

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes
10 N. Public Square
June 18, 2024
5:30 P.M.

1. Open Meeting

Called to order by Chairman Frisbee at 5:29 PM.

Present: Greg Frisbee, Becky Carr, David Elder, and Lisa Ellis

Absent: Brad Galland, Vandi White, and Larry Gregory

Staff Present: David Hardegree, Zack Arnold, Ashley Peters, and Keith Lovell

1. Approval of Minutes

Chairman Greg Frisbee called for a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting. Board Member Elder made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 21, 2024. Board Member Carr seconded the motion to approve the minutes. The motion carried unanimously. Vote:3-0

Certificate of Preservation:

2. COP24-17. 7 Oakland St.

Applicant: Alan Clark, AIA

David Hardegree, Planning and Development Assistant Director, stated per the original application COP24-17, the applicant proposes to construct a detached garage as well as multiple modifications to existing house. The following items are being proposed. Front Porch, Front of house (Brick/Shutters), Side Porch work, Existing Garage (New Doors/Windows), Newly Constructed Detached Garage, Rear Patio, Side of House (Brick/Shutters/Canopy). There will be three additional site improvements that will be brought to a future HPC meeting for review due to additional details being needed. Retaining walls, additional fence, and guest parking.

Per states records the original structure was built in 1953. GHRS states 1950-1959. Major Renovations occurred in 2021 that completely modified the interior and exterior. The ranch home is historic, non- contributing. The current proposals seem compatible with the renovations that have occurred and variations of the proposals that have occurred with the previous owners.

The Board may choose to ask for clarification on the materials to be used for the board and batten siding, railings, and roofing. The proposed site improvements will require review at a future HPC Meeting once more details are provided. The covered walkway will not be included in the scope of work.

Chairman Frisbee opened the floor for discussion.

Chairman Frisbee asked the applicant if there was a typo on the side porch pitch as well as the material of the roof for side porch and the detached garage as it is listed as unknown. The applicant stated there was and that it will be 6/12 pitch and the roof will be architectural shingles.

Board member Carr asked regarding the metal roof for the property. The applicant stated that due to the pitch the metal roof was needed and overall looks better.

Board Member Ellis asked if the shutters were used for esthetics? The applicant stated that they were.

Board Member Elder asked if the porch will be the same size as the porch is now. The applicant stated that it might be a bit bigger. Board Member Elder also asked about the new brick base and if it will be painted. The applicant stated that the brick base will match the brick that is on the home today and it will be painted to match the house.

Board Member Ellis asked if the driveway will be where the existing driveway is now. The applicant stated the new proposed driveway is in the same spot and will be nicer.

Chairman Frisbee asked a question regarding the material of the columns that are with the proposed plans. The Applicant stated that they will be wood/square Tuscan style columns.

Chairman Frisbee stated that he appreciated the thorough work on the plans.

Chairman Frisbee closed the discussion and asked for a motion to be made.

Board Member Elder made a motion to approve the application with the clarification on the columns and the architectural shingles. Board Member Ellis seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Vote: 3-0.

3. COP24-18. 10 Hillside

Applicant: Kevin and Michele Gunter

David Hardegree stated per the original application COP24-13, the applicant proposes to add a front porch and demolish brick steps. First Meeting on May 21, 2024, ended with a denial to allow for resubmission with further information for the committee. Mr. Hardegree met with the applicant to go over alternatives and with this new application they are submitting plans with elevations and materials.

The house was constructed c. 1954 according to Bartow County Tax assessor's records. There is no GHRS Survey. The house is Historic, Contributing. Applicant proposes to demolish the existing brick steps and landing at the front door. The front porch is to be constructed from wood or wood composite materials for the support columns, railings, and decking.

Chairman Frisbee opened the floor for discussion from the committee.

Chairman Frisbee stated that there are design standards that HPC follows for contributing structures. In the standards there are several sections that he wanted to point out.

1. Part 1 (B) paragraph 1 Masonry- retain and preserve masonry features that contribute to the overall historic character of the site.
2. Part 1 (J) paragraph 8 one shall not remove an original porch or entry or add a new entrance or porch on a primary façade.

