



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

300 Martin Luther King Blvd.

September 8, 2022

TIME: 4:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Staff member, Lisa Thrift, called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approve August 11, 2022 Minutes

A motion was made by Debbie Purves to approve the August 11, 2022 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mark Grantham. All approved.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

(Limit comments to five minutes or less)

There were no citizen comments.

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss.

5. NEW BUSINESS

2. Nominate 2022-2023 Chair and Secretary

Staff opened the meeting by introducing and welcoming a new commission member, Mark Gatlin.

Staff began with opening the floor for nominations for the 2022-2022 Chair.

Mark Grantham made a motion to nominate Rush Denson as Chair. The motion was seconded by Linda Lanz. All approved

Staff opened the floor for nominations for the 2022-2023 Secretary. Linda Lanz volunteered to continue the position.

Debbie Purves made a motion to nominate Linda Lanz as Secretary. The motion was seconded by Mark Grantham. All approved.

3. 807 Geneva St: Geneva Historic District

COA: Replace Siding and Demo Garage

Owner: Katy Doss

Resources:

Littleton-McClendon House, c. 1918; classic box cottage One-story, frame, pyramidal roof, central pyramidal dormer with check rail sash, central door, flanking 1/1 window, wraparound porch with square brick piers.

Proposal: The petitioner requests a COA for the following:

1. Remove existing vinyl siding and replace with cementitious siding with 5" reveal. Install pre-finished metal fascia and perforated cement board soffit to match siding.
2. Replace existing wood door with new wood door. Install new exterior light fixtures on each side of door.
3. Demolish garage.
4. Install non-swinging lasered and painted wood sign with wood posts approximately 5'4"H. Option 1 is rectangular and measures 2'h x 6'w (33SF). Option 2 is circular and measures 4' (22SF).

Guidelines:

2. Wood:

- a. Significant architectural features should be retained and preserved. Deteriorated material should be repaired or replaced with material that duplicates in size, shape and texture the old material as closely as possible. Composite and other materials may be used so long as these materials duplicate the original in size, shape and texture and do not cover any existing wood materials.
- b. Do not remove architectural features such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, doorway pediments, trim, shutters, etc. These are an essential part of a building's character and appearance and illustrate the history of the building.
- c. Do not resurface frame buildings with new material that is inappropriate or is incongruous with the architectural style or materials of the asphalt shingles or siding. Aluminum or vinyl siding overlaid over wood siding, wood soffit or wood fascia is not allowed on contributing structures in historic districts (see <http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief08.htm>). It may be allowed on non-contributing structures in historic districts, subject to the guidelines above and on a case-by-case basis. In no event shall vinyl or aluminum material be permitted to cover existing wood detailed trim such as door and window casings, wood cornice and frieze boards, brackets, window architraves, doorway pediments and wood columns.

H. DEMOLITION:

1. Definition: The tearing down of a building by active means or by neglect resulting in the structural decay of the original building fabric. Neglect

means not maintaining a weatherproof, watertight, secure building, structurally stable and/or maintaining vegetation around the structure or structures on the property.

2. Since the purpose of historic zoning is to protect historic properties, the demolition of a building which contributes historically or architecturally to the character and significance of the district is inappropriate and shall be avoided. This means demolition by active means or by neglect in failure to maintain a property. This also includes any structure that contributes to the architectural character of the historic district, not just the most outstanding architectural structures in the district, but the ordinary period structures as well.
3. Demolition is inappropriate:
 1. if a building is of such architectural or historical interest and value that its removal would be detrimental to the public interest.
 2. if a building is listed as contributing to the architectural character of the district.
 3. if a building is of such old or unusual or uncommon design and materials that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced without great difficulty and expense.
 4. if its proposed replacement would make a less positive visual contribution to the district, would disrupt the character of the district or would be visually incompatible.
 5. if a building is listed as contributing to the architectural character of the district or qualifies for any of the above a through d and can be feasibly stabilized and no new compatible structure is proposed to be built on the site. An existing structure shall not be demolished for a parking lot or vacant lot. The applicant for demolition must demonstrate financial resources for stabilizing the site after demolition and the construction of a new building or new structure. Stabilization plans as well as Architectural plans and specifications for the new construction along with a schedule for their completion shall be presented to the Opelika Historic Preservation Commission prior to a COA for demolition being issued.
4. Demolition is appropriate:
 1. if a building has completely lost its architectural and historical integrity and importance and has become structurally unsound and its removal will not result in a more negative, less appropriate visual effect on the district.

2. if a building is not listed as contributing to the historical or architectural character and importance of the historic district and its removal will result in a more positive, appropriate visual effect on the district.

