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- Keeping trim, gable, and gable vents which maintain aspects of historic façade.
- Remove and install new windows and doors on north elevation (façade).
- Keeping interior courtyard windows and railing the same.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History2
 Scope of Work.....3
 Applicable Standards.....3
 Staff Analysis.....6
 Discussion.....7

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.

The building at 555 Government street is a concrete-block commercial building faced with brick. The building is primarily a two-story U-shaped motor court hotel with a later one-story wing partially closing off the entrance to the central parking area. The building is typical of the mid-20th Century Colonial Revival style that grew out of increasing national feelings of nostalgia and patriotism during and immediately after World War II. The red facing brick, half-pedimented gable ends, classical entablature, and multi-lite sash and picture windows are highly indicative of the Colonial Revival style.

first appears in the 1941 City Directory as Terry Moore Apartments. Based on the numbering of the apartment units from 9 to 18, it appears that the complex was only partially completed at this time. On the 1955 Sanborn Map, it appears as a 35-unit motel called the Downtown Hotel Court. At the time, the property consisted of two two-story concrete-block buildings faced with brick. The buildings ran parallel to Cedar Street with a motor court between them. Each building featured a two-story gallery overlooking the central motor court. The single-story north and two-story wings did not exist at this time. Post cards dating to about 1958 and 1960 show a U-shaped structure with the iconic Colonial Revival north gable ends and the two-story south wing completed. Two construction dates are therefore appropriate: c. 1940 for the principal east and west wings, and c. 1958 for the south wing.

Survey photos indicate that the one-story north wing was constructed prior to 1979. Sometime between 1979 and 1993, the gable end entryways were infilled with brick and the picture windows on the eastern gable end were shortened. The picture windows at the western gable end are in their original configuration. In 2025, a commercial vehicle collided with the canopy over the vehicular entrance at the west end of the north wing. Significant structural damage resulted in the emergency removal of the canopy.

The building at 555 Government Street would not have met the 50-year benchmark required to mark it as contributing when the Church Street Historic District was first nominated in 1971, expanded in 1985, or updated in 2007. If the district were resurveyed today, the structure would meet the age requirement. As a largely intact example of mid-20th Century the Colonial Revival style, and one of Mobile's last surviving motor court hotels, it is staff's opinion that the structure would be considered contributing to the historic district today.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

All Elevations:

1. Paint all exterior brick and existing trim white.

North (Primary) Façade:

1. Remove all 12 existing windows on north elevation. Remove 2 existing faux door surrounds and one existing blind door where previous openings have been infilled.
2. Install 8 sets of storefront windows on the first-floor level of the north façade.
 - a. All window frames to be aluminum with dark bronze anodized finish.
 - b. Each of the two-story gable ends flanking the middle breezeway will feature a single tripartite storefront window at approximately the same location as the existing windows.
 - i. Windows to be tripartite storefront measuring 8'-6" in height and 6'-0" in width.
 - ii. The western window on the east gable end will feature faux spandrel glass to accommodate an interior laundry room space.
 - c. Windows along the single-story infill of the original breezeway to be two-lite storefront windows in approximately the same location as the existing windows and door.
 - i. Windows to be two-light storefront measuring 8'-6" in height and 4'-0" in width.
3. Install 6 sets of storefront windows and 4 full-lite doors on the second floors of the two end bays flanking the central breezeway.
 - a. At each gable end, windows and doors to be configured to create the appearance of continuous storefront. Doors and windows will alternate.
 - b. The center window at each gable end will feature faux spandrel glass to accommodate an interior dividing wall.
4. Install two metal galleries with balconies above at the two gable ends.
 - a. A single 5" round metal column will support the gallery at either end.
 - i. Columns will have an articulated capital and base that appear to reference galleries on commercial buildings from the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
 - b. Each balcony will feature composite decking behind a painted metal fascia.
 - c. Each balcony will feature metal cable railings with a dark bronze finish.
5. Remove the brick parapet wall above the wood entablature on the one-story north wing. Install cable railings with a dark bronze finish across a new roof deck.
6. Paint all exterior brick and existing trim white.

