



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 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, Chris Swain, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe

Members Absent: Creig Hoskins, Willie Oliver

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

Others Present: Rick Batson, Eric Bennett, Hannah Conzelman, Evan Crawford, Tim Lucy, Lyn Malcom, Scott Phillips, Mark Ritter, Mary Sanders, Elizabeth Sanfelippo, Michael Shattuck, Scott Thompson

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

- I. Name:** Mr. Lyn Malcom (3D Properties)  
**Site Address:** 3208 Norwood Boulevard  
**District:** Norwood (Local Historic)  
**Requesting approval for:** Rehabilitation Related: Reopen previously infilled porch; remove vinyl siding on front elevation and repair siding underneath; repaint.

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

“Page 15-Item K-Materials

The proposed wood siding matches the original siding material and is approved.

Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary)

Front porch modification will restore the front porch to its original state and therefore is approved.

Page 19-Item T-Trim

Applicant has proposed to replicate the horizontal trim detail located within the lower section of the house. The proposed skirt board trim detail appears to be similar to what



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

was installed prior to the previous installation of the vinyl siding and is approved.

Page 19-Item U-Windows

While reviewing the application, the front picture window was brought into the conversation and after some discussion it was decided that the applicant would be approved to either leave the picture window in place as-is, or that they could bring two 1 over 1 double hung style windows to be installed side by side in the existing opening.”

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 17-Item N-Porches (primary)

Page 19-Item T-Trim

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. Malcom stated that he wanted to remove a porch enclosure to return it to the original state. He wanted to remove the vinyl siding and repair the wood underneath. He also stated that he would add a horizontal trim detail at the bottom so that it matched. He stated that he also wanted to have the opportunity to change the picture window to two 1-over-1 windows, if needed, but the plan was to leave the existing picture window as-is. Mauk asked if there was a door to the porch. Mr. Malcom stated that there was, and that it would remain. Mauk verified that the LHAC approved this case. Macknally verified that only the trim and capstone would be painted, and not the brick.

**Motion:** Macknally made a motion to approve, in agreement with the LHAC.

**Motion seconded by:** Wieseman

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

**II. Name:** Mr. Rick Batson (Owner’s Representative)

**Site Address:** 1401 33<sup>rd</sup> Street North

**District:** Norwood (Local Historic)

**Requesting approval for:** Rehabilitation and Renovation Related: Reopen infilled porch; install tripartite wooden window in opening on front elevation; install vinyl



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

windows in basement.

**Statements:** Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated the LHAC voted to approve this proposal. The reasons for approval were as follows:

“Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary)

Front porch modification will restore the front porch to its original state and therefore is approved.

Page 19-Item U-Windows

Upon meeting with the applicant on site it was discovered that there is evidence in the paint outline that there were previously two window units installed in the front window opening rather than three units. After discussing it with the applicant further it was decided that they would prefer to move forward with the installation of two window units rather than the tripartite window as described in the application. Windows will still be wood and will be 8 over 1 configuration to match other existing windows within the house.

After some careful consideration, it was determined that all but one of the basement windows are not visible from the street. In addition, the majority of the basement windows sills are below or equal with the grade outside, which is causing rapid deterioration. The committee recommends that the single basement window that is visible from the street remain and be restored, while the other basement windows can be replaced with vinyl because they are not visible from the street view. She stated that the triple-paired window on the front of the house will now be a paired window, the materials and design would remain the same.”

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. Batson stated that he wanted to reopen the enclosed porch on the front of the house. He stated that he would need to replace one window when the porch is opened. He stated that the window would match, and would be painted to match. Swain asked what work would be done in the basement. Mr. Batson stated that he would replace four of the five of the wood windows in the basement with vinyl windows, so that they don't rot. The remaining wood window was in decent condition, so it would remain. Mr. Batson stated that the replacement windows would be vinyl so that they don't deteriorate as quickly as the wood windows have. Mr. Bennett, who is on the LHAC, explained that



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

the LHAC approved the vinyl windows in this case because the remaining wood window was the only one that was visible from the street.

**Motion:** Swain made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, in agreement with the LHAC, on the condition that the replacement windows include the muntins to match the existing window.

**Motion seconded by:** Montgomery-Mills

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

### III.

**Name:** Mr. Tim Lucy

**Site Address:** 3916 Clairmont Avenue

**District:** Forest Park (Local Historic)

**Requesting approval for:** Construction of canopies on side of building

**Statements:** Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated the LHAC voted to approve this proposal on the condition that the brackets be removed from the main entrance canopy rather than the construction elevation which shows brackets at the main entrance. The recommendation of the LHAC was based on the fact that the proposal 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. Lucy presented his proposal for two new canopies. He stated that the canopies would match the canopy on the front of the building. He stated that the canopies would feature exposed wood and metal roof. The canopy would be a deep red to match the new logo of the building. Macknally verified that the signage would return, as the business within the building will be changing.

