



402 LEE STREET
DECATUR, ALABAMA 35601
June 13, 2024
MINUTES

Council Chambers

Architectural Review Board

4:00 PM

I CALL MEETING TO ORDER

II APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 9, 2024 4:01 PM

Roll Call:

Present: Ellis Chenault, Barbara Kelly, Patrick Rasco, Jacob Woods
Michael Rogers arrived at 4:02, during the review of CoA #1.

III EXPEDITED CoAs SINCE THE APRIL MEETING:

811 Jackson Street SE (Burns) rear fence completion (#26 for the CoA)
621 6th Avenue SE (Dupper) new front porch roofing (#47 for the CoA)
519 Line Street NE (Bailey) new garage porch columns (#10 for the CoA)
422 Vine Street NE (Davis) new brick sidewalk (#64 for the CoA)
213 Cherry Street NE (Ryan) change in shingle color for prior approved CoA (#69 for the CoA)
504 Line Street NE (Riehl) remove 3 large oaks (decaying) (#61 for the CoA)
417 Oak Street NE (Cagle) new roofing (#47 for the CoA)
813 Ferry Street NE (Chancellor) new roofing (#47 for the CoA)
219 Cain Street NE (Stone) new rear fence (#26 for the CoA)

IV NEW CoA REVIEWS:

CoA #1: 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. If the commission feels that design adjustments need to be made, historically decks with wood railings and standard post height have been approved.

Discussion: Discussion over height of posts and possible lighting.

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

CoA #2: 812 Johnston Street SE (Machado)

Background: See CoA #1, 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.

Discussion: Concern by multiple board members about the metal roofing and visibility of the storage shed from the street.

Note: Motion made by Ellis Chenault to amend the CoA with the following changes: roofing material must be a composition shingle. Obstruct the view from the public rights-of-way by adding evergreen plant screening in front of the building. Building must be brought into compliance by October 13, 2024. Seconded by Michael Rogers. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

CoA #3: 421 6th Avenue (Dupper)

Background: Property owner has been working through a series of projects with the property and has been in front of the commission multiple times. New porch skirting was attached without a CoA. Staff reached out to property owner and requested a CoA. Since the proposed material has not been approved before, staff has forwarded the CoA to the full board.

Action Requested: Vinyl porch skirting

Decatur’s Design Review Standards: 4.0 Architectural Details 4.1 Maintain and preserve historic architectural details and features. 4.2 Repair existing architectural

details. 4.3 Replace a missing or severely damaged historic architectural detail and feature in-kind.

Staff Assessment: The ARB has historically not approved vinyl for siding, windows, fencing, or architectural details within the district. It has a sheen that is has been ruled as incompatible with historic buildings and paint does not adhere well.

Discussion: Michael Rogers expressed that the lattice and framing needed to be wood. Jacob Woods and Ellis Chenault agreed.

Vote: Motion made by Ellis Chenault to approve the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. Zero (0) votes in favor, Five (5) votes against. Motion failed to carry.

Staff was authorized to approve a wood lattice CoA with wood framing for the porch, as an in-kind replacement.

Courtesy Review: 421 6th Avenue (Dupper)

This is not a CoA, this is a future CoA and the applicant would like to discuss the project and options before a CoA is filled, ensuring the best possible outcome.

Background: Property owner has been working through a series of projects with the property and has been in front of the commission multiple times.

Action Requested: New driveway.

Decatur's Design Review Standards: 19.0 Parking, Driveways and Sidewalks. 19.3 Design off-street parking to be unobtrusively located in the rear or side yard. On side wards the parking area should be recessed beyond the mid-point of the side of the house. 19.4 Minimize the width of the driveways to the extent possible. 19.7 Screen and minimize the visual impact of parking areas in the rear or side yards with hedges, shrubs, or fences. 19.8 New driveways and curb cuts should not be constructed where they did not exist historically. 19.10 New curb cuts, driveways, and parking lots are typically not appropriate if accessed from the street, particularly on streets that have ample street parking.

6th Avenue prevents parking in front of the house. Mr. Dupper had originally discussed parking on the north side of the property, accessed from the alley. He now feels that a driveway entered off Sherman would be more appropriate. A portion of the retaining wall would have to be removed to accomplish this, it would place the driveway very close to one located at 446 Sherman.

There is parking for two cars on Sherman currently. Currently there is no entry to the house from Sherman.

Discussion: Street and building departments should be reached out to determine any distance requirements and setbacks for driveways. Discussion on requirement for a ribbon driveway and exposed aggregate. Landscaping plan must be submitted, with screening from 6th and possibly the neighbor on Sherman. A retaining wall will be needed on the east side, and that should be addressed in the CoA. How will someone access the driveway from the house? A sidewalk? Steps on the far west side of the porch? The western most tree in the planting strip will need to be removed to support a driveway, a new tree may be needed in its place.

Motion to adjourn meeting at 4:59 by Patrick Rasco, seconded by Michael Rogers. Unanimous approval, motion carried. Meeting adjourned.