

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

AUGUST 26, 2021

Members Present

Robert Stowe
Robin Crews
Jackson Weller
Robert Weir
Sonja Ingram
Kathryn Waters

Members Absent

Susan Stilwell

Staff

Doug Plachcinski
Bonnie Case
Ryan Dodson

Ms. Crews called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING – OLD BUSINESS

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-062, to revise a previously approved rear covered deck at 858 Pine Street to remove the roof.*

Ms. Crews stated that Item 1 under Old Business has been withdrawn.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING – NEW BUSINESS

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-293, to install an 8” by 16” wall sign and a 16” by 24” yard sign at 107 West Main Street.*

Ms. Crews opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request is John Ranson, who stated I am the Lay Leader for Mount Vernon United Methodist Church.

Ms. Crews stated thank you for representing this item and if you would tell us in your own words what you would like to see done today.

Mr. Ranson stated we want to put two signs on the church. The first one is an 8” by 16” wall sign which will go under those windows with the arch on top because that is the door to the church office. Then we want to put a ground sign that also says church office.

Ms. Crews stated we are seeing a picture of the sign now is that the second item?

Mr. Ranson stated yes.

Ms. Crews stated will it say church office or just office.

Mr. Ranson stated just office.

Ms. Crews closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weir stated I have a question on the sign that is going to be replaced there now.

Mr. Ranson stated we are not replacing it, that is the sign that we want to put there now.

Mr. Stowe made a motion to approve the Request 2021-293 that is meets the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Ms. Sonja Ingram arrived at 3:36 pm.

2. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-298, to demolish the home at 142 Chestnut Street to be replaced with a new building.*
3. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-299, to demolish the home at 937+938 Green Street then combine the land with adjacent properties.*

Mr. Doug Plachcinski, Director of Planning stated that these items are being withdrawn for today's meeting and one or both may proceed within the future.

4. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-300, to install up to 50 QR code/Identity markers at various locations throughout the OWE historic district.*

Ms. Crews opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Paul Liepe who stated, I am representing Renee Burton today. We have been working together on this project since March and we are now at the point where we are ready to go. We have a State grant that will pay for the markers themselves, they are 8" by 10" and they are very small, if the owners approve it. We have forty eight of the fifty markers at the present time committed and there may be a slight change in that. We have a list of houses in your agenda package but since then two people have moved, so we might have to make some minor adjustments to that. The City's responsibility among others was to create a story map that links to these signs and link to the markers. You can access that now by clicking on any of our historic properties with an icon on them and it will already give you the stories that are going to be linked to these markers. Our visitors that wander up and down these streets and our residents can take their smart phones and click on those and find out everything there is on a historic house. Among other things we think that this will be a great benefit as our local tourism increases with the casino. Not everybody will want to gamble, and some people will want to wander around a historic district, and we think that this will be a good thing for them.

Ms. Crews closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weir stated how big is the sign?

Mr. Liepe stated 8" by 10" if not a little smaller than that and it will be near ground level.

Mr. Weller stated who will maintain those signs?

Mr. Liepe stated we don't anticipate that there will be any maintenance needed. These will be engraved so we don't see any need for maintenance of the sign itself.

Ms. Ingram stated what are you using for the architectural descriptions? Like what source are you using?

Mr. Leipe stated many of the houses have been written up as part of the Old West End Gazette, so we are using those descriptions initially and we hope to improve on them over time.

Mr. Weir made a motion that a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for 2021-300 as submitted. Mr. Weller second the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

5. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-303, to install a 22' by 10' rear deck at 820 Green Street.*

Ms. Crews opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Doug Plachcinski stated that Mr. Mahesh Srinivasaiah has requested to call in today because he was unable to make it in person.

Mr. Mahesh Srinivasaiah called in to speak on behalf of his request. Mr. Srinivasaiah stated I want to build a basic deck 22' by 10' deck on the rear of my home.

Ms. Crews closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weir stated is this lot on the corner by any chance?

Mr. Plachcinski stated no, it is not a corner lot.

Ms. Ingram stated what are the materials that you are using?

Mr. Plachcinski stated treated wood will be used.

Ms. Ingram stated are you repairing the addition on the house?

Mr. Srinivasaiah stated yes.

Ms. Crews stated was there ever a deck there?

Mr. Srinivasaiah stated no, just stairs going down.

Mr. Weir made a motion that a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for 2021-303 as submitted. Ms. Waters second the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING – OTHER BUSINESS

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness Request 2021-295, to build fencing, entry gates, and marker for the Old West End Commons, 846 Pine Street.*

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Paul Liepe who stated, I see you have a picture in the agenda package of the gates that existed about two weeks ago. Earlier this week two additional side panels were added to that but the ones that you are looking at are the swinging gates and the side panels are fixed. What remains to be done on this project is to paint this wrought iron black and inhibit continued rusting. For those of you who are not aware this Old West End Commons is a little over an acre of property. A substantial amount was donated by First Baptist Church in order to provide a new amenity for the Old West End. We are also hopeful, and we think we are almost there for getting some property on Jefferson Avenue which will link into the same property so we will be able to have walkways that will extend through the neighborhood and toward the downtown area. Friends of the Old West End thought a monumental entrance was appropriate in this case. The property is owned presently by the Danville Housing Authority and I don't know what the intent is in terms of final ownership of that land but that is how it is held right now for convenience in terms of making the necessary land transfers.

Ms. Crews opened the Public Hearing.