West Elevation

1. Remove two existing windows from the west elevation of the west gable end. Remove existing faux door.
2. Infill resulting openings with brick.
3. Paint all exterior brick and existing trim white.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 5.1 Preserve the building's original placement and orientation.
 - Maintain the original orientation of a building to the street and neighborhood.
 - Maintain a property such that the historic setting of a building remains intact.

- Retain the pattern of front setbacks and building spacing that reflect those of adjacent historic structures.
- Design alterations so that the resulting building placement does not alter these established patterns.
- 5.3 Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic facades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
 - Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.
- 5.5 Preserve and restore the visibility of original historic materials.
 - Do not cover or obscure original building materials.
- 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.
- 5.15 Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.
- 5.20 Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
- 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.
- 7.1 Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade
- 7.7 Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.
 - Do not paint over exposed brick.
 - Strive to preserve materials on the sides and rear of a historic commercial building where possible.
 - Brick is the most common façade material, but in some cases stucco has been applied to an original brick façade.

- If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as closely as possible.
- 7.8 If replacement of some material is required, use a material that is similar to that of the original.
 - Use replacement mortar that is as soft as or softer than the original. Type O mortar is required for historic soft brick.
 - Use true stucco instead of an imitation material.
 - Do not use a rustic finish on masonry that will simulate aged masonry.
- 7.10 Preserve and repair doors and doorways of a historic commercial building.
 - Preserve historic doorways in their original location and configuration.
 - Retain original recessed entries and other key features defining a historic entrance.
 - Maintain an original doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
- 7.11 If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.
 - If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.
 - If a doorway was originally recessed, use a recessed doorway for the replacement.
 - Consider using a transom in a replacement storefront where appropriate.
 - Design a replacement doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
 - Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.
- 7.14 Where replacement of a balcony or gallery is required, replace it in a fashion that preserves the key character-defining features of a historic building.
 - Replace a historic balcony or gallery where documentation exists of its previous existence.
 - Design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the design of the original building. The ARB will consider modern balconies.
- 7.18 Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
 - Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.
 - Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.
 - Consider maintaining a Carrara glass or glass block storefront if it has attained historic significance as an alteration.
- 7.19 If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.
 - Use large panes of glass that fit the original opening for a display window. Where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.
 - Do not use opaque treatments for a window, including black plexiglass. Do not paint a window.
 - Do not use reflective mirror glass for a window.

- Unless evidence exists from existing buildings or historic photographs, do not use a multi-pane design that divides the storefront window into smaller components.
- Use a tempered glass window if required by the building code.
- Reopen an upper story window if it is blocked.
- If reopening an upper story window is not feasible, use a fixed shutter to define the original proportion of the window opening.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application seeks to make significant changes to the fenestration of the north wing and gable ends. This will include removing all existing windows and doors and replacing them with aluminum and glass doors and storefront windows. Two metal galleries would be constructed across the two north gable ends. The project would also involve removal of the brick parapet over the one-story north wing to create a rooftop deck. Both the galleries and the rooftop deck would feature horizontal wire railings. Two window openings and doorway on the west elevation will be removed and infilled with brick. The application also proposes painting all exterior brick white.

The first of the Design Guidelines instruct that the primary goal of any building treatment should be to “maintain the original orientation of a building to the street and neighborhood.” The application proposes removing the one remaining door on the north facade of the one-story wing as well as framing around the infilled entryways on the two gable ends. This would remove any suggestion of a primary façade entryway, essentially altering how the building interacts with the public right-of-way along Government Street. Moreover, the Guidelines dictate that the “the decorative and functional features of a primary door” should be preserved. Even in new commercial construction in the historic districts, the Guidelines require that primary building entries be oriented toward the public street (7.31). The proposed removal of all existing primary entryways on the primary façade with no provision for new entryways does not comply with these directives.