6. Doors:

- a. The original size and shape of door openings should be maintained. Original doors and door hardware should be repaired and reused in place. Original transoms, sidelights and doors should be maintained.
- b. Replacement doors when necessary, should be compatible with the original doors in terms of style, texture and size.
- c. Shiny aluminum storm doors and screen doors are not appropriate. Full view storm doors painted to match the door are appropriate.
- d. New door openings should not be introduced on the front, principal façade of the structure.
- e. Original door openings should not be filled in.

The following items DO NOT require a COA:

- Re-glazing of windows or replacing broken panes of glass
- Repairs to original wood windows and doors when there is no change in appearance and material
- Painting of window frames and sashes
- Installation of full view (glazed) storm windows and doors – either wood or aluminum with baked enamel or painted finish are acceptable

The following commonly requested projects require a COA:

- Replacement of original windows
- Removal or addition of a window or door opening
- Exposing a previously covered window units with a replacement according to the guidelines

c. Lighting:

1. Original lighting fixtures should be retained.
1. Where new lighting fixtures are required, they should be compatible or unobtrusive with the architectural style of the structure.

1. Yard and house lighting shall be compatible with the neighborhood and not overly bright (less than 1-foot candle as measured at the property line).

The following items DO NOT require a COA:

- Motion detector lighting

d. Signs:

1. The appearance, size, position, method of attachment, texture of materials, color, and design of signs shall be in keeping with the collective characteristics of the structures surrounding the property on which the sign will be located. *Murals and advertising relevant to the historic district is permitted. (updated 08/12/14)*
1. Off-site signs shall not be permitted.
1. Signs shall be limited to one sign for each street frontage per premise and if placed in the yard, less than five feet in height.
1. The maximum area of any sign located in a historic residential district shall be four (4) square feet; the maximum area of any sign in a historic commercial district shall be limited to twenty-four (24) square feet, *and in the Gateway Corridor (Geneva St, 10th St, Torbert Ave) shall be limited to forty-eight (48) square feet*, unless acceptable documentation proves that original signage from the date of construction of the building or the most significant architectural renovation of the building was larger. *(updated 08/12/14)*
1. No sign that flashes, blinks, revolves or is put in motion by the atmosphere shall be permitted. No visible bulbs, plastics or luminous paints will be permitted as a part of any sign.
1. Buildings and signs may be illuminated by remote light sources, provided that these light sources are shielded to protect adjacent properties.
1. Signs attached to the structures shall not cover any architectural feature.
1. Real estate signs shall be removed not more than ten (10) calendar days after the closing of a sale of a house, building, or lot.

The following items DO NOT require a COA:

- Real estate signs
- Home security signs
- Temporary signs and banners

The following commonly requested projects require a COA:

- All new building/business identification signage
- Replacement signs that differ in dimension, design, material or location from the existing

PARKING - #20.

Parking lots should be screened from public view.

LOCATION: Off—street parking should be located behind, or to the side of, commercial structures, not in front of the building. If a parking lot fronts the street, it should maintain that blocks' established setback through the alignment of landscape elements with the facades of buildings.

DESIGN: Parking lots should be screened from public view either by a wall or by landscaping that is only high enough to screen cars. Parking lots with a large capacity should consider landscaped islands with trees to divide the lot into small areas so that the visual impact of a large, paved area is reduced. The front of a multistory parking deck should be compatible with building facades in the block and have street level retail or office space.

Staff recommendation:

1. *Staff recommends approval of removing aluminum siding on house, garage, and garden shed and installation of cementitious siding with 5" reveal, which duplicates the size, shape, and texture of the original wood siding.*
2. *Staff recommends approval of metal fascia and cement board soffit.*
3. *Staff recommends approval of new wood door and lighting.*
4. *Staff recommends approval of demolition of this structure for it is not listed as part of the National Registry description not does it contribute historically or architecturally to the character of the district. The structure appears to have significant structural issues.*
5. *Staff recommends approval of either Option 1 or 2 for signage for both meet the guidelines in material and allowable square footage for gateway corridor.*
6. *Applicant to return with a formal parking plan.*
7. *Applicant to return at a later date for window and shutter approval.*

Discussion:

Staff provided a review of the applicants request and materials provided. Additional information provided in the packet includes an insurance summary on the garage and parking options. Mark Gatlin asked if renovations included the house and the greenhouse. Staff replied the greenhouse would be renovated.

Debbie Purves made a motion to approve with staff recommendations. Mark Grantham seconded to motion. All approved.

