

# MINUTES

## Valdosta Historic Preservation Commission

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

April 4, 2022 5:30 p.m.

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms. Celine Gladwin  
Dr. Harry Hamm  
Ms. Laura Yale  
Mr. Tommy Crane

Ms. Sally Querin

### MEMBERS ABSENT

Dr. Alex Alvarez  
Ms. Sandie Burkett

### STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Jeff Brammer  
Ms. Lauren Hurley

### VISITORS PRESENT

Daniel Schert  
Avery Walden  
Sara Evans  
Vickie Everitte  
Brandie Dame  
James Council III

### I. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Vice Chairman Gladwin. It was determined that a quorum of members was present. Ms. Gladwin thanked everyone for coming and reminded audience members to sign the attendance register.

### II. Review and Approval of Minutes

The March 7, 2022, draft minutes were reviewed by the Board. Mr. Crane made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Querin seconded the motion, and it was called and carried unanimously (4-0 vote).

### III. Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Applications

- A. HPC-2022-19 — 202 East Alden Avenue:** Mr. Brammer presented the staff report. The petitioner requests approval to replace a formerly existing front stoop porch with a new front stoop porch. Constructed circa 1944, the 1,135 square foot wood-framed house features an irregular rectangular plan with a brick foundation, wood clapboard siding, and a side-gabled roof covered with architectural shingles. This property is already undergoing renovations following HPC approval in January 2021. The new project is to construct a new, projecting front stoop porch. This porch is to replace the previously existing porch, which was removed by the applicant recently after damage was discovered when preparing the in-kind roof replacement. The applicant proposes a slightly larger, more elaborate design geared to enhance aesthetics and curb appeal. In general, staff has no objection to an accentuated stoop porch with elements of Colonial Revival design, a form of stylistic detailing sometimes associated with American Small Houses. However, given the occurrence of scalloped detailing in American Small House pediments, it is appropriate to retain this feature within the replacement design. Staff recommends approval of the replacement porch with a recommendation to incorporate the scalloped trim detailing into the design.

With no questions for staff, the applicant addressed the board. Avery Walden stated that the recommendation by Mr. Brammer is also the recommendation that many of his neighbors have had. He stated that he personally did not care for the scalloped detailing. He stated that he has enjoyed remodeling historic homes, which he has owned for over 20 years. He asked for the approval of the board for his design. Mr. Crane asked why this particular design was chosen. Mr. Walden stated that he

likes the brick arches. Ms. Gladwin asked if he was keeping the same slope of the pediment or the roof slope on the stoop. Mr. Walden stated that it will be steeper than before. Ms. Gladwin wanted to confirm that there was no other brick on the façade of the house. Mr. Walden stated that there is brick on the fireplace, which can be seen on the exterior of the home. Dr. Hamm asked if the brick on the fireplace is new or existing. Mr. Walden stated that it is existing.

With no one else in support or opposition, the commission discussed the application. Ms. Gladwin asked Mr. Brammer if there has been discussion regarding adding the scalloped design as the current design does not allow for the scalloping. Mr. Brammer suggested closing the pediment and adding the scalloping as a solution. Ms. Gladwin stated that bringing in colonial details to this house is inappropriate; however, the materials are acceptable. She stated that she worries that the design is not being true to the original construction of the home, and it would be ideal to replace the porch as it was originally. She stated that changing it to a design with capitals and crowns would take the house in another direction. Mr. Crane stated that he does not think that the materials are compatible, namely the brick, with the original design. Mr. Walden asked to speak again. He stated that the neighbors commented that the home needed more curb appeal as the original design of the porch was very simple. He stated that the colonial look mimics the houses in the neighborhood, and he does not consider this house a small house because of the size of the windows. He said that the neighborhood is mixed with all kinds of house styles. Ms. Querin stated that for scale, she prefers the original porch. Mr. Walden stated that the proposed porch is wider than the porch that was there before. Ms. Gladwin added that the proposed porch is more enclosed than the original porch. Ms. Gladwin asked about the materials for the sides of the porch. Mr. Walden stated brick, but that they are considering opening the sides of the porch. Ms. Gladwin asked if the pier on the corners of the porch are brick. Mr. Walden confirmed and stated that it would not be totally closed on the sides. The commissioners commented on the nice design and drawing for the design. Ms. Yale asked if he was considering putting shutters on the house. Mr. Walden confirmed that he would like to as the original house had shutters.