The Guidelines state that original windows should be preserved and restored where possible. If replacement is necessary, the replacement windows should match the historic fenestration in location, framing, and light configuration (5.20, 5.21). The application proposes removing all existing windows from the principal façade and replacing them with aluminum-and-glass store front that are significantly larger than the existing windows. The proposed plate-glass windows would lack the characteristic moldings of the original and would be at odds with the Colonial Revival moldings and entablature that would be retained elsewhere on the building. The application also proposes removing two original windows from the west elevation and infilling the openings with brick. This comparatively minor alteration would be less disruptive to the character of the building, as it is located on a secondary elevation. However, this portion of the west elevation is still easily visible from Government Street.

The Guidelines allow for adding galleries and balconies to existing building as long as they reflect the design of the original building and retain visibility of the cornice from the public right-of-way (7.14, 7.15) While the proposed galleries would retain visibility of the cornice, they would require removing the molded entablature over first-floor windows on the north gable ends. The simple design of the

proposed gallery columns is traditional enough to blend with the Colonial Revival details of the property. The contemporary horizontal balcony railings would be a stylistic departure from the building as a whole and specifically the decorative iron galleries that overlook the central motor court.

The *Guidelines* dictate that key character-defining features of historic commercial facades should be preserved and that original materials should be preserved and repaired whenever possible (7.1, 7.7). Specifically, the Guidelines state “do not paint over exposed brick”. The proposed project includes painting all exterior brick white, which would not be compliant with this directive. Moreover, painting the red facing brick would remove a significant character defining feature of the mid-20th Century Colonial Revival style. Moreover, since the structure is of load-bearing concrete block constructed in the 1940s, it cannot be assumed that there is a vertical wall cavity between the facing brick and the masonry behind. If the entire wall is through-body masonry, any moisture that enters the wall system will need to evaporate through the face of the brick. If painting is allowed, it is recommended that the applicant use an appropriate vapor permeable paint or stain to prevent moisture being trapped in the wall, which could cause significant material damage over time.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul Davis, project architect, presented the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Davis stated that he will likely have to redesign the project after hearing the previous applications, now understanding that even though the property is not listed as a contributing structure, decisions will be made on the design as if it were contributing.

Ms. Roselius said that applicant should evaluate existing material conditions.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor clarified what “contributing” means.

Ms. Roselius said that the applicant should confer with staff or schedule a Design Review Committed to get detailed feedback and discuss the project with Board members and Staff.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius moved to table the application pending a redesign by the applicant and a consultation with a Design Review Committee.

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



Agenda Item #7

Certified Record 2025-53-CA

DETAILS

Location:

853 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Alterations to west elevation entry to comply with ADA access and approach; paint exterior brick

Applicant (as applicable):

Don Bowden/Bowden Architecture

Property Owner:

Keith and Alison Jones

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed project will alter a key design feature of the subject structure’s design.
- The structure’s brick veneer has been heavily altered and repaired along the north and west elevations.
- The project has been reviewed by the CRC

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

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.

853 Dauphin Street is a one-story commercial building clad in brick and structural tile. Constructed in the late 1940s, the structure was originally known as the Delaney building, an auto sales and service business. The north and west elevations facing Dauphin and Broad streets express the Art Moderne or Streamline Moderne style with its flat roof, curved wall surfaces, and prominent long, horizontal lines and grooves along the exterior walls created by the brick and tile work.

The subject parcel consists of what was previously 5 and 7 Broad Street, along with 811 and 813 Dauphin Street. According to the 1924 Sanborn Insurance Map, all these lots consisted of frame single-family homes with the exception 5 Broad (on the corner of S. Broad and Dauphin) which was a masonry auto repair shop. The current structure is represented on the subsequent Sanborn survey from 1955. In 2018, permits were issued from the city of Mobile approving a renovation to convert the building into an event space and loft apartments. This renovation consisted of significant alterations to the fenestration along the façade.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Reconfigure existing entry and parapet wall on southwest elevation.
 - a. Square off existing recessed entry and parapet wall to create a projecting foyer entrance which would be clad in a painted brick veneer. The new foyer entrance would measure 10'-0" W x 12'-7" D.
 - b. Install new aluminum storefront entry and windows on the north and west elevations of the proposed new foyer entrance. The storefront entry would measure 8'-3" W x 8'-6" H. The entry system would consist of a centered door flanked by windows and topped by transoms. The storefront windows on the west elevation would measure 6'-1" W x 8'-6" H.
 - c. Reduce the height of the existing parapet wall by 5'-0", for a total height of approximately 23'-7".
 - d. Install a new fabric awning across the northwest entrance.
2. Paint brick exterior along the existing west and north elevations to match the existing painted brick along the east and south elevations.

