## Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes Regular Meeting—May 23, 2023

Present: Laura Powell, Elizabeth Jones, Marc Hammes, Fay Brassie

Absent: Jane Camp

Staff: Brad Callender, City Planner

Sara Shropshire, Dir. of Community Development

Laura Wilson, Code Admin

Visitors: Rob Goudiss, Kelly & Allen Connerley, Chanch Edwards, Shannon Sturgill, Greg Gajownik

Meeting called to order at 6:00 P.M.

Motion to approve agenda as submitted

Motion Hammes. Second Powell Motion carried

Chairman Jones asked if there were any changes or corrections to the previous months' minutes. To approve as submitted.

Motion by Hammes, Second by Brassie Motion carried.

## Old Business:

<u>The First Item of Old Business:</u> Request for COA #1915, a request to demolish 1251 S. Madison Ave. The request was first heard by the Historic Preservation Commission at the December 27, 2022 regular meeting. Rob Goudiss of Arnold Properties spoke in favor of the request. The request was tabled for the April 2023 meeting at the request of the applicant to allow time for any businesses or citizens interested in purchasing the property. One party expressed interest in the structure but ultimately concluded it was too difficult to move without destroying the structure.

Note: Chairman Jones read Section 54-174 (B) of the Code of Ordinances into the record; these ordinances detail considerations for the demolition and relocation of historic structures. Some of the main concerns of the Commission are

- No detailed plan for the property should the demolition be approved
- Belief that the property could provide reasonable economic return if restored

## Discussion continued:

- Goudiss: We are not interested in selling a piece of the property with the structure on it; that might allow a new owner in the future to come in and change the zoning to allow different uses
- Hammes: What are you going to do with the lot after demolition?
  - Goudiss—no development plans; house has been cited as dangerous, not inhabitable by the City
    Code Department
  - o Chairman Jones—is this due to neglect?
  - o Goudiss—that is for someone else to determine; the only plan is to demolish the dwelling

- Goudiss—as we presented early in this process, the cost to renovate the structure with the conditions that would be placed by this Commission is more than we can uphold
  - Chairman Jones—we have heard your estimation of costs but we have not heard what kind of income in could bring in if restored
  - o Goudiss—we are in the rental business; restoration is just not what we do

Chairman Jones: Any questions from the public? None

Commissioner Hammes: What are the future plans for the structure? Are you going to sell it in two months and put apartments on it?

Goudiss: Everything is subject to change but there are no plans for development on that property; I only want to comply with the City Code Department

Callender: Have you had a real estate estimate done of the property to show its value with the proposed improvements?

Goudiss: No

Callender: It could have a much higher value than the cost of the improvements if it is restored

Motion to approve

Motion by Hammes, Second -none Motion dies for lack of a second

Motion to deny because it would ruin the aesthetic of the district 54-174 (b)(2); one the last remaining examples of Victorian architecture with Eastlake trim & original roof 54-174 (b)(4); belief that the property could make a reasonable economic return 54-174 (b)(7);

Motion by Brassie, Second Powell Motion carried 2-1 (Hammes oppose)

Chairman Jones: Motion approved to deny demolition

<u>The Second Item of Old Business:</u> Request for COA #2216, a request for a shed at 120 Mears St.; Kelly and Allen Connerley spoke in favor of the project. The shed will be used for storage; especially during the current renovation project. It will also be used for wheelchair storage.

Commissioner Brassie: Is it temporary? K. Connerley: We would like to keep it.

Commissioner Hammes: Will you keep it in the same place?

K. Connerley: That is really the only place we have to keep it; the lot is full

Commissioner Brassie: The accessory building on the lot stands out for two reasons; the color of the roof and the shape of the roofline. Generally, you want the accessory structure to mimic the main structure. It may have been denied if you had come to us first because it does not go with your building. If you keep it, you need to make it not stand out. The white trim makes it more visually interesting than the building.

Wilson: (addressed to the commission members) This is an accessory structure, not attached to the building, and not permanent. Additionally, you do not have any say over paint color.

Chairman Jones: We are not going to decide what color you paint it (the accessory structure). Does anyone else have any questions?

Commissioner Powell: Typically, you put a shed in the back where it cannot be seen. That is not an option here but the shed is really in the best place.

