

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Conway Historic District Commission was held on Monday, June 22, 2026, at City Hall.

Corey Parks, Vice Chair called the meeting to order.

Members present: Corey Parks, Vice Chair, Marilyn Moix, Secretary, Jason Covington, JT Dixon, and Ali Dyer.

Absent: Josh Hamilton, Chair, and Nathaniel Johnson, Jr.

II. Approval of minutes: The minutes of the May 2026 meeting were approved 5/0 with Jason Covington making the motion and Ali Dyer seconding.

III. **1419 College Avenue** – zoning is R2-A and is in the suburban district of the Old Conway Design Overlay (OCDOD-SR)

The applicant is seeking after the fact approval for the installation of a detached metal carport. The applicant reached out to the Permits and Planning staff in February of 2025 requesting information regarding the installation of a carport near the single-family residence. Planning and Permits staff explained the process for approval as well as constraints regarding setbacks, materials, design and lot coverage. The applicant was notified that Historic District Commission review would be required.

In early May, it was brought to Planning Staff's attention that a carport had been installed on site without benefit of permit.

The applicant is seeking approval for the installed carport.

OCDOD Submittal Guidelines

Section 3. Application for Certificates from the Commission and Administrative Official

A. Considerations. In passing upon cases involving new construction, alterations, renovations or additions to existing structures, the reviewing authority shall consider the appropriateness of the size and shape of the building or structure both in relation to the land area upon which the building or structure is situated and to building and structures in the vicinity, and the reviewing authority may in appropriate cases impose dimensional and setback requirements in addition to those required by applicable ordinance or by-law.

B. Submission Requirements. No new building or structure or exterior renovation requiring a building permit or remodeling permit within the Old Conway Design Overlay District shall be constructed or altered in any way that affects exterior architectural features unless a Certificate of Appropriateness has been issued with respect to such construction or exterior renovation.

Section 8: Definitions.

Structure: Any construction, or any production or piece of work artificially built up or composed of parts joined together in some

definite manner. That which is built or constructed; an edifice or building of any kind; excluding but no limited to, electric and cable television distribution and transmission lines, poles and equipment, fire hydrants and wastewater collection manholes.

Zoning Code Guidelines:

Section 1302 – Definitions.

Accessory Building: A non-attached building or structure which is used in a subordinate and/or incidental manner to that of the main building on the same lot. If an accessory building is attached to the main building by a common wall or roof, it shall be considered part of the main building.

Structure: Anything constructed or erected for human occupancy and/or entrance, the use of which requires location on the ground or attached to something having a location on the ground.

Section 502.1 – Accessory Building Requirements.

A. Detached

Accessory building must be detached from the main structure or such accessory building shall be considered as an addition to the main or principle building.

B. Setbacks

1. Accessory buildings shall be no closer than five (5) feet to any interior lot line.
2. Accessory buildings shall be located behind the rear of the main structure or no closer than sixty feet from the front property line.
3. Accessory building located on a corner lot shall be no closer than sixty (60) feet to one (1) of the two (2) front lot lines. The setback from the other front lot line shall no be closer than the established front setback of the main structure.
4. Accessory buildings shall be no closer than ten (10) feet to the principle building unless attached to and considered part of the principle structure. Attachment to the principle building shall be by means of the structural attachment of abutting walls or by a roofed structure with a minimum four (4) foot width.
5. Accessory buildings shall be no closer than ten (10) feet from other accessory building on the lot unless the accessory buildings are attached by means of the structural attachment of the abutting walls or by a roofed structure with a minimum four (4) foot width.

D. Area Limitations

2. Total area of residential accessory building(s) shall not be larger than fifty percent (50%) of the covered roof area of the main building.

E. Building Permit Requirement

A building permit is required for all accessory buildings, except residential accessory buildings fifty (50) square feet or less in area.

2021 International Residential Code

406.3.3.1 Carports

Carports shall be open on not fewer than two sides. Carports open on fewer than two sides shall be considered to be a garage and shall comply with the requirements for private garages.

406.3.3.1 Carport separation

A separation is not required between a Group R-3 and U carport, provided that the carport is entirely open on two or more sides and there are not enclosed areas above.

