



402 LEE STREET  
DECATUR, ALABAMA 35601  
April 11, 2024

## MINUTES

---

Council Chambers

Architectural Review Board

4:00 PM

---

### I CALL MEETING TO ORDER 4:00 PM

#### Roll Call:

Present: Ellis Chenault, Barbara Kelly, Lynn Schuppert, Patrick Rasco, Jacob Woods

### II APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 11, 2024 (no ARB meeting in February or March)

**January 11, 2024 Minutes:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault, seconded by Barbra Kelly. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

### III EXPEDITED CoAs SINCE THE JANUARY MEETING:

813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor) remove non-contributing rear porch (#10 for the CoA)  
813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor) remove wheelchair ramp (#62 for the CoA)  
1018 Sherman Street SE (Stokes) new front stair hand railing (#53 for the CoA)  
421 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE (Dupper) new front porch ceiling lights (#38 for the CoA)  
623 Johnston Street SE (Mattern) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
1036 Sherman Street SE (Parker) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
421 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE (Dupper) Replace 11 compromised porch columns (#9 for the CoA)  
813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor) remove 5-6 dying trees (#35 for the CoA)  
422 Oak Street NE (Murphree) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
306 Lafayette Street NE (Prestwood) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor) remove cementitious siding (#10 for the CoA)  
805 Grant Street SE (Ratcliff) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
1044 Jackson Street SE (McKay) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
119 Cherry Street NE (Kennedy) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
651 Grant Street SE (Phillips) new roof (#47 for the CoA)  
503 Ferry Street NE (Staudy) repair damaged fascia and soffit on house, replace missing garage post (#9 for the CoA)  
204 Canal Street NE (Pike) replace approximately 720' of rotting siding (#9 for the CoA)  
601 Line (Shaw) re-shingle eve portions of roof (#47 for the CoA)  
Delano Park (Kelly) replace 21 rotting/removed trees (#71 for the CoA)

#### IV NEW CoA REVIEWS:

##### CoA #1: 1036 Jackson Street SE (Powell)

**Background:** House is a Dutch Colonial, constructed in 1927. It is located in the Albany District.

**Action Requested:** New front and rear doors.

**Decatur's Design Review Guidelines: 7.0 Doors and Entrances. 7.1 Preserve and maintain original doors and entrances.** All decorative and functional components of a historic entrance should be preserved, including original jambs, sills, and headers. Original doors should be preserved and maintained, as they contribute to a building's historic appearance. Never cover or fill in historic door openings. **7.2 Repair deteriorated or damaged historic doors consistent with historic materials.** Repair original doors using methods that retain their historic fabric and appearance as much as possible. Use epoxy to strengthen small areas of deteriorated wood. **7.3 If historic doors are missing or beyond repair, replacement doors should match the originals.** Use historic photographs to identify details, such as materials, dimensions, number of panels and glass lights, about original doors if possible. New doors should reflect the style and period of the building. Adjacent, similar buildings may provide guidance, as well.

**Staff Assessment:** The Commission has authorized front door replacement on a case by case basis, as needed. House is one of the original Connecticut Fabric Mill houses. As such, its design lacks the weather protecting front porches more commonly found within our historic districts. The original front door has weathered quite a bit, one of the lower panels is rotting, the door is separating at some of the seams, and has warped and is difficult to operate. The proposed new door is wood, and matches the historic door closely, the only difference is the glazing area is smaller, occupying less of the upper section of the door. The board should confirm that the door will be painted, since a painted finish is historically appropriate for doors in this district, of this era.

The rear door is not an original unit, the rear of the house has later 20<sup>th</sup> century additions. The rear is not visible from the public right-of-way. The proposed replacement door is a stock unit from a big box store.

**Discussion:** If existing hardware cannot be reused, the board would like staff to review new hardware selection. Confirmation that door will be painted.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Michael Rogers. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

## **CoA #2: 410 Sherman Street SE (Greenhall)**

**Background:** This vernacular house was constructed circa 1919 and is located in the Albany District.

**Action Requested:** New front yard fence. Fence will be wood, stained white. Panels are 2.83' tall, by 3.79' long. Panels are anchored with metal stakes (see images in the application).

