

Architectural Review Board

November 6, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dwayne Vernon, Kevin Jayroe, Sally Gillespie, Michael Norton, Jerry Miller

MEMBERS ABSENT: Linda Abate' & Clare Reigart

OTHERS PRESENT: Janet Grant & Debra Grant

I. Call to Order

- II. Approval of Minutes: October 2, 2017;** Mr. Jayroe made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Vernon, the motion carried unanimously.
October 16, 2017; Ms. Gillespie made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Norton, the motion carried unanimously.

III. Public Input: None

IV. New Business:

1. **Susan & Herman Beckman** are seeking the approval to repair/replace windows in their home at 111 Broad St.
Janet Grant/City Staff told the Board that owners would like to repair or replace windows on the sides and rear of their property.
Ms. Beckman/Applicant said they replaced some of the windows in the home 20 years ago with wood windows and they have failed. At this time the request is to replace the damaged windows with vinyl wood clad windows, the windows will be Anderson 2 over 2 profile. **Mr. Miller** asked if the windows are original. **Ms. Beckman** said no.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Vernon said there is nothing Ms. Beckman is asking for that is contrary to the guidelines, however he wondered if it would increase the contributing factor of the house if the bay window was replaced with an all wood window. Mr. Vernon said the installation of the vinyl clad windows should not diminish the contributing factor of the home.
Mr. Miller said he did not have a problem giving the applicant the option to use all wood or vinyl wood clad on the bay window.

Public Input: None

Motion: Mr. Norton made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Residential Guidelines Section 40; page 89 (Windows), seconded by Mr. Jayroe; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.

2. **J.E. Watkins** is seeking the approval to install a fence at 918 Duke St.
Ms. Janet Grant/City Staff told the Board that the applicant is seeking the approval to install a 6 ft. wood plank fence.
Mr. Watkins/Applicant said he is looking to install a fence to keep people from walking across his property. The fence will be set in concrete and will run from the corners of the house to the rear of the property. The fence will be constructed of treated material, the top

will be cut even, with no points. The Board had concerns with the egress of the windows on the left side. **Mr. Watkins** said he will drop the height of the fence on that side. Mr. Watkins said there will be a gate on the side and the rear that will be the same as the fence. **Ms. Gillespie** told Mr. Watkins that the guidelines states that there has to be a finish on the fence. **Mr. Watkins** said he would stain the fence.

Board Discussion: None

Public Input: None

Motion: Ms. Gillespie made a motion to approve the application with the following stipulations: 1. The fence does not extend toward the street any further than the front wall of the house (not the porch), 2. There will be a finish applied to the fence (treated lumber), 3. The gates will match the fence design, 4. Facing the house on the left hand side the fence will be dropped in height to allow ingress and egress of any windows, then will transition to the rear wall of the house, citing Residential Guidelines Section 11; page 45 (Fences), seconded by Mr. Vernon; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.

3. **Glenn P. Roberts** is seeking the approval to install a fence at 311 Orange St.
Janet Grant/City Staff said Mr. Roberts would like to install an aluminum fence on the property lines on the side and rear of the property.
Mr. Roberts/Applicant told the Board that he is requesting a fence for security purposes. The fence will be 4 ft. in the front and 5 ft. on the right side and on the rear. Two (2) gates will be installed to match the fence (4 ft. gate will be in the front and a 12 ft. gate on the right side at the driveway entrance). The Board had concerns about the height of fence on the front of the property, as well as the continuance of fence without any elements to soften the look for a residential property.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Miller said he felt there was no reason for the existing brick wall to be in front of the property other than there was once a metal fence there.

Mr. Vernon said if the applicant had a fence in the rear yard that would solve the problem of trespassing on the property.

Ms. Gillespie said the applicant needs to get something that would be the appropriate design and height for his home. She had some pictures that supported her comments. **Mr. Roberts** said he understood her comments but did not agree. **Ms. Gillespie** said that design in her opinion is more fitting for a commercial property and is not compatible for the architectural design of this home.

Mr. Vernon said the style is not an issue for him since the Board has approved this design before, but the height is an issue for him, as far as the front of the yard.

Mr. Roberts said he felt like the Board was trying to redesign his fence. His request is for a 4 ft. fence and that is approved in the guidelines, and he sees the same design up and down Prince Street.

Ms. Gillespie said that the Board is not designing his fence but the requested design is not appropriate to his home (in the front). She said she hopes he would reconsider the design on the front of the home.

Mr. Roberts asked for the Board to vote on the application.

Mr. Vernon said if the Board voted on the application as submitted and voted it down, it would prevent him from coming back before the Board for a year, unless he had a different request or change of design.

Mr. Roberts says his wife is not willing to move into the house without a fence for security.

Mr. Norton said he thinks the issue is the scale of the fence with there being uniformity throughout the entire fence that makes it look like an international style. If there was something to break up the uniformity it would make it look more residential.