4. 707 Geneva St: Geneva Historic District
COA: Rebuild Right Side Porch and Handicap Ramp
Applicant: GTR Contractor, LLC

Resources:

Under the Oaks, c. 1910, Neo-Classical Revival. Two-story, brick, hip roof, central portico with four Ionic columns and balustraded deck, broken pediment over central entrance, porte cochere, French doors. Contributing garage.

History: Right side porch was crushed and destroyed by large tree during storm several months back.

Proposal: The petitioner requests a COA for the following:

1. Porch to be built back in the exact location and dimension as before damage. New fiberglass columns to be installed, historical design will match existing design and profile of the historical columns and features of home mimicking the left side porch. We worked extensively with Pacific Columns, Inc. design engineers on matching the existing columns and pilasters.
2. Wood soffit, fascia, and trim will be closely matched through a specialty suppliers. Materials that are not available will be mill on site to match existing design and profile.
3. The new proposed roof structure is design to meet code while preserving the historical design. All structural members and anchors will be hidden. Structural 6"x6" post will be inside new architectural columns and fasten to existing patio, wall anchors will be used to tie new LVL beams to existing brick walls and will be covered by new pilasters that match the existing on the left side elevation.
4. A metal roof will be installed of the same color and profile of the main house.
5. Wood privacy fence will be reinstalled.
6. Wood handicap ramp will be rebuilt.

Proposed Guidelines:

7. Entrances, Porches and Steps:

- a. Porches and steps that are appropriate to the building and its development should be retained. Porches or additions that reflect later architectural styles are often important to the building's historical integrity and wherever possible, should be retained.
- b. Original material and architectural features, such as handrails, balusters, columns, brackets and roof decoration shall be preserved. Where necessary to replace deteriorated pieces, the new material should match the original in texture, shape, size and color.
- c. Original details and shape, outline, roof height and roof pitch should be retained.
- d. Enclosing of front porches is inappropriate if done in a manner that destroys their intended appearance.
- e. The enclosing of side and rear porches may be considered appropriate if the visual openness and character of the original porch is maintained.

The following items DO NOT require a COA:

- Minor repairs to materials and features when repaired to match the original
- Porch flooring and ceilings, trim boards, railings, brackets, etc.

The following commonly requested projects require a COA:

- Removal or addition of porches
- Screening of side porches according to guidelines (staff approval)
- Screening of front porches according to guidelines (commission approval)
- Enclosure of porches

NEW CONSTRUCTION:

1. Definition: The construction of any free-standing structure on any lot or addition to an existing structure.

2. General Principles:

1. These guidelines shall apply only to the exteriors of buildings and to areas of lots visible from public right-of-way.

2. The public facades, front and street-related elevations, of proposals for new buildings shall be more carefully reviewed than other facades.

3. New buildings should be compatible with other architectural styles in the historic district but are not required to imitate the past architectural styles of the historic district. They should reflect the era of their own construction.
 4. Since construction in a historic district has usually taken place continuously from the nineteenth century to the present, a variety of building types and styles result which demonstrate the changes in building tastes and technology over the years. The special architectural character of the majority of the buildings in the historic district is responsible for this designation and new buildings should complement and be compatible with the prevailing architectural styles of other buildings in the historic district.
 5. Reconstruction may be appropriate when it reproduces facades of a building which no longer exists and which was located in the historic district if; the building would have contributed to the historical and architectural character of the area, and if it will be compatible in terms of style, height, scale, massing, and materials with the buildings immediately surrounding the lot on which the reproduction will be built, and if it is accurately based on pictorial documentation.
 6. New buildings should relate to an established pattern and rhythm of existing contributing buildings, both on the same and opposite sides of a street, the dominance of that pattern and rhythm must be respected and not disrupted.
 7. New construction should be consistent with existing contributing buildings along a street in terms of height, scale, setback, and rhythm; relationship of materials, texture, details and color; roof shape; orientation and proportion and rhythm of openings.
-
1. Height: New buildings should be compatible in height with the height of adjacent buildings. This shall not mean that new construction must be the same height as adjacent structures, but that new construction should be of similar heights as adjacent structures. New construction may not be over one story higher than adjacent structures or more than one story lower than adjacent structures.
 1. Scale: The size of a new building; its mass in relation to open spaces; its windows, doors, openings, and porches should be visually compatible with the surround buildings.

