

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**REGULAR MEETING—JULY 22, 2025**

Present: Chairwoman Elizabeth Jones, Jane Camp, Chuck Bradley

Absent: Marc Hammes

Staff: Brad Callender – City Planner  
Laura Powell – City Clerk  
Kaitlyn Stubbs – Executive Assistant

Visitors: Russell Page, Robert Chancey, Clairissa Pequignot, Joy Pequignot, and Rob Goudiss

Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Chairwoman Jones called for a motion to approve agenda as submitted,

Motion by Camp,  
Second by Bradley,  
Motion carried unanimously

Chairwoman Jones asked if there were any changes or corrections to the May 27, 2025 minutes. Chairwoman Jones called for a motion to approve the minutes as submitted,

Motion by Bradley,  
Second by Jane,  
Motion carried unanimously

Old Business:

**The First Item of Old Business:** There was no quorum at the June 24, 2025 commission meeting, as Elizabeth Jones and Chuck Bradley were present, Marc Hammes and Jane Camp were absent, and Laura Powell was absent because she took a position with the City, which presents a conflict of interest. Therefore, the meeting was never officially opened and there are no meeting minutes. There were two request for COA's, both for fences, at 229 E. Marable Street #3857 and 231 E. Marable Street #3858. Both COA's were granted after the 45 days, once the meeting had passed, according to the City ordinance.

New Business:

**The First Item of New Business:** Request for COA – 307 Davis Street #3900 – A request for a remodel and exterior renovation.

Mr. Callender presented the slides of the property, in its existing condition of the dwelling and the proposed, representative renovations, that were in the agenda packet.

Chairwoman Jones: Asked if the applicant was present. The applicant, Rob Goudiss, was present and the contractor, Robert Chancey.

Rob Goudiss, the owner of 307 Davis Street introduced himself and spoke about the renovation and his desire to make similar changes similar to the new developments around the property.

Chairwoman Jones read the standards from the Preservation Primer and the Secretary of Interior's standards for historic preservation. She spoke specifically about the window replacements and the scope of the work. She stated that a two over two or a one over one paned window would be appropriate for this vernacular style home. The scope of the work within the application was presented.

Chairwoman Jones asked if there were any questions from the panel. Mr. Bradley stated that he noticed the one over one and spoke about the in lays you can add to the window to give a multiple pane effect.

Mr. Goudiss stated that the windows were not original and he and the contractor are trying to be consistent with other renovations around this particular project, and that one over one is what most homes in the area have. Chairwoman Jones stated that she would love to see more panes, but did not disagree that the one over one would be seen in this style of home.

Mr. Bradley stated that he lives at Church Street and Milledge Avenue and that his home does not have multiple panes and knows it is not a requirement. Chairwoman Jones and Ms. Camp had further discussion regarding the in lays that can be added to a one over one pane. Chairwoman Jones stated she would be fine with the one over one, as long as all of the windows were consistent.

Mr. Callender asked that the motion be very clear regarding the window style.

Chairwoman Jones confirmed the other items on the application including installation of new HardieBacker siding and Cornish trim, refurbishment of the two existing diamond-shaped vents on the front façade, which owner and contractor confirmed they would be brought back to the way they are, and refurbishment of the existing transom window above the front door.

Mr. Callender clarified that the existing is a three-paned transom window.

Chairwoman Jones asked if there were any questions from the public. There were none.

Chairwoman Jones called for a motion.

Motion to approve as presented,

Motion by Camp,  
Second by Bradley,  
Motion carried unanimously

**The Second Item of New Business:** Request for COA – 315 S. Madison Ave. #3901 – (the following item for 313 S. Madison Ave. was discussed concurrently with this item). These are adjacent properties owned by Clarissa and Joy Pequignot, daughter and mother. The motions were made separately.

Chairwoman Jones announced the Request for COA at 315 S. Madison Ave. as a request for an office/retail space renovation and parking lot. She asked the applicants to come to the podium and introduce themselves.

Mr. Callender presented the pictures from the application packet and asked for the applicant to go down the line of their requests.

Clairissa Pequignot introduced herself, her Mom, Joy, and their contractor, Russell Page. They explained the scope of the projects.

Chairwoman Jones shared some research regarding the homes and that they were built in 1910. She read the standards from the Preservation Primer in relation to retaining original elements, historical materials, distinctive architectural features, and the preservation axiom. Chairwoman Jones mentioned the applications suggestion of shaker shingles, and that she was not completely against them, but questioned their use since they are not part of the original.

Chairwoman Jones asked if there were any questions from the panel. Mr. Bradley stated that the shaker shingles was his biggest opposition, but he was glad to see the property being refurbished. Ms. Camp stated that the shingles take away from the historic features and value of the house. Mr. Russell stated that Arnold Properties added vinyl siding to the home and that the owner was simply trying to make it look better. Ms. Pequignot confirmed that they wanted to keep the two properties looking as similar as possible. They ultimately decided not to proceed with the shaker shingles.

Chairwoman Jones commended them on the handicap ramp and then confirmed that the ramp was not just on one of the homes, but on both. Mr. Callender clarified that they were currently discussing 315 S. Madison Ave. and then agreed that the discussion could be about both properties, as they are hinged together, but there would need to be two separate motions.

