



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> 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, 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. 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, Creig Hoskins, Richard Mauk, Shelia Montgomery-Mills, Ben Wieseman, Brian Wolfe

**Members Absent:** Scott Burnett, Ivan Holloway, Lea Ann Macknally, Willie Oliver, Chris Swain

**Staff Present:** Karla Calvert, Lauren Havard, Pamela Perry, John Sims

**Others Present:** Charlie Abram, Russell Boyla, Matthew Barron, Alan Croftwell, Brittany Foley, Celia Gannaway, Dan Gardner, Don Hawes, William Johnson, Chuck Kelly, Tom Kidwell, Alex Krumdieck, Alycia Levels-Moore, Annie McCarter, Ryan Medley, Derrick Owens, Avee Ashanti Shabazz, Janea Spillers

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chairman Mauk. He stated that the minutes from the 3/23/22 meeting were ready. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes. Wieseman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

- I. Name:** Mr. Don Hawes  
**Site Address:** 1927 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North (Woodward Building)  
**District:** Birmingham Green  
**Requesting approval for:** Signage

**Statements:** Mr. Hawes presented his plan to add signage to the Total on 1<sup>st</sup> Dermatology building. He stated that there would be two parking signs added on the Morris Avenue side of the building and one blade sign added to the 20<sup>th</sup> Street side of the building. He stated that the parking signs will be double sided, and will be unlit.



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

Mauk asked if the sign fit within the guidelines. Sims said that it did fit within the guidelines.

Montgomery-Mills asked if there were multiple tenants in this building. Mr. Hawes said yes. He also stated that Total Dermatology would be the only tenant that would be allowed to have signage on the exterior of the building. Mauk stated that if any other tenant wanted to have exterior signage, they would need to come back for a master signage plan. Mauk asked how thick the sign would be. Mr. Hawes stated that the sign would be about 4-6" wide. Montgomery-Mills asked what the material of the blade sign would be. Mr. Hawes stated that the sign would have an aluminum cabinet with an acrylic face. He also stated that the blade sign would be internally lit.

Mr. Hawes also stated that there would be two aluminum signs mounted onto the building on either side of the 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue corner of the building. He stated that these signs would not have a raceway, and would be unlit. Wieseman stated that a master signage plan would be needed. Sims stated that since this tenant is the only one with signage rights on the building, that this signage could be approved, but if another tenant wanted signage, then a master signage plan would be needed at that point. Wieseman stated that he would like to see a signage master plan for this building. Wieseman stated that additional information was needed for the blade signs on the building. He stated that the mounting details and the dimensions of the blade sign were needed. Hoskins stated that a ROW use agreement would be needed. Wieseman stated that the signs on the parking deck were confusing and busy.

**Motion:** Montgomery-Mills made a motion to carry this case over pending a working session.

**Motion seconded by:** Barnes

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

**II.**

**Name:** Mr. Tom Kidwell

**Site Address:** 401 14<sup>th</sup> Street South

**District:** Midtown

**Requesting approval for:** New Construction (Final)

**Statements:** Mr. Kidwell presented his plan for a new open-air pavilion adjacent to the Jefferson County Department of Health annex building. He stated that the pavilion would provide covered parking and a location for drive-in clinics. Mr. Kidwell stated that the structure would be open and would cover approximately 30,000 square feet. The applicant stated that the pavilion would be 14' off the surface of the parking lot.



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

She stated that the structure would be copper colored, and the side panels would be corrugated, perforated metal panels. There are three proposed canopies on the pavilion. Mauk verified that the existing fence around the property would remain. She stated that the canopy on top of the connecting piece will be translucent. Wieseman asked what the height of that section would be. The applicant stated that the high side would be 9'2", and the low side would be 7'6" high.

The applicant stated that there would be three main building signs on the pavilion, one sign on the annex, and additional pedestrian signage. She stated that the signage on the annex would be mounted to the canopy and the letters would be 18" tall. She also stated that this sign would be up-lit. She stated that there would also be a wall sign on the perforated metal panel, and it will not be lit. There will also be a black and white acrylic JCDH shield mounted to the pavilion. She stated that the monument sign (at the corner of 14<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Ave N) would mimic the new pavilion in color and materials. The applicant showed a photometric study showing that light pollution will be minimized under the pavilion while also maintaining security. Hoskins asked if the signage fit within the guidelines. Sims stated that he wasn't sure at this time. He stated that he would check on it.