1. The relationship and use of materials, texture, details, and material color of a new building's public facades shall be visually compatible with and similar to those of adjacent buildings or shall not contrast conspicuously.
1. The roofs of new buildings shall be visually compatible, by not contrasting greatly with the roof shape and orientation of surrounding buildings.
1. The setback from front and side yard property lines established by adjacent buildings must be maintained. When a definite rhythm along a street is established by uniform lot and building width, infill new buildings should maintain the rhythm.
1. Orientation: The site orientation of new buildings shall be consistent with that of adjacent buildings and shall be visually compatible. Directional expression shall be compatible with surrounding buildings, whether that expression is vertical, horizontal or non-directional.
1. The relationship of width to height of windows and doors, and the rhythm of solids to voids in new buildings shall be visually compatible with the surrounding buildings.

Staff recommendation:

1. *Staff recommends approval of rebuild of right side porch with fiberglass columns and wood materials specified to duplicate left porch.*
2. *Staff recommends approval of metal roof matching main structure.*
3. *Staff recommends approval of rebuild of wood privacy fence.*
4. *Staff recommends approval of rebuild of wood handicap ramp.*

Discussion:

Staff explained that a large tree fell on the right side porch during a storm destroying it and the handicap ramp completely. Both will be rebuilt duplicating the left side porch.

Debbie Purves asked how exact the columns will be? Bob Davis with GTR Construction addressed the commission. He stated that what they were unable to source will be milled on site

so that the columns will be identical to what was there before. They will also be repainting approximately 91% of the home. There was some additional damage done to the top of the house. They will be matching the original material and replacing it as well. Staff asked him to explain the difference in the original columns and the new columns. Mr. Davis stated that the original columns are assembled into four pieces, which often split or separate. The new columns will be one piece. These will be less of a maintenance and paint issue.

Mark Grantham made a motion to approve with staff recommendations. Mark Gatlin seconded the motion. All approved.

5. 104 N. 9th St: Downtown Historic District
COA: Parking Lot
Owner: Pyson, LLC

Resources:

This property is in the Downtown Historic District but is not on the National Register of Historic Places.

Proposal: The petitioner requests a COA for the following:

1. Install up to ten (10) parking spaces of gravel in rear and one (1) handicap space of concrete with wood handicap ramp onto side porch. Handicap space will be screened behind rock wall currently in place.

Proposed Guidelines:

PARKING - #20.

Parking lots should be screened from public view.

LOCATION: Off—street parking should be located behind, or to the side of, commercial structures, not in front of the building. If a parking lot fronts the street, it should maintain that blocks' established setback through the alignment of landscape elements with the facades of buildings.

DESIGN: Parking lots should be screened from public view either by a wall or by landscaping that is only high enough to screen cars. Parking lots with a large capacity should consider landscaped islands with trees to divide the lot into small areas so that the visual impact of a large, paved area is reduced. The front of a multistory parking deck should be compatible with building facades in the block and have street level retail or office space.

LANDSCAPE - #24

Use traditional frees and plants which unify the district and do not obscure the buildings.

PLANTING MATERIALS: New trees should be similar to varieties already planted. Trees with limited height and dimensions which do not completely mask signs and buildings are recommended. Low maintenance, drought resistant native varieties are more appropriate than ubiquitous Bradford Pear trees. Where overhead power lines are present, plant materials should “crown out” beneath the power lines. Shrubs and small trees which do not obscure the buildings as they grow are preferred. Potted trees, plants, and flowers are acceptable but should not impede pedestrian traffic and should be maintained.

MAINTENANCE: Maintenance of street plantings is very important. Replace and remove dead, dying or poorly maintained plants. Prune mature trees which obscure signs. Water and mulch plants regularly.

Staff recommendation:

1. Staff recommends approval of parking plan meeting all guidelines.
2. Parking Plan is contingent on letter from adjoining property owner giving access to lot.

Discussion:

Staff outlined the proposed parking plan. Linda Lanz asked how permissions given by adjoining property owner works. Planning Director, Matt Mosley, answered that if the agreement expired the business owner would be required to find another option. It is a little more flexible in the Historic District because we prefer that they not park in the front of the properties. There is often a contract in place specifying a length of time. Businesses often have agreements with churches that have parking lots. Debbie Purves asked where the rock wall is located and if it would be affected. The rock wall was pointed out and assured that it will remain in place. Staff also pointed out that a landscape plan has been submitted.

Mark Grantham made a motion to approve with staff recommendations. Debbie Purves seconded. All approved.

6. 807 Tolbert Blvd: Geneva Historic District
COA: New Construction
Owner: BC Stone Homes

Resources:

Vacant lot located in the Geneva Historic District.

Proposal: The petitioner requests a COA for the following:

1. New construction five-unit 2BR townhome units, each approximately 1511sf. The exteriors will be brick with Hardi

soffit and fascia, standing seam metal chimneys, architectural shingle roof, and vinyl SDL windows (2/2). Front lower windows will have transoms. The front doors will be stained fiberglass and rear doors will be glass full light steel. Both front and rear doors to be covered with flat metal awnings.

