

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:	Abra Barnes, Scott Burnett, Ivan Holloway, Lea Ann Macknally, Richard Mauk, Willie Oliver, Chris Swain, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe
Members Absent:	Creig Hoskins, Sheila Montgomery-Mills
Staff Present:	Karla Calvert, Lauren Havard, Paige Largue, Pamela Perry, Tonte Peters, John Sims
Others Present:	Hebert Beville, Dane Brown, Hannah Conzelman, Mary Helen Crowe, Karen Dorsey, Brian Gunn, Kurtis Hammond, Don Hawes, Bernard Lockhart, Issac McDowell, Ellen Michael, David Ratliff, Elizabeth Sanfellippo, Steve Vangieson, Rob Walker

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. He stated that the May 13th, May 27th and June 10th DRC minutes were ready. Macknally made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Barnes seconded. The motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously.

I. Name: Mr. Hebert Beville, Jr. (Ebert Investments, LLC)

Site Address: 4019 Glenwood Avenue

District: Forest Park (Local Historic District)

Requesting approval for: Renovation Related: After the fact approval for: Replacement of windows, infill of some windows; installation of windows on rear; replacement of doors; painting of brick; repairing of metal stair and construction of wooden stairs on rear

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated the LHAC voted to approve part of this proposal and deny part of it. They voted to deny the painting of the brick, and deny the addition to the railings on the second floor. They voted to approve the proposed windows and doors, and the roof.

"Part 1: The LHAC voted to approve the design review request for the following reasons:

This work was done outside of the permit application and seeks review after the fact of



execution. This committee has reviewed the proposal and is willing to approve part of the work and deny part of the work. This is a two-part response from our review.

This committee voted to approve the windows, doors, and roof shingles. ... This committee does not approve painting of the existing brick, please see Part 2 of the response.

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines: Is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood.

Part 2: The LHAC voted to deny the design review request for the following reasons:

This work was done outside of the permit application and seeks review after the fact of execution. This committee has reviewed the proposal and is willing to approve part of the work and deny part of the work. This is a two-part response from our review.

This committee voted to deny the addition to the second floor railing. It is an add-on to the existing railing and looks as such. A new railing should be fabricated to resemble the existing railing at the new height required by the current building code.

This committee also denies the painting of the existing brick because it does not meet the guidelines for maintaining existing materials which we are tasked with following. The brick was selected for its color and appearance and that is evident that the detail of the masonry work and character are an integral architectural element of this structure and true to its historic period. Brick is selected as an exterior material for a number of reasons but, its longevity with little need for maintenance is its main appeal. Paint is a protective barrier for wood and metal and requires frequent reapplication. Applying paint to a material such as brick, which does not require it, presents a maintenance issue and departs from the initial design intent of the structure. We strongly urge that this practice be discouraged, preempted and remedied."

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guidelines:

General Standards for Review:

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site shall be treated with sensitivity.

A. Exterior Siding

Original exterior construction and siding materials shall be retained, repaired and matched. Any change shall maintain the visual integrity and quality of original



construction.

The Forest Park AC also made the following Standard of Review Findings of Fact (regarding the windows and doors): (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. Beville stated that he wanted to get approval from the DRC to paint the brick on the home, and enhance the railing on the second floor. Mr. Beville stated that he didn't realize that prior approval was needed to paint the brick since several homes around his had painted brick. He stated that he wanted to paint the brick to make the house look more modern. Burnett stated that the additions to the railings were placed to achieve code compliance, but didn't reflect the historic nature of the structure. Burnett stated that he was disappointed with the painting of the brick, stating that it detracts from the historic nature of the neighborhood.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to uphold the approvals and denials of the LHAC. **Motion seconded by:** Holloway

Discussion: Mr. Beville stated that the house needed to be painted to make it fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. He stated that if other homes were allowed to paint their homes, then he should be allowed to paint his. Mauk stated that those homes were painted before the DRC existed.

Vote: The motion carried. Barnes abstained.

II.Name: Ms. Ellen Michael (Owner)
Site Address: 4336 10th Avenue South
District: Forest Park (Local Historic District)
Requesting approval for: Extension of front porch

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated the LHAC voted to approve this proposal with the condition that the porch needed to be framed with a lower rafter plate than the existing porch. The proposal was "approved as presented with the exception of the new porch addition is framed with a lower rafter plate than the existing porch in order to create a lower gable in front of the existing porch gable which will also result in a lower ridgeline on the new porch addition."

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the reason 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.