**Decatur's Design Review Guidelines: 16.0 Fences and Walls. 16.5 New fences should be compatible with the associated building, site, and streetscape in height, proportion, scale, material, and design.** Wood picket or metal fence materials are appropriate in front yards and side yards in public view. Wire, chain-link, and vinyl fences are not appropriate at these locations. Brick, stone, or concrete bases are not appropriate for any fencing that is readily visible from street vantages. **16.6 Fences in front and side yards shall not exceed a height of three (3) feet.** Back yards and other areas not readily visible may have fence up to six (6) feet in height. Fences at back yards should begin no further forward than at half the depth of the principal structure including the porch. Privacy and picket fences should always have the structural framework on the inside of the fence

**Staff Assessment:** Commission has historically approved 3' tall picket fences in the front yards. This fence is a slightly different construction method, instead of wood posts set in concrete it uses metal stakes, creating a more temporary fence that has the ability to replace individual panels as need.

The board should confirm that the fence will be painted or stained with an opaque stain.

**Discussion:** Mr. Rasco asked how far back the fence would sit from the sidewalk, property owner stated 1'. Mr. Woods asked if it would be painted, applicant stated yes, and that it would be white. Mr. Rasco was concerned about the longevity of the fence, and has requested that this approval be considered a test case with a two year hold before other fences of this construction are reviewed, to examine how this type of fence holds up. Rest of board agrees.

**Vote:** Motion made by Patrick Rasco to accept the CoA as submitted, with the understanding that it is a test case. Seconded by Michael Rogers. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

## **CoA #3: 650 Jackson (Shelton)**

**Background:** This Queen Anne Victorian was constructed in 1905 according to tax records. It is located in the Albany District. The project is broken into two CoAs, one for

the proposed landscaping and work on the non-historic portion of the house, the second for the proposed removal of a window on the historic home.

**Action Requested:** Back yard improvements, including a swimming pool. The majority of the CoA is for hardscape, a lap pool, and fenestration alterations to a late 20<sup>th</sup> century addition. The brick wall around the property will need to have both gates moved, to accommodate the new landscaping plan.

Although the original CoA requests painting the brick wall. That has been removed from the scope of the project, and the applicant is **not** requesting to paint the wall.

**Decatur's Design Review Guidelines: 18.0 Pools, Fountains, Gazebos, and Pergolas.**

18.4 Locate swimming pools in back yards where they are not readily visible from public view. 18.5 Screen swimming pools using landscaping and/or fencing.

The Design Review Guidelines do not have specific portions to address the proposed changes to the non-historic addition. There is one portion that does address new windows and glass coloration that may be relevant for this CoA. **14.0 Windows. 14.6 Tinted glass is not appropriate in historic dwellings in any area visible from public view.** Energy-saving or "low-E" glass may be used only if it is not tinted.

**Staff Assessment:** The pool, associated hardscaping and landscaping is similar in scope to other projects the commission has approved. The existing brick wall screens the pool. The late 20<sup>th</sup> century addition is not part of the original structure. Steel windows were not used on houses in the Victorian era period, but the majority of the replacement windows/doors are in the addition, and not the historic portion of the house.

**Discussion:** Question by Mr. Chenault about awning material, it will be copper to match other copper accents on the house. Nicole Shelton explained that the orbs on the plan will not be in the final design (front sidewalk) and that the front sidewalk will be a bluestone.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

Michael Rogers and Barbara Kelly abstained from voting due to personal relationships with the applicants.