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

1. **7.1** Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.
2. **7.2** Repair an altered storefront to its original design.

- Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.
 - Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront. Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
3. **7.6** Replace a historic storefront to be consistent with the historic location.
 - Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.
 5. **7.8** If replacement of some material is required, use a material that is similar to that of the original.
 6. **5.8** Preserve and repair original masonry materials
 - Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations.
 - Unpainted 19th Century imported Philadelphia and locally manufactured brick may not be painted. In cases where historic brick has been previously painted, the paint color should be of a suitable color to match the age and architectural style of the structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. The application under review proposes painting the brick exterior on the west and north elevations, along with alterations to the entrance on Broad Street.

The *Guidelines* call for the preservation of character-defining components of a commercial façade; and further direct that an altered storefront should be repaired to express its original design. (7.1, 7.2) The existing entry at 853 Dauphin along its Broad Street elevation is an integral element to the overall historic design of the structure. Recessed entryways with a vertical parapet wall rising above a flat roofline were common design elements used in Art Moderne which offer a sense of depth and architectural interest, contrasting with the smooth, horizontal and curved exterior walls of the main structure. The existing entryway on the west elevation of 853 Dauphin demonstrates this core principle of the style and would be considered a character-defining element. Over time, this entryway has become a secondary entrance. The applicant wishes to recreate a prominent entry way at this location to make the west elevation more accessible to pedestrian traffic, and the building more approachable. Additionally, the current configuration of the entrance does not meet ADA standards. The proposed lowering of the parapet wall would further modify the historic design.

Painting unpainted historic brick is not generally supported by the *Guidelines*. (5.8) On a recent site visit, staff identified multiple areas of damaged and poorly repaired brickwork, along with large spans of infill along both the north and west elevations that likely occurred during the c. 2018 renovation. These repairs and alterations have created areas of visibly unmatched brick and brickwork along the exterior wall. The proposed grey paint color may diminish the effect of the horizontal banding created by the contrast of materials between the brick and tile. This emphasis on the linear is an integral design feature, the preservation of which must be carefully considered when proposing the application any treatment to the exterior walls.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Don Bowden presented the project to the Board. He said that the building has sustained many changes and that is what he felt kept it relevant. Mr. Bowden stated that new brick has been added, and old brick has been removed. Mr. Bowden said the information presented in the staff report had influenced the applicant to consider changes to the proposed design plan, specifically as it relates to the horizontal bands and architectural style. He confirmed that the applicant still wants to paint the brick, but they want to paint it in a lighter color than what was originally submitted.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols asked if applicant is going to paint tile front.

Mr. Bowden responded that yes, they were.

Ms. Echols then asked what paint will be used.

The applicant responded that they haven't decided yet.

Ms. Roselius stated that she felt strongly that the brick shouldn't be painted. She then asked if there was another way other than paint to make the bricks that have been patched into the original to match.

Ms. Echols suggested a mineral paint to show the texture of the brick and acknowledged the difficulty of color matching the original brick. She also asked if they had considered choosing a paint color to match the original brick.

The applicant said they wanted to use a light off-white color

Ms. Roselius asked if there were any other options to match the original brick.

The applicant responded that the only way would be to find the same brick that was originally used which is impossible and that they have identified 4 different bricks that have been used on the building.

Annie Allen interjected that the replacement brick stands out when viewed in person.

Mr. Bowden clarified that the parapet design must meet ADA requirement as that will serve as a main entrance.

Mr. McNair agreed that the mismatched brick is obvious. He also stated he was familiar with the building and the 2nd tier of the structure retains the most integrity of original materials and design. He asked if the banding and architectural details will be removed/modified.

Mr. Bowden responded that their original plan included changing the 2nd level but have reconsidered after reading the staff report.

Mr. Bowden asked the Board about reopening a previously closed window opening.