310.4 Residential Group R-3

Residential Group R-3 occupancies where the occupants are primarily permanent in nature...

312.1 General

Buildings and structures of an accessory character and miscellaneous structures not classified in any specific occupancy shall be constructed, equipped and maintained to conform to the requirements of this code commensurate with the fire and life hazard incidental to their occupancy. Group U shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

Barns

Carports

Sheds

Etc.

Based upon the above information:

- The carport is a structure
- It is a structure that is not required to meet the minimum separation requirements per the International Residential Code, but is required to meet minimum OCDOD setbacks
- It is a structure that requires a building permit
- Because it requires a building permit, a Certificate of Appropriateness is required for its construction/installation

OCDOD Standards

SITE

Setbacks and Spacing.

Setback – The area of a lot measured from the lot line to a building façade or elevation.

This area must be maintained clear of

permanent structures with the exception of: fences, garden walls, arcades, porches, stoops, balconies, bay windows, terraces, and deck (that align with the first story level) which are permitted to encroach on the setback.

Outbuilding Setbacks.

Front: Rear of Principal Building or no closer than sixty (60) feet from the front property line; Side: 5 feet minimum; Rear: 5ft minimum.

Planning Staff reached out to the Fire Marshal who explained that an open-air metal carport would not need to meet minimum setback

requirements. Therefore, setback requirements are per the OCDOD ordinance. The applicant has installed the carport 6ft from the primary residence, 5 1/2ft from the side property line, 58ft from the front property line, and 30ft from a detached shop.

The carport is positioned at the eastern side of the single-family residence.

Lot Coverage. Lot coverage is the ratio of the occupied area (buildings, driveways, walks, garages, etc.) to the total area of a lot. Lot coverage for all impervious surfaces shall be less than 60%.

The lot coverage did not change because of the installation of the carport. It was placed on an existing driveway. The total lot coverage of the site is approximately 30%.

Garages/Outbuildings. Garages should be placed at the rear of the lot. When lot depth prevents a rear placement, the garage may be placed at the side of the structure along the back half of the structure. Two and three car garages should be placed at the rear of the lot in a detached structure.

The carport is installed at the side of the residence and is visible from College Ave.

Driveway / Parking. Parking in the front yard is not permitted. Parking is to be placed at the rear or side. Driveways should be concrete, pavers, or permeable paving and sharing of driveways is encouraged.

The carport has been installed on an existing driveway. The applicant is using the carport to park vehicles, including a recreational vehicle.

MATERIALS AND DETAILING

Outbuildings. The design of new outbuildings with a footprint of 160 square feet or larger should use materials, windows, doors, and

architectural detailing that are compatible with the existing or proposed residential structure. The footprint of a detached garage/out-building shall be no more than 30% of the footprint of the primary structure.

The applicant has installed a 22'x30' metal carport visible from College Ave. The materials are not compatible with the residential structure.

There are no architectural details. The applicant has indicated that the single-family residence is 2,122. At 30% of the footprint of the primary structure, the maximum square footage for outbuildings on site is 636sf. There is an existing shop on site that is 713sf. The site has already maximized the percentage of outbuildings on site without including the new metal carport.

CONDITIONS

1. The carport shall be modified to structurally attach to the single-family residence to be considered an addition and not an out-building.
2. The carport shall be modified to be composed of materials that are compatible with the single-family structure.
3. Any modifications must be submitted to Planning staff for review and may require approval by the Historic District Commission.
4. Applicant must obtain all applicable building permits if/when a Certificate of Appropriateness is granted.
5. If the applicant cannot meet conditions 1-4, the carport must be removed in its entirety by August 7th, 2026.

The applicant, Beau and Alexander Turner come to the podium. Mr. Turner states that he has lived in the Conway area for 20+ years. He and his wife purchased the home at 1419 College Avenue in 2017. Mr. Turner thanks the commissioners for being part of a voluntary staff. He is a former volunteer firefighter and current unpaid vice chairman of a committee he understands the sacrifices made by a group to serve. He begins to elaborate on the duties of the commission and the requirements of the Overlay District. He is asking for specific consideration to be given to his application.