**CoA #4: 650 Jackson Street SE (Shelton)**

**Background:** See CoA #3.

**Action Requested:** Remove a period stained glass windows (double-hung, wood) in the stairwell (west elevation) and replace with contemporary multi-light steel windows. The removal of the period stained glass windows does not show in the site plan labeled A-100.0, it is shown as a detail on the A-601 plan, and on the labeled photo.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards:** 14.0 Windows. **14.1 Preserve and maintain historic windows and significant elements such as frames, sashes, shutters, hardware, glass, sills, trim, and moldings.** **14.2 Maintain existing historic windows where possible.** Follow guidelines for wood or metal maintenance, as relevant. **14.3 Repair, rather than replace, existing historic windows where possible.** Wood epoxies and wood patches can be used to make spot repairs and strengthen deteriorated wood elements. Replacement may be warranted if 50% or more of the windows require significant repair. If a pick can penetrate more than halfway into the sash's rails then repair may not be possible. **14.4 Replace in-kind, using replacement windows that match the existing historic elements as closely as possible.** Attempt to replace only the deteriorated element, such as a single sash, rather than the entire frame. If an entire window is deteriorated, its replacement shall match the original in dimensions, materials, and detailing as closely as possible. Wood windows or alternative materials such as composite or aluminum-clad with a baked enamel finish may be approvable. Some modern windows do not accurately resemble historic windows and may not be approvable by the ARB. It is not appropriate to replace double-hung sash windows with sliding, single-hung, or fixed-light windows.

**Staff Assessment:** Historic stained glass windows are rare in our two historic districts and are considered character defining features for Victorian era homes when they exist. The municipal Design Review Guidelines address the importance of preserving the historic windows. The Board has historically required that character defining details, including historic windows, be retained, regardless of location. (14.2 and 14.3) There are very few historic stained glass windows in our historic districts. The proposed replacement window is a metal multi-light unit, with a multi-light transom. It does not appear meet guideline 14.4, nor is the design one found in Queen Anne windows within our district, even in wood form. It is contemporary in nature.

**Discussion:** Mr. Woods mentions that the stained glass window is a character defining feature of the house. The applicant responded that they not like the colored glass.

**Vote:** Motion made by Jacob Woods to accept the CoA as submitted (to remove the stained glass window). Seconded by Ellis Chenault. Jacob Woods and Ellis Chenault voted against the motion, Patrick Rasco voted in favor of the motion. Motion failed to pass.

Michael Rogers and Barbara Kelly abstained from voting due to personal relationships with the applicants.

#### **CoA #5: 812 Johnston Street SE (Machado)**

**Background:** This house is located in the Albany District. Tax records indicate the house was constructed in 1941, but it may be a remodel of an earlier house that occurred in the 1940s. A stop work order was placed on the property in March after recent construction work was observed on the site. A new rear deck was constructed and a new storage shed was moved onto the property. There are two CoAs, the first for the newly constructed rear deck, the second for a new storage shed moved to the property.

**Action Requested:** Replace an existing non-historic deck with a larger deck, on the rear elevation.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: 24.0 New Construction – Decks 24.1 Locate decks only on the rear ground level of historic buildings not visible from public view.** Their footprints should be recessed from the house's rear corners, to reduce their visual impact. **24.2 Design decks to eliminate physical or visual damage to significant historic architectural features. 24.3 Decks should be attached to the historic building so that they may be removed without significant damage. 24.5 Decks should be recessed from the side walls of the dwelling to help reduce their visibility.**

**Staff Assessment:** The new deck is larger than the existing deck that it replaced, but it is still set back from the rear elevation on both ends. Due to the deck's extension 15' off the back of the house, a portion of the western-most metal deck railing is visible from the street. The tall support posts for the railing are significantly higher than the railing and not something that the commission has reviewed/approved in the past. If the commission feels that the deck is sufficiently hidden at the rear of the house to allow these design elements, the discussion needs to be clearly addressed in the motion. If the commission feels that design concessions need to be made, historically decks with wood railings and standard post height have been approved.