Mr. Vernon said he wonders if the Board should vote on the fence with the exception of the front portion.

Mr. Roberts agreed to allow the Board to vote on the rear and side yard of his fence and come back for a vote on the front at a later date.

Public Input: None

Motion: Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the application as submitted, excluding the front fencing, and noting that the fencing system shall run from the corner of the house wall on the right side along the side yard, the rear of the property and along the left side connecting to the neighboring fence, the height being 5ft. (See Exhibit B), citing Residential Guidelines Section 11; page 45 (Fences), seconded by Mr. Jayroe; the motion carried 5 to 0. (Mr. Roberts wanted to go on the record that he was not happy about the decision).

4. **Richard & Gwynn Heusel** are seeking the approval to construct a new garden shed at 315 Front St.

Janet Grant/City Staff told the Board that the owners of 315 Front St. would like to build a new garden shed (10' x 7').

Ms. Cindy Owens/Contractor said the garden shed will be designed to match the main house in color and details. The building will be on the left side of the property, having a brick foundation, 1 x 6 pine siding, metal roof (standing seam), vinyl louvered shutters, and French doors.

Board Discussion: None

Public Input: None

Motion: Mr. Vernon made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Residential Guidelines Section 22-B; page 63 (New Construction/Secondary Buildings), seconded by Mr. Norton; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.

5. **Robert & Susan Fleming** are seeking the approval to construct a garden shed at 902 Highmarket St.

Janet Grant/City Staff told the Board that the applicant would like to construct a garden shed in rear yard.

Mr. J.E. Watkins/Representative said the owner would like to build a new garden shed.

Ms. Gillespie asked about the curves on the roof line (pg. 9), **Mr. Jayroe** said the detail was put on to duplicate the church. **Ms. Gillespie** also asked about the decorative material on the column post. **Mr. Watkins** said that the details are not on the other pictures. **Ms. Gillespie** asked that the decorative details be eliminated and the design be kept clean. **Mr. Watkins** said that would not be a problem and the details would be taken off.

Board Discussion: None

Public Input: None

Motion: Ms. Gillespie made a motion to approve the application with the exception of the details to the columns as shown on page 9 of the application, the columns will be unadorned, citing Residential Guidelines Section 22-B; page 63 (New Construction/Secondary Buildings), seconded by Mr. Norton; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.

6. **Wendy & Michael Janowski** are seeking directions on performing alterations at 911 Duke St. **Janet Grant/City Staff** told the Board that the owners of 911 Duke St. is requesting guidance from them to renovate the home.

Mr. Tom Krowka/Architect told the Board that he needed direction on how to proceed with the renovation of the home:

- 2 types of siding on the house (lap siding and German siding) and he does not know which one came first or which one to use in the replacement, or if 2 different sidings should be used. The Board asked if it is known why 2 different sidings were used. **Ms. Janet Grant/City Staff** said the owner recycled lots of materials and probably used what was available. The Board said either siding could be used. **Mr. Krowka** said he feels the lap siding would be more appropriate.
- The roof also has 2 types of roofing materials (Metal and shingles), the question was what type would be most appropriate to use. **Mr. Krowka** would like to use the metal roof (5V profile), the Board had no objections.
- The windows will be replaced with wood or clad, since they are not original to the house. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if the windows had wavy glass, **Mr. Krowka** said he did not know, the Board did not have a problem with the use of either one.
- The foundation needs to be rebuilt, **Mr. Krowka** asked for permission to raise the house 2 ft. and put it on brick piers, however he did not know the infill that would go between the brick piers at this time. The Board said that he would be encouraged to raise the house and rebuild the foundation.
- The front steps are brick and he would like to construct wooden steps and turn the steps to the West side. The Board had no objections to this request. **Ms. Gillespie** suggested adding a baluster and handrails to the front porch.
- The shutters that are currently on the house are nailed to the house,

Mr. Krowka does not know if shutters should be put back on the house for historic reasons. **Mr. Vernon** said he would delete the shutters. **Mr. Krowka** said he would draw the design and make a decision at a later date.

Mr. Krowka asked if the Board looks at the landscaping. **Mr. Miller** said typically if the grading is being effected, then landscaping would be viewed by the Board. **Mr. Krowka** had concerns about a Palm tree that is causing problems with the house and wanted to know how to address that. **Ms. Janet Grant/City Staff** said the City Arborist would be the best person to make that decision. **Mr. Krowka** thanked the Board for all the input.

V. Board Discussion:

- **The training for the new Guidelines will be on Thursday, November 9, at 4:30 and the rollout will begin at 6 pm at the Municipal Court.**
- **Mr. Miller announced that the elections will be held on tomorrow (Tuesday, November 7) and if he is elected he will have to resign after being sworn in, so the Board will need to start looking for a new member for the ARB.**

VI. Adjournment: With there being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted By,

*Debra Grant
Board Secretary*