Dr. Hamm stated that the commission had a similar situation on a house in Fairview and that the proposed doors on the house were not appropriate, but they approved them. He stated that it did not change the total look of the house but did affect the historic accuracy. He continued that the design would dress up the house, but stated that he could not answer if it is historically appropriate. Ms. Querin asked Mr. Walden what he wanted to do now that the neighbors have asked him to maintain the scallop. Mr. Walden stated that he is trying to maintain the scallop and is open to recommendations. He stated that he has seen houses with scallops further down Alden to the west but none of the homes are exactly the same and have varying design elements.

Ms. Gladwin stated that she would recommend the rectilinear design with the scalloped design being rectangular with posts that are thicker if he wants the porch to appear more open but have characteristics of a significant porch. She stated that her concern is that the correct way to do it would be to reconstruct what was there before because the proposed design is not compatible. Mr. Crane asked if there would be a similar design incorporating the brick on the carport area. Mr. Walden said no. Mr. Walden stated that he would appreciate if the commission could grant permission to go back and recreate the porch including the scallop, he would like to proceed that way. Ms. Yale made a motion to approve the construction of the front porch stoop as proposed with the recommendation that the scalloped trim be incorporated into the new design per the original design. Mr. Brammer asked if that meant that he would need to construct what was there originally. Ms. Yale confirmed. Ms. Gladwin restated the motion to clarify as stating that the motion was to approve the submitted application with the design to incorporate the scalloped elements of the previous porch. Ms. Yale confirmed. Ms. Querin seconded the vote. The vote failed to pass with Mr. Crane, Ms. Gladwin and Dr. Hamm voting against the motion (3-2 vote). Mr. Walden asked if he composed another draft of a proposed design reflecting the commissions concerns, could he submit it to Mr. Brammer for review and move forward. The commission agreed and Mr. Brammer confirmed that he could provide the commission with the new design. Dr. Hamm motioned that the applicant renders a new drawing with complete details be submitted to Mr. Brammer so that Mr. Brammer can distribute the drawing to the commissioners before

the next HPC meeting. Ms. Yale seconded the motion. Mr. Brammer brought up the point about public notice. Dr. Hamm withdrew his motion. Dr. Hamm voted to table the application until next month with the understanding that the applicant supply construction drawings reflecting the recommended changes. Ms. Yale seconded the motion. The motion passes (4-0 vote).

- B. HPC-2022-20—204 East College Street:** Mr. Brammer presented the staff report. The petitioner requests approval to construct an enclosed addition on the rear of the existing residence. Constructed circa 1925, the Craftsman-styled house features a rectangular plan with a concrete block foundation, stucco exterior cladding, and side-oriented jerkinhead roof with exposed rafters covered with asphalt shingles. The project is to construct a 14'x26' attached and enclosed rear addition. The 364 square foot addition will house a new bathroom and an open/or screened porch. The addition will utilize the existing roofline via an extension of the roof with the bathroom on the left, the open/screened porch on the right. As for the guidelines, the project complies. It's in the rear. The materials are differentiated from old to new, stucco to board-and-batten. The scale is appropriate. The project also meets setback requirements. Staff recommends approval of the project as proposed.

Daniel Schert, the applicant, addressed the commission. He stated that the project is a rear addition. His father-in-law had a stroke, wants to live near them and there are not many accessible houses in the area. With the rear addition, his father-in-law can get in and out. The front steps would not work, and they would not want to interfere with the façade of the home. The side could be an option, but access from the side would lead to a narrow hallway, which would not be a viable solution for his mobility. The rear addition would allow for easy access in and out of the house with rear parking and a large accessible bathroom. He stated that they would like to clean up the rest of the house with paint.

With no question for the applicant and no one in support or opposition to the application, the commission discussed. Ms. Yale stated that she went to the property and that it would not be visible from the front of the house at all. Dr. Hamm concurred. He stated that the applicant is doing exactly what is recommended from the commission. Dr. Hamm made the motion to approve the application as presented. Ms. Yale seconded the motion. The motion passes. (4-0 vote).

