
LANDMARKS COMMISSION

February 28, 2012

Minutes

Members Present:

Robert Calk
Rick Weatherl
Dr. Michael E. McClellan
Pebbles Lee
Steve Butman
Bill Minter

Members Absent: Phil Miller

Staff Present:

Ben Bryner, Planning Services Manager
Molinda Parker, Historic Preservation Officer
Kelley Messer, Assistant City Attorney

Guests:

Billy Olson, Billy Olson Bail Bonds
Brad Pursley, Billy Olson Bonds
Terry & Laura Browder, resident
Janet White, resident
Roland Orr, Interim Director of Global Samaritan
Dee Lott, Board Member of Global Samaritan
Tom Myer, Speedy Bond

Mr. Weatherl called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM, declared a quorum present and read the opening statement. Minutes of the January 31, 2012 meeting were submitted for approval. Mr. Butman made a motion to accept the minutes as written and Mr. Calk seconded the motion. The vote for approval was unanimous (5-0).

Ms. Lee took her place on the dais after the minutes were approved.

Agenda Item 3: CA-2012-02, Public hearing, discussion and possible approval of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for installation of a sign, door replacement and painting of exterior trim on the commercial property located at 2775 S. Treadaway Boulevard.

Mr. Weatherl read the above case description and asked Ms. Parker to give the staff report. Ms. Parker reviewed the staff report through a Power Point presentation describing the project.

Mr. Weatherl opened the public hearing and asked for comments. Mr. Olson introduced himself as a resident at 33 Pinehurst and owner of Billy Olson Bail Bonds. He acknowledged that installing the billboard-size sign on the rear of the garage was a mistake. The sign was purchased from Sign Pro who advised him that there were no issues with the sign and he would not need approval by the city. He explained that the sign is self-supporting and is attached to the rock wall with anchor bolts at the corners. The eave on the garage shields the sign from the weather. He and his business partner, Brad Pursley, purchased the building in October 2011 from Frank Peck, the long time owner of the property. He expressed his commitment to the restoration and preservation of the rock buildings.

Mr. Weatherl said that he remembered approving the two monument signs in 2007 that are located at the front of the property facing S. Treadaway Blvd. Ms. Lee asked why the two outside doors were being replaced. Mr. Olson explained that they are actually interior style, hollow core doors that are thin and split and need to be replaced with the proper exterior doors. Ms. Lee asked why flood lights, mounted on the back of the monument signs, were shining on the building. Mr. Olson responded that the rock house is pretty and should be illuminated at night.

Mr. Weatherl asked Mr. Olson if he would be amenable to removing the wall sign from the rock garage and replacing it with a monument sign to be located at the rear of the property facing the jail. Mr. Olson explained that because the cost of the wall sign was very high it wouldn't be his first choice, especially since it is possible that the lot at the rear of the property might be sold in the future. The greatest concern and main purpose of the large wall sign is to attract potential clients as they leave the jail.

Mr. Weatherl asked if there were any further comments from the public. Mr. Myer stepped to the podium and introduced himself as a resident at 23 Rue Mason and the owner of Speedy Bond. He pointed out to the commissioners that the owners of the rock house should have asked for approval of the wall sign as they had been given permission in the past to install the monument signs at the front of the property. In addition, he felt that the existing monument signs destroy the character of the rock house, which is like the "Little House on the Prairie". He feels that the flood lights may be a nuisance to the neighbors. He recommended that the signs be taken down and that the neighbors be surveyed before approving any more signage on the property. Mr. Olson approached the podium to rebut Mr. Myer's complaint. He commented that Mr. Myer is a competitor in the bond business and has flood lights on his property. He added that the flood lights on the back of the monument signs do not shine on the neighbors or the roadway.

Mr. Weatherl closed the public hearing. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the commissioners. A discussion ensued regarding notification of neighbors, flood light approval and if the items outlined in this case could be broken up and dealt with separately. Mr. Calk suggested that the wall sign be viewed as a separate issue.

Mr. Calk made a motion to approve all items listed in CA-2012-02, including lighting, doors and paint, but excluding the wall sign. Mr. Minter seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (6-0).

The wall sign discussion continued. Mr. Calk remarked that the need for a sign in the proposed location is warranted, but it should not be attached to the rock garage. Mr. Minter agreed and suggested that the sign be converted to a monument sign that could sit on the property away from the rock building. He added that the size should match the monument signs at the front of the property, which are four feet by fifteen feet. Mr. Weatherl agreed with the size reduction from the seven by sixteen foot billboard sign to the four by fifteen foot monument sign. Mr. Butman commented that a large monument sign would block the view of the rock garage.

Mr. Butman made a motion to approve CA-2012-02 with the condition that the sign size be reduced to a four by fifteen foot monument sign to match the existing signs at the front of the property emphasizing that there is no condition on a specific location at the rear of the property. Mr. Minter seconded the motion. The vote was (5-1). Mr. Calk cast the dissenting vote.

Mr. Olsen asked how he can to appeal the decision. Mr. Bryner answered that the sign has to be removed within 10 days and the applicant can return to appeal the ruling.

Agenda Item 4: CA-2012-03, Public hearing, discussion and possible approval of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a driveway and parking lot addition, extended sidewalk, privacy fence along north & east property lines and exterior renovation and addition on the residential property located at 642 Sayles Blvd.

Mr. Weatherl read the above case description and asked Ms. Parker to give the staff report. Ms. Parker reviewed the staff report through a Power Point presentation describing the project.