Mr. Turner proceeds to address each condition:

- 1) He requests that this condition be waived. The carport was specifically designed to be detached so as not to alter the primary structure.
Corey does remind the applicant that he is at 4 minutes and states for the record that he has 10 minutes to present and each other person has 3 minutes to speak. Mr. Turner says he knows the bylaws and he can ask for extra time if he needs it.
- 2) Material compatibility. Through meticulous research on the appropriateness of metal materials we believe that these materials were used throughout the 20th century. We have no way of knowing if our home at one time had a carport since 1952. The houses on both sides of us have carports but even with the internet we cannot locate any records/photos of our home. They did try to match the color of the roof of the metal carport with that of their home.
- 3) He agrees with this condition and am willing to submit any structural modifications to the existing structure for staff review prior to modification.
- 4) He agrees with this condition and will obtain all permits. Our goal was to bring the structure into full compliance.
- 5) Mr. Turner requests that he be given a reasonable timeline and plan. If a time requirement is necessary, then he requests no less than one year from this date.

Mr. Turner adds that the structure was built in its current location for benefit of UV rays as he has a medical condition and needs a shaded area to work on vehicles. Requiring him to completely rebuild with new materials will be a significant financial hardship, limit

their land use and exceed the cost of the original structure. This would also require a structural engineer and could lead to sagging and collapse of the structure. The structure does not increase the lot coverage as it was built over an existing concrete slab; total lot coverage is approximately 30%, well below the 60% maximum. The carport in his opinion substantially improves the functionality of the property without requiring any alterations to any historic structure.

In closing, we are willing to improve the structure and hoping to work cooperatively with the staff, but we respectfully request the commission to exercise its discretion and allow practical decisions that both protect the character and usability of our property.

Corey states that he was going to ask if there was a change of ownership between February 2025 and present...however, that question was answered at the beginning of the applicant's statement. He is curious that if there was an initial conversation with the staff in February, what was the disconnect between staff and applicant that we are here today with a retroactive situation?

Mr. Turner states to put it bluntly and honestly; when speaking with staff initially he got the feeling that he should not have bought a house in old Conway. At the end of the day he felt that was the message he got from them. We are jumping through hurdles with this commission, and it is what it is.

Corey states that it makes it difficult for this commission now to weigh in and potentially the cost of the carport would not even be an issue. I do want to understand the decision-making process because that could be an important factor in the decision today. We try to meet people where they are but with situations like this it becomes difficult for all involved with how to move forward. He wants to express appreciation for the homeowners investing in downtown and being in Conway and he hates that the homeowner's experience was one that was perceived as not being favorable. That has not been Corey's experience, and he hopes it will not be in the future for the homeowner.

Corey asks if there are any questions from the commission to the homeowner?

Mr. Turner interjects that last year he was diagnosed with a skin cancer that is increased with UV exposure and that did play a role in the construction of the carport.

No questions at this time from the commission.

Corey calls for anyone to speak for the proposed project.

- 1) JD Gingrich, 1405 College Avenue – Live a couple of houses down from the applicant. Just want to say that in terms of their interest in the neighborhood we have had multiple conversations and they have reached out to all of us to ensure that anything they were doing was not contrary to our own thoughts about the

