

May 13, 2020

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, including but not limited to: 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: Abra Barnes, Scott Burnett, Ivan Holloway Creig Hoskins, Lea Ann

Macknally, Richard Mauk, Sheila Montgomery-Mills, Willie Oliver, Ben

Wieseman, Brian Wolfe

Members Absent: Chris Swain

Staff Present: Karla Calvert, Lauren Havard, Paige Largue, Pamela Perry, Tonte Peters, John

Sims

Others Present: Michael Bailey, Jeff Belyea, Callan Childs, James Clark, Derek Dill, Mike

Gibson, Eric Hendon, Cheri Keith, Amanda Loper, Frank Reese, Stephanie

Smith, Grady Swicord, Dan Taylor, Robbie Washer

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. He stated that draft minutes for 12/11/19, 1/8/20, 1/22/20, 2/12/20, 2/26/20, and 3/11/20 were completed and sent out to the Committee. Hoskins made a motion to approve all sets. Macknally seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Name: Mr. James Clark

Site Address: 1516 29th Street North

District: Norwood (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Replacing windows, doors, roofing and paint. Replace siding

if needed.

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Perry for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the case was recommended for approval with conditions. For the conditions, the Advisory Committee noted that the recommendation of "approval is based on the assumption that the vinyl siding is going to be removed. If the home owner chooses to leave vinyl siding in place [the] application should be updated in order to be accurate." The applicant has agreed to both conditions. The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was to Approve with Conditions the design review request for the following reasons:

"Page 13- Item E- Doors: Proposed six lite "Craftsman style" entry door is suitable for the style and age of the home and is approved.



May 13, 2020

Page 15- Item I- Gutters and Downspouts: Gutters painted white to blend with the trim color are approved.

Page 15- Item K- Materials: This recommendation is written with the understanding that the existing vinyl siding will be removed. If applicant chooses to leave the vinyl in place they should notify the department of planning, engineering and permitting so that the application is accurate and up to date. If the original siding under the existing vinyl siding cannot be repaired the proposed #105 siding is approved for use.

Page 16-Item L-Paint: Proposed paint colors are compatible with the age and style of the house. Previously unpainted brick shall not be painted.

Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary): The removal of the porch enclosure to restore the front porch to what is shown in the historic photograph is approved.

Page 18-Item Q-Roofs: Proposed replacement asphalt shingles are approved.

Page 19-Item T-Trim (decorative): This recommendation is written with the understanding that the existing vinyl siding will be removed in order for the original trim to be addressed. If applicant chooses to leave the vinyl in place they should notify the department of planning, engineering and permitting so that the application is accurate and up to date.

Applicant has stated a desire to replace the historic brackets that are no longer on the home. Replacement brackets are approved to match the size and style as shown in the historic photograph. Corner board and water table trim is to be restored as shown in the historic photograph.

Page 19-Item U-Windows The proposed wood windows, matching the original windows as shown in the historic photograph, 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 I-Gutters and Downspouts, Page 16-Item L-Paint, Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary), Page 18-Item Q-Roofs, Page 19-Item T-Trim (decorative), and Page 19-Item U-Windows.

The Norwood AC also made the following Standard of Review Findings of Fact: (1) The proposed change conforms to the design standards established; (2) The proposed change is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value; (3) The proposed action will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect significant architectural features of the said property; and (4) The proposed change will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Mr. Clark presented his plans for renovation. He stated that he did agree with the LHAC's condition regarding removing the vinyl siding, and replacing it with 105s. Mr. Clark stated that he would be doing a full renovation of a Land Bank house. He stated



May 13, 2020

that he applied for Historic Tax Credits and was recently approved. He stated that he planned to replace the windows with wood windows. He stated that he would be removing the vinyl siding, and replacing it with wood siding. He stated that he wanted to restore the home to match the 1935 photo of the house that he found. Mauk asked if the large, front window would remain. Mr. Clark stated that he would remove the large window and replace it with three smaller windows to match the historic photo. Macknally requested a historic photo of the home. Mr. Clark stated that he would email a copy for the Committee to view.

Motion: Hoskins made a motion to carry this case over to the end of the meeting,

pending more information.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

(Later in the Meeting)

Statements: Ms. Perry stated that she sent the photo (historic) out to Committee members. Macknally stated that if he was going to return the house to its original state, then she would approve that because it is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this renovation, in agreement with the

LHAC.