- C. HPC-2022-21---200-202 East College Street:** Mr. Brammer presented the staff report. This COA request combines projects at two abutting properties, 200 and 202 East College Street. The petitioner requests approval to make exterior alterations to both properties, beginning with a request to convert a non-historic rear addition at 200 East College Street into a garage for automobile parking. 200 East College Street is a two-story, former university frat house. The project is to convert the non-historic rear addition into a garage for automobile parking. The proposed garage has two overhead garage doors, one door facing Slater Street, another door facing north from the rear elevation. The driveways and curb cuts are already there. The applicant is interested in installing Craftsman-styled overhead doors.

The guidelines state that garages should be in the rear, detached from properties dating before 1920, and should have a residential appearance. However, due to the property's frontage along Slater Street for zoning, the project also conflicts with historic district overlay regulations. Namely that front-facing garages be set back a minimum of 25 feet from the right-of-way line of public streets. The door along Slater Street does not meet this requirement. Therefore, the applicant must apply for and receive a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which he has said he would do. Staff has determined that the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historic, or archaeological significance and value of the subject property or the local historic district. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the project as proposed.

Dr. Hamm asked how the building was placed there as he does not recall it coming before HPC. James Council stated that he could speak on that. He stated that the building was built in 1973 by the fraternity before the existence of HPC. He then stated that it was remodeled in 2016 and it came before HPC for the remodel. Mr. Schert addressed the commission in support of the application. He stated that he intends to renovate the house. He stated that the proposed garage would give the addition a use, as it

is now a chapter room or bar. Ms. Querin asked how many square feet are in the house. Mr. Brammer stated 4,500 square feet. Ms. Yale asked if that included the garage area as it is heated floor space. Mr. Brammer stated that it may include the garage. Ms. Querin asked if this was built originally as a single-family home. Mr. Schert stated that from the title work it appears that it was originally a parsonage for the Presbyterian Church.

With no further questions for the co-applicant, Ms. Gladwin asked if there were any other comments in support of the application. Mr. Council stated that the addition was previously a garage. There were no comments in opposition from the public. Ms. Gladwin clarified that the application was simply for the location of the garage doors. Mr. Brammer confirmed. Ms. Gladwin stated that she would be opposed to the garage door being on Slater Street because of its proximity to the street. Ms. Yale asked Mr. Brammer for clarification on the street frontage. Mr. Brammer stated that as the parcel is a corner lot, the longer street frontage is technically the front yard meaning Slater Street is the front yard and College Street is the side yard, even though the house is oriented toward College Street. The way that the Historic Overlay District is written, garages cannot be front facing within 25 feet of the property line. In this case, the right-of-way comes very close to the property. Dr. Hamm asked if the building was attached to the house. Mr. Brammer confirmed. Ms. Querin asked why they would not put two doors on the rear instead of a door on Slater Street. Ms. Yale stated that maybe the intent was to take advantage of the egress from the right-of-way on Slater Street. Mr. Brammer stated that he spoke with Mr. Alvarez is aware of a possible variance for the structure.

Ms. Gladwin stated that she thinks it is inappropriate for there to be a garage door on the same plane as the historic structure. She went on to say that it should be discouraged to have cars parked on that side of the street as well. Ms. Querin suggested that it would be even better if they decided to tear out the concrete on the Slater Street side and add green space. She stated that if the buildings could be aesthetically tied together, it would visually be an improvement as they look totally incompatible from each other right now. Ms. Gladwin stated that it is an unfortunate position because the building is not part of the COA or can be voted upon now. The staff report stated that it is in direct conflict with the guidelines. Ms. Querin stated that if they took out the driveway on Slater Street, they could add trees to screen it to improve the situation. Mr. Schert asked if the commission could structure a motion so that the garage doors on the north elevation be permitted, so that could be an option. Mr. Hamm made a motion to deny the garage door location on the Slater Street side but to permit garage doors on the other elevations of the garage building. Mr. Crane seconded the motion. The motion passes (4-0 vote).

The petitioner has a second part to this application, concerning the vacant property on the abutting parcel to the east at 202 East College Street. The petitioner requests approval to either turn the building into an accessory dwelling unit to go with new residential construction or to convert it into a garage to accompany new residential construction. Either way, this will involve plans for future new construction, for which the plans have not been finalized and will appear before HPC later. The property is a two-story, Colonial Revival-styled vacant residence with about 1,050 square feet. Constructed circa 1930, the wood-framed building features a square plan with a concrete foundation, lapped wood siding, and a side-oriented jerkinhead roof covered with asphalt shingles. The property exterior is in poor condition. The Commission will remember this property appeared before the HPC last year seeking a demolition permit by the previous owner. That request was denied.