- neighborhood. They are also fully committed to the historic nature of our neighborhood and our street. Ironical to us is that our block is currently working very hard to deal with the City of putting 12' of concrete through our front yards with bicycles and lines on it knowing that this group has never had comment with regards to this project. Corey stops this narrative as it is not within the confines of the applicant request before this commission. Mr. Gingrich complies and gives his full support for this carport to remain and work with the applicant.
- 2) Vivian Lawson Hogue, College Avenue – She hasn't even noticed this carport until this issue came up. She doesn't see what the problem is with it. She states that old Conway homes have divided driveways, that went into a carport at some point and there was no regard as to where you had to put your carport. I kept thinking that "are they wanting them to put in a Craftsman carport"? Most homes had one or two spaces for cars, and she remembers that house does not have a carport. She states that her relative lives next door and didn't know the carport was built either. She acknowledges that she is not talking about the structure itself, but the carport and what they have gone through to build it means something. She thinks something needs to be done about the rules and help this applicant. She has written 103 articles about old homes in Conway and has never heard of anything like this being a problem and she wants to defend them and anyone else that wants to keep a car or anything else they have.
 - 3) Randall Fortoni, 1418 College – Live across from the applicant. He sees them regularly walking their dogs, always trying to improve their lawn and keep it clear. He has tried to renovate his own home and driveway and keep it within the standards and he can vouch these conditions in his opinion would make it more of an eyesore to remodel the carport to the structure and it is now not noticeable due to a tree on their property line. He cannot see it now but believes that with these proposed conditions it would be visible and an eyesore to the City of Conway and he would think it would benefit the Old Conway district to leave it as is.
 - 4) Lori Ross, 1371 College Avenue – She wouldn't have even known it was there had it not been pointed out. It is not noticeable to a neighbor that drives/walks past it all the time. It is not a problem at all. Spaces here are really tight and she understands the need for cover there. The houses are old and we have to do what we can to make them fit in with our current lives, so I am not opposed to this at all.
 - 5) Mike Rueff, 1455 College Avenue – Like others have said, I never even noticed it until I learned about this meeting. I'm in favor of them keeping it as is. I don't believe it is an eyesore and it is not hurting anything.

Corey calls for anyone to speak in opposition – No one comes forward.

Corey brings the discussion back into commission. He wants to clarify that first and foremost that the decision of this commission does not dictate the quality of the applicant's involvement in the neighborhood or the overall community. It only pertains to a land use decision and whether it is appropriate to the area. We do want to express

appreciation anytime we can in investment, both public and private in the district, and also contributing as a strong community member.

Jason likes that all the neighbors came out in support and do not have an issue with it, but is it allowed in this location to begin with and if we approve it is everyone in that district going to put up a carport and ask for permission after the fact? If it is allowed, then the rules would need to be re-written to allow it for everyone. This project in question is tucked back but the next one might not be and what are we going to say to them?

JT asks if an alternate design was proposed for say a detached garage or attached garage with different materials would they have to bring that design to this commission? Tara states that if it is an addition and it meets the standards, then may not need to and may be able to be handled administratively, however the same with an outbuilding so it may need to.

Ali agrees that part of the issue is that it is after the fact, and based on the information provided, this is not news to the homeowner, is that correct? In February they knew what the expectations were and ordinances were. That is my issue and it was done anyway.

Marilyn states that is her issue, she's a mom and I'm a rule follower, so if you are given all the information, you need in order to make a decision and you choose to ignore all of that; that's where I have my problem.

JT asks if there is a way to meet in the middle? Keeping the homeowner from attaching it to the primary structure? Could it be kept and wrapped with like materials? Tara states that it would depend upon how that would look because of the separation requirement as fire code comes into play.

Corey states that for him coming into this meeting was to ask the commissioners, taking into consideration that this is after the fact; would we have approved of this on the front end? I think that is something that we have to really consider as we don't set precedent, technically, I do think whenever people are presenting things to us there is the natural inclination to say, why here and not there? Last year we had a discussion with driveway width and overtime things have been built and there are things that are going to be different and again some will be similar within the district and the one that comes to mind is the one on Faulkner Street that was serving for church purposes. I just think we have to consider for this applicant to separate what we would have done initially rather than retroactively. Hopefully this doesn't bias us and we will remember that there is a process in place for a reason, and I think there is a difference in not knowing something and knowing and still proceeding.

If this had been presented to us on the front end, how would we have proceeded?

Marilyn asks; lot coverage aside, did I hear you correctly that before this structure went up there was already a structure that exceeded the allowed outbuilding space on the property? Tara answered that there is a lot coverage area and then there is a percentage that an outbuilding can be of the primary structure. Buildings and garages are limited to 30% of the square footage of the primary structure and they already have an outbuilding and have already maximized that percentage. So, yes, it is separate from lot coverage. It is a matter of scale of outbuildings to primary.