Mr. Lovell asked Chairman Frisbee if there is a porch there? If the committee considers it a porch, they are not adding a new porch, they are expanding. If they do not consider it a porch the applicant cannot build a new porch per the ordinance. The board is there to decide if there is a porch the board can vote on how it is to be expanded. Chairman Frisbee came back to Part 1 (B) stating the steps cannot be modified or changed. Mr. Lovell stated that in regard to Part 1 (J) the board needs to make a decision if the steps contribute to the historic features of the house.

Chairman Frisbee stated that in his opinion that the stairs contribute to the historic features of the home and that the porch is not a porch and would be considered an eve.

Board Member Ellis asked in regard to the stairs condition and if they be salvaged. Board Member Carr stated the application stated that the stairs were disintegrating.

Chairman Frisbee stated that in Section B- Paragraph 3 repair of historic masonry surfaces and features using recognized preservation methods for patching, damaged, or deteriorated masonry. That is stating to repair what is there and the applicant would need to go back with like kind materials.

Mr. Lovell states that the repair is not a shall not scenario. The board is here to review what the applicant is wanting to come back with materials and provide solutions on the repair. All masonry requirements are guidelines not set in stone and board can make their own decision based on the guideline and each property is unique.

Chairman Frisbee stated that in J (8) the guidelines state there shall not have a porch built. Mr. Lovell stated that it is up to the board to decide if it is considered a porch or not.

Discussion commenced regarding whether the property has a porch.

Mr. Lovell stated that there is not a defined term for porch in the ordinances or guidelines.

Board Member Carr asked if there was any attempt to save the porch that is present? The applicant stated that the contractor stated that it must be replaced due to settling and the bricks that are present disintegrating.

Mr. Lovell found an example from Huntington Woods. Their historic guidelines state a definition of what they consider to be a porch. A porch includes structures attached to or

immediately adjacent to a permanent structure, with or without a roof, without permanent weatherproof walls or windows used as or connected to an entrance to the main structure.

Discussion commenced further regarding the porch. Mr. Lovell also passed around the phone for all to read the definition.

Board Member Ellis stated that she would consider it a porch. If the stairs are not salvageable, they need to be replaced, and she believes it would not ruin the historic value of the home.

Chairman Frisbee stated that he does see this as an entrance and that it should not be changed according to our ordinances and that it will ruin a historic contributing home in the district.

Board Member Ellis asked about the materials being used and asked if the applicant would be willing to go back with like materials.

Chairman Frisbee closed the discussion and asked for a motion to be made.

Board Member Ellis made a motion to approve the application to salvage the original brick and have lapse siding to match the rest of the siding at the house as well as the steps to remain brick. Board Member Elder seconded the motion. Motion was denied. Vote: 2-1.

Mr. Lovell stepped in and stated that since there is a quorum of four there must be three affirmative votes to pass and if there are not three affirmative votes it is not approved. The chairman does not get to vote unless there is a tie. The request is still on the table, and nothing has been approved and denied. If there is no other motion from the board the request is approved after 45 days.

Board Member Carr asked for a definition of salvage. Board Member Ellis stated that it was using the bricks that are currently at the steps. The Applicant stated that he would use the bricks that could be used but that most of them are not salvageable.

Mr. Lovell stated that there would be new bricks. The applicant stated that he cannot use the bricks that are present due to them crumbling.

Chairman Frisbee asked for a motion to be made. No other motion was given.

Due to there not being a motion, the application is approved after 45 days.

4. COP24-19. 178 W. Main St.

Applicant: Matt Womack

David Hardegree stated per the original application COP24-19, the applicant proposes to demolish the existing structure to construct (18) new townhomes. Also, variance, V24-17, to increase the area and duration of (2) temporary signs. The fourth building will come back before HPC for approval once plans are ready.

The structure was constructed c. 1960 according to the Bartow County Tax assessor's records. There is no date provided in the GHRS survey.

The existing primary structure is Historic, Non- Contributing. The proposal to construct (18) 3-1/2 story, townhomes within for building units on the 1.6-acre site. The city sold the property to Womack Custom Homes in February 2024 after an extended period for an RFP process and developer due diligence.

