

Members Present

Cheri Vaughn – Chairman
Karen Mann – Vice-Chairman
Scarlett Boutchyard
Kathleen Couch
Scot Craigie
Colleen Knight
Rebecca Clark

Members Not Present

Others Present

Mike Dail, Director, Director Community and Cultural Services
Domini Cunningham, Historic Preservation Planner
Dawn Maye, Administrative Support Specialist

DUE TO COVID-19 MEETING WAS CONDUCTED VIA GoToMeeting.com.

I. Opening of the meeting

II. Invocation

1. Chairman, Cheri Vaughn requested a moment of silence to remember everyone that has been affected by COVID-19. A moment of silence was taken.

III. Roll Call

1. A verbal roll call was taken by staff. All members were present.

IV. Old Business

1. None

V. Certificate of Appropriateness

A. Major Works

1. A request has been made by Beacon Street Moss, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of 3 new single family homes at the following addresses:
 - A. 235 Water Street (Lot 23)
 - B. 231 Water Street (Lot 25)
 - C. 229 Water Street (Lot 26)
 - Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked the Commission if they would like combine the applications for Beacon Street Moss, LLC. It was the consensus that the Commission would agree on combining the applications into one discussion and vote.
 - Mr. Jim Wiley, representing Beacon Street Moss, LLC was sworn in.
 - Mr. Jim Wiley, Lots 23, 25, and 26 are closer to the Downtown area and the homes are a little smaller. These homes will have the same quality as the previous built homes. The three homes will fill in the remaining 3 lots on the West end of Water Street and will finalize the block for the development. The exterior details are noted in the agenda packets.
 - Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked for any questions from the Commissioners. The Commissioners did not have any questions at this time.

- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked if anyone public attendees would like to speak for or against the request.
- Mr. Scot Campbell, 213 N Market Street, asked to speak. He was sworn in. Stated that the cottages would be great and Moss Landing has done a great job on their homes. This is more of an observation. While speaking to some property owners that live in the development, the owners are not aware that changes to the property must be brought before the Commission. Mr. Campbell, has found that owners believe that if they neighbor installed something they must be allowed to install the same structure. Mr. Campbell, is asking that the developer, Jim Wiley, or the Commission or the City remind the property owners that they are in the Historic District and they do need to present changes to the Commission.
- Ms. Scarlett Boutchyard, thanked Scot Campbell for the suggestion and agreed this is something that is needed. Scarlett Boutchyard, this would be a good idea for the Commission to send information to the Moss Landing residence. Mr. Jim Wiley, would be happy to support sending information to the residence of Moss Landing along with a co-letter from the development company. This letter would state the importance of bringing changes before the Commission. Mr. Scot Campbell, thanked Jim Wiley. Mr. Campbell states that information has been presented to the development and the development has given approval for the changes and then the property owners proceed with the changes without coming before the Commission.
- Ms. Rebecca Clark, we (The Commission) have had some of the home owners have come before the Commission and we have given permission for their additions. But some of the newer property owners may not be abiding to the Guidelines. Ms. Clark, would support staff sending information out to the property owners of Moss Landing concerning the Major and Minor Works. Mr. Jim Wiley, also clarifying in the letter the difference between Major and Minor Works and what can be approved under a Minor Work.
- Ms. Rebecca Clark, have not been approved as a Minor Work and have only been voted on a Major Work. Ms. Scarlett Boutchyard, understood that this was voted on before Emily Rebert left. This needs to be checked out and the Commission needs to be made aware of the decision.
- Staff, there is an Appendix List in the Design Guidelines. This Appendix could be put in a letter format and have the Chairman of the Historic Commission sign, would this be acceptable? It was the consensus that the Commission agreed to the proposal.
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked for if anyone would like to speak for or against this proposal. No requested to speak. Brought it back to the table.
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked for a motion.
 - ❖ Karen Mann made the following motion: I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to, Beacon Street Moss, LLC to construct new single-family homes located at 235 Water Street (Lot 23), 231 Water Street (Lot 25) and 229 Water Street (Lot 26). This motion is based on the following findings of fact: the application is congruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Design Guidelines, specifically Chapter 4.1 – Landscaping, 4.2 – Lighting, 4.3 – Parking, Driveways and Sidewalks, 5.2 – Residential Construction and 5.4 - Decks. Scarlett Boutchyard seconded the motion. Verbal vote was taken, all voted, 7 in favor and 0. The Motion Passed

