

MINUTES

Valdosta Historic Preservation Commission

Valdosta City Hall Annex Multi-Purpose Room
300 North Lee Street, Valdosta, Georgia

September 13, 2021 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Alex Alvarez
Mr. Tommy Crane
Ms. Sally Querin

Dr. Harry Hamm
Ms. Celine Gladwin

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ms. Sandie Burkett
Ms. Laura Yale

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Jeff Brammer
Ms. Lauren Hurley

VISITORS PRESENT

Anthony Courson
Richard Hill
John Bennett
James Downey
Sementha Mathews

Kayla Roberson
Cassandra Stokes
James Stokes
Vickie Everitte

I. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Chairman Alvarez. It was determined that a quorum of members was present. Chairman Alvarez thanked everyone for coming and reminded audience members to please sign the attendance register.

II. Review and Approval of Minutes

The August 2, 2021 draft minutes were reviewed by the Board. Dr. Hamm made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Crane seconded the motion, and it was called and carried unanimously (5-0 vote).

III. Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Applications

A. HPC-2021-66—1112 North Toombs Street:

Mr. Brammer presented the staff report for the project. The petitioner requests approval of exterior renovations to existing duplex property. This is a follow up with Mr. Anthony Courson for items that were tabled for this property during the August HPC meeting. Mr. Brammer describes the property to the commission to refamiliarize them with the project. The one-story Colonial Revival is in subarea 1 and zoned R-6. The petitioner is now requesting three rehabilitation projects before the commission. Those include an in-kind roof replacement of shingles, the replacement of 23 exterior windows and window surrounds on all elevations and the replacement of 2 exterior doors on the façade and the rear of the house. Mr. Brammer showed examples of the shingles being Tamko Heritage Series 30-year architectural shingles. The shingles comply with the guidelines. The proposed windows are the Comfort View Series 900 vinyl single hung windows with profiled colonial muntins. The window replacement conflicts with the guidelines as the existing windows are wood frame, double hung windows. However, it is worth mentioning that HPC approved similar windows for Mr. Courson's other projects last year on West Ann Street. The proposed door for replacement is a steel clad, 6-panel door with PVC brickmould and composite jambs. This complies with the district guidelines. Staff recommendation is to approve the roof replacement, window replacement, and door replacement as proposed. Dr. Alvarez then asked if the applicant would like to address the commission. Mr. Courson discussed his plans moving forward for the project with keeping the existing roofline as it is and making the proposed garage addition to the house a detached garage so that he can move forward with replacing the roof. His goal is to keep the footprint of the house exactly the same. His most urgent matter is the windows as there would be a four month wait to receive the windows. He stated that he has several projects for this house including replacing the porches and

dormers to their original state. He also will be requesting to put a paved driveway that leads to the detached garage.

With no one else speaking in favor or opposition of the application, Dr. Alvarez asked for discussion from the commission. Ms. Gladwin stated that she is not the architect on the project but that she met with Mr. Courson after the last meeting. She does not consider it a conflict of interest because they simply discussed what was talked about within the meeting. She asked the commission members if they thought that she should recuse herself from the agenda item. All said no. Dr. Hamm stated that he thinks Mr. Courson has done exactly as they have asked him to do. Dr. Hamm made a motion to approve the project as staff recommends. Mr. Crane seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (5-0 vote). Ms. Querin added that she would like for Mr. Courson to consider an alternative for paving the driveway so that it does not add to the flooding happening in the area due to impervious space. She suggested the traditional way of having two tire strips instead of a solid pavement surface.