Wieseman stated that with regard to landscaping, there is a lot of alternation between hard and soft scape. Wieseman asked why the internal sidewalk was there. The applicant stated that the internal and external sidewalks were existing. Wieseman asked if they were both necessary. The applicant stated that since they were both existing, they decided to keep them. Wieseman verified that the landscaping would be refreshed. Wolfe asked if this was in the Parkside District. Wieseman stated that it was just outside the Parkside District. Wieseman asked if the ADA ramps would be updated/maintained. The applicant said yes.

**Motion:** Hoskins made a motion to approve this proposal, on the condition that City Staff verify that the signage fits within the Guidelines.

**Motion seconded by:** Wolfe

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

**III. Name:** Mr. Grover C. Burns III (Homeowner)

**Site Address:** 580 Rutherford Circle

**District:** Roebuck Springs Local Historic District

**Requesting approval for:** Replacing damaged fascia boards and soffits; painting the brick exterior of the home; and painting all wood surfaces



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

**Statements:** The applicant was not present; therefore, the case was not heard.

- IV. Name:** Ms. Avey Ashanti Shabazz (Homeowner)  
**Site Address:** 2618 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
**District:** Norwood Local Historic District  
**Requesting approval for:** Replacing all the windows in the house

**Statements:** Chairman Mauk asked if there was a report from the Local District. Perry said that the LHAC approved this proposal as presented.

On April 4, 2022, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Norwood Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 2618 17th 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 19-Item U-Windows

"Replacement of entire windows shall be discouraged. However, where window replacement is unavoidable because of deterioration new frame units are to match the original window in terms of material style, light pattern, design, construction and proportions.

Wood windows or metal clad wood windows are acceptable."

Windows have previously been replaced with all aluminum windows. Original windows are no longer installed. The proposed aluminum clad wood windows conform to the guidelines and are approved as submitted.

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

Page 19-Item -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



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

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 wanted to replace the windows in the home. He stated that the windows would be wood clad and would match the existing. He stated that the new windows would be the same size and shape as the existing. Mauk asked if he would be using any vinyl windows. The applicant stated that no vinyl windows would be used. Wieseman asked what color the windows would be painted. The applicant stated that they hadn't chosen their color palette yet, and that they would return for paint color approval. The applicant stated that he would return with all other exterior materials (siding, roofing) and colors at a later date.

**Motion:** Wolfe made a motion to approve the windows only, in agreement with the LHAC.

**Motion seconded by:** Hoskins

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

V.

**Name:** Ms. Cassandra Alender

**Site Address:** 1026 28<sup>th</sup> Place South

**District:** Highland Park Local Historic District

**Requesting approval for:** Replacing windows and a door

**Statements:** Chairman Wolfe asked if there was a report from the Local District. Perry said that the LHAC approved this proposal with conditions, and that the applicant has agreed to the conditions.

On 4/5/2022, the Local Historic Advisory Committee (LHAC) for the Rhodes Park Local Historic District heard the DRC case for the property located at 1026 28th Pl. S, and the Committee took the following action: Approve with Conditions.

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

The Local Historic Advisory Committee also voted to request that the following conditions be placed upon this request:

That any future windows replaced in this building by any owner be, in appearance color



## City of Birmingham Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes April 13, 2022

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

and material and dimensions, similar to the windows installed in this request and that the frame and trim of the windows be wrapped back metal and in a color and profile to match the current windows. Also, that the Homeowners Association agree to this policy.

Rationale for the Recommendation:

This building is not a contributing structure in the District; however, it does have an impact on the surrounding area. The structure dates to the 1990s and is in a Post-Modern style containing a number of different non-matching elements. However, even given the different shape of windows found in the building, all of the windows in the unit are the same color and overall character. The request is for a vinyl replacement window with a very different character than the existing windows, and, as this request is not for the entire structure, but for one unit only, the visual impression of the building will be jarringly different. Given the condition of all of the windows in the building, it is likely that most or all the owners will want to replace their windows in the near future. As that is the case, and as the replacement windows are conventional and easily obtainable, it is thought best to allow the replacement if all of the other windows, in time, will conform to the same standard.