**Applicant failed to show, CoA tabled until the May 9, 2024 meeting.**

#### **CoA #6: 812 Johnston Street SE (Machado)**

**Background:** See CoA #4, above.

**Action Requested:** Add a storage shed along street view in side yard.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: 22.0 New Construction – Outbuildings. 22. 1 The design of new outbuildings should be compatible with the associated dwelling in architectural style and scale. 22.2 Site new outbuildings on the lot appropriately.** Locate new outbuildings to the rear of a dwelling or set back from side elevations. Attached garages and accessory buildings should be set back from the front façade of the primary dwelling at least one-half of the total depth of the dwelling. **13.0 Roofing**

**13.6 Metal standing seam, copper, copper-plated steel or patterned metal roofs are typically not appropriate for dwellings built after 1915 unless documentation for their original application exists.** The application of modern factory- finished metal roofing systems is typically inappropriate, but may be considered where pan-width, ridge details, seam profile and eave details are consistent with traditional metal roof designs. The use of “V-crimped” or corrugated metal roofing is not appropriate for primary dwellings but may be considered for outbuildings not readily visible from the public right-of-way. Installing a copper or copper-plated steel roof on a building that never had copper originally is not appropriate.

**Staff Assessment:** The board has consistently required that new outbuildings be placed out of public sight from the sidewalk, and if they are within public sight that they be screened and have an asphalt roof. The building is highly visible (it is almost 9’ tall on the front) and has a 5-V metal shed roof, a style of roof and type of roofing material that have not been approved within public sight lines within the district historically, per Design Review Guideline 13.6. In the past the commission has required asphalt shingle roofs and gable roofs on auxiliary buildings. The only identified exception was a shed roofed garage (in the alley) that matched the shed roof on the main house at 430 Sherman. In cases where the site did not allow an auxiliary building to be hidden behind the house, the commission has required evergreen landscaping (tightly packed tall Arborvitae) to shield the structure.

**Applicant failed to show, CoA tabled until the May 9, 2024 meeting.**

#### **CoA #7: 813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor)**

**Background:** House is located in the Old Decatur district and was constructed in 1910. Several CoAs for the house have been staff approved (removal of cementitious siding, removal of old wheelchair ramp, removal of non-historic deck on a non-historic rear addition.) Contractor went beyond the original scope of approved work, added a new window (larger) on the street side of the rear, cut a larger opening for a new window on the rear addition, started siding the non-historic addition, and enclosing the crawl space. A stop work order was issued as staff does not have the authority to approve these alterations. There are four (4) CoAs on the agenda for this property.

**Action Requested:** Replace window on Church Street side addition with larger one-over-one, double-hung window (done without a CoA). Place new larger window on alley side of addition (opening was enlarged without an approved CoA) with a wood casement window. Replace prior rotting door with a new solid door (new door is already in place without a CoA).

**Decatur’s Design Review Standards:** The addition on the rear of the house is non-historic, as such the windows are treated as new window openings.

**Staff Assessment:** The larger window opening on Church Street with the proposed one-over-one, double-hung wood window is in character with the windows on the main house. The casement window proposed for the alley side of the rear addition is an uncommon window design in the district, although it was sometimes used on additions (and indeed, the closed sleeping porch on the second floor was enclosed with casement windows at an unknown date).

Exterior doors from this time period historically had at least a portion of the door glazed, for light and visibility. However, the architectural review board historically has not been concerned with glazing on a rear, secondary entrance unless a historic door was being removed. There is no historic door in this case, as the addition is contemporary.

**Discussion:** n/a

**Note:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Michael Rogers. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

#### **CoA #8: 813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor)**

**Background:** See CoA #7

**Action Requested:** New siding on the rebuilt rear addition. Clapboard on Church Street (installed without a CoA), and Craftsman style Cedar Even Butt Shingle (it comes in 8' long panels)

<https://www.homedepot.com/p/Craftsman-8-1-4-in-x-96-in-Cedar-Even-Butt-Shingle-Siding-Panel-8-Pack-CSS1C7EKXX/313814741>

**Decatur's Design Review Standards:** The New Construction, Additions portion of the Design Review Guidelines would be most appropriate for siding guidance. 23.0 New Construction. **23.3 A new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, color, roof forms, massing proportion, and spacing of doors and windows, details, surface texture, and location.**

**Staff Assessment:** The existing building has clapboard siding. The enclosed sunporch on the second floor rear was clad with wood shingles. Either type of siding selection appears to meet the guidelines. There are no known historic examples within the district that split siding design on two different sides, with one siding (clapboard) on one side, and a second siding (wood shingle) on a different side.