Corey says with regards to scale; looking to our design professional – with the height of the carport, while I do appreciate that it is set-back, the height is a real struggle for me within the district, and it feels out of the norm. JT states that whenever his firm designs these types of structures, they do not dominate the primary. It should be lower in height; it is pretty tall, but I do understand why they did that due to the RV parked under it. Corey is inclined to think that if there is somewhere in between a middle ground. Respecting the homeowners need for coverage but also getting it into a place where it is more compliant – while the existing neighbors may be okay, new neighbors may not. This body must take into consideration the overall look for the overlay, especially a visually noted street like College Avenue. He drove up and down several times to try and get the feeling for how it looks and impacts the overall area. JT states that he had to play devils advocate; he sees the homeowner's perspective and neighbors stated they can't see it; a tree blocks the view from one angle and the residence blocks from another. I don't believe that we would have approved this going into it initially, is my guess. That is my hang-up with this whole issue.

Ali states that if we were to dismiss that this is an after the fact application there are still 3 areas where the project would not have been in compliance. She does not believe that we would have approved it upon initial application.

The applicant asks to re-address the commission – From the side you are not going to see the carport. If you are right in front of it you will see it. The tree has been there a long time and is covering 50% of it. The set-back concern? Ali says it is the outbuilding percentage from the existing building already in back of the primary structure. Color matching is also another concern and use of materials.

Mr. Turner states that if they went with a traditional garage the footprint would not allow it either. It would over extend itself and would take over the property for our needs at the end of the day. No one builds anything just for fun. Is it taller than we expected? 100%. The only reason the height is what it is has to do with the RV being parked there. He has additional photos of it and reiterates that the tree and house block the carport. When you zoom in on this one photo you are 100% going to say the scale is questionable at the end of the day. So, he would ask us to zoom out and look at the entire property. He insists he would like to pass around additional photos of the side views. He says he has a whole additional presentation on how metal is used...Corey stops him to say that for this commission the question is now if this had come before us initially how we would have responded. It certainly would not have been approved as it is constructed now and

so that is what is making this particularly difficult to figure out how to navigate because we do want to be considerate of property owners, we do want to invoke their needs and wants, but I think this volunteer commission is tasked with the responsibility of ensuring the long-term sustainability and feel, look and appreciation of the build environment, specifically in downtown and so that is what is very difficult. If you had presented this to us initially, we would have had a lot more flexibility, whereas now its that we either accept it as is or, I don't know – a precarious situation.

Mr. Turner now asks about the two feet in question that are too close to the house? He expresses that he sees any solution to that issue as a fire hazard to the primary. Corey says for him personally that moving down College toward Donaghey there is a carport that looks “as if it belongs there”, when looking at it I know it was clearly added later. If this was pre-HDC then this is a different conversation. We just have to figure out how to move forward and that is the challenge before this body. We want to respect individual property rights and all the things that go with that but still be mindful that while the existing neighbors are fine with it, maybe new neighbors will not be – that is where it is hard for us. Mr. Turner does not disagree with what Corey said but he feels it is hard to comply as he understands that if he had come initially and asked for a metal carport it would have been met with a negative connotation.

Corey asks if there are any further questions for the applicant? No. Corey tells the applicant that we appreciate the additional context, but we are bringing it back into committee. Mr. Turner attempts to continue to offer photos and give historical perspective with metal roofs to St. Joseph and CBC. He says the metal roof aspect has been blended in to the neighborhood since 2006/07. He continues to go on about this lot and not being able to choose certain aspects of the property. He conjectures that someone might ask about moving it back and states he cannot do that due to a right of way for the City of Conway. Again, Corey says thank you for the added context, but we do have another applicant and need to move on with business.

Another comment is requested by Vivian Lawson Hogue, 1753 College Avenue – These carports are all over town. Have all of these people come to the HDC to ask anything about theirs? No. Corey states that the difference would be the macro and the micro view. What happens before this body is dictated by a line in the sand that was drawn at a period in time of what was appropriate or not for this area. So, you have two different districts downtown with different restrictions, one more than the other. You could have two houses sitting side by side and what is at one may be allowed and what is at the other would not be based off the period in time when it was constructed. There are all kinds of considerations with regard to this commission and we will do our best to meet all the needs.

