



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes June 24, 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: Scott Burnett, Ivan Holloway, Creig Hoskins, Lea Ann Macknally, Richard Mauk, Sheila Montgomery-Mills, Willie Oliver, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe

Members Absent: Abra Barnes, Chris Swain

Staff Present: Karla Calvert, Lauren Havard, Paige Largue, John Sims

Others Present: Mark Martin, Eric Bennett, David Brandt, Derek Dill, Caroline Harding, Melanie McCann, Laura Roberts, Elizabeth Sanfelippo, Mike Trettel, Robbie Washer

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. He stated that there were no minutes to approve at this time.

- I. Name:** Moving Up Collaborative
Site Address: 3226 Norwood Boulevard
District: Norwood
Requesting approval for: Relocate existing house (out of district) to Norwood (Carried over from the 5/27/2020 DRC meeting)

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that the LHAC recommended denial of this proposal. In its recommendation, the LHAC noted the following: "On June 16th the Norwood Historic Advisory Committee met with the applicant to again 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.

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



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes June 24, 2020

Neo-classical Revival.

Therefore, it is the committee's recommendation that this project not be approved as submitted. The proposed structure does not fall within the described housing stock of significance and in our opinion would not further contribute to the historic character of the street."

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections (cite the applicable section numbers) of the local historic district's design guidelines: Page 22-Item B-Architectural Style 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 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 case for relocating a Minimal Traditional house to Norwood. This proposal was denied by the LHAC. Macknally thanked the applicant for doing his research, and going back to the LHAC as requested. Macknally stated that she thought that the proposal was reasonable. Montgomery-Mills agreed. Mauk reminded the Committee that they would need a 2/3 majority to overturn the LHAC's decision. Mr. Oliver asked why the LHAC denied the case, the applicant stated that the LHAC did not want to set a precedent.

Motion: Oliver made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, overturning the findings of the LHAC. Oliver amended his motion, stating that the approval was contingent upon the applicant returning with wood windows instead of vinyl. Oliver also stated that this approval was justified based on the background and research presented by the applicant, proving that this style of house belonged in this neighborhood.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills

Discussion: Macknally asked that the motion include the applicant returning with wood windows instead of vinyl windows. She also wanted the justification for this decision included.

Vote: The motion carried. Wolfe voted against. Hoskins abstained.

II. Name: Ms. Caroline Harding (Stager & Interior Decorator)

Site Address: 300 20th Street North (Blachs Lofts)

District: Birmingham Green

Requesting approval for: Awnings (Carried over from the 5/27/2020 DRC meeting)

Statements: Ms. Harding presented her proposal for a new awning on the Blachs Building. She stated that she would be removing the existing awning, and the new awning would be smaller than the existing. She stated that the new awning would be



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes June 24, 2020

steel, and would not have any poles into the sidewalk. Ms. Harding presented her attachment details, and site plan. Wieseman asked if the awning would be all black with "Blachs" in white, Ms. Harding said yes. Wolfe asked the sizing of the letters. Ms. Harding didn't have the exact sizing but stated that they letters would be 10"-11" tall. Wolfe asked if the sign was centered on the door. Ms. Harding said no, that it was aligned with the right of the door. Burnett was concerned that the new awning didn't fit within the style of the building. Ms. Harding stated that the style of the awning was chosen intentionally, to match with the Art Deco style of the building.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve the awning on the condition that the height of the letters needs to be notated, and the size of the awning be reduced so that the awning could fit between the two columns. She also stated that the size of the letters on the awning needed to be notated on the drawings. She stated that the new plans would need to be presented to City staff for approval.

Motion seconded by: Wolfe

Discussion: none

Vote: The motion carried, Burnett voted against.

III.

Name: Mr. Robbie Washer

Site Address: 1064 32nd Street South

District: Highland Park Local Historic District

Requesting approval for: Construction of new wooden deck; rebuilding of an existing deck; and replacement of a back door

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated the LHAC voted to approve this proposal. The Highland 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.

Largue stated that the LHAC approved this proposal as presented. Mr. Washer stated that he was asking for forgiveness for a deck that he built on an existing project. Hoskins asked if the deck was visible from the street. Mr. Washer stated that the deck was not visible from the front of the house, but it was visible from the side street. Mr. Washer stated that the new deck was at the same height and of the same style as the house on the corner.

Motion: Hoskins made a motion to approve this proposal in agreement with the LHAC.

Motion seconded by: Oliver



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
June 24, 2020

Discussion: none

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

IV.

Name: Mr. Mike Trettel

Site Address: 4010 10th Avenue South

District: Forest Park Local Historic District

Requesting approval for: Replacing a front door with a new front door and adding a screen door; and repairing a fireplace chimney metal cap

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated that color scheme #1 was denied by the LHAC, and color scheme #2 had a split vote. 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.