Sue Ellen Lawton, of 137 Holbrook made a comment stating I am a little curious will the fencing go all the way around the property?

Mr. Paul Liepe stated not this particular fencing. I believe the RFP is out to retain architect and engineering services to decide exactly how to use the area. The proposals included fencing around the entire area but there is nothing definite on that yet.

Ann Williams, of 875 Green Street stated I would like the city to encourage the use of fencing that is compatible with our neighborhood. In the past I have heard things about chain link and split rail. Those have nothing to do with the Old West End. I understand that these gates were extremely expensive, but I believe the welder who installed them said that he could make something similar and if that is at all cost effective even if it had to be done at a piece meal basis as we got the money, I would prefer to see something like that than something more modern.

Ms. Crews closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weller stated how tall is that fence?

Mr. Liepe stated I believe 7 feet and the width is 8 but all together it is a little over 32.

Mr. Ingram stated you are representing the Old West End or the Housing Authority?

Mr. Liepe stated Friends of the Old West End has undertaken the gate project.

Ms. Ingram stated I'm not against this at all but is this the first time that it has come before this board?

Mr. Liepe stated yes, it is, and I guess you can say it is an oversight on our part because we were cordially so close with the city and trying to move rapidly and then we said that we should have gotten permission for that and now we are begging your forgiveness.

Mr. Stowe stated you are requesting the fencing, gates, and the marker?

Mr. Liepe stated the marker is not designed yet and if you instruct us, we can come back with a marker design when that is done. The intention is perhaps to have a piece of marble with some brass plaques on it recognizing the major contributors and there have been private contributors as well as some city funds going into this project and to the Old West End Commons as a whole.

Mr. Weller stated how was the height of that fence determined being that there is no house or home on its property and it is on the front of this property? How does that mesh with the guidelines?

Mr. Plachcinski stated I believe that it exceeds the guidelines.

Mr. Weller stated it does exceed the guidelines so for us to improve we?

Mr. Plachcinski stated you would have to do the two-step process.

Mr. Weller stated the remainder of the fence across the front and the side of the property will also be at that 7" foot height exceeding the guidelines?

Mr. Liepe stated I don't know the answer to that, and it would depend on the results of the AA study.

Mr. Weller stated it would look odd though having a giant fence and then something much shorter along the sides.

Mr. Liepe stated this was intended to be monumental whether you want to have monumental fencing around the entire thing. I don't have the answer to that. That will be an answer to future study.

Ms. Ingram stated did you say that there will be other pieces on either side of it?

Mr. Liepe stated they are there now but there was no opportunity to get that in the package. The packages went out on Monday or Tuesday. There are four sections, these two and the ones on the sides are fixed.

Ms. Ingram stated then you will have more but you're not sure just how much more?

Mr. Liepe stated this would be the grand entrance to the Old West End Commons.

Mr. Weller stated we don't know who will eventually take ownership or responsibility for this property and expense?

Mr. Liepe stated for my expectations and what I have been told is that it will eventually go to Parks and Rec.

Mr. Weller stated so it will be maintained by city tax dollars?

Mr. Liepe stated correct, at my understanding and at this time anyway.

Mr. Stowe stated I am concerned about the guidelines since the fence exceeds by almost double. That will be my biggest issue.

Ms. Ingram stated does it sit behind the sidewalk?

Mr. Liepe stated I believe it is setback 14 feet behind the sidewalk.

Mr. Weir made a motion that request 2021-295 does not meet the guidelines as submitted. Mr. Stowe seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

Mr. Weir made a motion that we approve request 2021-295 as submitted as it does not have an adverse effect on the neighborhood. Ms. Ingram seconded motion and asked future projects to seek commission approval first. The motion was approved by a 5-1 vote.

2. Appeal of CAR COA decision 2021-244, to install roof-mounted solar panels at 918 Green Street.
3. Appeal of CAR COA decision 2021-245, to install roof-mounted solar panels at 154 Chestnut Street.

Mr. Doug Plachcinski said I just wanted to inform the commission that an appeal of decisions for COA 2021-244 and 2021-245 have been appealed. Just to let you know what happens is if somebody claims to be aggrieved by the decision of the commission, they have 30 days to review the decision and file an appeal. The appeal is filed to City Council and to the commission. The ordinance grants the Planning Director as the agent for the commission in this case. The appeal was received by me and the City Clerk. The City Council shall consult with the review commission in relation to the appeal and require any documentation. We have the agenda materials that were presented to the commission and we have the minutes that you will be approving shortly of the decision that is being appealed. Those will go to City Council and again it is not an appeal of the applicant, it is an appeal of The Commission of Architectural Review

decision. The City Attorney and I will be coordinating that aspect of the case and it will not be the applicant of those two certificates of occupancies as a party. We will be scheduling a meeting at City Council to take the appeal up. We will probably have another CAR meeting in the meantime, so if there is any additional information, I can provide to you in September I will let you know then. That is where we are at with the appeal.

Mr. Weir stated does the applicant for the original request need to be notified?

Mr. Plachcinski stated yes sir, unfortunately I did have to notify to them that they are proceeding with the permit under their own risk. They did not receive the permit right away because there were some issues between their contractor and the city about getting all their registrations, filings and business licenses submitted. Everything is paid up and the permits were released but we did advise them if there is an appeal and the COA is overturned or modified you may have to remove some or all of the materials that you have requested.

APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the July 22, 2021 minutes. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Approved