Our challenge is that there was information given to the homeowner of what the expectations would be and that information was not respected and now we are here to try and be fair and responsible as a body for all.

Corey brings this back into the commission. Jason adds that no one on this current commission wrote the standards for this body but yet we have to try to uphold what is written. A metal structure like that is not allowed in that district and therefore we cannot allow it or we will have them popping up and what would be said to that?

JT states that he hates this for the homeowner, because they take care of their property, but we can't approve as is or others will follow suit. This group didn't set the design standards, but we have to uphold them.

Corey calls for a motion; Tara clarifies the motion process. By making a motion to approve the carport with these conditions, if it is the commissioner's interest to deny the project all together the motion still needs to be in the affirmative and then the vote would be no, rather than making a motion to deny. Corey wants to clarify, due to a question earlier, what paths does the applicant have to work directly with staff and respect the procedures in place to inform neighbors and ensure that everyone is on the same page, but still try to make the process as streamlined as much as it can be? Tara – The applicant is going to meet these conditions, and it does meet the design standards there would be a public notification as we would do for anyone with an addition or outbuilding that does meet the standards. If the applicant would like to come back and provide a new architectural drawings or staff is not comfortable making that determination (does it meet it to a T) then it would come back to HDC. There is also an appeal process if the applicant wants to appeal within 30 days to staff, but they would need to be showing new information that was not presented at this time, at which case they would go back to HDC and meet all the notification deadlines and that information can be presented, that can happen one time. If there is no new information and they want to appeal, they can go before the City Council. That would be the outlet for moving forward.

Corey now entertains motion. Ali moves to approve the motion with proposed conditions. Jason Seconds. All in favor – JT & Ali. All opposed – Jason, Marilyn & Corey. The vote being 3/2 the motion fails. Tara repeats the next steps for the applicant.

Corey asks the applicant if he understands the next steps. He states that staff could deny his appeal – Tara states twice that it is not within her perview to approve or deny anything. He persists and she states again for the record that she does not approve or deny anything. She would gather any new information, that was not presented today, and would take that information and work with the applicant to make a new application for submission to the HDC to have that new information come before this body. She does not have any say in determining anything. If there is no new information then you can appeal directly to the City Council or if you go before the HDC again and are denied you can go before the City Council for appeal.

Mr. Turner wants to know what is new information? Corey defers the applicant to work with the planning staff to obtain future assistance with this process.

1259 Ingram Street – Derek Walter (7 Irene Cr, Greenbrier)

Present Zoning. T-3 (Suburban Transect)-Northeast Old Conway Area Specific Plan (NEOCA), Old Conway Design Overlay Suburban District (OCDOD-SR).

Abutting Zoning. North/South/West: T-3, OCDOD-SR; East T-4 (Transition Zone), OCDOD-Transition (TR).

Lot Area. 0.17 acres ±.

Surrounding Area Structures. The property is located in the OCDOD-SR district on the west side of Ingram St between Pine St and Walnut St. Area structures are predominantly minimal traditional style homes.

General Description of Property and Proposed Development. The applicant is proposing to construct an 1800± sf single-family residence with front and rear porches and an attached garage. Also proposed is a driveway, sidewalk and the removal of a tree along the street frontage. This is an infill development on a vacant lot. The lot is one of four vacant lots on the west side of Ingram St between Pine St and Walnut St. The dwellings on the east side of Ingram St are eastern facing with their rear facades fronting Ingram St. As such, there are limited comparisons by which to attribute a pattern of development along Ingram St in the immediate area. The style of the proposed residence is reflective of a contemporary minimal traditional home.

SITE

Setbacks and Spacing. Front: 25 feet-35 feet.

Secondary Front (adjacent to street): 8 feet minimum.

Side: 6 feet minimum in all residential zones.

Rear: 5 feet or 15 feet from centerline of alleyway in residential zones.

The proposal conforms to all setbacks.

