

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:	Ivan Holloway, Creig Hoskins, Lea Ann Macknally, Richard Mauk, Shelia Montgomery-Mills, Willie Oliver, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe
Members Absent:	Abra Barnes, Scott Burnett, Chris Swain
Staff Present:	Karla Calvert, Lauren Havard, Pamela Perry, John Sims
Others Present:	Gregg Blank, Justin Brown, Jeremy Corkern, Larkin Delk, John Forney, Lissy Frese, Joseph Montgomery, Jonathan Perry, Chris Racer, Kathryn Rapier, Stephen Schrader, Scott Thompson

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. He stated that the minutes from the 2/9/22 meeting were ready. Macknally made a motion to approve the minutes. Oliver seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

I. Name: Mr. Scott Thompson (ArchitectureWorks, LLP) Site Address: 1530 6th Avenue North District: Downtown Northwest Requesting approval for: Roll Doors

Statements: Mr. Thompson presented his plan to install roll doors on 16th Street Baptist Church. The purpose of the doors is to prevent unauthorized people from using the front porch of the church. The doors would not be visible during the day. Montgomery-Mills asked if the doors could be seen through. Mr. Thompson said yes. Hoskins verified that the doors would not be seen during the day. Mr. Thompson stated that there would be a



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

series of three doors. Mr. Thompson stated that he would still need NPS approval.

Motion: Montgomery-Mills made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.Motion seconded by: HoskinsDiscussion: noneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

II. Name: Mr. Phillip Price (Ansco & Associate, LLC)
Site Address: Various
District: Cultural
Requesting approval for: New Small Cell Poles

Statements: Mr. Price presented his plan to install new AT&T cell towers to increase cell coverage for the World Games. Hoskins asked if the lights would be reused. Mr. Price said that they would, but that the lights would be converted to LED. Mr. Price stated that the current poles are 24' tall, and that the new poles will be 31' tall. He stated that the new poles will have the teardrop lights, not cobra head lights. Mr. Price stated that the new poles would be 8" in diameter, but would not taper. Wolfe verified that the light fixtures would match with whatever is already in the district. Macknally stated that a specification sheet would be needed for the poles. Hoskins stated that there would need to be a call out of which type of poles would be in which districts. Oliver stated that a typical detail for how the poles are installed would be needed. Wolfe stated that the DRC didn't need to see the poles that were outside of the Design Review Districts. Montgomery-Mills suggested a working session for this project.

Motion: Montgomery-Mills made a motion to carry this case over pending more information. Motion seconded by: Wolfe Discussion: none

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

III. Name: Mr. Jonathan Perry (Live Design Group)
Site Address: 1625 3rd Avenue South (Red Mountain Theater)
District: Midtown
Requesting approval for: Phase II (Final) (Last seen 12/17/21)

Statements: Mr. Perry presented his plan for Phase II of the Red Mountain Theater renovation. He stated that the demolition had already mostly been completed. He also



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

stated that a new courtyard would be installed in its place. Mr. Perry stated that he would be matching the Phase I colors and materials in Phase II. Mr. Perry also stated that a new restaurant tenant would hold the corner of the site. Mr. Perry stated that the windows would match Phase I as well. Macknally asked if the gate on the courtyard would be an egress gate. Mr. Perry said yes. He stated that the gate would be closed almost all the time. Wieseman stated that he appreciated that the applicant moved the entrance to the courtyard so as not to cause a bottleneck. Hoskins asked Macknally if the landscaping plan met the landscaping ordinance. Macknally said that it did meet the Parkside Guidelines, except that the pedestrian score pattern needed to be extended across the driveway.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to approve this proposal (including the signage master plan) as presented, on the condition that the pedestrian score pattern is extended across the drive on 17^{th} Street.

Motion seconded by: Oliver

Discussion: Wolfe stated that the painting of the brick was allowed because of the extensive fire damage to the brick.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. 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 (Carry over from 2/9/22 DRC meeting; returning with legible landscaping and site plan)

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 topography on a difficult lot.



February 23, 2022

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

The front parking area, while not ideal, is necessary in this instance 3. 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 site plan and landscaping plan. He stated that the driveway would be cobblestone. He stated that the parking area would be pea gravel with cobble stone borders. Wolfe asked if the retaining walls would be rubbed concrete. Mr. Corkern said no, that the poured in place retaining walls would be stone-clad to match the other walls in the Redmont Neighborhood. He also stated that the finished floor elevation was about 20' below the road. Macknally asked if the retaining walls tapered with the grade. Mr. Corkern said yes. Wolfe asked if there would be a 3' fence on top of every wall. Mr. Corkern said yes. Mr. Corkern stated that he would be using as much of the existing landscaping as possible. Macknally asked if the driveway would have walls on both sides. Mr. Corkern said no. Montgomery-Mills asked if there was a color sample for the fence. Mr. Corkern said no. Macknally stated that she wanted to see the full grading for the extent of the driveway. Montgomery-Mills stated that a full planting plan was needed, particularly along the road, where the landscaping would be visible.

