



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes May 27, 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 Lea Ann Macknally, Richard Mauk, Sheila Montgomery-Mills, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe

Members Absent: Creig Hoskins, Willie Oliver, Chris Swain

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

Others Present: Mark Barton, David Brandt, Lissy Frese, Caroline Harding, Erik Hendon, Bill Meadows, David Ratliff, Bethany Rooney, Robbie Washer

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. Mauk asked if there was a quorum, Calvert stated that there were more than 6 members present, so there was a quorum. There were no minutes to approve at this time.

- I. Name:** Mr. Robbie Washer (Romar Construction)
Site Address: 1064 32nd Street South
District: Highland Park (Local Historic District)
Requesting approval for: Alteration of eave detail (Carried over from the May 13, 2020 DRC Meeting)

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that color scheme #1 was recommended for denial by the LHAC, and color scheme #2 had a split vote. The LHAC was not able to reach a consensus regarding color scheme #2. As stated in the recommendation, "We have 2 voting no: The feeling is the colors selected are current trendy colors, not appropriate to either half-timbered (too cool tones, lacking contrast, and neither Tudor, for Craftsman). And we have 2 voting yes to Scheme B...not really liking the colors, but feeling they are merely not offensive and could be re-painted better colors later. The no votes are the more vocal in this scenario." The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: "J. Paint: In cases where a building permit is required (i.e., work other than routine maintenance), paint colors will be reviewed along with the project's overall construction plans. Paint color shall be compatible with the age and style of the house."



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes May 27, 2020

Montgomery-Mills asked if the split vote meant that the decision was up to the DRC. Mauk said yes. Macknally asked for some clarification on which colors would be used in which location. Macknally verified that the darker wood would be painted the darker gray, and the field color would be white. Mr. Washer stated that the other details (trim around the entry door) would also be painted white. The eave detail was approved by the LHAC as well.

Motion: Montgomery-Mills made a motion to approve the 2nd paint color options.

Motion seconded by: Wieseman

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

II.

Name: Ms. Lissy Frese (CCR Architecture)

Site Address: 4308 5th Avenue South (AvonDwell)

District: Avondale (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: New Construction: construct multi-family residence.

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Lague for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the case was recommended for approval. In its recommendation, the LHAC stated that the applicant's plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood. The Avondale 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.

Ms. Frese presented her plan for a new multi-family residence in Avondale. She stated that the home would have eight units. Wolfe asked if she had a materials board. She stated that it was sent out just prior to the meeting. Mauk asked if this use was allowed in this location. Lague and Ms. Frese said yes. Ms. Frese stated that the size, set back, and exterior of the building fit into, and were appropriate for, the neighborhood. She stated that the building would have hardie board siding and hardie trim and asphalt shingles.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve this proposal on the condition that the landscaping return for staff approval.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: Wieseman stated that at least two shade trees would need to be added to the front yard to provide shade, along either side of the front walk.

Vote: The motion carried. Burnett recused himself.

III.

Name: Moving Up Collaborative

Site Address: 3226 Norwood Boulevard



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes May 27, 2020

District: Norwood (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Relocation of residence out of historic district into Norwood Historic District

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the case was recommended for denial. The recommendation of denial was based on the following reasons:

“On May 19th the Norwood Historic Advisory Committee met with the applicant to review the proposal for relocation of a structure from Homewood into Norwood. While we very much respect and appreciate Dr. Martin’s non-profit and his plans for helping low income residents of the City of Birmingham, our committee’s responsibility is to provide an unbiased review of each application as to whether it conforms to the guidelines in the Norwood Historic Preservation Plan. In addition, we feel strongly that applications for new build construction or relocation projects be very detailed and clear in their graphic representation and the project details, especially considering that this project would be precedent setting for future construction in our neighborhood.

Page 22, Section B - Architectural Style of the Norwood Historic Preservation Plan states that in-fill housing shall be of similar architectural design and character to a style represented among the district’s contributing housing stock that was constructed during the first four decades of the twentieth century. Those styles include: Craftsman Bungalow, American Foursquare, Colonial, Revival, Tudor Revival, Greek Revival, Dutch Revival, Classical Revival, Prairie Style, Victorian, Queen Anne, Italianate and Neo-classical Revival.

After explaining that the cottage style house did not conform to the guidelines, and could not be approved, the applicant expressed interest in potentially modifying the house so that it could be moved and reconstructed in more of a Craftsman style. The committee was willing to review an altered application in order to see if there was a way for the project to move forward while meeting the guidelines.

On May 20th the committee received an updated application, which included a new elevation drawing showing the addition of a shallow porch to the front of the structure and the addition of a parking pad behind the house, which was requested by zoning.

After reviewing the updated submission it was determined that the changes also did not conform to the guidelines. The updated design changes were neither in keeping with historic Craftsman detailing nor were they a modern interpretation of the Craftsman style. There was also an overall concern about the scale of the porch addition and architectural elements as they related to the existing structure to be relocated.