Demolition of the primary structure is a single story, brick structure that is known to have served as a funeral home, the city police station, and city municipal courthouse. The floor area of the building is stated as 11, 467sft and the accessory structure is 27x37ft. Both structures are required to be demolished for the townhome development. All existing trees on site will be removed.

The building units are primarily brick with some lap siding. The primary roof will be asphalt shingle. Metal roofs are introduced over the ground floor and rooftop terraces. Balconies with metal railings are introduced on the rear side of the townhomes. The building units are rear-access (2 car garages in rear).

This will be the first townhome project in the DBD and the first significant residential project since the condominium apartments were constructed at 148 W. Main St. c. 2004.

Chairman Frisbee opened the floor to discussion.

Board Member Elder stated that all the plans are showing all brick and some lap siding. The applicant stated that the gables will be siding due to the weight distribution on the fourth floor. Board Member Elder also asked regarding a gated access that will be on Bartow/Leake Street. Applicant stated they are not planning a gate for car entries. Pedestrian gates will be added. Stated that if the HOA wants gated access, they can come back to get approval later. The applicant also stated that the fire department added an additional gate that will allow a fire truck to come through the property.

Chairman Frisbee asked regarding the roof and windows for the property. He also asked regarding a landscaping ordinance. The applicant stated that the roofs will have architectural shingles and metal for the gables. The windows will be wood double hung windows. As far as the landscaping ordinance there will be grass or bushes between each driveway. Mr. Hardegree stated that this site is a very complicated site with utilities so large trees will not be planted.

Chairman Frisbee stated that he is glad to see residential housing coming to this area.

Board Member Carr asked about a timeline of the project. The applicant stated that they should be ready by late spring/early summer 25.

Chairman Frisbee closed the discussion and asked for a motion to be made.

Board Member Carr made a motion to approve the demolition and construction of the 18 new townhomes as submitted. Board Member Elder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Vote: 3-0.

5. COP24-20. 341 W Cherokee Avenue. Applicant: Colt Kelley and Stephanie Gargiulo

David Hardegree stated per the original application COP24-19, the applicant proposes to add a retaining wall to property.

The house was constructed in c. 1958. The property is historic, contributing. The original house type is a Ranch House. The original house style is mid-century modern.

The Owner/Applicant has faced multiple drainage challenges, and the solution was to raise the grade elevations in the backyard and diffuse and divert the stormwater flowing across their property. Retaining walls is needed. There will be (2) architectural walls installed along the rear property line and the left side property line. A residential garden- style block wall along the right-side property line on side and rear yards.

Retaining walls do not have a specific HPC design standard but are reviewable based on the definitions section of the HPC ordinance, a new (retaining) wall constitutes a change in material and is subject to HPC review.

Chairman Frisbee opened the floor to discussion.

The applicants Stephanie Gargiulo and Colt Kelley, 341 W Cherokee, came forward for the property and stated that they are trying to help deter water from the property due to a large amount of run off from the nearby residences.

Andria Hertle, 24 Charles St, came forward asking for clarification regarding the fence that will be located at the back of the property.

Chairman Frisbee opened the discussion among the committee. Stated that retaining walls is in the ordinance and the committee has the authority to approve the walls.

Board Member Elder asked Mr. Hardegree regarding the material of the walls. Stated that the wall along the rear and left side are one material and the wall on the right side is different material. Mr. Hardegree stated that they are two different architectural styles and that they almost match in color.

Chairman Frisbee asked about the fence in the back of the property as well as the gates that will be added into the fence. The applicant stated that the wood fence will go around the property

line and that it will be cut 2ft to stay within the ordinance. The gates and fence were all approved administratively.

Chairman Frisbee closed the discussion and asked for a motion to be made.

Board Member Carr made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Board Member Elder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Vote: 3-0.


II. OTHER

Chairman Frisbee asked if there were additional items to discuss.

Mr. Hardegree stated that there were not any additional items to cover.

Chairman Frisbee adjourned the meeting at 7: 17 PM

Date Approved: 07/16/2024

/s/ 
Greg Frisbee, Chairman