B. HPC-2021-76—104 East Brookwood Place:

Mr. Brammer presented the staff report for the petitioner's request for approval for construction of a rear garage addition. The house is a 1920s Craftsman style home in the Brookwood North National Register District. It is a contributing property in subarea 1 and is zoned R-10. Mr. Brammer described the property as a wooden home on a concrete block foundation in very good condition. In the rear there is a closed in porch that was added in 2003. In the rear and to the right can be seen the non-historic open garage and fence that was put in in 1983 as well as an accessory shed. Mr. Brammer oriented the commission members by pointing out the adjacent properties. The project description includes plans to demolish the non-historic carport and fence and the construction of the new attached garage to the rear of the property. The new attached garage will have a concrete foundation, a fiber cement "hardieboard" shingle exterior, and a 50-year architectural shingle roof. The applicant intends on re-using 2 windows from the rear bedroom in the new garage addition. Mr. Brammer then presents the elevation plans with arrows indicating where and to what extent the addition will impact the main structure. The applicant also provided floor plans depicting the existing garage structure and where the new garage will be. There was also a floor plan submitted depicting how the addition will alter the floor plan of the main structure. Staff recommends approval of the project because: 1) The demolition of the non-historic garage does not conflict with the guidelines. 2) The size and scale of the new addition do not overwhelm the historic home. 3) The design and materials are complementary with the historic home. 4) The reuse of the windows from the historic home is additive. The addition of an attached garage does conflict with the guidelines, but the property already has some non-historic additions while maintaining its integrity.

The homeowner, John Bennett, he stated that he plans to use this as his personal residence. His parents lived next door and stated that in later years he had fought a battle with the zoning department to not allow the duplexes to go up next door which led to his father being part of the historic ordinance that stands today so "out of a loss came a gain". He stated that he is glad to be back in his parents' neighborhood. He asked if anyone had any questions. Dr. Hamm asked about the French doors that come out near the roof. Mr. Bennett clarified that those are two full length windows at the top of the staircase. Mr. Crane stated that the old floor plan had the HVAC system in the rear of the house and the new floor plan has the HVAC system on the side of the house and unhidden. So that from the front, the HVAC could be seen. Mr. Bennett stated that it is a small unit that services the upstairs of the home and that there is a larger unit on the east side of the house that could serve the house and new addition. Mr. Crane was stating that the smaller unit would need to be screened from the road with either landscaping or screening of some sort.

With no one else present speaking in favor or opposition of the application, Dr. Alvarez asked for discussion from the commission. Dr. Hamm motioned to approve the application as presented. Ms. Gladwin seconded the motion. The motion passed (4-1 vote).

C. HPC-2021-78—2000 North Oak Street:

Mr. Brammer presented the case as the petitioner requests approval for the replacement of an existing asphalt shingle roof with a metal roof. The property is a 1912 Queen Anne contributing house in the Brookwood North National Register District and zoned R-15. The property has non-historic side and rear additions. There are many different window arrangements. Mr. Brammer exhibited the neighboring properties as to orient the commission members. He then provided the commission with the material description as a silver/gray 40-year galvalume coated 3 feet width, 29-gauge sealed panel MasterRib roof system. Mr. Brammer gave the commission alternative metal roofing that is popular in the local historic district. The guidelines allow metal roofs on historic homes. Staff recommends replacement of the existing roof with metal roof system as proposed.

Dr. Alvarez asked if the applicant could speak in support of the application. There was no one present to speak in favor or opposition of the request. Mr. Brammer stated that he received a call today from a neighbor who was unable to come to the meeting but whose concern was if the house had a metal roof, and if the color was silver or gray, what effects sun glare could have on the neighbors and traffic.

Ms. Gladwin stated that the sun glare is really an issue and that depending on the elevation and orientation, the glare could cause issues. She also stated that the commission does not have a control over the color but that the house sits at a busy intersection. Mr. Brammer stated that while looking up the specs for the roof options, there were other colors available. Mrs. Querin asked why someone would prefer or choose the metal roof over the shingles. Ms. Gladwin stated that it has been marketed as a durable material for roofing with a 40-year life span. Mr. Brammer also stated that it can be more affordable than replacing the shingles. Dr. Alvarez asked if they could approve the material and recommend that the applicant go with another color. Mr. Crane stated that they could deny the request due to lack of information and so that the applicant could either come in front of commission or replace with in kind materials. Dr. Hamm stated that HPC did a blanket approval for a metal roof years ago without specifying color and the house was roofed with a cheap material and ruined the look of the historic house. Ms. Querin stated that the applicant was very specific with the material of the roof, but the color is in question. She asked if it could be tabled. Dr. Hamm and Ms. Gladwin asked if it is required that the applicant be present at the meeting. Mrs. Gladwin confirmed that the application states that the applicant or the applicant's representation be present for the meeting. Ms. Querin then made a motion to table the request due to the lack of presence of the applicant for discussion and asked that the applicant bring a sample for next month's meeting. Mr. Crane seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (5-0 vote).