**Motion:** Wolfe made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, in agreement with the LHAC.

**Motion seconded by:** Wieseman

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

### IV.

**Name:** Ms. Hannah Conzelman (Owner)

**Site Address:** 2835 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue South

**District:** Highland Park (Local Historic)



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

**Requesting approval for:** Construction of walkway and retaining wall and replacement of windows.

**Statements:** Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. The LHAC voted to approve this proposal on the condition that the contractor confirm brickmould, sills and 7/8” SDL muntins match the existing. They also noted that if the height of the retaining wall needed to change, then that would be okay with them. The recommendation of the LHAC was to approve with conditions the design review request for the following reasons: The windows selected appear to match the existing in details and character. Item 1: The recommendation of the LHAC was based on the following sections of the local historic district’s design guidelines: D. Windows: where window replacement is necessary due to extreme deterioration or damage, new units shall match the originals as closely as possible in appearance. The LHAC also voted to request that the following conditions be placed upon this request: The contractor needs to confirm brickmould, sills and 7/8” SDL muntins match existing. Item 2: Construct retaining wall, steps, and walkway: The recommendation of the LHAC was to approve the design review request for the following reasons: Wall, steps and walkway were determined to be in character with the existing residence. The recommendation of the LHAC was based on the following section of the local historic district’s design guidelines: K. Additions, New Construction: ...new construction should be in keeping with the original structure in terms of quality, scale, and appearance. The LHAC also requested that the following observation be noted: The committee noted that a decision by the owner to shorten the height of the wall would meet with approval and should not require re-review by this committee. 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.

Ms. Conzelman presented her proposal to renovate the front of this house. She stated that the previous stairs were dangerous and falling apart. She stated that she wanted to build an era-appropriate retaining wall. The wall would be concrete and rebar, and would be covered in stucco to match the house. She stated that the stairs were rebuilt to code, safer and wider, and covered by Alabama natural stone. Macknally asked if the applicant had a site plan, or an elevation showing the details of the retaining wall. Ms. Conzelman said no. Macknally asked how tall the retaining wall was. Ms. Conzelman stated that it was 6’ tall on the tall end. She also stated that the windows were rotting and she would be replacing the windows with era-appropriate windows. She stated that all new windows would be gridded at the top and the bottom with a wood composite to



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

look as close to the original windows as possible. She stated that none of the windows that would be replaced were visible from the street. Burnett asked if Ms. Conzelman had a site survey to see how the retaining wall relates to the overall site particularly the property line and the ROW. The applicant said no. Burnett asked if there was any documentation showing the relationship of the retaining wall to the sidewalk.

**Motion:** Burnett stated that he wanted to carry this case over pending more information, particularly a site plan showing the relationship of the retaining wall to the property.

**Motion seconded by:** Macknally

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

- V. **Name:** Mr. Evan Crawford (Commercial Sign & Graphics)  
**Site Address:** 2000 Avenue D. (Ensley Health Club)  
**District:** Ensley  
**Requesting approval for:** Signage

**Statements:** The applicant presented his plan for a new monument sign for a new business in Ensley. The sign will be in the center of the parking lot by the front door of the gym. He stated that the sign would be 4'x9' and would be double-sided. Montgomery-Mills asked if the sign fit within the guidelines. Sims said yes. The applicant stated that the owner would be willing to remove the building sign, if the monument sign were to be approved. Mauk asked if the sign would be mounted on a post. Mr. Crawford stated that the sign would be mounted on a double post system. Macknally asked if the applicant was worried about the sign being hit, the applicant stated that the sign would be protected by bollards, and would be placed by the side door.

**Motion:** Macknally made a motion to approve the monument sign, placed between the bollards. She also stated that the building sign was approved, on the condition that the square footage was allowed by the Design Guidelines.

**Motion seconded by:** Swain

**Discussion:** Wieseman asked if the owner had considered a painted sign on the building. The applicant said yes, but decided against it because it would only be visible from one street.

