

Applicants please note: The decisions of the Design Review Committee (the Committee) are binding. It is each applicant's responsibility to see that the decisions of the Committee are carried out as stipulated. Any changes or deviations from the Committee's decision, <u>including but not limited to</u>: colors, forms, configurations, materials, assemblies or any other aspects of the approved work shall not be undertaken by the applicant or the applicant's agent unless said changes are approved by the Committee beforehand. Under the terms of City ordinance, any change or deviation from work approved by the Committee constitutes a violation of the ordinance and renders the applicant subject to citation with penalties as prescribed by a city magistrate.

Members Present:	Don Cosper, Creig Hoskins, Lea Ann Macknally, Richard Mauk, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe, Chris Swain
Members Absent:	Sam Frazier, Sheila Montgomery-Mills
Staff Present:	Karla Calvert, John Sims, Pamela Perry, Tonte Peters
Others Present:	Steve Allen, Cary Baker, Angel Calhoun, Jeff Chopin, Diane Foley, Mike Gibson, Brian Lemoine, Greg Malcolm, Keely McCown, Howard Mckay, Scott Phillips, Dustin Slaughter, Kyle Stover, Gregg Stein

**Call to Order:** Chairman Frazier called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. He stated that the minutes were not ready at this time.

Name: Mr. Steven Allen
Site Address: 101 12<sup>th</sup> Street S.
District: Midtown
Requesting approval for: Renovation

**Statements:** Mr. Allen stated that he was here on May 8, 2019 and that he is here today to request approval to paint the building. At the last meeting, the committee agreed to approve his proposal subject to him cleaning the brick and returning with a landscape plan that coincides with Parkside guidelines and the new 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North streetscape improvements. Mr. Allen said Mr. James Fowler stated that if there was no new curb cut, there is no need to do anything at this point.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve the proposal.Motion seconded by: MacknallyDiscussion: Wieseman stated for the record that the painting of the building is needed because of the mix match in existing brick types.Vote: The motion carried, with Cosper voting.

II. Name: Mr. Jeff Chopin
Site Address: 2121 Highland Avenue South
District: Five Points South
Requesting approval for: Roof Replacement

**Statements:** Mr. Chopin stated that he is removing the existing cooper roof and replacing it with a standing seam metal roof. He is proposing a neutral color (Buckskin) to coordinate with the



building color. Cosper said that he thinks that the roof would develop a vertigreen copper color. Macknally stated that she agrees that patina green makes the building look more historic.

Motion: Cosper made a motion to approve subject to the applicant using the patina green color.Motion seconded by: WolfeDiscussion: NoneVote: The motion carried with Wieseman voting no.

III. Name: Ms. Diane Foley (Scott Electric Sign Co.)
Site Address: 2217 Bessemer Rd. Ensley (CitiTrends)
District: Five Points West
Requesting approval for: Signage

**Statements:** Ms. Diane Foley presented the new City Trend sign proposal that was designed to replace an existing sign. Ms. Foley stated that the square footage of the new sign is smaller than the area of the existing sign. Sims noted that there is no signage master plan for this shopping center but a signage agreement does exist. Macknally suggested that the sign would appear better if the letters were below the red band under the roof fascia making it consistent with other signage systems on the sign band. Ms. Foley said she would make the necessary adjustment to comply with MacKnally's suggestion.

**Motion:** Macknally made a motion to approve the signage subject to the sign being lower and wider below the red band.

Motion seconded by: Wolf Discussion: None Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Name: Mr. Michael Parsons (Rives Construction Company)
Site Address: 2801 University Blvd (Martin Advertising)
District: Lakeview

**Requesting approval for:** Repainting existing one-story building; repainting existing site fence and fence columns. Color of building and columns to be Oyster White 7637. Fence color to be black to match existing. Replacing damaged windows. Cleaning brick and paint existing window frames / trim and cornice White to match replacement windows.

**Statements:** Mr. Michael Parsons of Rives Construction Company presented the proposed renovations to the Martin Advertising building (previously Lakeview School). Mr. Parsons said they propose to paint the previously painted one-story building. Macknally asked if the replacement windows would match the existing windows. Mr. Parsons said the new windows would match the existing windows. Mr. Parsons also noted that the proposed windows would allow more natural light into the building.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve the project as presented. Motion seconded by: Wieseman Discussion: None



Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

 V. Name: Mr. Mike Gibson (Creature Architecture) Site Address: 2218 1<sup>st</sup> Ave N. and 2216 1<sup>st</sup> Ave N. District: Morris Avenue Requesting approval for: Renovation of two-story building and addition of third-story.

