A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows.
   - **Members Present:** Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, Steve Stone, and Gypsie Van Antwerp
   - **Members Absent:** David Barr and Jim Wagoner
   - **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, Flo Kessler, and Marion McElroy

2. Ms. Harden moved to approve the minutes from the May 6, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

3. Adoption of the Agenda
   Ms. Harden moved that the Architectural Review Board find that all agenda items listed for the May 20, 2020 Architectural Review Board meeting be adopted as necessary for the performance of the ARB’s essential minimum functions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

4. Mr. Rodrigues moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Cheryl Zafiris
   a. Property Address: 1711 Hunter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 4/27/2020
   c. Project: Repair rotten fascia at porch to match original in material, dimension, and profile. Repaint.

2. **Applicant:** Gillian McGee Studio LLC
   a. Property Address: 306 S. Broad Street
   b. Date of Approval: 04/29/2020
   c. Project: Update to permit on 3/05/2020 for exterior repairs, replacements and repainting.

3. **Applicant:** Robert/Helen Chapelle
   a. Property Address: 1254 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 04/29/2020
   c. Project: Replace chain link fence and gate on S. Georgia Street side with 5' aluminum fencing and gate.

4. **Applicant:** TIMOTHY MCKEE
   a. Property Address: 1011 Augusta Street
   b. Date of Approval: 04/29/2020
   c. Project: Repair damaged siding in-kind, re-paint in-kind.

5. **Applicant:** ATT Mobility
   a. Property Address: 801 Spring Hill Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 05/01/2020
   c. Project: Install metal box near top on existing monopole.

6. **Applicant:** Colt Turner
   a. Property Address: 163 Hannon Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 05/04/2020
   c. Project: Extend existing six-foot privacy fence to front plane of house, angle it to join
7. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
   a. Property Address: 103 S Ann Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 05/04/2020  

8. **Applicant:** Kari Peterson  
   a. Property Address: 109 Parker Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 05/05/2020  

9. **Applicant:** Southern Building Structures  
   a. Property Address: 64 Hannon Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 05/05/2020  
   c. Project: New Construction: Standard design 20'x 20' detached garage at W side of lot behind house.

10. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
    a. Property Address: 77 S. Lafayette Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 05/06/2020  

11. **Applicant:** Mark B. Hammond  
    a. Property Address: 1400 Church Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 05/07/2020  
    c. Project: Replace roofing to match existing; repair/replace existing wood shingles on second floor; repaint brick first floor; repair or replace windows to match existing; replace exterior doors with period-appropriate style.

12. **Applicant:** William David III & Autumn T Porter  
    a. Property Address: 19 N Ann Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 05/07/2020  
    c. Project: Repair/ replace rotten wood to match existing in dimension, material and profile. Repaint to match existing.

13. **Applicant:** Vernon Blackwell  
    a. Property Address: 1408 Conti Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 05/07/2020  
    c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood to match original in material, profile, and dimension. Repaint house pale green with white trim, door turquoise.

14. **Applicant:** All-South Subcontractors Inc  
    a. Property Address: 901 Government Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 05/11/2020  
    c. Project: Remove existing BUR roof system to wood deck on rear (south end) of church building. Replace deteriorated wood substrate as needed. Install R-25 rigid insulation. Install new 60mil TPO.

15. **Applicant:** Wendy McRae  
    a. Property Address: 100 S Georgia Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 05/11/2020  
    c. Project: Paint exterior of house Flo Claire Crocus Yellow.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2020-29-CA:** 60 Fearnway Avenue  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Don Bowden, Architect  
   b. Project: Construct an addition containing two bedrooms and a bath over rear
porch and add dormer window to south elevation for egress
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS
The next ARB meeting is scheduled for June 3, 2020.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (christine.dawson@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, May 19, 2020.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-29-CA: 60 Fearnway Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Don Bowden, Architect
Received: 4/22/2020
Meeting: 5/20/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition above rear porch; add dormer for egress

BUILDING HISTORY

The house on the property is a wood-frame, side-gabled Craftsman style bungalow designed by C.L. Hutchisson, Sr., and constructed c. 1918. The front porch is sheltered by a front-gabled roof supported by square wood columns resting on brick plinths. A screened porch at the southeast corner of the house was enclosed with wood windows, and the covered rear patio was added in 1997.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines), in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. General guidance for additions to historic residences include
      • “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged, or obscured.
      • Whenever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.
      • Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.
      • Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.
      • Maintain the relationship of solids to voids in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.
      • Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”(6.0)
   2. “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.” (6.9)

3. “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.” (6.10)

4. “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 … horizontal elements.
   • Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a manner that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.” (6.11)

5. “Clearly differentiate the 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 the new.” (6.12)

6. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition.
   • 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.” (6.13)

7. “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.” (6.14)

8. “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.” (6.15)

9. “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 … the proportions used on the original historic structure.” (6.20)

10. “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.” (6.21)

C. Scope of Work

1. Construct an addition atop the existing covered patio on the rear (east) elevation to contain two bedrooms and one bathroom.
   a. The addition would measure approximately 38’-10” wide by 15’-10” deep. The addition would be one story in height with a side-gabled roof rising slightly above the existing
rear-gabled roof; the pitch would match the existing. The addition would be clad in siding to match the original structure (wood clapboards), and the roof would be covered in architectural shingles, in a style and color to match the existing.