Motion seconded by: Wieseman

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

II. Name: Ms. Amanda Loper

Site Address: 1931 2nd Avenue North / 116 20th Street North

District: Birmingham Green

Requesting approval for: Renovation / Signage Masterplan (Last seen 4/10/19)

Statements: Ms. Loper presented her plans to renovate the exterior of two buildings at the corner of 2nd Ave N and 20th Street. She stated that the buildings would be a combination of retail space and residential space. She stated that Chocolata would remain, and the entrance to the residential spaces would be on the 2nd Avenue side of the building. Ms. Loper stated that she was pursuing Historic Tax Credits for this project. The building on the corner will be painted a light color, with black aluminum windows, and new storefront. On the smaller building on 20th, the façade stone would be removed, and the brick underneath would be repaired and restored, and new storefront added and painted black. Sims asked if the curved glass would remain on the corner building. Ms. Loper said yes. Sims asked what would be on the wall underneath the windows. Ms. Loper stated that it would be a fire glazed clay brick tile. Hoskins asked what color the brick would be. Ms. Loper stated that it would be black. Burnett stated that he felt like



May 13, 2020

the Committee needed more information for final approval. Hoskins asked about the landscaping that Ms. Loper would use. She stated that she wanted to clean out the existing beds, and plant rosemary. Hoskins stated that a more detailed plan was needed. Sims stated that Ms. Loper would need to work with the City Urban Forester to verify which species were allowed in the ROW.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to approve this renovation conceptually. He stated that interior renovations could proceed. He stated that Ms. Loper would need to return with additional building details once the applications for Historic Tax Credits are completed, including signage and landscaping.

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

III. Name: Mr. Dan Taylor (bDot Architecture)

Site Address: 2201 7th Avenue South

District: Midtown

Requesting approval for: Renovation / Signage Masterplan (Last seen 1/22/20)

Statements: Mr. Taylor presented his plan to renovate the old Berthon's Cleaners building. He stated that he wanted to update the façade and paint the brick and add new signage. He stated that he would be replacing the windows and storefront. The storefront will be clear anodized aluminum. Macknally verified that this case was previously carried over because the applicant was proposing to paint previously unpainted brick. Mr. Taylor said yes. Mr. Taylor stated that he proposed not painting the brick to the owner of the building, and the owner still wants to paint the building. Mr. Taylor stated that there was already a small area of the building that was painted. Mauk asked what color the applicant wanted to paint the building. Mr. Taylor stated that it was an offwhite color, Sherwin-Williams "Big Chill." Hoskins commented that that color looked stark white. Macknally stated that she couldn't see any areas that were previously painted. Macknally stated that she could see painting the trim, but that since the brick was in such good condition, she didn't see why the brick needed to be painted. The Committee strongly objected to painting previously unpainted brick. Macknally asked if any new information was being presented. Mr. Taylor stated that the presentation was mostly the same, but that he was also presenting his master signage plan and his site plan. Burnett asked what Mr. Taylor planned to do with the awning at the front of the building. Mr. Taylor stated that he intended to remove the metal cladding on the awning to expose the soffit, and reclad it. Hoskins asked if there was a darker band on the signage band. Mr. Taylor said no, that the field would be monolithic. Hoskins stated that there was a lot of information missing from this presentation. Hoskins asked if the adjacent building would be painted. Mr. Taylor said no.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve the renovation and site plan, deny the painting of the brick, and carry the signage over to a later meeting pending more detail.



May 13, 2020

Motion seconded by: Burnett

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Name: Mr. Erik Hendon

Site Address: 2013 2nd Avenue North

District: 2nd Avenue North

Requesting approval for: Renovation /Signage

Statements: Mr. Hendon presented his plan to renovate the old Meelheim building. He stated that he removed the stucco and wanted to paint the brick underneath. He presented his color scheme. He also stated that he wanted to replace the existing windows. He stated that on the second floor there was just one large existing window. He stated that he wanted to replace it with four smaller casement windows. He stated that he wanted to replace the first floor store front because it was rotting. He stated that he would go back with gray paint for the trim. He stated that he would be adding new downspouts, and they would be painted black to match the storefront.

Motion: Hoskins made a motion to carry this case over to the end of the meeting, pending more information.