**Statements:** Mr. Mike Gibson began his presentation by stating that he was seeking permission to remove the broken portions of the brick façade. Mr. Gibson stated that the renovated building would be mixed-use in nature with a restaurant space on the first level and two levels of residential units above. Weismann asked Calvert if the building is a contributing historical structure. Calvert responded that it is a contributing historical structure. Cosper asked if the new roof would be a wood structure or steel framed, to which Mr. Gibson responded that it would be a manufactured wood framed structure and the existing decking would remain. Wieseman commented that the character of the concept of the front elevation is a departure from the historical nature of the building, and asked if the owner would be willing to revise the design in an effort to retain its history. Mr. Gibson said they would rather not change the concept and argued that the historical character is retained within the design. Macknally also commented that she appreciated the fact that the brick on the facades would not be disturbed but she would like to see some movements in the horizontal alignments of elements of the building facade to reflect the historical character. Cosper said that he likes the fact that the design is different. Macknally stated that it is okay to be different but the design was too sterile. She argued for a compromise that does not have to be ornate or sterile.

**Motion:** Macknally made a motion to approve the demolition based on the structural engineer's report. She also made a motion to approve the concept subject to exploring alternatives for the design and the top rail area.

Motion seconded by: Cosper Discussion: None Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VI. Name: Mr. Greg Malcolm

Site Address: 1613 27<sup>th</sup> Street North District: Norwood Local Historic District Requesting approval for: Replacing all windows, roofing, and siding; painting the siding

**Statements:** Mauk stated that there was a report and requested to hear the report from Perry. Perry stated that the Norwood Local Historic Advisory Committee recommended to approve the proposal as presented. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee was to approve the design review request for the following reasons: "It is assumed based on the style of the house that 1613 27<sup>th</sup> Street North is a non-contributing structure. If 1613 is not included on the list of non-contributing structures, our comments are as follows: Page 13-Item E-Doors: Product information was not submitted for the new entry door. Door style as shown on submitted drawing is approved; Page 15-Item K-Materials: #105 wood siding is appropriate to the character of the neighborhood and is approved; Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary): The proposed new wood columns are

Page 3 | 10



appropriate to the time period of the house and are approved; Page 18-Item Q-Roofs: Proposed asphalt shingle roof is approved; Page 19-Item U-Windows: All wood double hung windows in the proposed 1-over-1 style are approved." The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: Page 13-Item E-Doors; Page 15- Item K-Materials; Page 17 – Item N- Porches (primary); Page 18 – Item Q- Roofs; Page 19 – Item U-Windows. The Local Historic Advisory Committee's Standard of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the district.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

#### Motion seconded by: Hoskins

**Discussion:** Macknally asked Mr. Malcolm to clear up his paint colors specs and to give the location of each color. Mr. Malcolm answered that the colors would be off white cream for the trim and green for the siding. Cosper stated that the pictures did not look like the house. Macknally explained that it was just examples of the siding. Wolfe asked if the porch floor would be concrete, and Mr. Malcolm answered yes.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VII. Name: Mr. Greg Malcolm

**Site Address:** 1227 29<sup>th</sup> Street North

District: Norwood Local Historic District

**Requesting approval for:** Installing new roof, siding, and windows; painting exterior trim and columns; rear room modifications; installing a new door and columns; and adding landscaping

**Statements:** Mr. Malcolm proceeded with presenting his proposal. Mauk asked if there was a report from the Advisory Committee. Perry stated that the Norwood Local Historic Advisory Committee recommended to approve the proposal as presented. The Advisory Committee recommended to approve the request for the following reasons: "Page 13-Item E-Doors: Product information was not submitted for the new entry door. Applicant has described the door as a three lite craftsman style door. This style is appropriate to the period of the home and is approved. The addition of sidelights and a transom is also approved; Page 14-Item H-Foundations: New foundation for addition to match existing foundation; Page 15-Item K-Materials: Applicant verbally proposed using #105 wood siding on the vertical portion of the north elevation and on the new addition. This siding profile is appropriate and is approved; Page 16-Item L-Paint: Applicant is attempting to remove the existing paint from the block siding by using shell blasting. If the shell blasting cannot be completed without damaging the existing block then new paint is approved; Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary): Existing porch columns have been altered and are in disrepair.