Spacing. Spatial relationships among existing buildings on a block and neighborhood suggest an appropriate width and spacing for new construction in the area.

The proposal conforms.

Lot Coverage. Lot coverage for all impervious surfaces shall be less than 60%.

Lot coverage for this site is approximately 30%. The proposal conforms.

Orientation. The front door of the structure should follow the orientation of entries along the street.

The front door for this structure faces the street in a similar fashion to other structures on the west side of Ingram. The residences on the east side of Ingram face Jersey St with their rear facades fronting Ingram.

Garages/Outbuildings. Garages should be placed at the rear of the lot. When lot depth prevents a rear placement, the garage may be placed at the side of the structure along the back half of the structure. Two and three car garages should be placed at the rear of the lot in a detached structure.

The applicant proposes an attached garage which is flush with the front façade of the residence. Based upon the configuration of the lot and residence, a detached garage at the rear appears feasible but is not proposed.

Alley. There is a closed alley at the rear of the lot.

Driveway / Parking. Parking in the front yard is not permitted. Parking is to be placed at the rear or side. Driveways should be concrete, pavers, or permeable paving and sharing of driveways is encouraged.

The applicant has indicated a driveway off Ingram St near the southern property line.

The width and material type is not specified.

Sidewalks. Sidewalks are required for new construction projects.

A sidewalk with greenspace is shown on the site plan. The widths are not specified.

Fences/Walls. Fences shall be no more than 3.5 feet tall in front yards with pickets no more than 4 inches wide and 3 inches apart.

Privacy fences shall be no more than 6 feet tall and are only allowed in rear yards or side yards as deemed appropriate. Fences may be constructed of wood, iron (or aluminum mimicking iron), brick, or stone. The upper two feet of privacy fencing should have 50% opacity, provided by a lattice or grid pattern of wood or iron.

The applicant has not indicated any proposed fencing.

Tree preservation. Any trees over 8" in diameter or great must be protected and preserved. Canopy trees shall be required for each 30' of street frontage.

One significant tree will be removed. A tree will be planted to replace its removal. There will be one tree every 30 feet of frontage.

MASSING

Scale. The scale of the building should maintain the relationship of the structure's scale to the lot size of surrounding buildings.

The scale of the proposed structure is compatible to the overall scale of structures in the surrounding area.

Height/Width/Directional Expression. The height/width and directional expression of the structure should relate to historic patterns in the neighborhood.

The proposal is for a single-story structure which is similar to most residences in the neighborhood. The width at approximately 30' will not be out of scale of the pattern of the neighborhood.

Footprint. The structure should respect the ratio building footprint to lot area of homes within the general vicinity.

The building footprints will cover around 24% of the site which is similar to other structures on similarly sized lots in the area.

Complexity of form. The detailing and wall breaks should relate well to structures in the area.

The structures will contain a level of detailing and form that is compatible with the patterns of the area, especially recently constructed infill development.

Façade, wall area, rhythm. New facades shall be compatible with those of the surrounding area. 25-40% of front façades should contain windows. Window and door openings should relate to the size and proportions contained in the surrounding area.

The front elevation would benefit from an additional window, vent and/or dormer. It does not appear to have 25% windows on the front façade.

DESIGN ELEMENTS

Style. New design should respect the context of the area while expressing the contemporary nature of the structure.

The contemporary, minimal traditional proposal is in alignment with the surrounding area and is appropriate for infill development in an area with other vacant lots.

Entries, Porches, and Porticos, Doors and windows, Awnings. Porches are encouraged and should be at least 6' deep, when present. Entries should contain special decorative elements and ornamentation. Windows should be of divided-light construction, where divided-light windows are proposed.

The depth of the front porch is not specified. There is minimal ornamentation. Wooden columns and a brick skirt contrasting board and batten siding characterize the front façade and entryway.

Lighting. Any new lighting should be inward, downward, and shrouded so as to stay within the bounds of the property.

No lighting is shown.

MATERIALS AND DETAILING

Architectural Details, Siding, and Bricks. Detailing and siding should complement the surrounding area. Siding should include brick, stone, wood, or Hardieboard/LP Smartside type siding.

