

Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m. Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall

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. In addition, please note that prior to obtaining any permit(s), all applicants must meet with Zoning staff to determine compliance with the Zoning regulations. Design Review approval does NOT mean that Zoning has approved the request.

Members Present:	Abra Barnes, Scott Burnett, Lea Ann Macknally, Richard Mauk, Shelia Montgomery-Mills, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe
Members Absent:	Ivan Holloway, Creig Hoskins, Willie Oliver, Chris Swain
Staff Present:	Karla Calvert, Lauren Havard, Pamela Perry, John Sims
Others Present:	Carolyn Buck, Jeremy Corkern, Matt Foley, Hank Long, Mai Nguyen, Mary Melissa Taddeo, Brad Ward

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. He stated that the minutes from the 1/26/21 meeting were ready. Macknally made a motion to approve the minutes. Wieseman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

 I. Name: Ms. Carolyn Buck Site Address: 42nd Street South and 2nd Alley South District: 41st Street Requesting approval for: Final approval of resting and wayfinding architectural feature for the new Continental Gin Connector recreational and commuting trail (last seen on 9/22/21)

Statements: Ms. Buck presented her project for final approval. Wieseman verified that all materials, colors, and measurements were labelled on the drawing. Macknally verified that there was only one location.



Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m. Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.Motion seconded by: WiesemanDiscussion: noneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

II. Name: Mr. Matt Foley
 Site Address: 2013-2015 4th Avenue North
 District: Birmingham Green
 Requesting approval for: Renovation

Statements: Mr. Foley presented his plan to renovate the Hood-McPherson building on 4th Avenue for the new Auburn Urban Studio. Mr. Foley stated that signage would return at a later date for approval. He stated that the terra cotta façade would be restored. He stated that he would be replacing the windows on 4th Avenue with similar windows. Montgomery-Mills asked if the new windows would match the existing windows. Mr. Foley said that they would match, but would be new upgraded aluminum windows. Wolfe asked if the applicant would be applying for historic tax credits. Mr. Foley said no. Wieseman asked if the building was currently painted. Mr. Foley said yes. He stated that the building was currently covered with terra cotta, and he presented the color he planned to use to paint the terra cotta. Macknally asked if signage would return. Mr. Foley said yes. Montgomery-Mills asked if the muntins were inside the glass of the windows. Mr. Foley said that they would be applied to the glass. Mauk asked if the sign band would be removed. Mr. Foley said that it would be removed, and that the transom windows would be restored. Mauk asked if the canopy needed to be approved. Mr. Foley said yes.

Motion: Burnett made a motion to approve this proposal as presented. Motion seconded by: Wieseman Discussion: Montgomery-Mills asked if the HVAC unit on the rear of the building

would be removed. Mr. Foley said yes. **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

III. Name: Mr. Brad Ward (Sign Shop Inc.)
 Site Address: 7740 1st Avenue North
 District: East Lake District
 Requesting approval for: Signage

Statements: Mr. Ward presented his plan to add a flat metal sign to his building. Mauk asked if the sign would be lit. Mr. Ward said yes. Mauk asked Sims if this sign fit



Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m. Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall

within the guidelines. Sims said yes. Mauk asked if the sign would be lit. Mr. Ward stated that the sign would not be lit. Montgomery-Mills verified that the building color would remain the same. Wieseman asked if the applicant would be willing to move the sign so that it is over the door, instead of centered on the building. Mr. Ward stated that he thought that the owners would agree to that.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve this proposal on the condition that the sign is moved and centered over the door.

Motion seconded by: Wolfe Discussion: none Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

 IV.
 Name: Mr. Mark Martin (Owner/Contractor)

 Site Address: 1222 29th Street North

 District: Norwood Local Historic District

 Requesting approval for: Replacing and repairing windows; replacing siding over the entire home; adding rear dormers for the bedrooms; replacing roof and painting the exterior

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

 V. Name: Mr. Jeremy Corkern and Mr. Jeremiah Wade (Architects) Site Address: 3835 Redmont Road
 District: Red Mountain Suburbs Local Historic District
 Requesting approval for: New single family construction

Statements: Mauk asked Perry if there was a report from the LHAC. Perry stated that this project was approved by the Red Mountain Suburbs LHAC.