Chairman Jones: Any questions from the public—no

Motion to approve

Motion by Hammes, Second Powell Motion carried 2-1 (Brassie opposed)

<u>The Third Item of Old Business:</u> Request for COA #2221, a request for exterior renovations including signage at 134 N. Broad St.; Chanch Edwards with Nehemiah Construction spoke in favor of the project. The applicant would like to replace the existing windows with single pane to match the surrounding buildings. There will be three lights on the sign and one light on either side of the entrance door. Previously there was some questions about the color of brick that will be added in the rear to fill up the hole caused by the smaller door.

Edwards: It will be the best looking back of a building in a terrible looking alley in downtown.

Commissioner Brassier: You are removing the shutters?

Edwards: Yes

Chairman Jones: Any questions?

Wilson: Are you making any changes to the windows?

Edwards: Replace the current brown windows (6/6 light pattern) with black windows (1/1) light pattern to

match the rest of downtown

Chairman Jones: Any questions from the public—no

Motion to approve as presented

Motion by Brassie, Second by Powell Motion carried

<u>The Fourth Item of Old Business:</u> Request for COA #2229, a request for exterior changes including porches and an addition at 314 S. Wayne St. The applicant and property owner Shannon Sturgill spoke in favor of the project. He provided the Commission a brief recap of the work done on the property:

- Previously used as warehouse
- Rear addition with shed roof had a massive leak—roof replaced by extending the existing gable which resulted in the house increasing by 7.5 sq feet
- 10x16 deck removed—requesting to put back same dimensions

The main items left to be discussed are the front porch pickets and the rear deck.

Commissioner Brassie: I spoke with Pat in the Code Office and Brad (contractor for 314 S. Wayne St.) to try to come up with a plan for the balustrades so that the front porch and back porch are compatible. Perhaps the front could be at 34 inches and the back at 36 inches. The house also had a double newel post on the stairs that needs to be restored.

Sturgill: When I purchased the house, it only had one post

Commissioner Brassie: Need to restore both handrails in the front and the one along the side in the back

Sturgill: Right now, in the front and along the side we have 33.5" and none of those porches are more than 30" off the ground.

Wilson: We have confirmed with Patrick Kelley, head of the Code Office that the front railings can be less than current code height. The porch in the back must be at code height which is 36".

Sturgill: We can do that

Commissioner Brassie: I was trying to work with Brad to make sure that the transition from the front to the back porch was not so jarring. We still want to have the handrails with the double newel posts.

Chairman Jones: Any questions from the public—no

Motion to approve 34-inch balustrade in the front to go with the 36-inch balustrade in the back, handrails will be same height has the railings with the double newel posts with round caps, and rebuilding the back deck on the same dimensions (with no newel posts)

Motion by Brassie, Second by Powell Motion carried

<u>The Fifth Item of Old Business:</u> Request for COA #2226, a request for exterior changes including signage at 130 S. Broad St. The applicant was not present to speak in favor of the project.

Motion to table until June 27, 2023

Motion by Hammes, Second by Powell Motion carried

**New Business** 

<u>The First Item of New Business:</u> Request for COA #2404, a request for a 10'x16' shed at 110 Mears St. The applicant, Greg Gajownik, executive pastor at Walton Community Church spoke in favor of the project. Walton Community Church is requesting a shed for storage purposes.

Commissioner Hammes: Is this where you plan to keep the shed?

Gajownik: Yes, we think that is the best spot. It is as far back on the property as we think we can put it.

Chairman Jones: Any questions from the public—no

Motion to approve as presented

Motion by Hammes, Second by Powell Motion carried

<u>The Second Item of New Business:</u> Request for COA #2405, a request for signage at 100 S. Broad St. for The Roe restaurant. Chad Draper with Bolt Construction spoke in favor of the project. Of the two options, the applicant prefers the option with "THE" centered over the "ROE". The letters will be aluminum and painted black and gold.

Commissioner Brassie: Will the sign be centered on the building? Can you pull the "THE" down into the "ROE" space to give the sign more visual weight on that side so you do not notice the sign is off center? It is about a foot off center if you stand in front of it.

Callender: I think the only way it impacts it, is if you look at the sign from directly across the street. The optics of the photograph are throwing things off a bit.

Commissioner Brassie: Is the size alright?

Wilson: The size is well within code requirements.

Callender: Is the sign back lit?

Draper: No

Motion to approve as presented

Motion by Hammes, Second by Powell

Motion carried

Motion to adjourn

Motion by Hammes, Second by Powell

Adjourned at 7:07 pm