2. A request has been made by Seldon Taylor, Stocks and Taylor, representing Dr. Andrew McCoy, Owner, of 234 West Main Street, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following:
- a. To remove existing rear wall and reconstruct in like materials with wood studs; sheathing; brick veneer; windows and doors.
 - b. Reinstall electrical service, phone services and gas meter.
 - c. Install roof drainage downspouts in the existing location.
 - d. Install a concrete sidewalk along the rear of the building.
- Seldon Taylor of Stocks and Taylor, representing Dr. Andrew McCoy, was shown in.
 - Mr. Seldon Taylor, wanted to make sure that the Owner is Dr. Andrew McCoy. Dr. McCoy has had a structural engineer to exam the rear of the building. The structural engineer determined that the rear exterior wall has structurally failed and will need to be demolished. The owner is trying to maintain a business and there are also two tenants on either side of the building. They are proposing the following: it appears that there was a veneer made of masonry brick, could not tell when the brick was installed and the brick was painted at some point. A portion of the brick has been removed to see the back brick wall structural damage in the main bearing wall. The proposal is to build a temporary wall inside the existing space and remove the entire rear brick wall. The reconstruct the wall with wood studs and then reinstall the brick veneer. Will place the three windows in the rear in the same location of similar size. Concerning the aluminum storefront door that is currently installed would be replaced with a new aluminum entrance door in the same location. There is also a modern hollow core wood door, with no historic value, going into the rear of one of the tenants. Will replace the door with similar profile but using hard metal. Will be installing a new sidewalk at the rear of the building. All meters will need to be replaced with new meters.
 - Chairman Cheri Vaughn, asked for any questions from the Commission.
 - Ms. Kathleen Couch, are the windows going to be replaced with wood windows or vinyl clad? Mr. Taylor, we proposed vinyl clad. Mr. Taylor, contacted Builders First Source to find out what windows had been approved in the Historic District. Mr. Taylor, was told that the vinyl clad window had been approved for the Annex Building on Second Street. Ms. Couch, as far as she is aware the Commission never approved vinyl clad windows on the Annex Building. Ms. Couch, asked if any of the other Commissioners recall concerning this vote? Mr. Scot Craigie, that request was withdrawn. Ms. Scarlett Boutchyard, they said that they were going to proceed with wood windows not vinyl clad and come back as a Minor Work. Mr. Taylor, the windows are located on the rear of the building. The windows are not original to the building but, are made of wood. Ms. Couch, are you going to replace with six (6) over six (6)? Mr. Taylor, yes, same double hung with six (6) over six (6). Ms. Couch, regarding the chimney was removed so that the structural integrity of the building could be evaluated, is that correct? Mr. Taylor, correct, that was removed before Stocks and Taylor saw the building, under the first evaluation by the owner. The chimney was falling down. Ms. Couch, do you have any intention of replacing the chimney? Mr. Taylor, the owner prefers not to replace the chimney. Ms. Couch, what would be the reason for not replacing the chimney? Dr. Andrew McCoy, the chimney is not a functional chimney.

- Staff, swore in Dr. Andre McCoy.
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked for any questions.
- Ms. Rebecca Clark, the sidewalk leading to the rear, are you going to repair the sidewalk and is there a walkway leading from the parking area? Dr. McCoy, the current property adjoins the Presbyterian Church property, which is shown on the tax map in your agenda packets. Currently there is asphalt pavement and a couple of concrete pads and concrete by the door. Mr. Taylor, some of the concrete and asphalt will be removed to install a new footing for the wall. After that is completed we will clean it up and install a new sidewalk on the rear of the building. Dr. McCoy's customers park in the rear of the building.
- Ms. Karen Mann, you do have clients that park in the rear of the building and will use the rear entrance? Dr. McCoy, correct. Ms. Kathleen Couch, the awning of the back door will the awning be replaced? Dr. McCoy, yes, I could do an awning similar. Ms. Couch, will the brick be painted. Mr. Taylor, currently the brick is painted, not sure what the Commission prefers. Ms. Couch, believes that if the brick was painted originally, then the brick would need to be painted again. Mr. Taylor, most of the projects that Stocks and Taylor have completed downtown have used "Common Brick" and painted a "Common Red." If the Commission required that the brick be painted, we would propose to use a Red Common Brick color. Ms. Mann, asked staff what is his thought on painting the brick? But it is her understanding not to paint the brick and in this case part of the veneer has been painted. Mr. Taylor, the entire wall will be removed. Staff, if all of the brick is being replaced there is no point in painting the brick, because brick needs to be brick. If it was previously painted and leaving painted brick, it could be seen as matching the existing façade so that you would not have the patchwork. But, you are replacing everything the brick would need to stay as the style of brick that you are using. A brick façade looks better unpainted. Mr. Taylor, the front of the building will remain painted, but you cannot see both sides at the same time. Also, the buildings on either side are not painted.
- Ms. Cheri Vaughn, would you be willing to reconstruct the chimney on the rear of the building, because the guidelines do call for maintaining chimneys or character defining structures. Dr. Andrew McCoy, the chimney was not original to the building and was built at the same time as the brick façade on the front of the building. Dr. McCoy, assumes that the chimney was built to vent furnace and is not a functional chimney. It was made of modern brick placed against the existing wall. Ms. Scarlett Boutchard, what are the two (2) holes coming out of the rear façade? Dr. McCoy, vents for the furnace, below the holes the chimney consists of solid brick and concrete. Ms. Vaughn, where does the air that comes out of the vents go? Dr. McCoy, for a while they were vented into the chimney and the holes will be gone with the new construction. Ms. Vaughn, the holes were installed when the furnace was installed. Dr. McCoy, not sure when the chimney was installed but, it was tied into the façade that is coming down and was placed over the existing failing wall. Ms. Couch, we are looking at the original brick where the chimney has been removed? Dr. McCoy, yes. Ms. Couch, after you tore off the chimney that is the original brick? Dr. McCoy, yes. Mr. Taylor, the chimney itself was constructed out of the modern brick, not sure why this was done. Ms. Mann, this was a false chimney for looks to hide the two vents that come out of the wall. Dr. McCoy, all that is known is that it was built with modern chimney and does not know when the chimney was constructed. Ms. Couch, there is no evidence of a

fireplace ever located inside the building. Dr. McCoy, no and under the two (2) vents was filled with concrete.