Motion seconded by: Burnett

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

(Later Discussion of the Case)

Statements: Hoskins had asked to see more detail on the exterior renovation. Mr. Hendon sent that information for the Committee to consider. Mr. Hendon stated that when he removed the EIFS from the building, it revealed two different types of bricks that had actually already been painted before the EIFS was applied, and that's why they chose to paint the building. Burnett stated that there was still not enough detail on the upper windows. Burnett verified that the storefront windows would have simulated divided lights. Wieseman asked about the signage. Mr. Hendon stated that the new sign would be a painted aluminum plate above the second story windows. He stated that the restaurant's name would be "Helen," and that it would be illuminated by three gooseneck lights. He stated that there would also be a blade sign centered over the door. Chairman Mauk asked if Mr. Hendon was removing the historic Meelheim sign that was on the building. Mr. Hendon said yes, because the sign was mounted to the EIFS that they removed. Mr. Hendon stated that he had already started the process to get a ROW use agreement.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to approve this proposal and signage, but asked that the second story windows return for approval.

Motion seconded by: Wieseman



May 13, 2020

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

V. Name: Ms. Stephanie Smith (Maaco) Site Address: 3101 3rd Ave South

District: Lakeview

Requesting approval for: Signage

Statements: Ms. Smith presented her plan to add signage to a building in Lakeview. She stated that she was presenting three wall signs and one pole sign for the building. Macknally asked if the pole sign was existing. Ms. Smith stated that she didn't think that it was existing. Hoskins stated that the Guidelines don't allow new pole signs. Macknally asked if, excluding the pole sign, the remainder of the signs on the building fit within the guidelines. Sims said yes.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal (the building signs) as

presented, but denied the new pole sign.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VI. Name: Mr. Jeff Belyea, PE (Land Development)

Site Address: 1201 3rd Ave South (UAB Student Housing)

District: Midtown

Requesting approval for: Final Landscaping, Hardscaping/Signage(Last seen 3/11/20)

Statements: Mr. Belyea presented his landscaping and signage plans for a new residential development near the UAB campus. Mr. Belyea stated that even though this project falls outside the Parkside Guidelines, the applicant planned to comply with the Parkside Guidelines. Mr. Belyea stated that the street trees would be Nuttall Oak, Greenleaf Hollies and Bald Cypress. Macknally suggested not using the cherry trees on this project, but changing them out for another species. Montgomery-Mills asked what vegetation would be planted along the alley. Mr. Belyea stated that it would be grass. Macknally stated that grass wouldn't get enough sunlight to grow there.

Mr. White presented his signage plan for this development. He stated that there would be one main marquee sign. He stated that the letters would be 6" channel letter and would be backlit. Mr. White also presented the dragon mural, painted on the building. Wolfe asked if the letters on the blade sign would be routed out of the cabinet, or would be face mounted. Mr. White stated that they would be routed out. Wolfe asked for more information about how the signs attached to the building. Wolfe asked what color the letters on the signs on the second page would be. Mr. White stated that they would be black aluminum, but that they would light up white.



May 13, 2020

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to carry this case over pending more information on the

signage and landscaping.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VII. Name: Mr. Derek Dill (Novare Group)

Site Address: 10 13th Street South (Foundry Yard)

District: Midtown

Requesting approval for: Landscape/Streetscape (Last seen 3/27/19)

Statements: Mr. Reese presented his landscaping and streetscaping plans for a new residential development near Railroad Park. He stated that the streetscape complied with the Parkside Guidelines. He also stated that the side of the development that faced the Denham Building reacted to the plantings on that development. Macknally complimented the plant choices for the streetscapes.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, on the condition that the applicant consider more urban plant types in place of the boxwoods and loropetalums.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: Wolfe verified that the pole lights were consistent with the district.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VIII. Name: Mr. Stephen Fambrough

Site Address: 509 North Drive

District: Roebuck Springs (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Uncovering existing porch; replacing window, siding, and roof; relocating steps back to the front of home; adding dormer to the roof; and painting

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

IX. Name: Ms. Cheri Keith

Site Address: 1505 36th Street North

District: Norwood (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Rehabilitation and Renovation Related: Repair and replace

siding; replace roof; replace doors and windows.

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the case was recommended for approval (including the dormer, the front door, opening up the porch), except for the new vinyl windows which were denied. The DRC also noted that the LHAC recommended denial of the proposed back door and the request to paint the brick. Committee understands that the



May 13, 2020

work was completed prior to the submission of this application.