The proposed new wood columns are appropriate to the style and time period of the house and are approved; Page 18-Item Q-Roofs: Proposed asphalt shingle roof is approved; Page 19-Item U-Windows: All wood true divided lite windows in the proposed 3-over-1 style are approved; Page 22-Item A-Additions: Although the submitted drawings show a single story addition, the applicant would like to construct a two-story addition. Two-story additions are fairly common among four square style homes. The scale and proposed materials are in keeping with the original house design, therefore the addition is approved." The recommendation of the Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: Page 13 - Item E-Doors ; Page 14-Item H-Foundations; Page 15- Item K- Materials; Page 16- Item L- Paint; Page 17- Item N- Porches (primary); Page 18- Item Q-Roofs, Page 19- Item U-Windows; Page 22-Item A-Additions. The Local Historic Advisory Committee's Standard of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the district.

**Motion:** Macknally made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted, with the information for the front door which was not in the packet, to be submitted to staff.

#### Motion seconded by: Wolfe

**Discussion:** Macknally asked if this was a contributing structure. Perry stated yes. Weismann asked Mr. Malcolm if he was going back with 3 over 1 windows. Mr. Malcolm's answer was yes. Cosper asked the applicant if he was going back with asphalt shingle roof and if he had a shingle sample. Mr. Malcolm insisted that he will be going back with the original materials and designs. Mr. Malcolm stated that the only difference was that the roof line would be a little lower, but the pitch would remain the same.

**Vote:** The motion carried, with Cosper voting to deny.

#### VIII. Name: Mr. Cary Baker

Site Address: 1125 Cullom Street District: Cullom Street Local Historic District Requesting approval for: New home construction

**Statements:** Mr. Baker proceeded with presenting his proposal and Mauk interrupted to ask if there was a report from the neighborhood. Perry stated that the Five Points South Neighborhood Association's Executive Committee recommended to approve the proposal with conditions, and the applicant agreed to the conditions. The Neighborhood Executive Committee also voted to request that the following conditions be placed upon this request: The Executive Committee recommended that the original stone wall at the front of the property remain to preserve the reminence of the original property. The Neighborhood Association Executive Committee's Standards of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or

Page 5 | 10



demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the district.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve the proposal subject to the wall remaining.

### Motion seconded by: Macknally

**Discussion:** Wieseman asked if he was keeping the wall. Mr. Baker stated that it he was told that he could keep the wall or use the wall materials on the property for something else. He wanted to use the cap stone on the porch. Macknally asked if there was a reason why the wall couldn't remain. Mr. Baker stated that the brick will be used for the foundation, which will cover the concrete.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

**IX.** Name: Mr. Dustin Slaughter

Site Address: 3204 Carlisle Road District: Red Mountain Suburbs Local Historic District Requesting approval for: Repairing rotten wood window sills and trim; replacing selected windows

**Statements:** Mauk asked if there was a report from the Advisory Committee. Perry stated that the Redmont Local Historic Advisory Committee recommended to approve the proposal as presented. The Advisory Committee approved the design review request for the following reasons: The proposed addition & renovation conforms to the design standards. The new windows were noted as replacing existing Kolbe wood windows which were installed in 2003. The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: III.10 The Local Historic Advisory Committee's Standard of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Motion: Cosper made a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

#### Motion seconded by: Swain

**Discussion:** Macknally asked if these are the restoration plans from 2003. Mr. Slaughter answered yes. Cosper asked if the windows in the addition will be the only ones replaced. Mr. Slaughter stated no, and that they would be replaced throughout the house and that all windows



would match in design and paint color. **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

Name: Mrs. Angel Calhoun
Site Address: 1304 29<sup>th</sup> Street North
District: Norwood Local Historic District
Requesting approval for: Painting the trim of the house; adding new railings and brackets of the original design to the upper terrace; repairing and replacing damaged siding and replacing all windows

**Statements:** Mrs. Calhoun stated that this could be a multifamily dwelling or a single family Perry stated that the recommendation of the Norwood Local Historic Advisory dwelling. Committee was to approve the design review request. The Advisory Committee recommended to approve the request for the following reasons: "Page 15-Item K-Materials: Hardiplank siding to replace areas of existing siding is approved, and #105 wood siding is also approved as an alternate; Page 16-Item L-Paint: Painting existing and new siding and trim is approved. Norwood Advisory Committee does not typically vote on paint colors; Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary): Applicant is approved to replace damaged or missing sections of railing and to add corbels to match what is shown in the historic photo; Page 19-Item U-Windows: All wood true divided lite windows in the proposed 6-over-1 style are approved for the front of the house. All wood 1-over-1 style is approved for the sides of the house." The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: Page 15-Item K- Materials; Page 16-Item L-Paint; Page 17- Item N- Porches (primary); Page 19-Item U-Windows. The Local Historic Advisory Committee's Standard of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or part, will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve the proposal as presented

#### Motion seconded by: Hoskins

**Discussion:** Wolfe asked Mrs. Calhoun what use she would go back with for the property. Mrs. Calhoun answered single family. Ms. Calhoun also stated that she would be using 105 wood siding.