On May 20th the committee responded with a list of concerns to the updated design, as well as a list of clarifications and additional information that we felt were required in order to make an informed decision about the application should the design reach a point



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes May 27, 2020

that it would conform to the guidelines.

The following is a list of the requested information: -Detailing of the masonry columns as well as concerns about the lack of detailing shown in the elevation drawing - Clarification of the eave detail, what was shown on the elevation did not match what was shown in a wall section and the wall section noted the use of aluminum soffit material, which is not an approved material. -Clarification on the detailing of the porch roof as it related to the existing structure. The elevation indicated the ridge line at a higher elevation than the main house rooflines. -Example of what the “mortar washed wall” would look like. -Clarification on information included in the “appendix” document, i.e. Where will the blocking with stucco veneer be used? Will the included paint schedule be used? -Footprint of relocated structure shown in context of the adjacent houses. - Proposed detailing of window trim. -Clarification on whether windows were to remain as is or be relocated. There was a discrepancy between what was shown in the elevation and what was shown in the pictures of the house before it was moved from its original location. -Manufacturer’s information for any of the following products that would be new: front door, roof shingles, siding and windows.

The committee did receive a written response to our concerns and questions on May 21st. The response did include clarifications on some of the inconsistencies in the drawings. It was stated by the applicant that the previously provided drawings were not accurate to what the applicant would be proposing. While the applicant stated that they would do their best to meet and exceed the historic guidelines there was no updated graphical representation, detailing or requested manufacturer’s product information included for the committee to review in order to make an informed decision.”

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district’s design guidelines: Page 22-Item B-Architectural Style and Page 28-Item S-Size, Scale, Massing, Orientation and Setback.

The LHAC stated that more information was needed for a recommendation of approval. The Norwood AC also made the following Standard of Review Findings of Fact: (1) The proposed change does not conform to the design standards established; (2) The proposed change is not 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 detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect significant architectural features of the said property; and (4) The proposed change will not be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Mr. Barton presented his plan to move a historic house from Morris Blvd in Homewood to Norwood Blvd. Mr. Barton discussed the benefits of this relocation to the community and its residents. Mr. Barton stated that the home that he proposed to move was the Minimal Traditional style, and was built in 1945, so it would fit within the same era as the majority of the homes in Norwood. Mr. Barton also discussed modifying the house to reflect a style that would fit in best with the community. He stated that he could add a



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes May 27, 2020

craftsman-style porch to help this home fit in better.

Macknally asked why Mr. Barton wanted approval from the DRC before approval from the LHAC. Mr. Barton stated that it was more about timing of the request, not what the LHAC was asking for. Wolfe stated that in reading the findings of the LHAC, it appeared that they had not been supplied with the information that they had asked for, and that's why they denied the request. Mr. Barton requested that the DRC overturn the denial of the LHAC. Wolfe stated that he wanted to see Mr. Barton work with the LHAC.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to carry this case over, stating that the applicant needed to get approval from the LHAC before coming back to the Design Review Committee.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: Mr. Barton asked if he needed to replicate a craftsman-style house, or if the home could remain Minimal Traditional. Wieseman stated that he would rather see the house truly be a historic house, rather than be altered to replicate a historic home. Burnett agreed.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

IV.

Name: Mr. Bill Meadows

Site Address: 4232 Cliff Road

District: Forest Park (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Construction of wooden fence

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Perry for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the case was recommended for approval. In its recommendation, the LHAC stated that the applicant's plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood. The Forest Park 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. Meadows presented his plan to replace the fence around the backyard of the home. He stated that it would be constructed with 2"x6" pressure treated lumber. Macknally verified that the applicant would be replacing an existing fence. Mauk verified that the previous fence had vertical boards where this one would have horizontal boards. Wolfe asked what color the fence would be painted. Mr. Meadows couldn't immediately locate his color swatch.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve the proposal, in agreement with the LHAC, on the condition that the color of the fence be approved by City Staff.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2020

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

- V. **Name:** Mr. Steven G. Malcom (Steven G Malcom Builder)
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.

- VI. **Name:** Ms. Lynn Hinkley
Site Address: ~~2621 Aberdeen Road~~
District: ~~Forest Park Local Historic District~~
Requesting approval for: ~~Construction of a stucco retaining wall in rear yard~~

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

- VII. **Name:** Mr. Dave Branch (Fifth Dimension Architecture)
Site Address: ~~206 22nd Street South (Kelly Hotel)~~
District: Midtown
Requesting approval for: ~~Renovation~~

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

- VIII. **Name:** Ms. Haley Linville (Research Specialist)
Site Address: 3200 6th Avenue South (Mavis Tire)
District: Lakeview
Requesting approval for: Signage (Last seen 5/13/20)

Statements: Mr. Ratliff presented his plan to change out the signage. The new signage would say “Mavis Tires and Brakes at Discount Prices.” Mr. Ratliff stated that the sizes of the pole sign wouldn’t change, just the face. He also stated that the wall signs would be slightly bigger than the existing. Mauk asked if “at Discount Prices” was a tagline. Sims stated that he thought that it was. Wolfe stated that taglines aren’t allowed per the Design Guidelines. Mauk asked if the applicant would be willing to remove “at Discount Prices.” Mr. Ratliff stated that he would ask his client, but that his client does want “at Discount Prices” for brand recognition. Mauk verified that the signage fit within the Design Guidelines.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to carry this case over pending a discussion with the owner and/or new construction documents.