On 2/2/22, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Red Mountain Suburbs Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 3835 Redmont Road, and the Committee took the following action: Approve.

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was to Approve the design review request for the following reasons:

1. The proposed structure is compatible in scale, character, material, and level of detail with the neighborhood.

2. The orientation of the house to the street rather than the lot lines, as well as the significantly dropped main floor elevation, allows the structure to fit in with the



Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m. Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall

topography on a difficult lot.

3. The front parking area, while not ideal, is necessary in this instance because of the extremely difficult lot. The motor court is far below street level and more easily camouflaged than if it were at street level.

The LHAC also made the following findings:

The proposed change, erection, or demolition: Conforms to the design standards established.

2. The proposed change, erection, or demolition: Is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value.

3. The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part: Will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant architectural feature of the resource.

4. The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part: Will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Mr. Corkern presented his plan to build a moss rock home, which he said was in keeping with some of the other homes on the street. He also stated that the visible doors would be old oak doors, and would be waxed. He stated that the roof would be slate. Macknally asked if the house would be completely built up. Mr. Corkern stated that it would be. He stated that there would be a retaining wall, and that the home would sit about 14-20' down from street level. Macknally asked for more information on the site plan, a section through the site, and a landscaping plan. Macknally stated that the submitted site plan wasn't legible, and that the Committee needed more information.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this project conceptually. She stated that the applicant would need to return with a site plan, landscaping and hardscape plan, and sections that are legible.

Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills Discussion: none Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

VI. Name: Mr. Forney/Mr. Jameel Todd (Contractor)
 Site Address: 10 Norwood Circle
 District: Norwood Local Historic District
 Requesting approval for: Painting or mortar washing the exterior of this brick and stone on home



Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m. Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall

Statements: This item was removed from the agenda.

VII. Name: Mr. Hank Long (Architect)
 Site Address: 3560 Altamont Road
 District: Red Mountain Suburbs Local Historic District
 Requesting approval for: Construct a new driveway and fence

Statements: Mauk asked Perry if there was a report from the LHAC. Perry stated that this project was approved by the Red Mountain Suburbs LHAC.

On 2/2/22, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Red Mountain Suburbs Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 3560 Altamont Road, and the Committee took the following action: Approve.

The recommendation of the Local Historic Advisory Committee was to Approve the design review request for the following reasons:

1. The proposed gate and fence design is compatible in scale, character, material, and level of detail with the neighborhood.

2. The front parking area, while not ideal is necessary in this instance because of the difficult parking situation on Altamont Road. The proposed off street parking will be in keeping with the neighboring properties on the street.

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

IV. Specific Element Guidelines: R. Fencing: Front yard fencing shall be appropriate to the period of the house and neighborhood as referenced in the Red Mountain Suburbs Historic District National Register application, and shall be in keeping with zoning regulations. Materials used for fencing shall be consistent with those originally used in the district.

The LHAC also made the following findings:

The proposed change, erection, or demolition: Conforms to the design standards established.

2. The proposed change, erection, or demolition: Is compatible with the character of the historic property and the historic district and does not detract from their historic value.

3. The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part: Will not detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect any significant



Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m. Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall

architectural feature of the resource.

4. The proposed erection, alteration, restoration, relocation or demolition, in whole or in part: Will be compatible with the exterior features of other improvements within the District.

Mr. Long presented his plan to construct a new driveway and fence. Mauk asked if the applicant would be adding a curb cut. Mr. Long said yes, and that the arbor would be removed. Mr. Long stated that there would be a new parking pad and a fence above the wall and adjacent to the house next door. He stated that the planter would remain. Mauk stated that parking pads had been approved in this neighborhood before. Mr. Long stated that there were six parking pads on the same block as this house. Mr. Long stated that the parking pad needed to be added for the safety of the residents. Mr. Long stated that the wooden fence would be 6' tall and would mimic the shape of the house. He stated that the fence would be cedar and would be painted to match the house. Macknally reminded the applicant that the DRC could not approve a curb cut, but that he would need to apply for a curb cut through the City.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.Motion seconded by: BarnesDiscussion: noneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business, Wolfe made a motion to adjourn. Wieseman seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 a.m.