Ms. Michael stated that she agreed with the condition of the LHAC. Macknally asked if the existing stone paving and other materials would remain. Ms. Michael said yes.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, in agreement with the LHAC.Motion seconded by: WiesemanDiscussion: NoneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

Name: Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Crowe
Site Address: 3221 Cliff Road
District: Highland Park (Local Historic District)
Requesting approval for: Replacement of an asphalt shingle roof with a new Decra Villa clay tile roof, which matches the original tile roof material

III.

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Perry for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. She stated the LHAC voted to approve this proposal as presented. The recommendation of the Committee was to support the design review request for the following reasons:

"The proposed metal barrel tile design and color will complement the style of the house and are closer to the historical look the house than the current 3 tab asphalt shingles.

The recommendation of the Neighborhood Association/Subcommittee was based on the following sections (cite the applicable section numbers) of the local historic district's design guidelines:

General Standards for Review: 3 ... reasonable effort should be made to assure that the new material matches the old in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities."

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.

Motion: Holloway made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, in agreement



with the LHAC.Motion seconded by: MacknallyDiscussion: NoneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

 IV. Name: Mr. Steve Vangieson (Epic Home Repair) Site Address: 3428 7th Court South District: Avondale Park (Local Historic District) Requesting approval for: Removal and rebuilding new wood deck to code within the same footprint

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Perry for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. The Avondale LHAC recommended that this proposal be approved as presented. The LHAC determined that the plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood.

The Avondale 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. Vangieson stated that the deck would be made of pressure treated lumber, and would be painted white.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, in agreement with the LHAC.Motion seconded by: SwainDiscussion: NoneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

V. Name: Mr. Brian Gunn and Mr. Kurtis Hammond (Contractors)
 Site Address: 1330 29th Street North
 District: Norwood (Local Historic District)
 Requesting approval for: Rehabilitation Related: Remove infilled porch

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. The LHAC voted to recommend approval of this proposal as presented, on the condition that the applicant choose one of the two doors that the LHAC recommended for approval. They also stated that any replaced windows should be a 6-over-1 configuration with either true divided lights, or simulated divided lights. Largue

Page 5 | 11



also stated that the infilled wall would be removed down to the original design of the porch.

The recommendation of the LHAC was to approve with conditions the design review request for the following reasons:

"Page 12-Jtem C-Decks

Proposed deck is located at the rear of the house. which conforms to the guidelines.

Page 13-Item E-Doors

Applicant proposed three styles of door for the new front door. The committee determined that the middle door and the right door would be appropriate, but that the fan style door would not be recommended.

Page 15-Item K-Materials

Applicant confirmed that soffit material on porch will be repaired with material matching what is existing as needed.

Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary)

Applicant is proposing to return the porch to its previous condition by opening it back up. Center columns will be allowed to stay for structural reasons. It was noted by applicant that the infilled wall will be removed down to the level of the original brick porch surround, not as it is shown in the elevation drawing.

Page 19-Item U-Windows

Where windows cannot be repaired the committee recommends replacing double hung units with a six over one configuration rather than the proposed one over one. This was decided after closer observation of the existing windows and the historic photograph and noting that the six over one configuration appears to be what was originally installed in the majority of the window openings. Proposed Anderson 100 wood composite windows are approved, but between the glass muntins should not be used. Six light sash should be true divided light or simulated divided light as required by the Norwood Historic Preservation Plan."

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections of the local historic district's design guide lines:

Page 12-Item C-Decks Page 13-Item E-Doors Page 15- Item K-Materials Page 17-Item N-Porches (primary) Page 19-Item U-Windows

The Norwood AC also made the following Standard of Review Findings of Fact: (1) The

Page 6 | 11



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.

Macknally asked if the applicant agreed with the conditions of the LHAC. Mr. Gunn said yes. Ms. Dorsey stated that the owner wanted to keep the windows as consistent as possible, and would use simulated divided lights. Mauk asked the applicant which door he intended to use. Mr. Gunn stated that he wanted door #3.

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

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

 VI. Name: Ms. Hannah Conzelman Site Address: 2835 11th Avenue South District: Highland Park (Local Historic District) Requesting approval for: Retaining wall and site improvements; installation of windows on side elevations (Carried over from the July 8, 2020 DRC meeting)

Statements: Chairman Mauk asked Largue for her report from the Local Historic Advisory Committee. The LHAC made a recommendation to approve this proposal as presented, on the condition that any replaced windows should match the existing.

"Item 1: Remove and replace windows

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee 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.

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee 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 Local Historic Advisory Committee also voted to request that the following conditions be placed upon this request (in the case of an "approval with conditions"):



Contractor to confirm brickmould, sills, and 718" SDL muntins match existing.