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 wanted to replace windows and a storm door on the property. He stated that the windows would match in color and configuration. He also stated that the dimensions of the trim would remain the same as well. The applicant stated that she would be the first tenant in the building to replace her windows, and the only one completing this work at this time. The applicant stated that the windows would be vinyl, and more energy efficient. Hoskins verified that the reason that the LHAC approved this proposal was because the building was not a contributing structure.

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



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

with the LHAC.

**Motion seconded by:** Montgomery-Mills

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

- VI. Name:** Ms. Alycia Levels- Moore  
**Site Address:** 5521 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue South  
**District:** Woodlawn  
**Requesting approval for:** Renovation

**Statements:** Ms. Moore presented her plan to improve the façade. Montgomery-Mills verified that this was a one-tenant building. Mauk verified that the signage would return, and that the blue color would not be a part of the renovation. Ms. Moore stated that she would also be painting the planters Pure White.

Wolfe asked what the material of the lattice would be. Ms. Moore stated that it would be galvanized steel and would be painted. Ms. Moore stated that it will be manufactured this way. Ms. Moore stated that she wasn't sure what plants would be placed in the planters, but they will be small shrubs. Hoskins verified that the plants will be real.

**Motion:** Wieseman made a motion to approve this proposal as presented.

**Motion seconded by:** Hoskins

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

- VII. Name:** Ms. Brittany Foley  
**Site Address:** 1524 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North  
**District:** 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
**Requesting approval for:** Demo and parking lot

**Statements:** Ms. Foley presented her plan to demolish a building and build a parking lot. Ms. Foley presented photos of the building, showing why it needed to be demolished. She also stated that the building was not on the National Register of Historic Places. She stated that the building was significantly deteriorating.

Mauk asked if the parking lot would be gravel or paved. Ms. Foley stated that the parking lot would be paved, and would have 96 spaces. She also stated that she was working with BDOT to identify the exact locations of the curb cuts. Mr. Kelly presented the landscaping plan for this parking lot. Ms. Foley stated that there will be three electric car chargers, and new site lighting for the lot.



**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

Wolfe asked if the parking lot would be fenced. Ms. Foley said no. Hoskins asked if there would be controlled access for this lot. Ms. Foley said not at this time. Wieseman stated that the curb cuts needed to be thought through a little more.

**Motion:** Wieseman made a motion to approve the demolition, with curb cuts and final landscaping to return.

**Motion seconded by:** Barnes

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

- VIII. Name:** Mr. Derrick Owens  
**Site Address:** 2131 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
**District:** Midtown  
**Requesting approval for:** New Construction

**Statements:** Mr. Krumdieck presented his plan to build a new retail building for three tenants. He stated that there was no parking on the site, and there was no access to the alley. He stated that the storefronts would be on the property lines. Mr. Krumdieck presented where the signs would go, but would come back with a master signage plan. Wolfe asked if the 45-degree street parking was going away. The applicant said no. He also stated that the spaces would have clear anodized storefront. He also stated that the building façade would be a smooth-faced block. Hoskins asked if there was a possibility for a second floor. Mr. Krumdieck said no. Hoskins asked if the dumpster area and service court would be fenced. Mr. Krumdieck said no.

**Motion:** Wieseman made a motion to approve this proposal conceptually, with the final presentation to return, including materials and signage.

**Motion seconded by:** Hoskins

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

- IX. Name:** Mr. Patrick Chatman  
**Site Address:** 2250 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
**District:** Cultural  
**Requesting approval for:** New Roll-Up Door

**Statements:** Mr. Gardner presented his plan to add a new roll-up door to the façade of a new jazz club in the Sheraton building. He stated that he wanted to match the existing storefront with a roll-up door. Mr. Gardner stated that it would be dark bronze.





**City of Birmingham Design Review Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 13, 2022**

**Meeting Time: 7:30 a.m.**

**Meeting Location: City Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**

---

Wieseman asked which bay the door would be located in. Mr. Gardner stated that it would be the bay to the right, behind the low retaining wall. He stated that the roll-up door would be 8'x10' and would be to the right of the main front door. Wolfe verified that the roll-up door would match the existing mullions. Hoskins stated that there was information missing from the proposal for approval.

**Motion:** Montgomery-Mills made a motion to carry this case over.

**Motion seconded by:** Wieseman

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business, Wieseman made a motion to adjourn. Wolfe seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 a.m.