b. The South elevation would appear as follows.
1) A new gabled dormer would be placed in the south slope of the existing roof, above the east end of the side-gabled roof. If possible, the window will be reused from the necessary demolition of the existing rear second floor wall. If not a reused element, the window would be a twelve-over-one aluminum clad type. A single exposed bracket would be located in the apex of the gable.
2) Fenestration in the side-gabled addition would consist of a single twelve-over-one aluminum clad window. The soffit and fascia would be composed of wood to match the existing house, and the gable end would be supported by three brackets.
3) The south slope of the rear-facing bump-out gable and a support column would be visible from this elevation.

d. The second-floor East elevation (rear) of the building would appear as follows.
1) Two twelve-over-one aluminum clad windows would be located south (left of) the rear-gabled bump-out. Two twelve-over-one windows, either reused from the existing structure or new aluminum clad types, would be present in the gable end. A single twelve-over-one light would be located at the far north end of the rear elevation.
2) The gable end would be supported by three brackets, and the bump-out would be supported by two 10”x10” boxed columns.

e. The North elevation would be devoid of fenestration. Three brackets would support the gable end of the roof.

2. The columns added to support the rear-gabled bump-out would rest on a new step and deck extension to match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 60 Fearnway Avenue, is located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application involves the construction of an addition over an existing rear covered patio and adding a dormer window to the south elevation to allow for egress.

In regard to additions to historic residential structures, the Guidelines state that additions should be designed to incur the least possible loss of historic fabric so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged, or obscured and should be constructed in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired. Furthermore, the Guidelines provide that the ratio of solids to voids, materials, building components, and color of an addition should be compatible with the original structure, but the addition should not be identical to the original structure (B.1).

The proposed second floor addition would be located at the rear of the house and would be subordinate to the existing house, as directed by the Guidelines (B.2). Although the roof of the addition would be slightly taller than the roof of the existing structure, the square footage of the addition is far smaller than the existing second floor of the house (approximately 363 square feet versus 1,149 square feet). Furthermore, the north and south walls of the addition would not extend past the existing north and south walls of the house, thus making the addition inconspicuous from the street (B.3).

The rhythm and scale of the addition would be similar to the original block of the house, and the floor height of the addition would match the existing second floor height (B.4). The exterior finishes of the addition would be compatible with the existing house (B.6). The cladding of the addition would match that of the existing structure in dimension, material, and profile. If feasible, some windows from the existing structure will be reused, and new windows would match the existing in profile and dimension (B.10).
The roof shape, material, pitch, and complexity would closely mirror that of the existing structure (B.7). Although the roof would be slightly higher than that of the existing structure, the difference would be difficult to see from virtually any line-of-sight due to the angle from which one would have to view the existing and new roof junction. Furthermore, because the house sits on a hill and the addition would be at the rear, the height difference likely would not be noticeable from the street. The dormer would be a new architectural element for this house; however, dormer windows are in keeping with Craftsman style houses, and the plans propose to reuse an existing window if possible (B.8).

The details proposed for the addition serve to marry the addition to the existing house, but they are not overly ornate in relation to the existing house. The most commonly used decorative detail in the addition, brackets under the gable ends, ties the addition to the existing house so that it is compatible but not identical (B.9).

The addition would be differentiated from the existing house by its side-gabled roof. Because the side gable would be “cross” to the existing rear gable, it would be apparent that an addition had been made. Furthermore, although the slightly higher side-gabled roof of the addition would not be noticeable from the street, closer inspection would suggest the addition (B.5). Therefore, the proposed addition would be in accordance with the Guidelines.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the construction of the proposed second floor addition would not impair the architectural or historical character of the subject property and the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Bowden, the applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with public testimony.

Mr. Stone stated that the addition looked as if it was squatting at the rear of the house, and Mr. Rodrigues agreed that the rear of the house did appear top-heavy with the proposed addition.

Ms. Davis concurred regarding the top-heavy appearance but noted the addition would not be visible from the street. Mr. Stone asked rhetorically if anything not visible from the street was approvable, why have guidelines?

Mr. Roberts wondered if the existing house didn’t work for the owners, instead of putting the proposed, somewhat awkward addition on, why are the owners in the house.

Ms. Davis noted the proposed new roof pops up above the existing roof line, and the heavy massing of the addition sits over the open patio. Mr. Stone stated that the addition looked like new construction in west Mobile.

Mr. Roberts suggested to Mr. Bowden that it appeared enough Board members had voiced concern about the addition that he may wish to withdraw the application and return with a revised proposal. If the application went to a vote and was turned down, the application could not be heard again for six months.

Mr. Bowden addressed the Board’s comments. He noted that the addition, in fact, would not be visible from the street. The two additional bedrooms were necessary due to the size of the homeowners’ family (five children). They enjoy the neighborhood with many young families and don’t want to move to west Mobile. Therefore, the square footage of the addition could not be reduced. The roofline cannot be lowered for two reasons. One, the
entire addition would have to be lowered, which would impede light getting onto the patio and through the glass on
the rear elevation. Second, the roof was designed to encourage shedding of water away from the house.

No comments were received from the public prior to the meeting. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harden and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed rear addition and gable window
would not impair the architectural or historic character of the house or the surrounding district and a Certificate of
Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis. The motion was approved, though not unanimously. Ms. Davis, Ms.
Harden, Mr. Rathle, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rodrigues, and Ms. Van Antwerp voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Echols
and Mr. Stone voted against it.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.