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

XI. Name: Mrs. Keely McCown

Site Address: 1235 33<sup>rd</sup> Street North District: Norwood Local Historic District Requesting approval for: Removing vinyl siding; restoring and painting wood siding that is



under the vinyl siding; installing new front door and roof; repairing existing wood windows

Statements: Mauk asked if there was a report from the Advisory Committee. Pamela stated yes and that the Norwood Local Historic Advisory Committee recommended to approve the proposal as presented. The Advisory Committee recommended approval for the following reasons: "Page 15-Item K-Material: Restoration of original wood siding is encouraged; Page 13-Item E-Doors: Product information was submitted for the new entry door. Door style as shown on tear sheet is appropriate to the house style and is approved; Page 18-Item Q-Roofs: Product information was submitted for the new roof and is appropriate and approved; Page 18-Item Q-Windows: Restoration of original windows is encouraged." The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: Page 13 - Item E-Doors; Page 15- Item K- Materials; Page 18- Item Q-Roofs; Page 18- Item Q-Windows. The Local Historic Advisory Committee's Standard of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part will not detrimental change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the district.

#### Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve the proposal as presented

#### Motion seconded by: Macknally

**Discussion:** Cosper stated that the column looks greater than a 6x6 in the plans and that it should go up to a built up column by eight inches. Cosper stated that he understands the sag in the beam. Ms. McCown stated that as much of the original siding as possible would be saved and repaired. **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

#### XII. Name: Mr. Brian Lemoine

**Site Address:** 640 45<sup>th</sup> Street South **District:** Avondale Park Local Historic District **Requesting approval for:** Replacing an asphalt shingle roof with a metal roof

**Statements:** Mauk asked if there was a report from the Advisory Committee. Perry stated that the Avondale Park Local Historic Advisory Committee recommended to approve the proposal as presented. The Local Historic Advisory Committee determined that the Applicant's plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood. The Local Historic Advisory Committee's Standard of Review Findings of Fact were as follows: (1) The proposed change, erection, or demolition conforms to the design standards established. (2) The proposed change, erection, or demolition is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value. (3) The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will not detrimental change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource. (4) The proposed erection,



alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part, will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the district.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

#### Motion seconded by: Wolfe

**Discussion:** Cosper asked Mr. Lemoine why he was going back with a metal roof instead of a shingle roof. Mr. Lemoine answered that it was more financially responsible. Mr. Lemoine mentioned that a neighbor had a metal roof, and Mauk stated that it slipped through the cracks. Macknally asked what the color of the roof would be. Mr. Lemoine stated that it would be the green color shown in the packet.

Vote: Motioned approved unanimously.

XIII. Name: Mr. David Brandt (Fravert Services)
Site Address: 1817 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North (Alabama Theatre)
District: 19<sup>th</sup> Street/Retail & Theatre
Requesting approval for: Update on Signage

**Statements:** Mr. Brandt stated that he was asked by John Sims and Planning, Engineering & Permits Department to update the Committee on the removal of the Historic Alabama Theatre sign. Mr. Brandt is proposing a new blade sign that will replicate the existing blade sign on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North and will feature new LED lighting. This sign will be identical to the sign on 18th Street North that was installed in 2017. The new sign will be completed by July or August 2019.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve the proposal.Motion seconded by: WolfeDiscussion: Sims stated that Mr. Brandt should get approval before removing a historic sign.Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

XIV. Name: Mr. Greg Stein

**Site Address:** 4100 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue South (Thirsty Donkey) **District:** 41<sup>st</sup> Street **Requesting approval for:** Landscape Fence /Container Approval

**Statements:** This case was last heard at the May 8, 2019 DRC meeting. At that time the Committee carried over the case to allow the applicant to return with a more detailed proposal. Mr. Greg Stein was accompanied by Architect Scott Phillips. Mr. Phillips presented a proposal to add a new wood framed canopy, new planters, and a 3'- 4" perimeter railing. He said that there was an existing shipping container that was left by the prior tenant, and that Mr. Stein is asking the Committee to allow the container to remain.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve the proposal. Motion seconded by: Wolfe Discussion: None Vote: The motion carried unanimously.



There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 a.m.