Motion seconded by: Macknally



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2020

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

- IX.** **Name:** Ms. Caroline Harding (Stager & Interior Decorator)
Site Address: 300 20th Street North (Blachs Lofts)
District: Birmingham Green
Requesting approval for: Awnings (Last seen 1/8/20)

Statements: Ms. Harding presented her plan to change out the awnings on the Blachs Lofts. She stated that the new awning would be smaller than the existing awning, and resembled the original awning that was on the building. She stated that the remaining awnings would be removed. She stated that the awning would be black, powder coated steel and would have a satin finish, and would say “Blachs.” Sims asked if the applicant would repair the damage left behind from removing the existing awning. Ms. Harding said yes, that the area would be repaired and repainted. Macknally stated that the exact verbiage wasn’t clear based on the drawings. Ms. Harding stated that the awning would just say “Blachs.”

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to carry this case over pending submittal of construction documents.

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

- X.** **Name:** Mr. David Brandt (Fravert Services)
Site Address: 1001 20th St. South (Ascend)
District: Five Points South
Requesting approval for: Signage Master Plan

Statements: Mr. Brandt presented his signage master plan for the new Ascend building. He stated that there would be space for two building signs. He stated that there would be room for two retail tenants on the ground floor. One of the building identification signs would be a lighted, projecting sign. The second building identification sign would be channel letters attached to the canopy. He stated that the two retail signs would also be channel letters mounted to the canopy. He stated that the retail signage would not be allowed to exceed the square footage of the “Ascend” building sign. Wolfe asked if vinyl lettering would be allowed on the doors of the retail spaces. Mr. Brandt said not at this time. Mr. Brandt also stated that the raceway would be painted to match the canopy. Montgomery-Mills verified that the wiring and hardware wouldn’t be visible.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve the proposal on the condition that the applicant submit the Signage Master Plan narrative to City Staff.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: None



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2020

Vote: The motion carried. Macknally recused herself.

- XI. 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 for four fixed windows on the second floor of his building. He stated that the windows would have applied aluminum muntins on the inside and the outside. The new windows will be black anodized, simulated divided light storefront windows. The remainder of the project had previously been approved.

Motion: Montgomery-Mills made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: none

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

- XII. Name:** Ms. Bethany Rooney
Site Address: 5428 1st Avenue North
District: Woodlawn
Requesting approval for: New concrete island / ATM (Last seen 9/12/18)

Statements: Ms. Rooney presented her plan to add a new concrete island and ATM under an existing canopy. Macknally asked if all of the lane widths would remain the same. Sims said yes.

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

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

- XIII. Name:** ~~Mr. Willie Oliver~~
Site Address: ~~309 41st Street South~~
District: ~~41st Street~~
Requesting approval for: ~~Signage, deck, and rear storage~~

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

- XIV. Name:** ~~Mr. Steve Looney (Commander Board Signs)~~
Site Address: ~~2331 Bessemer Road, Ensley (AL Nails)~~
District: ~~Five Points West~~
Requesting approval for: ~~Signage~~



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2020

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

- XV. Name:** Mr. David Brandt (Fravert Services)
Site Address: 2 North 20th Street (2 North 20th Building)
District: Birmingham Green
Requesting approval for: Signage Master Plan

Statements: Mr. Brandt presented his new Master Signage Plan for the 2 North 20th Building. He stated that Strayer University would be a new tenant in the building, and needed new signage. Mr. Brandt stated that the signage master plan was an inventory of the existing signs on the building. He stated that he intended to keep the existing building signage. He stated that the only new sign would be for Strayer University. Macknally asked how the owner of the building intended to address the billboard on the roof of the building. Mr. Brandt stated that his signage master plan didn't address that sign since it was owned by a different company than the building's owner. Mr. Brandt stated that he hoped that the rooftop billboard would be addressed separately from the signage master plan since it didn't address building or tenant signage. Chairman Mauk stated that he thought that the DRC should get the City's Legal Department's advice on how to proceed with this case, as the City's Zoning Ordinance does not allow rooftop signs.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to carry this case over, pending advice from the City's Legal Department on how to proceed regarding the billboard on the roof of the building.

Motion seconded by: Macknally

Discussion: Montgomery-Mills advised Mr. Brandt to provide more information regarding the pedestrian level signage. Montgomery-Mills also advised Mr. Brandt to develop a full signage master plan narrative when presenting this case again. Wieseman asked Mr. Brandt to address all of the retail spaces' signage when he returns.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

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