Item 2: Construct retaining wall, steps and walkway

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee 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 Local Historic Advisory Committee was based on the following sections 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 Local Historic Advisory Committee also requests 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 stated that the windows and their surround would match the existing exactly. Burnett stated that the retaining wall extends several feet over the property line. Ms. Conzelman stated that she had applied for a vacation of the City's ROW so that her retaining wall could remain in place. Sims stated that the retaining wall could be approved by the DRC but would still be subject to the ROW approval. Burnett stated that as the retaining wall stands, there isn't room for landscaping to soften the wall. He stated that he couldn't approve this plan as it's drawn/built.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve the windows and structure revisions as presented, and to approve the site work based on all other City approvals needed and based on the applicant adding landscaping to soften the retaining wall, above the retaining wall. The applicant must return for landscaping.

Motion seconded by: Mauk

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion carried. Burnett and Wieseman voted against.



VII. Name: Mr. Rob Walker (Rob Walker Architecture)
 Site Address: 3116 4th Avenue South (Barber Redevelopment)
 District: Lakeview
 Requesting approval for: Renovation

Statements: Mr. Walker presented his renovation for an existing vacant one story brick building in Lakeview. Mr. Walker stated that he planned to install new windows, install new storefront, install a new awning over the door, and paint the brick. Mauk asked about the color the awning. Mr. Walker stated that it would be painted "Wheat." Mauk asked what the windows would be replaced with, and Mr. Walker stated that they would be storefront. Mauk asked what the window sills were made of, and Mr. Walker stated that they would be painted. Mr. Walker stated that when the roof is replaced, the parapet will be covered by a black, aluminum cap. Mauk stated that since this building was commercial and not residential, and since it was located outside of a Local Historic District, the DRC could vote to approve painting the brick in this case.

Motion: Macknally made motion to approve this proposal as presented. Motion seconded by: Oliver Discussion: None Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VIII. Name: Ms. Candice Watson Site Address: 3112 Ensley 5 Points W Ave. (B Elite) District: Ensley Requesting approval for: Signage

Statements: Mr. Hawes presented his proposal for two new signs in Ensley. Mauk stated that the temporary signs needed to be removed before the new signs could go up. Mauk asked if this signage fit within the Guidelines. Sims said yes. Wolfe asked how the signs would be mounted. Mr. Hawes stated that they would be stud mounted, and the screws would be painted to match where they were pushed through the PVC. He stated that the signs were made of PVC, and had vinyl graphics applied to the faces. Mr. Hawes stated that these signs would not be lit. Mauk asked if the building was for multiple tenants. Wolfe said no, that individual contractors could lease space. Mr. Hawes stated that the individual contractors would not have their own signage.

Motion: Holloway made a motion to approve this proposal on the condition that the existing temporary signage be removed from the building before the new signs were installed, and that the screws would have caps on them. **Motion seconded by:** Swain



Discussion: Oliver asked what size the screws would be, and Mr. Hawes stated that they were $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Oliver stated that caps on the screws would be preferable to painting because they would last longer.

Vote: The motion carried.

IX. Name: Mr. Dane Brown (Birmingham Fence)
 Site Address: 1930 Rev. Abraham Woods Jr. Blvd.
 District: Cultural
 Requesting approval for: New Metal Fence

Statements: Mr. Brown presented his proposal to install an 8' ornamental metal fence on either side of the Boutwell Auditorium. Mauk asked if zoning allowed this type of fence. Sims said yes. Oliver asked what color the fence would be, and Mr. Brown said black. Mauk asked if the fence would be on the front and back of the building. Sims said yes. Oliver asked if the fences would have man or vehicular gates. Mr. Brown said both. He stated that the man gates would have panic bars. Wieseman asked if this gate would match the one approved for City Hall. Sims stated that it was similar, but not exactly the same. Burnett asked if this fence affected egress. Sims stated that Zoning staff would check that. Macknally stated that the tops of the pickets didn't complement the style of the Boutwell. Mauk stated that the pickets needed to be complimentary. Wieseman stated that City buildings needed to have consistent styles for the security fences.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve this proposal on the condition that this fence match the fence previously approved for City Hall at Wiggins Walk.Motion seconded by: HollowayDiscussion: NoneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

 X. Name: Ms. Haley Linville (Research Specialist) Site Address: 3200 6th Avenue South (Mavis Tire) District: Lakeview Requesting approval for: Signage (Carried over from the 5/27/20 DRC Meeting)

Statements: Sims stated that the owner agreed to take "at discount prices" off of their signs to comply with the Guidelines. Mr. Ratliff stated that the only signage that Mavis was seeking were the pole sign and the two wall signs, and the other sign would be removed. Mauk verified that the reader board and the additional pole sign would be removed.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve this proposal on the condition that the pole sign in the corner of the lot in the landscaped island be removed.



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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 a.m.