2. Parking will be on the rear off Tolbert Blvd. The back courtyards will have brick walls with wrought iron fencing and gates. Sidewalks along Tolbert Blvd and from front doors to sidewalk along Columbus Pkwy.

Guidelines:

G. NEW CONSTRUCTION:

1. Definition: The construction of any free-standing structure on any lot or addition to an existing structure.

2. General Principles:

1. These guidelines shall apply only to the exteriors of buildings and to areas of lots visible from public right-of-way.
2. The public facades, front and street-related elevations, of proposals for new buildings shall be more carefully reviewed than other facades.
3. New buildings should be compatible with other architectural styles in the historic district but are not required to imitate the past architectural styles of the historic district. They should reflect the era of their own construction.
4. Since construction in a historic district has usually taken place continuously from the nineteenth century to the present, a variety of building types and styles result which demonstrate the changes in building tastes and technology over the years. The special architectural character of the majority of the buildings in the historic district is responsible for this designation and new buildings should complement and be compatible with the prevailing architectural styles of other buildings in the historic district.
5. Reconstruction may be appropriate when it reproduces facades of a building which no longer exists and which was located in the historic district if; the building would have contributed to the historical and architectural character of the area, and if it will be compatible in terms of style, height, scale, massing, and materials with the buildings immediately surrounding the lot on which the reproduction will be built, and if it is accurately based on pictorial documentation.

6. New buildings should related to an established pattern and rhythm of existing contributing buildings, both on the same and opposite sides of a street, the dominance of that pattern and rhythm must be respected and not disrupted.
 7. New construction should be consistent with existing contributing buildings along a street in terms of height, scale, setback, and rhythm; relationship of materials, texture, details and color; roof shape; orientation and proportion and rhythm of openings.
-
1. Height: New buildings should be compatible in height with the height of adjacent buildings. This shall not mean that new construction must be the same height as adjacent structures, but that new construction should be of similar heights as adjacent structures. New construction may not be over one story higher than adjacent structures or more than one story lower than adjacent structures.
-
1. Scale: The size of a new building; its mass in relation to open spaces; its windows, doors, openings and porches should be visually compatible with the surround buildings.
-
1. The relationship and use of materials, texture, details and material color of a new building's public facades shall be visually compatible with and similar to those of adjacent buildings or shall not contrast conspicuously.
-
1. The roofs of new buildings shall be visually compatible, by not contrasting greatly with the roof shape and orientation of surrounding buildings.
-
1. The setback from front and side yard property lines established by adjacent buildings must be maintained. When a definite rhythm along a street is established by uniform lot and building width, infill new buildings should maintain the rhythm.
-
1. Orientation: The site orientation of new buildings shall be consistent with that of adjacent buildings and shall be visually compatible. Directional expression shall be compatible with surrounding buildings, whether that expression is vertical, horizontal or non-directional.
-
1. The relationship of width to height of windows and doors, and the rhythm of solids to voids in new buildings shall be visually compatible with the surrounding buildings.
-
3. Additions to Existing Buildings:

1. Additions to existing buildings should be kept to a minimum and should be compatible in scale, materials, and texture. Additions should not be visually jarring or contrasting
2. Additions should not be made to the public facades of existing buildings. Additions should be located to the rear or sides of existing buildings in ways which do not disturb the main public facades.
3. The creation of an addition through enclosure of a front façade porch is inappropriate and should be avoided.

Staff recommendation:

1. *New construction homes should be compatible with other architectural styles in the district but reflect the era of its own construction. This plan meets the new construction guidelines for height, scale, materials, orientation, and setback.*
2. *Staff recommends windows be wood, wood with aluminum clad, or composite as approved on previous plans.*
3. *Staff recommends wood front door as approved on previous new construction.*
4. *Applicant has received setback approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment and Planning Department.*

Discussion:

Staff gave an overview of the project and supporting documentation.

Mark Gatlin began by stating that this part of the Geneva historic district is in a high-profile location. This project is not something that can be taken lightly, it will be very impactful to the historic district. There have been a lot of good and positive things happening in this district in the last few years. Looks like this is slab on grade and the building is about 150 ft wide.

Todd Reaves of BC Stone stated each building is approximately 25ft wide x 30ft deep. With asphalt shingles. A parapet wall divider will stick up roughly 12inches with a standing seam roof that goes up over the top.

Mark Gatlin said we have ivy on the bottom with the same brick across all five units with very little features breaking up the front other than windows and then a door that's at grade with a piece of metal over the door. There's no porch, no raised slab, it is plain.