The recommendation of the LHAC was based on the following reasons: "As noted on Page 12, Item 9 and 10 of the Norwood Historic Preservation Plan, additions or alterations shall be allowed if they do not destroy significant historical material, are compatible with the size and scale of the existing architecture and can be removed in the future without ruining the integrity of the original structure. In this case, the dormer is an appropriate scale to the original structure and could be removed in the future and taken back to its original form. Therefore, in this instance the dormer will be allowed.

Page 13-Item E-Doors: Proposed six lite "Craftsman style" entry door is suitable for the style and age of the home and is approved. Back door is not appropriate to the style and character of the home.

Page 16-Item L-Paint: As noted in the Norwood Historic Preservation Plan, previously unpainted brick shall not be painted.

Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary): The removal of the porch enclosure to restore the front porch is approved.

Page 18-Item Q-Roofs: Proposed replacement asphalt shingles are approved.

Page 19-Item U-Windows: Vinyl windows do not conform to the Norwood historic preservation plan and therefore cannot be 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 16-Item L-Paint, Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary), Page 18-Item Q-Roofs, and Page 19-Item U-Windows.

The Norwood AC also made the following Standard of Review Findings of Fact (regarding the items recommended for approval): (1) The proposed change conforms to the design standards established; (2) The proposed change is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value; (3) The proposed action will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect significant architectural features of the said property; and (4) The proposed change will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Ms. Keith presented the renovations that she had already made to her home. She asked that the DRC approve the vinyl windows since she had already purchased and installed them. Wolfe stated that vinyl windows were not allowed in Historic Districts. Hoskins asked what color the brick was previously. Ms. Keith stated that the brick was just a typical red brick, but was mismatched due to various repairs. Burnett stated that the brick and mortar at the base of the home was mismatched, and recommended painting it, but stated that the color that was chosen was inappropriate for the historic nature of the home. Holloway asked if the dormer windows were vinyl. Ms. Keith said no, that they



May 13, 2020

were aluminum. Macknally asked if all the windows in the home were replaced. Ms. Keith said yes. Burnett and Wolfe stated that they both supported the painting of the brick, but felt that the color of the brick should be more in keeping with the neighborhood guidelines. Wolfe stated that he was apprehensive to approve the vinyl windows, and that it might set a dangerous precedent.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve the recommendation submitted by the LHAC (including the denial of the vinyl windows). He also stated that the painted brick needed to return to the LHAC for alternate colors, as the blue was not acceptable.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

X. Name: Mr. Robbie Washer (Contractor) Site Address: 1064 32nd Street South

District: Highland Park (Local Historic District) **Requesting approval for:** Alteration of eave detail

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the case was recommended for approval with conditions. The conditions included the following: "The raked eave design currently visible (as of 5/8/20) on the front of the house is appropriate to the historic character of the neighborhood. That same design concept should be repeated at appropriate scale on the other raking eaves of the house including the side elevations and at the entry awning. The color palette was not presented at our meeting, although the colors discussed (grey tones) are inappropriate for the architecture of this house. Proposed color scheme of the house should reflect the existing colors, i.e. dark brown half timbering, trim and windows, and cream stucco, with the clapboard a suitable third color." The applicant agreed to the conditions.

The LHAC's reasons for recommending approval with conditions were as follows: "This project is one of the few we have reviewed where the 'proven infeasibility' clause seems to actually apply. The old roof was built with a material (metal shingles) used to simulate the warping, tapering shape of a thatch roof. While interesting as an oddity, it was not attractive and as proven by the visible damage to the eaves, problematic to replicate and make watertight. As the applicant had already removed this fabric prior to our review, our review is judging the proposed new work as appropriate to the historic character 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: Section G. Decorative Trim: Addition of trim not appropriate to the historic character of a house generally will not be approved. Section J. Paint: Paint color shall be compatible with the age and style of the house."

