



402 LEE STREET  
DECATUR, ALABAMA 35601  
October 10, 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, Patrick Rasco, Jacob Woods

Absent: Michael Rogers

**II APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 12, 2024**

**Vote:** Motion made by Elis Chenault to approve the Minutes as submitted, with a change to correct the term "CoA" to the proper "Minutes."

Seconded by Barbra Kelly. Unanimous approval, motion carried.

**III EXPEDITED CoAs SINCE THE SEPTEMBER MEETING:**

721 Ferry Street NE (Suggs) demo of damaged sunporch to slab and remove approximately 10' of chimney (#10 for the CoA)

406 Canal Street NE (Perrin) replace in kind of damaged front columns and new gutters (#9 and #30 for the CoA)

809 Line Street NE (Thomas) front and side porch handrails (#53 for the CoA)

644 Johnston Street SE (Hughes) new rear fence (#26 for the CoA)

**IV NEW CoA REVIEWS:**

**CoA #1: 1018 Sherman (Stokes)**

**Background:** This Colonial Revival house is located in the Albany district.

**Action Requested:** Construct an attached covered porch to the rear of the house with a pergola style roof structure and tin roof. 13x15 with two 6x6 posts. Floor will be 12x12 pavers and brick. Pergola will be attached to the rear of the house, off the new bathroom addition and will not be visible from the street.

**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 the public view. 24.2 Design decks to eliminate physical or visual damage to significant 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 patio/pergola will not be visible from the street and is set back from the sides per the design review standards.

**Discussion:** No discussion.

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

## **CoA #2: 316 Lafayette (Davis)**

**Background:** City received a call of a non-approved carport being installed at this site and sent staff out to investigate.

**Action Requested:** Installation of a metal car port

**Decatur's Design Review Standards:** 22.0 New Construction – Outbuildings 22.2 Site new buildings on the lot appropriately. Locate new outbuildings to the rear of a dwelling or set back from side elevations. 22.10 New carports should be located at the rear of dwellings and not readily visible. Prefabricated metal carport designs are not appropriate if visible from primary vantage points.

**Staff Assessment:** There is an alley to the southeast of the front façade which provides substantial visibility to the rear yard from the street. The board will need to determine if they find the current location of the carport is visible from primary vantage points.

**Discussion:** Discussion on how the carport is visible from the public right of way. Solution could be to move carport to where it is hidden on the lot, replace with a more appropriate carport, or remove all together.

**Vote:** Motion made by Ellis Chenault to approve the CoA as submitted. Seconded by Patrick Rasco. Zero votes in favor of motion. Motion fails to pass.

Motion made by Ellis Chenault, seconded by Patrick Rasco that the applicant must return with a new CoA to the commission for review or remove the carport completely by November 27, 2024.

## V COURTESY REVIEW:

### 721 Ferry (Suggs)

**Background:** House was significantly damaged by a falling tree in 2023. Roof has been replaced, the damaged sunporch was removed.

**Action Requested:** Applicant would like to rebuild the sunporch, but possibly with some changes. THIS IS A COURTESY REVIEW/DISCUSSION and no vote will be taken at this time. This meeting will allow the ARB to discuss a range of possibilities for the property

**Decatur's Design Review Standards:** 23.0 New Construction. 23.1 Construction new additions at the rear of a dwelling as to result in minimal impact to the façade of the building or adjacent properties. 23.2 The overall proportions of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in height, scale, size, and massing so as to not overpower it visually. A new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, color, roof forms, massing proportion, and spacing of doors, windows, details, surface texture, and location. Additions should be constructed for possible future removal without damage to significant features. 23.5 Vinyl, aluminum, or pressed wood are not appropriate additions to historic buildings.

14.0 Windows. 14.6 Tinted glass is not appropriate in historic dwellings in any area visible from public view.

**Staff Assessment:** The storm damaged required removal of the sun porch. Although the guidelines do not typically allow for side additions, this addition was not removed by choice. If a replacement sunporch is authorized with a similar footprint, this could be a good opportunity to ensure that the glass matches the glass on the rest of the historic house. Removing the non-historic patio to the front of the addition and replacing the non-historic door with a window as originally constructed would be supported by the design review standards.

**Discussion:** Applicant corrects statement on patio, patio is historic, was part of a historic porch that was later removed. The sun room portion of the house is non-historic.

Considerable discussion regarding the size and location of the proposed sunporch replacement. The commission all felt that a pitched roof, matching the addition on the other side of the façade, front windows that match proportion and rhythm on the rest of the historic façade, and that the new addition can not extend towards the front any

more than the destroyed 1980s-90s addition, they would consider supporting a modest (2-4') extension into the side yard.

Applicant was encouraged to keep working with staff to refine the proposal and thanked for being proactive on the design process.

Motion to adjourn meeting at 5:01 by Patrick Rasco, seconded by Barbara Kelly. Unanimous approval, motion carried. Meeting adjourned.