Todd Reaves explained it is fitting with the older style of the area, older brick townhouses, not trying to match and emulate, but fit where it is in the community.

Debbie Purves stated that she doesn't see any historic charm or character at all. It says you try to match the surrounding, you take notice of the homes around it, they are all either Victorian or craftsman style. I don't see the character of that neighborhood.

Linda Lanz said her impression is they are building a lot of storage units now that the facades tend to look like apartments, but they are really storage units, in a way it kind of looks like that.

Mark Gatlin stated it looks too governmental.

Elaine Burton said there has been other new construction in the area and care was given in making sure that look and feel of the neighborhood was maintained.

Mark Gatlin expressed concern with the side elevations profile as approached coming down Columbus Parkway, dominating the entrance, a gateway lot into the historic district.

Debbie Purves stated she would like to see the applicant take what has been said and come back. Change the exterior, the appearance so that it to blends better with the architectural features of the neighborhood in both materials and design.

Planning Director, Matt Mosley, mentioned the raised podium and elevation.

Mark Gatlin quoted the Design Guidelines-Under (G). New Construction, 2(d) Since construction in the district has usually taken place continuously from the 19th century to the present, a variety of building types and styles result from which demonstrate the changes in building taste and technology over the years, which is good, it is the next sentence that separates the historic district from every other part of town, the special architectural character of the majority of the buildings in the historic district is responsible for this designation and new buildings should complement and be compatible with the prevailing architectural styles of other buildings in the historic district. So, I'm looking at not what is just left and right, but in the whole of the Geneva Street area that has been redeveloped. I don't see slab on grade in any construction, unless it's out of place within a historic district. The brick is very plain with no character to the front of this building. What about landscaping?

John Reaves replied that they can do a lot with landscaping. The brick will be pulled out adding definition, there will be transom windows, inside SDL windows, and iron fencing. All of this will make it fit into the neighborhood.

Staff asked if the commission wanted to address the windows, doors, or any other materials. Staff recommendations were read and then the floor was opened for comments.

Evelyn Mickel addressed the commission voicing concern of the amount of traffic and speed of traffic along Columbus Parkway and Glenn Avenue. This project would bring more traffic along S. 8th Street and Tolbert Blvd., near the daycare center.

Debbie Purves suggested porches on the front or rear.

Todd Reaves stated that with the setbacks of the property, it is difficult to do anything with a bump out. They are on the setback line as it is making it difficult to do anything on the front. He asked what suggestions that could be done to the front to break up the look and make it fit within the neighborhood better.

Linda Lanz asked if there was any danger of cars running into the buildings. Matt stated that there are trees in place that will help with this. Also, the developer will be required to provide a landscape and tree replacement plan. Any tree removed or damaged during construction will require to be replaced with a similar tree.

Mark Gatlin asked about the distance for right of way and setbacks and then if there was any room to add a porch or raise the slab or finish floor to do a porch. Mark Grantham asked if a porch could extend outside the setback.

Todd Reaves said doing a raised slab on something this large and \$120/yd, to do something at that magnitude would make it very difficult to do this project. Porches on the front would be too close to the sidewalk. The units will have rear courtyards for private outdoor space.

Mark Grantham asked what the contractor could do to add character to the front to improve the appearance with the setbacks being so tight, sitting so close to the road, and being in a gateway of the neighborhood.

Debbie Purves said there is a townhouse complex at the corner of 10th St and 4th Ave that are connected but they all have personalities, porches, and fit into the historic neighborhood.

Todd Reaves replied that these have a 12in brick firewall between each unit; seen on the rear elevation. Plus, you will have a lot of brick accents there that will be pulled and separate along the headers of the windows. Below the windows there will be roll-offs to give dimension to the brick itself.

Debbie Purves suggested the side views need some interesting features. Something besides a solid wall. The location is an important part of the district.

Staff asked if they had any visuals for what the courtyard would look like? Have they done this before? Would they consider doing some heavy moldings around the front door to give the fronts a heavy ornamental historic look?

Todd Reaves responded that they try to keep their products low maintenance and that will last 15-20 years. Something like that would have to be painted and they wouldn't all get painted at the same time. Staff explained that the HPC does maintenance enforcement and could regulate that.

Mark Gatlin stated there is an overall issue with the feel and look of the project. He suggested they return with something that addresses the concern voiced and the commission could vote on it at the next meeting.

Todd Reaves responded that if they need to come back with a 3d model they could. The have renderings being made right now for signs for the lot that will show it at an isometric view. Due to setbacks, it would be difficult to do a porch. That is why an awning is show and we are doing the courtyards in the rear. We're trying to

provide as much dimension as possible within what the site will allow and keep with a historical look.