Largue stated that the LHAC approved this proposal as presented. Burnett asked about the chimney cap. Largue stated that the chimney cap was just repair work, so the materials would match existing.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to approve this proposal in agreement with the LHAC, including repairing a roof leak at the rear addition to the house.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: Mr. Trettel asked if he could repair a roof leak.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

V.

Name: Mr. Willie Oliver

Site Address: 309 41st Street South

District: 41st Street

Requesting approval for: Signage, roof over deck, mural and demolition rear storage (Last seen 2/12/20)

Statements: Mr. Oliver presented his proposal for signage, a roof over the deck, and a mural on the Avondale Vape and Hookah Lounge. Mr. Oliver stated that the interior renovation of the building had been completed. Mr. Oliver stated that he would use the same materials on the roof as are on the existing building. Montgomery-Mills asked if the roof would be standing seam or asphalt. Oliver stated that the roof would match, so it would be standing seam. Mauk asked that the signage information on the door be removed. Macknally verified that all the work on the exterior of the building has been



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes June 24, 2020

completed without DRC approval. Burnett asked if the deck was handicap accessible, Oliver said no. Hoskins asked if the front door was accessible. Oliver said not at this time, but he would fix that. Burnett stated that he was worried that the new roof would look dramatically different than the existing roof. Macknally stated that none of the exterior work on this project has been presented to the DRC. Hoskins pointed out that a new site plan was needed. Burnett asked if the deck was handicap accessible, Oliver said no. Burnett suggested breaking up the roofline so that the color difference between the new and old roofs wouldn't be as noticeable. Macknally stated that this building is not handicap accessible, and has made no attempt to be pedestrian accessible, which is vitally important for the Avondale area. She also stated that the mural was questionable because it looks like advertising, and the signage looked excessive. She stated that the existing exterior features of the building would need to be approved by DRC before any new work would be considered.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to deny this proposal, and stated that the applicant needed to return with a more comprehensive packet to address all work completed and all concerns of the Committee.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: Oliver stated that he advised the applicant not to complete work without DRC approval. Burnett stated that a site plan would be required, along with mural and signage details. Hoskins stated that the phone number on the building needed to be removed.

Vote: The motion carried. Oliver recused himself.

VI.

Name: Mr. Derek Dill (Novare Group)

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

District: Midtown

Requesting approval for: Signage (Last seen 5/13/20)

Statements: Sims stated that the remainder of the project had been previously approved. Ms. Roberts described where all the signs would be located on the buildings. She stated that the awning depicted where the main entrance/leasing office of the development would be. She stated that the materials would match the building. She stated that the blade sign would be made of I-beams, wood, and aluminum letters, and the letters would be reverse lit. Ms. Roberts then described the attachment details. Sims stated that the structural integrity of the proposed sign was not being reviewed by the DRC. Wolfe asked if the signage fit within the Guidelines, Sims said yes.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, on the condition that the raceway on the west elevation be changed to a 4" raceway.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: Hoskins asked how the applicant would prevent the letters from swaying,



City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes June 24, 2020

Ms. Roberts stated that the letters were ¼” aluminum letters, and they would be stud mounted twice. Burnett asked if the raceway could be narrowed and painted to match so that it would blend in. Ms. Roberts said yes.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

- VII. 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 (Carried over from the 5/27/2020 DRC meeting)

Statements: Mauk asked if everyone had received the Assistant City Attorney’s letter. The DRC members said yes. Mauk stated that the City Attorney’s opinion is that the rooftop billboard is an off-premise sign, and should not be considered as a part of the rest of the building’s signage. Burnett stated that that sets an unreasonable precedent. Mauk then stated that the DRC is not required to rule based on the Assistant City Attorney’s opinion.

Mr. Brandt asked if there was any way to consider the building signage and the roof top billboard separately, per the Assistant City Attorney. Hoskins said no. He stated that this is the only way to get the building owner to comply with the City Ordinance. Montgomery-Mills stated that a previous tenant put their signage inside the building, and that Mr. Brandt’s client could do the same. Macknally stated that the DRC didn’t want to disadvantage businesses by denying their signage, but that this building owner has continuously attempted to circumvent the City Ordinance and the Design Review Committee.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to deny this proposal until the signage can come back and be seen as a whole.

Motion seconded by: Hoskins

Discussion: Brandt asked if any of the DRC members could provide some feedback about the proposed signage. Wieseman stated that Mr. Brandt needed to provide the same design detail for all of the tenants, not just for the primary tenant (Strayer University). The other retail tenants need to have the opportunity for more signage in agreement with the building owner. Wieseman said that the signage package needs to address other potential signage spaces on the building.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 a.m.