The first proposal is to convert the vacant building into an accessory dwelling unit. This will be an accessory unit to an as-yet planned and approved new residence. The scope of work is noted as a new roof, new siding, new windows, new doors, interior renovations. Also, wood panel fencing similar to the neighboring property along the north and west parcel boundaries. The big change is the open front porch with a hip roof.

The second proposal is for a garage conversion. Instead of a front porch, this will call for an overhead garage door in the front to allow cars to pull in and park. The structure is 25' wide and 21' deep.

Looking at the guidelines, the potential conflicts concern the window replacements and the front porch addition.

Staff acknowledges two points of possible contention with district guidelines. First, the addition of a porch on the façade of a historic structure where one did not previously exist. Second, replacing missing/damaged windows with vinyl-framed double hung window systems. That said, overall, staff is encouraged and supports either option. Given the deteriorated state of the property and the (until-recently) dubious prospects for long-term preservation, this level of adaptive reuse and retention of historic fabric should be considered welcome. Staff also feels it appropriate to note the applicant's proven record in rehabilitating historic properties.

Dr. Hamm asked if that was the original residence on the property and no other residence had been on there. No reply was given. Ms. Querin asked what the setbacks for the property were. Mr. Brammer stated that the historic district has different setbacks being no closer than 15 feet to another structure.

Ms. Gladwin asked if there was anyone in support of the application. Mr. Schert addressed the Commission. He stated that the property is in bad shape. The two-option approach was submitted with the intent to restore it back to a residence. The option with the new construction was submitted so that if they get into the existing structure and it cannot be rehabilitated into a residence, the new construction option is on the table. The applicant is optimistic that the structure can be saved. Ms. Sarah Evans, who lives across the street stated that she would prefer that it becomes a residence. She stated that she is in favor of any rehabilitation efforts as she can see this structure outside her front windows. The property at 202 East College Street is in the center of her dining room window. She supports approval of the project. There was no one in opposition of the application.

The commissioners discussed. Dr. Hamm stated that when this property came before HPC last year, they denied demolition. Ms. Gladwin stated that she believes both options are workable, but this is a preliminary overview. She stated that whatever is going to be proposed should be submitted for HPC approval with complete plans. Dr. Hamm stated that it should be a stand-alone project and voted on once plans are solidified. Dr. Hamm concluded that it be treated as a house and rehabilitated as what it was originally intended to be. Ms. Gladwin stated that this portion of the application (202 E. College St.) is premature. Dr. Hamm made the motion that this project be tabled and separated from the original application and be presented back as a single property. Mr. Crane seconded the motion. The motion passes (4-0 vote).

#### **IV. Consideration of Administrative Review and Approvals**

Board members reviewed the Administrative Reviews for the month of March with no questions.

#### **V. Other Business**

**(A) Local Historic District Survey Update (Phase II)** – Mr. Brammer stated that the first draft has been given to commissioners and the comments are due back on April 15. He stated that he has made several comments and would like for the commissioners to send comments to him so that they can be included in his review. He gave the commissioners the previously completed survey for comparison. Dr. Hamm stated that the properties have been categorized differently in the new survey. The new survey has wrong dates, terrible photos, and incorrect information. Half of the photos have addresses under them and some do not. They are also in no particular order. Mr. Brammer stated that he agrees and that the GNAHRGIS numbers are useless without reference to the properties' address. The photos are dark. There are bad breaks in the descriptions. The editing is poor. The surveyors picked up incorrect information and cited it. Mr. Brammer asked the commissioners to draft edits and email them to Mr. Brammer by April 13, so that he can add them to his own edits.

(B) **Training/Workshop Update** – Mr. Brammer reported that DCA will be holding a training on Wednesday, April 27 to from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Mr. Brammer stated that there will be a conference room available for the training. This training will satisfy the training requirements for the commissioners.

VII. New Business

(A) **New Business on the Floor** – Mr. Brammer introduced Brandie Dame as the new Main Street Director. Ms. Dame introduced herself. She stated that she was the Main Street Director in Adel and is available for the commissioners if they need anything.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Querin made a motion to adjourn. Dr. Hamm seconded the motion. It was called and carried unanimously (4-0 vote). The meeting adjourned at 7:13 pm.

HPC Chairman CAF

Date 5-3-22