Ms. Allen said that minor fenestration changes can be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked applicant to choose the paint color carefully

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor worried about creating a boxed entrance that would detract from the character of the building and potentially affect the original tile on the main entrance.

Applicant stated that the existing entrance would be enlarged to meet ADA requirements without altering its design.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor requested that the Board see the entrance design prior to approval.

The applicant asked for approval to paint exterior and then return later with a new design for the foyer.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report, as written, with a revision to consider only the proposed painting of the exterior brick along the existing north and west elevations with the color and material to be approved by the Board at a later date.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #8

Certified Record 2025-54-CA

DETAILS

Location:

612 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Replace existing garage doors and paint exterior brick white.

Applicant (as applicable):

Paul Davis

Property Owner:

Peter Gaillard

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject project retains the location and size of door openings, which is consistent with the *Guidelines*.
- Painting exterior brick is not consistent with the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....2
 Scope of Work.....2
 Applicable Standards..... 2
 Staff Analysis.....3
 Discussion4

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.

The contributing subject property was constructed in 1940 and is a one-story commercial block brick building with a wood and glass storefront and has a flat canopy.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove 2 existing wooden panel doors located on the Northwest elevation of the structure
2. Install new glass paneled garage doors to fit existing openings
3. Paint all exterior brick white

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

- 7.7 Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.
 - a. Do not paint over exposed brick.
 - b. Strive to preserve materials on the sides and rear of a historic commercial building where possible.
 - c. Brick is the most common façade material, but in some cases stucco has been applied to an original brick façade.
 - d. If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as closely as possible.
- 7.10 Preserve and repair doors and doorways of a historic commercial building.
 - a. Preserve historic doorways in their original location and configuration.
 - b. Retain original recessed entries and other key features defining a historic entrance.
 - c. Maintain an original doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
- 7.11 If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - a. Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.
 - b. If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.
 - c. If a doorway was originally recessed, use a recessed doorway for the replacement.
 - d. Consider using a transom in a replacement storefront where appropriate.
 - e. Design a replacement doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
 - f. Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The *Guidelines* state to, “preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible” and “do not paint over exposed brick”. (7.7) The subject project includes the painting of all exterior brick white which would not be in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

The *Guidelines* dictate that doors and doorways of historic commercial buildings should be preserved and repaired. Additionally, the doorways should remain in their original locations and configurations. The proposed project includes the removal of the paneled wooden garage doors that are along the northwest elevation of the structure. The doors have also experienced significant deterioration, including a missing panel. However, the location of the doorway would remain unchanged to the current configuration (7.10).

The section of the subject structure that the garage doors are located was originally 6 N Dearborn Street and separate from 612 Dauphin Street according to the 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. There were no historic photographs found that show what the storefront of 6 N Dearborn St. looked like prior to the two structures being connected. Evidence of infill brick can be seen in picture 6, looking at the east elevation, and aerial photography shows that this joining of the 2 structures occurred sometime between 1967 and 1974.

The proposed replacement garage doors would be consistent with the *Guidelines* as they would be sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building (7.11). This is accomplished by mimicking the wood panel design of the current doors with glass. However, the design would be more modern in appearance as the finish of the new glass paneled doors would be a dark bronze.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul Davis presented the project to the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked about the material for the new doors.

Mr. Davis responded that he just received the drawings for the door and they are aluminum. The applicant also asked about painting the brick exterior.

Mr. McNair asked for clarification on door design.

Mr. Davis clarified that there would be panels on the top and bottom and glass in between.

Mr. McNair asked if the exterior brick had been painted previously.

Mr. Davis responded that he had not seen evidence that it had, but there is some infill brick.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the panel would be 6x6 to match the panel doors that are currently there.

Mr. Davis said that it would be, he then handed the Board the drawings of the new doors.

Ms. Echols stated she does not believe this building should be painted

Mr. Howle agreed.

Mr. Davis asked if paint could not be approved, could limewash be applied to the exterior instead?

Ms. Echols said that it would be more acceptable as it would not be seen as permanent.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant to submit the new drawings to staff and demonstrating what color the new garage doors will be.