Chase with BC Stone stated because of the setbacks, it is going to be a brick building with parapet walls, I really don't think that in the footage of 25ft you could put a whole lot more on the front. We've got windows, rig details, awnings, transom windows, and the ivy. It would look like we were trying too hard. I think when you got to the finished product you would think it was too much.

Elaine Burton asked if the new renderings would provide a better visual of the exterior façade. The commission wants to be able to give it their best thought in terms of keeping it what they feel it should be. A rendering with landscaping may make all the difference in the world because it is stark and plain. If you can't do a porch and keep your price point where you want it to be, landscaping helps. But I need to see some definition.

Debbie Purves said she needs to see some historical characteristics. All I see is a brick pattern over the windows.

Todd Reaves said the design overall meets all the requirements stated in the Geneva guidelines here. We went through extensively to make sure we met everything.

Mark Gatlin did not agree and referred to New Construction 2(d) of the guidelines. We are looking at something that is stark, it's not connecting with any portion of this historic district. We are trying to get there.

Todd Reaves replied that riding around Tolbert and the surrounding area there is nothing built like this to compare. They looked at surrounding properties and other new construction on adjacent street and tried to meet all criteria set in the guidelines. Right above where you mention "new buildings should be compatible with other architectural styles in the historic district but are not required to imitate the past architectural style in the historic district, they should reflect an era of their own structure." We don't want to exactly emulate something from the past era but something that is new and will fit in. We feel strongly this will fit in with other architecture within the district and within all the regulations set forth by the Geneva Street district rules.

Mark Grantham stated that you can't move the building. The Davis Dyer building, isn't it a long brick building with a metal awning on the front of it? With huge windows. I think we're off and want them to build an old Victorian structure in an old neighborhood.

Debbie Purves said people are buying into the historic district because they are wanting the guarantee that everything around them is going to keep the character of that neighborhood. And that is what we are doing, preserving that character of the neighborhood.

Matt Mosley responded he thinks what Mr. mentioned is this issue of scale, height, and setbacks. The podium whether it's raised or not, I know is a substantial burden, but I do think as members of the board are bringing some items too. Now, whether the board feels you need those and you feel you need those are potentially

different, and that's where a decision has been made. By no means is this an easy lot. It's created by the realignment of the street for the last 30 years it's always been a tough lot. It's not to say a project like this can't work there but it does sound like there is still some work that needs to be looked at.

Todd Reaves voiced concern that in the future another contractor would be allowed to build something of lesser quality. BC Stone will build a nice townhome product. It could be prevented if we would just have let go of what they have presented. Their goal is to protect to preserve everything. They preserve as many trees as they can. They stand behind their products 5-10 years. A raised foundation would add about \$45,000 of a project like this.

Staff asked if the commission wanted to address other materials presented, such as doors, windows, etc. Apparently, everyone is ok with the brick and architectural shingles. Is everyone ok with the metal awnings over the doors as a design? No specs were turned in for the awnings. Nothing showing if it is supported with a rod or chain to the building.

Todd Reaves said the awning is a C-style with a welded chain style for support.

Staff reported the front doors are fiberglass and rear are full glass steel. The Staff recommendation was read.

Todd Reaves said the fiberglass glazed door they offer once looks exactly like a wood door once stained or painted. A wood door will rot and warp if it gets wet. The fiberglass door has longevity, 10-15 years. A standard wood door the homeowner would have to maintain.

Mark Gatlin stated that the wood door would soften the governmental look to make it appear more residential.

Staff reported the doors used in the Southside project were wood fir doors that were stained, and the new door installed at the house directly behind this property was a wood door that was stained.

Linda Lanz said she could appreciate the decision to go with that, but how are you going to control how the homeowners maintains their units? Somebody could just decide to paint the door rather than stain it. Good wood doors last for 100 years. I have one that is 120 years old that is stained.

Todd Reaves said the wood door would be an area that we would be willing to give on, it's a give and take. It would be a little more costly, but not like raising the foundation.

Staff stated that included in the packet is examples of vinyl SDL windows BC Stone has installed in two other homes. Staff recommendations were read.