- Ms. Kathleen Couch, the door that is to the left the chimney in the apex of the roof, is that original? Dr. Andrew McCoy, yes. Mr. Taylor, we are putting that door back in its existing place because it is original to the building.
- Chairman Cheri Vaughn, asked for any questions from the Commissioners. No one had any questions.
- Chairman Cheri Vaughn, asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak for or against the proposal. There were no questions.
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, brought back to the table. Asked for any discussion from the Commissioners.
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked if the Commission wanted to make one motion or break down the items into separate motions. Ms. Karen Mann, thinks that the windows should be replaced with wood windows because they are at ground level and that is what is currently installed. Not sure why the building company advised them of using the vinyl clad windows, but that has no bearing on the Commission. Chairman, Vaughn, asked if they wanted to break the windows out as a separate motion? Mr. Scot Craigie, regarding the windows, if you look in the guidelines at section 3.8.7 it states, "Original windows on upper floors that are located on rear or non-character-defining elevations may be repaired, or replaced with vinyl-clad windows that match the originals in design, size, proportions and detail." Ms. Kathleen Couch, with this elevation and having people going in and out of the building, might be a real elevation and there is a public parking lot and is visible from the church. Ms. Rebecca Clark, all of the buildings downtown are visible from the rear, but we have always treated the rear elevation as the rear of the building. Ms. Vaughn, thinks that if it also faces a main street, I know that it is not a main street and even not like an alley. Ms. Clark, it is two (2) parking lots. Ms. Couch, the owners have an agreed to do wood windows, so why would we not just follow what we have done in general and say that you should install wood windows. Dr. McCoy, would like to install vinyl clad windows. Mr. Craigie, was reading from the guidelines section 3.8.7. Ms. Mann, Scot the guideline that you are referring to is talking about the second story, it is not talking about the first floor of a building. Mr. Craigie, and it also says non-character defining elevations. Ms. Clark, agree with Scot on the windows, the building does not face a street. Ms. Couch, it is a business entrance and people do walk behind the building.
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, asked for any questions.
- Ms. Rebecca Clark, have we determined if this will be one motion or will the windows be pulled out for a second motion?
- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, sounds like there is some difference of opinion concerning the windows and I believe that we should break the windows out. What is the feeling about the chimney? That is not listed on the application. Ms. Rebecca Clark, the chimney is already being removed. Ms. Kathleen Couch, point is that you can see, looking at the picture and from the back of the building, after removal of the chimney we can now see the original brick. By this we can see that the chimney was not original to the building, weather the chimney has obtained historical significance we do not know, because we do not know when the chimney was added. We could not worry about the chimney.

- Chairman, Cheri Vaughn, suggest doing two (2) motions, one (1) to cover the majority of the application and one (1) to cover the windows. Ms. Scarlett Boutchyard, we could put on a condition with the motion.
- ❖ Kathleen Couch made the following motion: I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to, Dr. Andrew McCoy to make the above changes on the property located at 234 W Main Street. This motion is based on the following findings of fact: the application is congruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Design Guidelines, specifically Chapter 3.1 – Exterior Walls, 3.2 – Materials, 3.4 – Windows and Doors, 3.5 – Roofs, 5.9 – Rear Elevations and 3.14 – Mechanical and Communication Systems. Pertaining to the following items: A, B, C & D. Rebecca Clark seconded the motion. Verbal vote was taken, all voted, 7 in favor and 0. The Motion Passed
- A second motion was presented concerning the windows on the rear façade.
- ❖ Rebecca Clark made the following motion: I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to, Dr. Andrew McCoy to make the above changes on the property located at 234 W Main Street. This motion is based on the following findings of fact: the application is congruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Design Guidelines, specifically Chapter 3.4 – Windows and Doors and specifically Chapters 3.8.7. Scot Craigie seconded the motion. Verbal vote was taken, all voted, 4 in favor and 3. The Motion Passed.

VI. Minor Works

- ❖ Rebecca Clark made the following motion to approve all minor works. Kathleen Couch seconded the motion, Verbal vote was taken, all voted, 7 in favor and 8 opposed. Minor Works Passed

VII. Other Business

1. None

VIII. Approval of Minutes – March 3, 2020

- ❖ Kathleen Couch made a motion to approve the March 3, 2020 minutes. Karen Mann seconded the motion. Verbal vote was taken, all voted, 7 in favor and 0 opposed. Minutes were approved.

IX. Adjourn.

1. There being no other business
 - ❖ Rebecca Clark made a motion to adjourn. Kathleen Couch second the motion. Verbal vote was taken, all voted, 7 in favor and 0 opposed. Meeting was adjourned.