Motion: Macknally made a motion to carry this case over pending a landscaping plan, and more information on the fence and pickets. Motion seconded by: Montgomery-Mills **Discussion:** none **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

V. **Name:** Dave Smithey (Contractor) Site Address: 736 Linwood Road **District:** Forest Park Local Historic District



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

Requesting approval for: Replacing windows

Statements: Mauk asked Perry if there was a report from the LHAC. Perry stated that this project was approved on condition by the Forest Park LHAC. She stated that the applicant had agreed to the condition.

The Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Forest Park Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 736 Linwood Road, and the Committee took the following action: Approve on condition.

The LHAC's condition was that any windows that were not replaced need to have their trim painted to match the replaced windows.

The Local Historic Advisory Committee determined that the Applicant's plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood.

The LHAC also made the following findings:

1. 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.

The applicant stated that he would be replacing all of the windows on the house. He stated that the windows would be painted "Iron Ore." He stated that this is the closest color to match the original. He also stated that all of the light patterns on the windows would remain the same. Mauk asked if this home was on the National Register. Perry stated that this home is on the National Register. Mauk asked if changing out the two windows would affect its position on the National Register. Calvert stated that it would not, since the style of the window would not change.

Motion: Hoskins made a motion to approve this proposal as presented. **Motion seconded by:** Holloway **Discussion:** none

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.



February 23, 2022

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

VI. Name: Mr. David Brandt (Fravert Services, Inc.) Site Address: 2100 Highland Avenue (Alabama Holocaust Education Center) **District:** Five Points South **Requesting approval for:** Signage

Statements: Mr. Brandt presented his plan for a new sign as the Alabama Holocaust Education Center. He stated that it would be a single monument sign, and is in keeping with the other signs along the street. He stated that the sign would be internally lit. Macknally asked if there was already a sign in this location. Mr. Brandt said no. Macknally asked if there was landscaping around the monument sign. Mr. Brandt said yes. Macknally asked if this sign matched surrounding signs. Mr. Brandt said yes, that it was a very simple sign.

Motion: Hoskins made a motion to approve this proposal as presented. Motion seconded by: Macknally **Discussion:** none **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

Name: Ms. Lissy Frese VII. Site Address: 2000 3rd Avenue South **District:** Midtown **Requesting approval for:** Modification of Signage Master Plan

> Statements: Ms. Frese presented changes to the signage master plan of 20 Midtown. She stated that a couple of the wall signs would be removed, and blade signs would be added to help with wayfinding for the parking lot of the site. She stated that the new signage would mostly be directional signage for the parking lot entrances. Hoskins asked if the signage still fit within the guidelines. Sims said yes. Ms. Frese stated that the tenant signs were not changing.

Motion: Hoskins made a motion to approve this proposal as presented. Motion seconded by: Oliver **Discussion:** none **Vote:** The motion carried, Macknally recused herself.

Name: Mr. Justin Brown (Creature) VIII. **Site Address:** 2320 2nd Avenue North **District:** 2nd Avenue North **Requesting approval for:** Signage



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

Statements: Mr. Brown presented his new blade sign at the Frothy Monkey. He stated that the new sign would be the same size as the previous sign, but it would be round. Montgomery-Mills asked if there was a signage master plan. Wieseman said no. Macknally asked if there was vinyl signage on the door. Mr. Brown said yes but it was not finalized yet. Macknally stated that that vinyl signage would need to return for approval.

Motion: Montgomery-Mills made a motion to approve this proposal as presented, with the vinyl signage to return.

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

IX. Name: Mr. Troy Whetstone
Site Address: 703 19th Street
District: Ensley
Requesting approval for: Painting and Signage

Statements: This case was removed from the agenda.

Name: Mr. Gregg A. Blank (Homeowner)
Site Address: 3918 4th Avenue South
District: Avondale Park Local Historic District
Requesting approval for: ADA Handrails on front porch stairs

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

On February 15, 2022, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Avondale Park Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 3918 4th Ave. S 35222, 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:

Applicant's plan is approved as presented—basic metal railing without embellishments or frills on both sides of the steps leading down from the front porch.

Applicant's plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood.

The LHAC also made the following findings:



February 23, 2022

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

1. 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. Blank presented his plan to add ADA handrails to the front of his house. He stated that the handrails would be steel. He stated that the handrails would be 4" on center. Montgomery-Mills asked what color the handrails would be painted. Mr. Blank stated that the handrails would be satin black.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to approve this proposal as presented. Motion seconded by: Hoskins **Discussion:** none **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

XI. Name: Mr. John Forney (Architect) Site Address: 4036 5th Avenue South **District:** Avondale Park Local Historic District Requesting approval for: Building addition

> Statements: Mauk asked Perry if there was a report from the LHAC. Perry stated that this project was approved by the Avondale Park LHAC.

