



HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMISSION
Meeting Summary
March 18, 2025
5:30 pm City Hall, Council Chambers

Present: Paemon Aramjoo, John Carr, Kathy Chelton, Vern Drottz, Aimee Gray, Matt Grundy, Brett Rinker,

Absent: Linda Armstrong, Katie Schmidt

Applicants present: Mr. Benn Garrett, 418 E Mississippi, Mr. Ken Personett representing 430 E Franklin

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Aramjoo to approve the meeting summary from March 4, 2025 as corrected. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carr. The motion passed 7-0-0.

HDRC Case #25-003J Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a six-foot privacy fence in the west side yard and in the east rear yard at 418 E Mississippi, Jewell Historic District.

- Ms. Thill read the staff report and recommended approval with the stipulation that the west side yard fence be moved back (North) past the side entrance to the rear so as not to block the architectural features of the home. It was clarified that on the site plan provided by the applicant that west and east were noted incorrectly.
- Mr. Bennett said he wants the fence to protect the west side door access. He feels that "objectionable view" as stated in the design guidelines is subjective and there isn't a definition in the code. You can still see the stone porch and the side of the home.
- Commissioner Carr commented that the previously approved front retaining wall looks great. Regarding this application, Commissioner Carr said he would prefer to see a shorter or picket style fence. He asked Staff what the architectural details that are hidden related to the west side yard fence. Ms. Thill said that a six-foot privacy fence in the side yard would screen architectural features of the home including the side entry door and the windows, and therefore it would not be appropriate. Ms. Sharp reiterated that privacy fences should be only in the rear yard.
- Commissioner Carr commented that he agrees that the objectionable view is subjective and there are two 6' fences across the street.

- Ms. Thill responded to a question as to when the neighbor's existing privacy fences were approved, clarifying that they were administrative approvals done by previous staff at least 8 years ago. Ms. Sharp said that a misinterpretation of the code done that long ago does not apply to how this body decides the appropriateness of this fence.
- Mr. Bennett commented that there are many examples of privacy fences in the Historic District.
- Chairman Grundy commented that if the fence is positioned in front of the west side door then a shorter picket style fence would be a more appropriate style, adding that a six-foot stockade fence would not be appropriate.
- Ms. Sharp commented that there is a fence code for the entire city and another for the historic district. If not visible from the street, a privacy fence may be allowed in the rear yard to screen an objectionable view.
- Commissioner Rinker said what would be an objectionable view is adding a privacy fence to this yard. He will not support this application for that reason and because he doesn't feel it is an objectionable view, adding that the most objectionable view he has is the six-foot privacy fence.
- Ms. Sharp read the part of the code related to privacy fences and commented that not having an objectionable view definition is a bit subjective, but requiring it in the rear yard is not. As long as the fence is in the backyard, staff is recommending approval.
- Commissioner Carr said there are two options to solve the problem, that he could move the fence back or do a shorter picket style to the West.
- Mr. Garrett asked what the appeal's process looks like. Ms. Sharp said that an appeal would be sent to the Board of Zoning Adjustments. She will send him information on the process.
- Chairman Grundy commented that the UDO is pretty clear.

Commissioner Rinker made a motion to deny the application because it doesn't meet the UDO and Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gray. The motion passed. 7-0-0.

- Mr. Garrett asked if he changed it to move the fence behind the side door, could he do that without coming back through to the Commission.
- Ms. Sharp said the picket fence in the side yard would be allowed, and moving the fence back to the rear would allow them to have privacy in the back.
- Mr. Garrett commented that he was not anticipating the tone of the meeting. He said he will reevaluate.
- Ms. Sharp clarified that the appeal of a denial by HDRC must be done within 30 days then reviewed by BZA.

HDRC Case #25-001LA Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the front porch, window replacement, alterations to the garage and like in kind repairs at 316 E Franklin, Local Landmark

- Ms. Thill read the staff report and recommended approval.

- Commissioner Gray said that 15-inch columns could be a little heavy. Maybe 11 or 12 inches wide might look more appropriate to match the lower columns.
- Commissioner Carr said he doesn't have a problem with the proposed size, but they need to be proportionally appropriate.
- Commissioner Rinker asked if that is typical for the windows to be a combination of 6/6 and 2/2. Commissioner Carr said he doesn't find that unusual.
- Commissioner Carr asked for clarification on the Andersen 400 windows he is proposing, specifically if the muntins are simulated divided lite showing a putty line and if the grid is inside the glass. Mr. Personett said that he would have to double check, but he thinks the grids are inside the glass. Commissioner Carr said he thought they would like to match the profile of the original window. Simulated divided lite will be preferred.
- Commissioner Carr asked about the doors on the home and specifically if the north first floor door was going to be replaced or repaired as it appeared the vertical muntin was missing. Mr. Personett said that they are all in good condition and he doesn't plan to replace any doors at this time.

Vice Chairman Aramjoo made a motion to approve the application with the stipulation that the upper floor porch posts are proportionate to the lower posts and that the windows have exterior divided lites. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chelton. The motion passed 8-0-0.

Other Business

Administrative Approvals:

- 459 E Franklin Like in kind roof replacement
- 430 E Franklin Like in kind fence and sidewalks
- 471 E Kansas Like in kind roof and gutters

Miscellaneous matters from the Commission:

- Commissioner Carr complimented Mr. Personett on the new front porch at 337 N. Water Street.
- Commissioner Drott said Kyle at Countryside Gutters works on half round gutters.
- Commissioner Carr asked about the windows at 120 S Terrace and what was approved by the commission. He commented that they were casement windows and they are mull double hung. Staff will look into this.

The meeting adjourned at 6:38 pm.