Mr. Davis specified that the doors would be bronze.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about the trim color.

Mr. Davis stated that the trim was to be painted a dark brown, but that may be reconsidered if the brick cannot be painted.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report, amended to remove the proposed painting of the exterior brick, and to state that garage door and trim colors be approved by staff.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application to replace the garage doors would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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



Architectural Review Board
November 19, 2025

Agenda Item #9

Certified Record 2025-55-CA

DETAILS

Location:

255 Rapier Avenue

Summary of Request:

Construct a 13'10" x 18' rear addition.

Applicant (as applicable):

Madison Talley

Property Owner:

Glenn Robertson

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed addition is in conformance with the *Guidelines'* standards for compatibility in placement, massing, scale, and materials.
- The proposed rear porch is clearly differentiated and does not disrupt the dwelling's historic massing.
- The project proposes the relocation of two existing windows and one existing entry door.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History2
 Scope of Work.....2
 Applicable Standards.....3
 Discussion.....5

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.

Historical Development records show that the contributing dwellings at 255 Rapier Avenue was constructed in 1915 by Gabriel G. Touart. The residence is a Craftsman style home with a side gabled roof, centered shed dormer with a break in slope of the roof over the front porch. The roof also has exposed rafters over the porch, which is supported by 3 wooden columns and 3 stucco piers that have the same applique as the porch. The front elevation has 5 windows that have blank lower panes with decorated panes above.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Create addition along the east (rear) elevation of the existing structure that measures 13' 10" W x 18' L
 - a. Addition will have
 - i. Shingle roof to match existing which will have a gabled end.
 1. Exposed rafter tails to match existing
 - ii. Hardie siding and trim to match existing
 1. There will be detailed trim which will distinguish addition from original structure
 - iii. Windows and doors
 1. 5' x 5' aluminum-clad picture window will be on the east elevation of the addition
 2. Shifting existing door on east elevation of the current structure
 3. Use 2 repurposed windows along the south elevation of addition
 4. Add new wood full-lite door on south elevation of the addition
 - iv. Brick piers that match existing
 1. Foundation infill will match existing wood diagonal lattice
 - v. Floor height of addition will match existing structure
 - vi. Roof height of addition will measure 13'4"
 2. Create covered side porch on the south elevation of the addition that will measure 6' W x 18' L
 - a. Wood porch will have wrap around stairs
 - b. Arched openings to the covered porch on the south and east elevations
 3. Remove existing window on the north elevation and infill with Hardie siding

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.
- 6.17 Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
 - Do not expand an original historic front porch. Additions of new front porches or expansion of existing front porches are generally not appropriate.
 - Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.
 - Replace a rear porch where a previously existing rear porch is lost or enclosed.
 - Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
- 6.18 Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
 - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
 - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
- 6.19 Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
 - Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
- 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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review proposes a one-story addition that measures 13' 10" W x 18' L with a covered porch that would be 6' W x 18' L. These additions would be along the east (rear) elevation of the existing property and would be largely out of view from the public right of way.

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 achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition to the rear of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The proposed additions would add in total 358 square feet, 250 square feet of air-conditioned space and 108 square foot side porch, to the existing 1900 square feet. 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 subject project accomplishes this with the inclusion of detailed trim which would only exist on the addition. The use of Hardie siding and trim would be done to match what is on the existing structure (6.12, 6.13)

The proposed covered side porch includes arched openings along the East and South elevation. While there is no precedent for this type of arched opening on the existing structure, similar arched openings appear on Craftsman style bungalows of the same period. Additionally, the proposed wood full-lite door for the east elevation of the addition provides a contemporary take on the multi-lite main entry door to the existing residence. An existing multi-lite door and two one-over-one windows on the rear elevation would be relocated to the addition. The door will remain on the east elevation, shifted slightly to the south. The windows will flank the new full-lite door on the addition's south elevation. An existing window on the north elevation will be removed, and the opening will be filled with Hardie plank to match existing. The 5x5 picture window proposed in the addition's east (rear) elevation deviates from the established pattern of double-hung sash windows. However, its proposed location on the south (rear) elevation is minimally visual. (6.17, 6.18, 6.21)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Madison Talley with Tall Architects presented the proposed addition to the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair asked about the windows being removed/reinstalled.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about the rounded arches of the covered back porch.