The LHAC noted that the change to the eaves occurred because of damage, and the new design is appropriate. The LHAC requested the applicant choose a color scheme that is



May 13, 2020

more appropriate for the house. The Highland Park LHAC also made the following Standard of Review Findings of Fact regarding the eaves: (1) The proposed change conforms to the design standards established; (2) The proposed change is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value; (3) The proposed action will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect significant architectural features of the said property; and (4) The proposed change will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Mr. Washer presented his plan to renovate the eaves of this home. Mr. Washer had been working with the LHAC for an approved proposal. The plan submitted to staff had changed since his original proposal, and he didn't have any drawings or images of the new eave details recommended by the LHAC. Hoskins stated that there wasn't enough information provided to make a decision on this case. Mr. Washer was unable to present the proposed color scheme, but stated it was neutral.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to carry this case over pending more information and requested the applicant return to the LHAC for recommendation of paint colors.

Motion seconded by: Burnett

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

XI. Name: Mr. Steven G. Malcom

Site Address: 1725 28th Street North

District: Norwood (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Rehabilitation Related: Repair wooden windows to match. Remove front door and replace with wooden door (specs say fiberglass). Remove siding and install hardie plank lapboard siding. Replace asphalt shingle roof with asphalt shingles in weather wood. Repaint.

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

XII. Name: Mr. Mike Gibson (Creature, LLC)

Site Address: 1801 2nd Avenue North (New Ideal Building)

District: 19th Street North

Requesting approval for: Signage

Statements: Mr. Gibson presented his signage plan for the New Ideal building that he has been renovating. He stated that there would be a new "New Ideal" building sign. The letters would be metal and painted white, and attached to the I-beam. Mr. Gibson stated that there would be two 4'x4' blade signs for the tenants. Mauk stated that the signage fit within the guidelines. Burnett verified that there would be no signage affixed



May 13, 2020

to any glazing at this time.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.

Motion seconded by: Wieseman

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

XIII. Name: Mr. Mike Gibson (Creature, LLC)

Site Address: 300 18th Street South (The Citizen)

District: Midtown

Requesting approval for: New construction – 6-story residential 140 units building

with ground floor 3,000 sf of commercial conceptual design

Statements: Mr. Gibson presented his plan for a new residential building in Midtown. He stated that he had already received conceptual approval. He stated that he was seeking final approval of the design and materials of the building. He described the materials that he would use. The building would mostly be comprised of architectural metal panels that are made of aluminum. The unit windows would be vinyl sliders that open up onto Juliet balconies. The balconies and railings will be perforated metal panels and will be painted black.

Mr. Gibson also stated that landscaping would return, but that this site falls within the Parkside District, and would comply with the Parkside Guidelines. Mauk asked if there would be any parking for this project. Mr. Gibson said that there would be no permanent parking. Montgomery-Mills asked if signage would return. Mr. Gibson said yes.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

XIV. Name: Mr. Grady Swicord

Site Address: 2940 4th Avenue South

District: Lakeview

Requesting approval for: Demolition

Statements: Mr. Swicord presented his request to demolish the building directly beside his business. He stated that the building was in disrepair and was a public safety risk. He stated that he wanted to demolish the building down to the dirt, and put hay and grass seed on it. He stated that he intended to return within a few months with a plan to expand his business and building into this adjacent lot. Burnett asked about the architectural condition of the building. Mr. Swicord stated that it was completely rusted out, and a hazard.



May 13, 2020

Motion: Montgomery-Mills made a motion to approve the demolition on the condition that Mr. Swicord return with building plans within 6 months, and seed and straw the lot in the meantime.

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

XV. Name: Mr. Haley Linville

Site Address: 3200 6th Avenue South

District: Lakeview

Requesting approval for: Signage

Statements: The applicant was not present, but Macknally stated that new pole signs weren't allowed in the District per the Guidelines.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to deny the pole sign.

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

XVI. Name: Ms. Callan Childs

Site Address: 2730 3rd Avenue S.

District: Lakeview

Requesting approval for: Site Plan/Landscaping (Last seen 11/13/19)

Statements: Ms. Childs presented her new site plan that showed the renovated greenspace and hardscaped areas on her site. Ms. Childs also stated that she also included the Pepper Place plant palette at this new site. Macknally stated that Ms. Childs did a good job addressing her previous concerns for the site. Macknally noted that there were no connections from the sidewalk to the building, without having to walk through the middle of the parking lot. Ms. Childs stated that she would address that. She stated that she could add a permeable walkway to address this issue.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve the proposal, on the condition that an accessible pedestrian connection be added between the building and the sidewalk.

Motion seconded by: Burnett

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.



May 13, 2020

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.