**Discussion:** Mr. Woods expressed concern over the two types of proposed siding on the addition, and that it was a contemporary design aesthetic. Discussion of if the owner would be supportive of it all being clapboard. Ms. Chancelor agreed.



**Vote:** Motion made by Jacob Woods to amend the CoA to show the cladding material as clapboard on all sides, no wood shingles. Seconded by Ellis Chenault. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

**CoA #9: 813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor)**

**Background:** See CoA #7

**Action Requested:** Lattice panels to enclose post and beam foundation.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards:** There are no specific standards for foundation panels.

**Staff Assessment:** The panel design proposed is similar to those historically used throughout the district and the late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Discussion:** Ellis Chenault wanted to know if the lattice needed to be at 45 degree angles or if straight lines were ok. Jacob Woods stated that the straight lines were ok. Jacob Woods confirmed that the lattice would be painted a dark color to disappear.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Barbara Kelly. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

**CoA #10: 813 Ferry Street NE (Chancelor)**

**Background:** See CoA #7

**Action Requested:** New entry steps/landing to non-historic rear addition. 5' x 5' brick landing/stairs with wrought iron railing similar to submitted drawing for size and double staircase, with metal railing similar to that shown in the submitted photo. Also seeking approval for a small shed roofed entry roof.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: 23.0 New Construction – Additions.**  
**23.3 A new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, color, roof forms, massing proportion, and spacing of doors and windows, details, surface texture, and location.** Contemporary adaptations of the original that clearly look like an addition and reflect the period of construction are encouraged.

**Staff Assessment:** Historically, rear entrances during the time period this house was built were constructed from wood, but the commission has historically not been concerned with rear entrances as long as they are not considered intrusive in their design. There are a number of post WWII era metal railings on both the front and rear entrances of houses in the district. The board has approved similar shed rear entrance roofing for other homes within the district, when it is a secondary entrance.

**Discussion:** Ellis Chenault wanted to know if the lattice needed to be at 45 degree angles or if straight lines were ok. Jacob Woods stated that the straight lines were ok. Jacob Woods confirmed that the lattice would be painted a dark color to disappear.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Barbara Kelly. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

### **CoA #11: 422 Vine Street NE (Williams)**

**Background:** House is located in the Old Decatur district and was constructed between 1909 and 1912 based on Sanborn Map images. By 1952 house was converted to a duplex, removing the original front door, and all windows on the front façade, and adding two front doors (one for each unit). The front façade was given a brick veneer, and the front porch floor was removed and a concrete slab was poured, requiring steps from the “porch” to the front door.

The owner met with staff and the Architectural Review Board architect two years ago to discuss altering the front of the house to reflect the building’s return to a single-family unit. At that time the documents required for a CoA submittal were discussed, as well as the design standards used for work within the district. A stop work order was issued last month when property was being remodeled without a building permit or an approved CoA. There are six (6) CoAs on the agenda for this property.

Because there are no known photos of the house before it was remodeled in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, some of the Design Review Guidelines used for the remodel will be those for New Construction. Those specify that neighboring houses similar in style should be reviewed and used as base line patterns for the new construction.

**Action Requested:** The removal of Victorian styled turned posts, and replacement with contemporary slender square posts. (Posts were removed without a CoA.)

**Decatur’s Design Review Standards: 12.0 Porches. 12.7 If a porch is missing, use accurate historical documentation, such as historical photos, to reconstruct it.** If no such evidence exists, use similar dwellings as examples to achieve an appropriate porch design. The owner shall provide the ARB with such documentation in the application for a CoA.