Ms. Talley stated that the goal was to incorporate an element to differentiate from the original home.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked staff if this would be seen on houses from this period.

Annie Allen clarified that there are examples of arches on Craftsman style homes, though the smaller arch may read as more Spanish revival.

Ms. Echols agreed.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about the detailed trim

The applicant responded that this element is another feature to differentiate the addition.

Mr. McNair asked if lattice will be used around foundation.

The applicant responded that it would.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor commented on the 5x5 window on the rear elevation of the addition, stating that is differs from the other windows.

The applicant stated that it would be the only new window used.

Ms. Allen said it seems appropriate for use on a rear addition.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report, as written.

Mr. McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #10

Certified Record 2025-56-CA

DETAILS

Location:

959 Church Street

Summary of Request:

Remove 2 historic chimneys

Applicant (as applicable):

Nathan Sisk

Property Owner:

Allison Russo, Jeff Hall

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Removing chimneys is not consistent with the Guidelines, however the state of deterioration may be to a degree that the chimneys are beyond reasonable repair.

Report Contents:

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

Historical Development records show that the contributing dwellings at 959 Church Street first appeared in its current configuration in the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. However, a structure was first documented on the property in the same footprint of the subject property in the 1878 City Atlas. The residence is a folk house in the Pyramidal family. Possibly, the north block with hipped roof was the structure documented in the 1878 City Atlas, and sometime between then and 1904 a wing was added on the south elevation to create the current footprint.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove 2 chimneys below the roof line.
2. Re-roof the structure to fortified standards using black architectural shingle

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

- 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.
- 5.10 Preserve the original form of a historic roof.
 - Maintain the original pitch.
 - Preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The proposed project includes the removal of 2 chimneys that are located on the west and east elevation.

The *Guidelines* dictate to, “preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys” (5.10). The applicant has expressed concern about the structural integrity of the 2 chimneys and has submitted a structural review of them. The review discusses the severity of deterioration that was observed including crumbling and spalling of the exposed brick-and-mortar joints on the eastern chimney, (chimney 1). Much of chimney 1 is covered by a thin concrete like material likely applied to seal off

cracking and water intrusion. Chimney 2, on the western elevation, also expressed spalling of the brick-and-mortar joints. Additionally, chimney 2 exhibits severe mortar deterioration, especially near the roof decking and the mortar joints are recessed approximately 1" from the face of the brick, which was noted as an indication of advanced loss of mortar and structural strength.

The *Guidelines* say to, "preserve original building materials" and to only remove materials that are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair (5.4). The submitted documentation reveals the chimneys to be in a precarious condition and would most likely qualify as being beyond reasonable repair. The applicant has expressed their preference to preserve the chimneys if possible, but has noted that there is high likelihood that the chimneys could become destabilized during the flashing installation process due to the comprised integrity of the brick and mortar.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jordan Amstutz presented the re-roof project and the potential need to remove both chimneys.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked if the chimneys can remain and the roof still be fortified?

Mr. Amstutz responded that the roof may be able to meet fortified standards, but it would be risky with the condition of the chimneys.

Applicant explained the process of securing around the chimney using ram-shot

Mr. Howle interjected by stating that this is a percussive method that involves a small, directed explosion.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor said that the usage of the chimneys is irrelevant to whether the application should be approved. Chimneys are an important decorative element.

Meredith Wilson clarified that the condition of the chimneys, specifically the chimney that had a cement-like layer applied to it, would be beyond reasonable repair or unable to be repaired.

Ms. Echols asked if the chimneys could be replaced/built back.

Mr. McGowin clarified how fortified roof grants work and that rebuilding or replacing the chimneys may not be financially feasible.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked how many fireplaces there are in the home

The applicant clarified that he only knew of 2 but that he had not counted in the home. He also stated that there was no evidence in the attic space of previous chimney removals.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report, as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:11pm