**Vote:** The motion carried. Wieseman voted against.

- VI. **Name:** Ms. Mary Sanders (Barrett Architecture Studio)  
**Site Address:** 700 29<sup>th</sup> Street (Los Amigos Restaurant)  
**District:** Lakeview  
**Requesting approval for:** Metal Canopy (last seen 7/24/19)



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

**Statements:** Ms. Sanders presented her proposal for a new metal canopy system and railing for outdoor dining. The canopy would be over the existing concrete patio. The new canopy would be black to match the trim on the building. The railing would be perforated metal panels. Sims stated that none of this work would be in the ROW. Mauk mentioned that the new work would cover up the architecture of the building. Wieseman asked why the owner wanted to take down the existing shade structures in favor of a permanent roof. Ms. Sanders stated that the owner wanted the patios users to be more comfortable dining outside, and the larger roof would better protect them from the elements. Mauk asked if the canopy would detract from the historic nature of the building. Ms. Sanders stated that the design team tried to design the canopy under the architectural details of the building, in an effort to not cover them up. Montgomery-Mills stated that the proposed work seems very heavy and stated that the materials didn't compliment the historic nature of the building, and covered up a lot of the architecture of the building, and asked if the applicant had considered any other options. Ms. Sanders stated that they did, and that the metal option was the best choice. Mauk stated that he didn't think that the proposed canopy was appropriate for the building. Wolfe suggested a working session to work through other options, since this canopy doesn't work with the architecture of the building.

**Motion:** Wolfe made a motion to carry this case over pending discussion with a sub-committee regarding other options.

**Motion seconded by:** Montgomery-Mills

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

- VII.** **Name:** Mr. Scott Phillips (Scott Phillips Architecture)  
**Site Address:** 5607 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue South (InSighters Financial Center)  
**District:** Woodlawn  
**Requesting approval for:** Renovation

**Statements:** Mr. Phillips presented his plan for renovation to a former dental office into a new financial center. Mr. Phillips asked for approval to replace the roof, paint the fascia, and paint the brick. Mauk asked if the windows would be replaced, Mr. Phillips said no, they would just be sanded, repainted and reglazed. Macknally asked why the brick needed to be painted. Mr. Phillips stated that there was some cracking, but mostly he wanted to paint the brick because the owner liked the aesthetic of the painted brick. Mauk asked if the owner of the building would be okay without painting the brick. Mr. Phillips said that the owner really wanted the brick to be painted. Macknally asked if any other color schemes were explored that included not painting the brick. Mr. Phillips stated that the owner really didn't like the tone of the brick. Montgomery-Mills asked to see the images of the adjacent buildings.

Wieseman asked if there would be the option to close one of the two curbcuts on the site.



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes July 8, 2020

---

Mr. Phillips stated that one of the curbcuts is very narrow, so it would be possible to close that one. The owner stated that he was open to removing one of the curbcuts. Wolfe verified that the sign would be aluminum back lit letters that wrap the corner of the building. Mr. Phillips said yes, and that if the signage changed at all then he would return for approval of the new sign. Wolfe asked if there would be and landscaping changes. Mr. Phillips said no, that he just wanted to get someone to take care of the existing landscaping to make it look better.

**Motion:** Montgomery-Mills made a motion to approve this proposal, except for painting the brick. She stated that she would be interested in seeing closer pictures of the brick, to make a decision on whether painting the brick was appropriate.

**Motion seconded by:** Wolfe

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

**VIII. Name:** Mr. Scott Thompson (Architecture Works)

**Site Address:** 1530 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North

**District:** Downtown Northwest

**Requesting approval for:** Renovation

**Statements:** Mr. Thompson stated that this project was for restoration and rehabilitation of the parsonage for the 16<sup>th</sup> Street Baptist Church. He stated that he would be painting and replacing the windows on the building, repairing the roof, and stabilizing the foundation of the building. He stated that the windows would be aluminum-clad wood windows. He stated that he also wanted to make the building handicap-accessible. He stated that the ramp would be low-profile. He also wanted to restore the cornice to the historic profile. Mr. Thompson stated that the crape myrtles would need to be removed to put the ramp in, and one large tree toward the front of the property would need to be removed as well. Macknally asked if Mr. Thompson had a landscaping plan to show how he would replace the tree canopy that he is proposing to remove. Mr. Thompson said not a formal plan. Montgomery-Mills stated that it would be appropriate to replace the removed tree with something else to anchor the corner. Macknally asked what color the hand railing would be. Mr. Thompson stated that it would be black. Mauk asked if the burglar bars would be removed. Mr. Thompson stated that they would be removed and not replaced. Mauk asked if Mr. Thompson would return if the NPS required any changes. He said yes. Montgomery-Mills stated that a landscaping plan would need to return.

**Motion:** Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, on the condition that a landscaping plan return for approval. She stated that large trees shouldn't be proposed in the new landscaping plan as they would not be appropriate, but that smaller/understory trees would be fine. A buffer needed to be planted along the





**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**July 8, 2020**

---

ramp also.

**Motion seconded by:** Montgomery-Mills

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried. Holloway abstained.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 a.m.