**Staff Assessment:** Similar houses in the district have either turned Victorian posts (like those removed) or simple Tuscan columns. Either could be appropriate. There is no historic precedent for the slender square posts within our districts. The architectural review board has approved fiberglass supports on more than one occasion, when the original supports are missing or are too damaged for repair.

**Discussion:** Jacob Woods indicated that the 6x6 wood posts were not appropriate.

**Vote:** Motion made by Jacob Woods to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Ellis Chenault. Jacob Woods, Ellis Chenault, Barbara Kelly, and Patrick Rasco voted against the motion, Michael Rogers voted in favor of the motion. Motion failed to pass.

Discussion if applicant would be willing to use fiberglass Tuscan columns, applicator agreed.

**Vote:** Motion made by Jacob Woods to support an amended CoA with eight inch (8" wide) Tuscan fiberglass columns. Seconded by Ellis Chenault. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

#### **CoA #12: 422 Vine Street NE (Williams)**

**Background:** See CoA #11.

**Action Requested:** Apply beadboard to the front porch ceiling.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: Porches 12.0. 12.3 Replace in-kind with appropriate materials.** Naturally rot-resistant or pressure-treated woods are appropriate. Paint them within six months. Alternative materials that duplicate the appearance, texture, and architectural detail may be considered by the ARB. Replacement elements should match the original in size, shape, pattern, color, and texture.

**Staff Assessment:** Beadboard porch ceilings are very common throughout the Old Decatur district and would be considered an appropriate finish.

**Discussion:** n/a

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

#### **CoA #13: 422 Vine Street NE (Williams)**

**Background:** See CoA #11.

**Action Requested:** Two new front façade windows

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: 21.0 New Construction. 21.7 Windows and doors in new construction should be compatible in proportion, shape, location, pattern, and size with those of contributing buildings on the block or side of the street. 21.9 The use of substitute products may be appropriate.** Use of fiber-cement siding may be approved for use on new structures. If this type of siding is used, it should have a smooth exterior finish and not grained to resemble wood. **21.10 Use materials in traditional ways.** New materials should be applied in a traditional manner as to convey the same visual appearance as historically used and applied building materials. **21.11 Vinyl clad windows may be used in new construction provided that they are similar in profile and match historic fenestration patterns.** If the windows have divided lights they shall be either true divided lights (TDL) or simulated divided lights (SDL) which have three dimensional grilles on both the interior and exterior sides and a shadow bar. Snap-in grilles or grilles between the glass are not appropriate.

**Staff Assessment:** Property owner proposes placing the windows in the voids created by removing the two non-historic front doors. The single one-over-one, double-hung wood window selected is consistent within the district.

**Discussion:** Jacob Woods asked what would be below the windows, applicant responded brick fill. Mr. Woods also requested a brick windowsill.

**Vote:** Motion made by Patrick Rasco to accept the CoA as submitted with the understanding there will be a brick sill. Seconded by Ellis Chenault. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

#### **CoA #14: 422 Vine Street NE (Williams)**

**Background:** See CoA #11.

**Action Requested:** New half circle front entrance steps

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: NEW CONSTRUCTION. 21.0. 21.13 Design new construction that reflects the basic shapes and forms on the block and in the historic districts.**

**Staff Assessment:** Dropped concrete floor porches on the front façade are not found within the district. The addition of a masonry step/s to access the front entrance (which is now raised above the porch floor due to prior remodels). Half round front entrance steps are not found on early 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings within the district. Simple

rectangular masonry steps are ubiquitous within the district and would be more appropriate than introducing a new design vocabulary.

**Discussion:** Patrick Rasco discussed that a half moon design would not be appropriate, a rectangular design would be more appropriate. Asked applicant if they were supportive of amending the nomination for the design to be rectangular instead of half round. Applicant was supportive. Final design details to be worked out with staff after the building department reviews for any code requirements.