D. HPC-2021-80—305 Jones Street:

Mr. Brammer provided the staff report for the petitioner requesting approval to add an accessory building to the property. The home is a 1917 vernacular cottage located in the East End National Register District. It is a contributing property located in subarea II and zoned R-6. It has a concrete foundation, weatherboard siding, and an asphalt shingle roof. Mr. Brammer shows photos of the home with the rear yard exhibited as it is home to the proposed accessory structure. There is a dog crate on the left side of the yard and an additional storage unit on the right side of the yard. The proposed placement is directly back from the driveway. Mr. Brammer then shows photos of the adjacent properties to orient the commission members to the neighborhood. The petitioner asks to place the new accessory structure to the rear of the residence. Mr. Brammer exhibited the building that the applicant is purchasing as a 24'x30'x12' wood frame, concrete slab, metal siding, metal roof building with a main door and a side entrance. Staff's recommendation is to approve the addition and placement of the new accessory building as proposed. Dr. Hamm asked to see the photos of the back yard again to show how many accessory buildings and structures are already in the back yard. There is a dog crate and an existing accessory structure in the back yard already. Mr. Brammer pointed out that with zoning the building must remain 15 feet from each other and 10 feet from the property lines. Dr. Alvarez asked if the applicant would like to speak in favor of the application. Kayla

Roberson addressed the commission. There were no questions for Kayla. There were no other people speaking in favor or opposition of the application.

Dr. Alvarez then turned it back to the commission for discussion. Mr. Crane motioned to approve the request as presented. Ms. Querin seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (5-0 vote).

E. HPC-2021-82—506 North Ashley Street:

Mr. Brammer presented the staff report for the petitioner requesting approval to enclose an open-air front porch/patio on a contemporary commercial property at 506 North Ashley Street. The building was built in 1976 and resides in the local historic district. It is a non-contributing structure in subarea III and is zoned Highway Commercial (C-H). The open-air porch has 10 stucco columns supporting a roof made of asphalt shingles and is attached to a closed space with a stucco exterior. Inside the open-air interior is an open-air rafter system with a skylight. The entryway to the porch has a ramp and railing around the perimeter. The adjacent properties include a vacant bank property, a law office, and vacant county land. The project description is for an in-kind roof replacement for shingles to shingles and to enclose the open-air front porch/patio with a metal framed, metal-paneled, glass, and screen storefront infill system. There is a proposed mixture of panels and louvers, tempered glass, and screening. The floor plan depicted how the panels will be situated between the columns. Elevation drawings were presented to depict how the panels, screens, tempered glass, and louvers would constitute the walls of the enclosure. Staff recommends approving the project as proposed with the in-kind roof replacement and enclosure of the front porch because it is a non-contributing property and has been vacant for years.

Dr. Alvarez called upon the applicant to speak in support of the application. Sementha Mathews addressed the commission. She thanked HPC for hearing the proposal. Turner Center for the Arts received the building through a donation along with the vacant Synovus Bank and parking lot behind the two buildings allowing for 56 additional parking spaces. Ms. Mathews emphasized that they would like for the project to be functional and nice looking. She wants the project to contribute to the beauty of downtown. The project will be a glass blowing facility. She also mentioned that there is drug and sexual activity happening on the vacant property and that enclosing and utilizing the space will prevent those things from occurring. She is hoping that improving the block will initiate the progress in the surrounding noncontributing properties. She then introduced Richard Hill, project architect, and James Downey, the glass blowing teacher, who will be utilizing the space. Dr. Hamm asked if the building will be air conditioned. Ms. Mathews stated that the louver system is there to assist in airflow and allow ventilation because of the heat in a glass blowing facility. The glass blowing facility will only use the outside portion from September to April. Inside there will be classes on stained glass, fused glass, and bead making so that there are two spaces to work. There will be fans but no air conditioning outside.

With no one else speaking in favor or opposition to the application, the commissions discussion commenced. Ms. Querin stated that she thinks that the project will add value to the area, but she must recuse herself from the vote because she is on the board for the Turner Center for the Arts. Dr. Alvarez asked what the building was previously. Ms. Mathews stated that it was the Special Olympics office then a used car lot. Mr. Crane motioned to approve the application as presented. Ms. Gladwin seconded the motion. The motion passed (4-0 vote).