Mr. Callender spoke about the proposed parking lot, to join the two sites, and that he has been working with the applicant's engineer, and the lot would be to code. The lot meets the minimum for the form based code. There are tight constraints, but hundred-year-old easements have been found for the property line that gives 5 feet on each side. The 315 property has a larger expanse in the back allowing for more parking. Also, the form based codes take into consideration the parking spaces across the street at the Town Green, giving the applicant the amount of spaces needed. Mr. Callender confirmed that Ms. Pequignot meets all the minimums for the zoning ordinance. The applicants have been working with Chris Croy to get all of the drainage correct.

Mr. Bradley asked to view the elevation map for 315 S. Madison and had questions regarding a lower window (upper right image in packet) being removed and replaced with a door. Mr. Page stated it was for handicap use. Mr. Bradley asked for confirmation regarding what would be there and it was confirmed that it will be a door. The rendering's elevation is not accurate. Mr. Bradley then questioned the door on the lower left (rear elevation image) and stated that he thought he had seen one on the original application. Mr. Callender confirmed that was not the same location and Mr. Bradley was speaking of the bump out. Mr. Page spoke to the positioning of the doors. Ms. Pequignot explained that on 315, the bottom door would be the handicap access, from the parking space to the building. Mr. Callender asked for clarification that the ramp would be on the rear of the 313 property, based on the new description, and Mr. Page stated no. Joy Pequignot said her ramp, for 313, would be on the side to the front entrance. Mr. Callender stated that the application said the ramp would be installed from the rear, so there was some confusion. Mr. Page stated that it would not work in the back as the HVAC unit is there and there would be no room for a handicap space. Mr. Page then began discussion regarding the issue with the ramp in the front saying there was only 15 feet from the porch to the sidewalk, and in order to pass code, it would have to be 21 feet, so they are 6 feet short in the front. Mr. Callender stated that the only issue with CD4 was the encroachment of the side set back. Mr. Page mentioned how the townhomes did theirs and Mr. Callender responded that they were done before the adoption of the form based codes and that it is attached to the primary

structure so it must follow the principal building setbacks. Chairwoman Jones asked if we could say allowable by code? Mr. Callender stated you could but it would not help him. Mr. Callender looked up the code requirements. Ms. Camp asked what the two buildings were going to be used for and the response was 313 will be retail and 315 will be an office space and conference room. Mr. Callender stated that CD4 had some generous setbacks, so there may be some relief. He also stated that the original submission proposed the ramp would be more side and front, and that is where the tightness was. Now they are proposing the rear where the bump out is. Mr. Callender said he had measured the side proposal and there was only 4.5 feet, so the ramp would encroach the property line; there would be no variance, it would just be over property line. He went on to say that if there is a zero setback, it will probably be fine but you do not want there to be a condition that throws it back to the Code Office and contractor gets a building permit and then is told no. Mr. Bradley mentioned moving the HVAC unit and explained his thoughts on the site plan. Mr. Page stated that they would still lose a parking space by doing that. Mr. Callender confirmed that the side setback is indeed zero, in CD4, so they should be fine (if it is done in the front). The applicants disagreed wanting it on the side to the front. The bump out is the issue. Mr. Page, stated again, that the issue with the ramp in the front is that there is only 15 feet from the porch to the sidewalk, and in order to pass code, it would have to be 21 feet, so they are 6 feet short in the front. Mr. Callender asked if he could cut a landing? They discussed details of the ramp regarding rise and landings. Mr. Callender thinks there is enough room but the ramp will have to go in front of the home in order to make code. Mr. Page then began discussion regarding the issue with the ramp in the front saying there was only 15 feet from the porch to the sidewalk, and in order to pass code, it would have to be 21 feet, so they are 6 feet short in the front. Ms. Joy Pequignot expressed concern about it taking away from the historical value. Mr. Bradley encouraged the moving of the HVAC again. Mr. Callender mentioned that by doing what Mr. Bradley suggested, it would cause a car to be stuck.

Chairwoman Jones suggested approving the parking lot, so the applicants can get started on that and Mr. Callender approved. Mr. Callender mentioned that from a parking space requirement, they are good and could probably get rid of one of the handicap spots. He thinks it is accommodating, since the two buildings are sharing a parking lot. HPC does not need to vote on ADA issues. They will readdress the handicap ramp issue at the next meeting.

Chairwoman Jones called for a motion for 315 S. Madison Ave.

Motion to approve as presented,

Motion by Camp,  
Second by Bradley,  
Motion carried unanimously

**The Third Item of New Business:** Request for COA – 313 S. Madison Ave. #3902. See discussion above in the Second Item of New Business.

Chairwoman Jones called for a motion for 313 S. Madison Ave. parking lot and readdress the handicap ramp at the next Historic Preservation Commission meeting on August 26, 2025.

Motion by Bradley,  
Second by Camp,  
Motion carried unanimously

Chairwoman Jones called for a motion to adjourn,

Motion by Camp,

Second by Bradley  
Motion carried unanimously

Adjourned at 7:04 p.m.