**Vote:** Motion made by Jacob Woods to accept an amended CoA with a rectangular stoop design instead of a half-round design. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

### **CoA #15: 422 Vine Street NE (Williams)**

**Background:** See CoA #11.

**Action Requested:** New double front doors (vintage doors).

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: 7.0 DOORS AND ENTRANCES. 7.3 If historic doors are missing or beyond repair, replacement doors should match the originals.** Use historic photographs to identify details, such as materials, dimensions, number of panels and glass lights, about original doors if possible. New doors should reflect the style and period of the building. Adjacent, similar buildings may provide guidance, as well.

**Staff Assessment:** There is only one set of original historic double doors located in the district, located at 618 Line, which is city's only example of an Empire Revival house, a style which lasted from 1855-1885. The proposed door is exceptionally ornate when compared to other doors on houses of similar size and construction date within the district. It features design elements not seen on doors within our district, strong classical revival detailing with its temple pediments around narrow single lights door. The Design Review Standards refer to doors on similar homes, particularly those that might be neighboring. The closest comparable house for 422 Vine would be next door at 424 Vine, which is a turn of the century door with a single oval light. Also common in this period would be doors similar to that at 424 Vine, but with a rectangular light instead of an oval light. Early 20<sup>th</sup> century doors in this district had considerably less detailing than doors from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Example of an oval light single door

Example of a rectangular light single door



**Discussion:** Jacob Woods indicated the double doors are not appropriate, they are too fancy, nor is the ornamentation appropriate, needs to be less ornate. Ellis Chenault and Patrick Rasco concur.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to accept the door CoA as submitted. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. No votes in favor of the motion. Motion failed to carry.

Discussion with the applicant if he would be supportive of a door similar to either example shown (oval light, or single rectangular light). Applicant agreed.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to amend the door CoA for the design to be similar to one of the two shown in the meeting- the oval light or a single rectangular light. Seconded by Michael Rogers. No votes in favor of the motion. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

**CoA #16: 422 Vine Street NE (Williams)**

**Background:** See CoA #1410 0.

**Action Requested:** Paint the non-historic brick façade. Only the front elevation is brick, the side elevations are not.

**Decatur's Design Review Standards: 1:0 Materials, Masonry. 1.12 Do not paint previously unpainted masonry surfaces.**

**Staff Assessment:** With historic masonry the Architectural Review Board has consistently ruled that painting is not appropriate. However, with non-historic masonry there has been approval in very specific instances, the application of mineral paint or limewash. Most recently approved in a case almost identical to this application, at 1016 Gordon. This house had been severely altered in the mid-20th century, and had a brick veneer added on the front elevation at that time, contrasting significantly with the painted siding on the side elevations. In that instance the board felt that in a case where a brick veneer had been added only to the front at a later date and was incongruous with the house as a whole, applying a treatment to the front to assist the brick in blending in with the rest of the house was indeed appropriate. Mineral paint (a potassium silicate) or whitewash would be less damaging to the bricks, and won't cause the long term maintenance issues that paint will. (Two brand names suggested by colleagues were LimeWorks or Romabio, both limewashes), or Everkote 300 by Edison Coatings.

**Discussion:** Discussion regarding how the unusual non-original brick façade was a distraction from the historic home and the historic homes on the street, and painting masonry in this instance would be appropriate. Discussion that the paint should be either a mineral paint or a lime wash to ensure that the brick is not damaged and becomes a future maintenance challenge. Applicant asked if they would support an amended CoA requiring lime wash or mineral paint. Applicant said yes.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to amend the paint CoA for mineral paint or lime wash only. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

**CoA #6: 812 Johnston Street SE (Machado)**

**Vote:** Motion made by Jacob Woods and seconded by Michael Rogers to table the CoAs from 812 Johnston Street SE, since no representative of the property had arrived. Seconded by Michael Rogers. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

Motion to adjourn meeting at 5:53 by Ellis Chenault, seconded by Patrick Rasco. Unanimous approval, motion carried. Meeting adjourned.