F. HPC-2021-83—501 North Troup Street:

Mr. Brammer presented the staff report for the petitioner requesting approval to remove and replace 21 exterior windows. The Craftsman style home was constructed in the 1930s, is in the East End National Register District, is a contributing property to the National Register district, is located in subarea II and is zoned R-6. It has a stucco exterior and brick foundation. There are many windows around the exterior of the home. There is also a non-historic attached greenhouse to the rear of the

house. The neighbors to the north are in a Colonial Revival home, to the south is a Gable Cottage and across the street is a contemporary one-story home. The proposed project is to replace 21 exterior windows and window surrounds across three elevations. The applicant hopes to replace wood-framed 6 over 6 double-hung sash windows on the façade and both sides, wood-framed 6-light single sash windows on the north front and rear, and two coupled casement windows on the upper façade with vinyl-framed single pane 1 over 1 windows. Mr. Brammer exhibited the state of the windows via individual photos. He stated that the windows are in poor condition with the encasing rotting on nearly every light including the seals, aprons, rails and muntins. Moisture, insect, and fungi contribute to the damage. Several of the windows have lights missing and many of the windows are inoperable. Mr. Brammer showcased each of the 21 windows the applicant wants to replace along with the replacement windows. The replacement windows differentiate from the original windows in that they are vinyl, and they are 1 over 1 instead of 6 over 6 like most of the windows that are being replaced. He presented information provided to the commissioners in their packet regarding color, grid, blind and architectural shape options for the windows. Staff recommendation is to disapprove the replacement of the 21 exterior windows as proposed and work with the petitioner to reach an agreement on window replacement. Staff suggestion is to retain the façade fenestration on the first and second floor through repairs and in-kind replacements; retain first floor casement array on the south elevation through repairs or with in-kind replacements; approve the removal and replacement of 11 second story floor windows, including 9 with vinyl-framed 6 over 6 double-hung sash windows and 2 vinyl-framed 6-light single sash windows; approve removal and replacement of 5 first floor windows on the North elevation with vinyl-framed 6 over 6 double-hung sash windows.

Dr. Alvarez asked if the applicant would like to speak in favor of the application. Mr. Stokes addressed the commission stating that replacing or restoring the windows has been an ongoing process. He said that over the last 17 years, the windows have deteriorated. The wood is no longer good enough to keep the panes in. He said that if you grip the muntins, they come off in your hands. He also said that there is solicitation up and down Troup Street and they would like to secure their home. Mr. Stokes said that they have used plastic in the windows to keep the outside from coming in and that their light bill has gone up to \$800 because of the inefficient windows. He asked that the commission provide solutions for replacing the windows. He and his wife would like to have the house in the family so that his grandchildren will have a place to call home. He wants to be able to get an approval that will fit within the guidelines and keep his home safe from the elements. He stated that there are 14 Habitat houses around them and that they could have gone through the process of changing out their windows through Habitat but that they were unaware. He thanked the commission for hearing their case and asked for suggestions. Dr. Hamm asked if the bars on the windows were burglar bars, and if they were going to remain. The applicant stated that they wanted to remove the bars all the way around the house. He stated that he wants to do many projects around the house including pressure washing but that the windows are stopping him from further renovating the house. Ms. Gladwin asked if the house is being lived in currently. Mr. Stokes stated that it is their family home and has been lived in since 2006. He then stated that the windows have been an issue since 2014 after he had his first of four strokes. He said the upstairs windows are where he attempted to fix the missing lights but that there is nothing to caulk because the wood is deteriorated. Dr. Hamm asked if there was any way that the windows could be replaced with PVC because from the second story roof down to the first story roof, water is going to affect the windows under the roof awning. The applicant stated that the HVAC unit adds to the moisture damage issue because of the condensation from the HVAC unit. He said that Window World, the window company they are using, has suggested that they use a vinyl window frame. Ms. Querin asked if the house was built to be a residence originally. Mr. Stokes said that when he was a little boy in Valdosta there was a pastor who owned their house and the house on the south side of it. Their home was where recreational activities were held. He stated that what Mr. Brammer called a greenhouse was originally an indoor swimming pool. All the bible studies were done in this property between the living room and the formal dining room. Dr. Hamm recalled that the pastor's name was Steinburg. Mr. Stokes agreed. Dr. Alvarez pointed out that this house is painted and has similar windows to the church at 406 North Ashley. Ms. Querin asked if the commission thinks that there is some grant money that they could get to help with the