The applicant is proposing brick siding on the side, rear, and garage with board and batten siding accenting the front façade. Architectural shingles are proposed for the roof. Shutters, Roof, Decks/Plaza Space, Skylights, Mechanical Screening. Roofing should respect the character of the surrounding area with respect to materials, pitch, and form. Metal roofing is prohibited unless historically used on the structure.

The applicant is proposing a gable roof with asphalt shingles. This is compatible with surrounding homes.

Mechanical system screening. HVAC units should be located where they are not readily visible from the street. If visible, they should be screened with shrubbery or fencing. No HVAC equipment is shown on the site plan.

CONDITIONS

1. Applicant must obtain all applicable building permits if/when a Certificate of Appropriateness is granted.
2. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, the applicant shall submit to Planning Staff a site plan and elevations showing:
 - Exact square footage of the proposed residence and garage
 - Depth of the front porch
 - Lot coverage tabulation
 - Driveway width and material type
 - Width of sidewalk and greenspace
 - An additional window/opening on the front façade

3. Sidewalk constructed in right-of way shall be a minimum of 5' wide as measured from the property line. Greenspace shall be provided between the sidewalk and the street at a width determined by the amount of area available after accounting for the sidewalk. If there is not sufficient right-of-way to accommodate a 5' wide easement shall be recorded.
4. Fencing in the front yard shall be no more than 3.5' tall in the front yard with pickets no more than 4 inches wide and 3 inches apart. Privacy fences shall be no more than 6' tall and are only allowed in the rear yard. Privacy fences shall be setback from the front façade at least one-half the distance between the front and rear walls of the structure with it transitioning down to 3.5 feet tall as it transitions to the front yard.
5. The front porch depth shall be at least 6'.
6. Windows shall be at least one-over-one (not fixed windows). May need staff approval once the window placement is determined.
7. Siding shall be brick, stone, wood, or Hardieboard/LP Smartside.
8. Driveway shall be concrete, pavers, or permeable paving.
9. Metal roofing is prohibited.
10. Lighting shall be downward and inward toward the property.
11. HVAC equipment shall be screened from public view.
12. There shall be one canopy tree for every 30' of street frontage and it shall be a species from the approved species lists.
13. Staff work with windows – Administratively.

Derek Walter comes as applicant and he has a few questions. He did try to upload the floor plan but was unsuccessful. His main question is that if any of these, for example the windows, because this is such a narrow house to get another window on the front would probably have to go above the garage or something on the gable. Is that something that I can come back to staff for? Tara states that if the commission is comfortable with the plan and conditions, then no we could handle that through staff approval. He will state tonight anything such as this, so the commission has the information necessary to approve all conditions.

Mr. Walter states that the sq footage is 1,354, heated and cooled, 309 garage and 87 on the porch for a total of 1,470. It currently has a 4' set-back now, but he does not see any reason why it couldn't be 6'. We will change the porch to 6', instead of 4'. The plan is LP or Hardeeboard on the front, board and batten and then brick everywhere else. He has a question on the tree; when speaking with staff he stated that there is a tree right where the driveway needs to go. It is within three feet of the road. It is narrow and he is also working around a storm drain. The house behind is a new build within the past 5 years. Does he have to have a fence in the front? He does not. HVAC in the back of the house does not require screening? No.

Any questions for the applicant? No. Anyone to speak in favor of? No. Anyone to speak against? No.

Commission discussion: Jason and Marilyn comment that everything seems straightforward. Proposed amendment to 3 – change greenspace to sidewalk and then adding that staff has approval to work with the applicant on windows and acknowledging the 6' porch change. JT asks if the garage cannot be on the front or is that just a recommendation? Tara says it is an encouragement so that it sets back rather than being dominate to the façade of the primary structure.

Corey entertains a motion to accept the amended proposed conditions. Jason motions to accept as amended. Ali Seconds. All in Favor? 5/0 passes.

Tara states that there were no administrative notes for the commission this month.

Corey calls to adjourn. Jason Covington motions to adjourn / second by JT Dixon. Passes 5/0.

/mm