> On February 15, 2022, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Avondale Park Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 4036 5th Ave. S 35222, and the Committee took the following action: Approve with Conditions.

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

> Applicant's plan is approved as modified during the presentation to the Avondale Park Local Design Review Committee.

> Applicants need to install a garage door with clear glass rather than frosted glass. 1.



February 23, 2022

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

Applicant agreed to forego planting roses and installing steel supports for the 2. roses in front of the building.

Applicant agreed to plant Creeping Fig along the front of the building for the 3. purpose of covering the front facade of the proposed addition.

The LHAC determined that the Applicant's plan is in keeping with the architectural integrity of the neighborhood.

The LHAC also made the following findings:

1. 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. Forney presented his plan for a building addition in Avondale. He stated that the new addition would serve as storage for the adjacent bar/café. Mr. Forney stated that the glass would be clear, but the owner will add a curtain to hide the items stored. Macknally asked if the stucco would be painted to match the painted brick. Mr. Forney said yes. Wolfe verified that the stucco would only be on the front of the building, the remainder of the building will be concrete block. Wolfe also verified that the building will be painted to match the painted brick on the adjacent building. Wolfe asked if there was any signage associated with this building. Mr. Forney said no.

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

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

XII. Name: Mr. Barry Harwell (Contractor) Site Address: 3408 15th Avenue North **District:** Norwood Local Historic District **Requesting approval for:** Painting & Repairing/Replacing damaged window glass

Page 9 | 13



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

panes

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

On February 16, 2022, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Norwood Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 3408 15th Ave. N, 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:

Page 16-Item L-Paint

"Colors shall be compatible with the age and style of the house."

Page 19-Item U-Windows

"Repair windows in accordance with the original window design. Repair and maintenance shall include replacing broken panes with new panes to match, repair and replacement of deteriorated frame elements with new frame to match and painting."

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

Page 16 – Item L – Paint Page 19 – Item U - Windows

The LHAC also made the following findings:

1. 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.

The applicant presented her case to replace broken window panes, re-glaze the windows,



February 23, 2022

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

and repaint the trim. Macknally verified that the paint color was Oyster White.

Motion: Wolfe made a motion to approve this proposal as presented. Motion seconded by: **Discussion:** none **Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

XIII. **Name:** Mr. Louis Aller (Homeowner) Site Address: 40 Norwood Circle **District:** Norwood Local Historic District **Requesting approval for:** A new driveway

> **Statements:** Mauk asked Perry if there was a report from the LHAC. Perry stated that this project was approved by the Norwood LHAC.

> On February 16, 2022, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Norwood Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 40 Norwood Circle, and the Committee took the following action: Approve with Conditions.

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

Page 24-Item G-Driveways

"Install residential driveways in a manner and width compatible with those historically installed, generally not wider than ten feet and also in compliance with the City's Zoning Ordinance.

"Locate driveways to the side and rear of the main building.

"Extend all driveways to at least the rear of the main building."

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

Page 24-Item G-Drive

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"):

Driveway shall extend to at least the rear corner of the main building.

The LHAC also made the following findings:

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

Page 11 | 13



February 25, 2022

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

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. Aller was not present. Perry presented his case on his behalf. She stated that there was not a house on the site, but that the house plans had been submitted to the City for approval. Mauk stated that he was hesitant to approve this proposal piecemeal. Montgomery-Mills stated that more context was needed.

Motion: Wieseman made a motion to carry this case over, pending more information.Motion seconded by: MacknallyDiscussion: noneVote: The motion carried unanimously.

XIV. Name: Mr. Larkin Delk

Site Address: 816 Conroy Road

District: Forest Park Local Historic District

Requesting approval for: Replacing the roofing material and other modifications on carriage house

Statements: Mauk asked Perry if there was a report from the LHAC. Perry stated that this project was approved by the Forest Park LHAC with conditions.

She stated that the conditions were that the windows and doors that do not have historically accurate divided lite patterns should not be visible from the street.

The LHAC also made the following findings:

1. 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



February 23, 2022

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. Delk presented his case to renovate a carriage house on Conroy Road. Mr. Delk stated that he wanted to replace the windows on the carriage house, and paint them to match the existing. He stated that he would be replacing the concrete tile roof with an asphalt shingle roof. He stated that the color of the shingles would match the existing. Mr. Delk stated that the carriage house was not visible from the street. Mr. Delk stated that he would also be replacing the windows on the carriage house.

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

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

There being no further business, Wolfe made a motion to adjourn. Macknally seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 a.m.