Todd Reaves explained in historic home you have old wood divided lite windows. New vinyl SDL (Simulated Divided Lite) windows keep the look of divided lite of old times but to today's code. Even if you went with an aluminum clad window, you're not getting the divided lite like the 1930's, it is still one solid thing (glass) in there. With these you have grids, and it still has that inset look. I can see an argument if it was a siding house because then you wouldn't have that inset look of the window

like restored homes. But because this is a brick building that is why we went with this product. These windows would be inset just like in the pictures that you can see. From the street view, you would not be able to tell the difference between the vinyl window or the aluminum clad window. The homes built on the adjacent street they are aluminum clad windows, but they do not have grids. Aluminum clad windows add more cost to a project. Adding grids is cost prohibitive. If you go with the SDL vinyl window you can have the simulated divided light lines and historic look. I really do not see a benefit of aluminum clad windows. Cost wise we are looking at about a \$20,000 difference for this project between an aluminum clad with no bricks at all versus an SDL vinyl window. If you add grids on the aluminum clad, it is an additional cost. This is an upgraded window to emulate the look of a historic building.

Debbie Purves said she doesn't think we can say yes to BC Stone when we have said no to others that wanted to use vinyl.

Todd Reaves asked if others requested GBG, grid between the glass, or were they requesting an SDL style window? Or, were they requesting SLD style window?

Staff responding that GBG is not allowed. Grids must be on the outside of the windows. Vinyl is not allowed within the historic district.

Mark Grantham stated our specific guidelines do not allow vinyl at all regardless of if it's divided or not. It's one area we just don't allow.

Todd Reaves asked where are you referring in the guidelines? I saw windows references in the remodeled portion of the guidelines, but I didn't see anything in the guidelines on the new construction.

Mark Grantham answered it is based on the state historic commission. He doesn't know that there is a historic commission anywhere that allows vinyl windows in their historic district.

Staff stated that the Federal National Standards are followed.

Todd Reaves said if aluminum clad windows were required, they would probably have to go with the no grids option like the other adjacent new construction project. The cost to add grids on a window going from a vinyl style window to a clad window is a tremendous cost difference. We are trying to keep the look, which the SDL would give from the street versus a no grid option, with a clad window.

Mark Gatlin asked if this moves forward, are you willing to use the approved materials that she states here for your windows? And would you be willing to use a wood front door which is what is suggested.

Todd Reaves said they would be willing to look at adding the wood door and using the aluminum clad windows.

Mark Gatlin explained he was not saying that gets it approved, but those are things that could keep it from getting approved, not using approved materials.

Staff stated the deadline for the next meeting. Any changes would need to be submitted with specs on awning, wood door, aluminum clad windows, new renderings of the project and courtyard, etc.

Todd Reaves stated that they didn't have renderings of the courtyard. Plans are sent off to a third party. They do renderings of the front. We don't do the side or rear view because they can be so different.

Mark Gatlin asked who they use as an architect? They answered John Nettles. Does he have software that can present some variations that may help with picturing some of this? Try to get away from that governmental look. I've said it multiple times tonight. Try to soften the 125ft on either side of stark brick and then on the ends. Can you bring an architect into this discussion and see if he could help us a little bit with softening the look. I understand what you are saying about uniformity and I'm saying just the opposite. The uniformity is almost what bothers me the most.

Todd Reaves said with it being a connected structure, he doesn't think you want a lot of variation. There's a lot of limitations with this land and this building

Staff stated that we are always willing to sit down with you, you can pass ideas by Matt and I anytime and we will give you an opinion of if you are headed in the right direction or where we think the commission would agree with it.

Mark Gatlin said what we have is not very detailed and everybody at this platform is asking for something that we can visually understand better. What's going on and if there are options, that is what we want to know.

The applicant will return to the next meeting with a revised plan.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

7. Enforcement Report

There were no new enforcement cases to review.

8. Staff Report

Staff presented to the commission proposed changes to the guidelines for tree removal of dead trees. This would allow staff approval on dead trees. George Barker, city arborist, assisted with verbiage of guidelines and addressed the commission.

Mr. Barker explained that he was contracted to do a citywide tree inventory and look for available tree planting spaces. He looked for trees causing problems, that had decayed, needed to be trimmed or removed, and how urgently this needed to happen. Approximately 250 trees have been removed and another 700 have been planted. His concern is the shifting of liability once the city receives a letter from an arborist stating that a tree needs to come out. If the HPC requires the applicant to wait for the next meeting, you have shifted the liability from the homeowner to the city.

Staff reviewed the proposed changes to the guidelines requiring a certified arborist to provide a letter of recommendation and a tree replacement plan. This will be for dead trees only. All other tree removal requests will still have to come before the commission.

A motion was made by Mark Grantham to approve changes to guidelines. The motion was seconded by Elaine Burton. All approved.

9. Next meeting DATE

1. Next meeting October 13, 2022

7. ADJOURN

A motion was made by Mark Grantham to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mark Gatlin. All approved.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Rush Denson, Chair

Linda Lanz, Secretary