costs of the renovations because of the significance of the house. Dr. Alvarez stated that there are tax incentives when you purchase. Mr. Brammer stated that he thinks that the house would need to be listed on the National Register District to be eligible for grant funding. Ms. Querin then stated that if they took the steps to get it listed on the National Register District, they could do that, understanding that this is a pressing need and knowing that there would not be enough time to do something now. Mr. Brammer confirmed that getting something listed on the National Register district takes several months and the need for the replacement windows is pressing. Dr. Hamm stated that he believes the windows are too busy and that the 1 over 1 windows would simplify the design. Ms. Stokes stated that that is what they had originally wanted because once you get into multiple frames and more intricate design patterns, the more money it all costs. Dr. Alvarez stated that on the church that looks similar to this property, what the commission decided to do was maintain the front elevation that was repaired and recommended that the muntin design be matched on the replacement windows using PVC exposed muntins on the North, South, and West side. He stated that this house looks like the sister property to the church.

With no other questions for the applicant and with no one else speaking in favor or opposition of the application, the discussion was opened to the commission. Dr. Hamm stated that he thought that the burglar bars should come off the house because they detract from the window design. The Stokes commented that the front windows are in the best shape and that the windows on the second story front elevation are broken. Dr. Alvarez asked about which windows lead to what rooms to get a better understanding of window priority. Mr. Stokes stated that there are 4 bedrooms upstairs and one downstairs. Ms. Stokes clarified that the replacement windows will be 1 over 1 not single paned. The replacement windows will be double paned. Ms. Stokes then went window by window describing what rooms those windows are in on the second floor. Their house is located in the middle of the block. The sides of the house are not visible from the road. The windows that look like French doors on the side, first floor of the house have some lights missing but they are not as bad as the other windows. Ms. Querin asked if there could be storm windows put in the inside of those windows to help with insulation. The commission members said yes, they could. Dr. Hamm made a motion to approve the windows that are proposed on all places except the front façade to retain the features on the façade and remove all iron bars on the windows. Mr. Crane clarifies, the side windows that appear as French doors be repaired and not replaced as well. Dr. Hamm confirmed the clarification and added that the bars be taken off those windows as well. Dr. Alvarez asked if the Stokes knew someone who could pull the panes and reglaze. Mr. Stokes stated, yes, they have 5 sons. Dr. Alvarez reiterated the motions stating that the North, South, and East sides of the house can change the windows as proposed but maintain the foyer doors and the front façade windows. Ms. Querin seconded. The vote passed (4-0 vote).

IV. Consideration of Administrative Review and Approvals

Board members reviewed the Administrative Reviews for the months of August with no questions.

V. Other Business

- (A) **Local Historic District Survey Update** – Mr. Brammer updated the commissioners on the contract with JMT for the update to the Local Historic District Re-Survey and the purchase order and requisition are being processed. The city approved the contract at 43 thousand dollars and change. The grant that was received equaled 17 thousand dollars, so the city is approve covering the remaining 26 thousand dollars.

VI. New Business

- (A) Dr. Hamm stated that Ms. Gladwin said that the county should be contacted to give a presentation to the Historic Preservation Commission in regard to the historic courthouse and the actions being taken for reopening because the county is publicly discussing the project, but HPC does not know anything about it and it is significant to the district. Mr. Brammer asked who the contact person would be. Dr. Hamm

said Paige Dukes would be the contact person for the project. Ms. Querin showed the commissioners an example of impervious paving of driveways regarding Mr. Courson's project. She stated that the commission should pay attention to how much Mr. Courson plans to pave on the project at 1112 Toombs Street referring to his past projects.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairman Alvarez called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Crane made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Querin seconded the motion, and it was called and carried unanimously (5-0 vote). The meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

HPC Chairman



Date

10/5/21