Mr. Weatherl opened the public hearing and asked for comments. Mr. Browder introduced himself as a resident at 941 Sayles Blvd. and owner of the property at 642 Sayles Blvd. He explained that the Bed & Breakfast facility requires driveways for safe ingress and egress, ample parking, fencing for safety and privacy and a screened porch as an important amenity to the house. He added that the extended sidewalk between the parking lot and the front door will be comprised of 85 year old concrete from the 941 Sayles property intended to match closely with the existing concrete sidewalk. He continued to describe the need for the installation of the side porch, emphasizing that since the addition in 1910 nothing has been touched on the south side of the house. There are three existing doors which will be opening onto the porch, one of them serving as a fire exit from the second floor. He pointed out that his purpose is to renovate the house which is 123 years old and make it viable again. Mr. Butman inquired about the roofing material. Mr. Browder explained that it will be shingled to match the existing roof on the house. Ms. Lee asked how the porch will be supported. Mr. Browder answered that it will be built on pier and beam and the porch will have a wood floor and clapboard siding below the screened area to mirror the design of porches of that era. He has also acquired a door with sidelights, the same age as the house, to serve as the exit to the backyard. There is a brick terrace that was installed by the previous owner. The section of brick that is currently located where the porch is to be constructed will be removed and used in other areas of the yard.

Mr. Weatherl closed the public hearing. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the commissioners. After hearing none he asked for a vote. Mr. McClellan made a motion to accept CA-2012-03 as written. Mr. Calk seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (6-0).

Agenda Item 5: CA-2012-04, Public hearing, discussion and possible approval of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a room addition to the residential property located at 1302 Highland Ave.

Mr. Weatherl read the above case description and asked Ms. Parker to give the staff report. Ms. Parker reviewed the staff report through a Power Point presentation describing the project.

Mr. Weatherl opened the public hearing and asked for comments. Ms. White introduced herself as the resident and owner of the property at 1302 Highland Ave. She said that her project had been explained clearly in the presentation. She confirmed that the two existing bedroom windows would be moved to the south wall of the addition and the existing bedroom will still have windows on the south wall.

Mr. Weatherl closed the public hearing. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the commissioners. After hearing none he asked for a vote. Ms. Lee made a motion to accept CA-2012-04 as written. Mr. Minter seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (6-0).

Agenda Item 5: CA-2012-05, Public hearing, discussion and possible approval of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof replacement and exterior repair and painting to the residential property located at 342 Palm Street

Mr. Weatherl read the above case description and asked Ms. Parker to give the staff report. Ms. Parker reviewed the staff report through a Power Point presentation describing the project.

Mr. Weatherl opened the public hearing and asked for comments. The applicants were not in attendance.

Mr. Weatherl closed the public hearing. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the commissioners. Mr. Calk reminded staff members that the property has two addresses, 340 & 342 Palm St, which should be noted. There were no further comments.

Mr Weatherl asked for a vote. Ms. Calk made a motion to approve CA-2012-05 as written. Mr. McClellan seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (6-0).

Ms. Lee vacated her position on the dais at 5:46 P.M. prior to the introduction of the last case.

Agenda Item 6: HOZ-2012-02 Public hearing, discussion and possible approval of an application for split-zoning to redefine the boundary lines of the historic property located at 2074 N. 1st Street.

Mr. Weatherl read the above case description and asked Ms. Parker to give the staff report. Ms. Parker reviewed the staff report through a Power Point presentation describing the project.

Mr. Weatherl opened the public hearing and asked for comments. Mr. Orr introduced himself as Interim Director of Global Samaritan. He had been asked by the board of his organization to request a zoning change to avoid having to seek approval from the Landmarks Commission for future alterations and additions to the warehouses and parking lot area. He explained, as the presentation showed, that the gym is surrounded by the warehouses and on the end by the brick office building that was built in 1956 by the Coca Cola Bottling Company. The only visible part of the gym is the roof. The interior of the gym is being used to store medical supplies that are shipped to needy people all over the world. He reiterated that the only truly historic building from an architectural perspective is the Coca Cola office building that faces N. 1st Street. It was built in 1951.

Mr. Weatherl initiated the discussion by commenting that it is not necessary to obtain Landmark Commission approval for maintenance work. Mr. Orr responded that the organization needs flexibility to construct additional warehouses and also have the option to sell part of the property in the future. Mr. McClellan commented that the only historic structure is the office building. Mr. Weatherl responded that the whole complex is historic in his opinion. Mr. Calk suggested that requesting approval to work on the property should not be a deterrent in the future. Mr. Minter commented that he might be in favor of isolating the office building from the rest of the bottling plant, since there is no external view of the gym. Mr. McClellan reminded the commissioners that Mr. Orr needs to know what his options are. Mr. Weatherl added that Mr. Orr can always confer with staff members for any future projects prior to submitting a request to the Landmarks Commission.

Mr. Weatherl closed the public hearing. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the commissioners. After hearing none he asked for a vote. Mr. Minter made a motion to accept HOZ-2012-02 as written. Mr. Butman seconded the motion. The vote was (3-2). The motion did not carry and the request was denied. Mr. Calk and Mr. Weatherl cast the dissenting votes.

Mr. Weatherl asked for a motion to adjourn at 5:55 P.M. Mr. Calk made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Butman seconded the motion. The vote to adjourn was unanimous (5-0).

Approved: _____,
Chairman