

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 26, 2012 THE CITY OF STARKVILLE, MISSISSIPPI

The Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Starkville, Mississippi held its regularly scheduled meeting in the Building Department on the Second Floor of City Hall, located at 101 E. Lampkin Street, commencing at 5:30 PM. Present were Commissioners Jason Barrett, Maxine Hamilton, Joy Day Greene, Briar Jones and Cyndi Sullivan. Commissioners Michael Fazio and Tom Walker were absent. Vice-Chairman Hamilton chaired the meeting in Chairman Fazio's absence. Attending the Commissioners was City Planner Ben Griffith.

AN ORDER APPROVING THE WRITTEN AGENDA

The Commission considered the matter of approval of the written agenda dated June 26, 2012. After a brief discussion, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the written agenda as presented.

AN ORDER APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 22, 2012 MEETING

The Commission then considered the matter of approval of the minutes of the May 22, 2012 meeting. After a brief discussion, Commissioner Greene made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion and the Commission voted unanimously to approve said minutes as presented.

CITIZENS' COMMENTS

Vice-Chairman Hamilton asked if any member of the public cared to address the Commission and no public comments were received.

DISCUSSION REGARDING ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Next there came before the Commission a discussion regarding the election of officers. Mr. Griffith stated that the enabling ordinance did not provide any guidance for the election or re-election of officers. He then presented a draft motion for the Commissioners to review, which provided five specific requirements. Several revisions to the proposed motion were suggested and discussed. Commissioner Jones suggested that the revised motion be reduced to writing and presented at the next meeting for further consideration. Mr. Griffith offered to provide the verbiage in a memo to the Commissioners, and the Commission voted unanimously to direct Planning staff to prepare said memo for review and discussion at the next meeting.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT “WINDOWS, DOORS, SHUTTERS, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES” SECTION OF THE PROPOSED STARKVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN GUIDELINES

Next there came before the Commission a discussion of the draft “Windows, Doors, Shutters, Awnings and Canopies” section of the proposed Starkville historic preservation design guidelines. A lengthy discussion began regarding the contents of the section. Commissioner Jones and Sullivan asked why there was verbiage regarding storm windows and storm doors if the Commissioners had previously decided not to review them. Commissioner Barrett suggested that the “Use of Storm Windows in Starkville” paragraph at the bottom of page 90 be stricken and the Commissioners unanimously agreed.

The discussion then turned to the “Storm doors” section at the bottom of page 95. After a lengthy discussion, Commissioner Jones suggested that the first sentence of that section be stricken and replaced with: “Storm doors are allowed. It is recommended that the design be as unobtrusive as possible.” The last sentence in that section was to remain as proposed and the Commissioners unanimously agreed.

Another lengthy discussion began regarding the “Commercial Awnings and Canopies” verbiage on page 100. Commissioner Sullivan suggested that the entire page be set aside from the design guidelines, but reserved for possible future inclusion and use, especially if a downtown or other historic district with commercial areas is established. The Commissioners unanimously agreed to this change.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT “STOREFRONTS” SECTION OF THE PROPOSED STARKVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN GUIDELINES

Next there came before the Commission a discussion of the draft “Storefronts” section of the proposed Starkville historic preservation guidelines. Commissioner Jones stated that this section should be closely integrated with the City’s recently-adopted Form Based Code, especially the portions regarding signage, to avoid any conflicts in the future. Commissioner Sullivan agreed, adding that perhaps the section should be placed on hold, similar to portions of the previous section. After a brief discussion, the Commissioners unanimously decided to set aside this section from the design guidelines, but reserved for possible future inclusion and use. They also asked the City Planner to forward a copy of the Form Based Code to Consultant David Preziosi.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT “INTRODUCTION AND USE OF THE STARKVILLE DESIGN GUIDELINES” SECTION OF THE PROPOSED STARKVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN GUIDELINES

Next there came before the Commission a discussion of the draft “Introduction and Use of the Starkville Design Guidelines” section of the proposed Starkville historic preservation guidelines. After a brief discussion the Commissioners unanimously decided that no revisions were required for the section.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT “CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS PROCESS SECTION” OF THE PROPOSED STARKVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN GUIDELINES

Next there came before the Commission a discussion of the draft “Certificate of Appropriateness Process” section of the proposed Starkville historic preservation design guidelines. There was a short discussion regarding colors used on the flowchart and it was suggested that the chart use a yellow color for the “not required” boxes and perhaps a blue color for the “required” box. There was also discussion regarding the conflict between the enabling ordinance (6 months) and the section for the expiration of a COA on the proposed application form (1 year). Mr. Griffith stated that Mr. Preziosi had just forwarded a revised draft section of the COA Process section and that perhaps the Commissioners should review the newly revised section before the next meeting. Commissioner Jones suggested that the Commission table discussion of this section due to the number of revisions required. The Commission unanimously decided to table discussion of the section until the next meeting so they could review the revised section provided by Mr. Preziosi.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT “QUICK REFERENCE” SECTION OF THE PROPOSED STARKVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN GUIDELINES

Next there came before the Commission a discussion of the draft “Quick Reference” section of the proposed Starkville historic preservation design guidelines. Commissioner Jones suggested that the fourth line of the chart on page 158 for “Change in siding material from wood to brick veneer or stucco” should require approval by the SHPC and the Commissioners unanimously agreed. A lengthy discussion regarding the “Roofing” section of the table at the top of page 159 began next and the Commissioners decided that they should consider this section further and perhaps add a third section, but did not offer any suggestions for verbiage at that time. Commissioner Sullivan suggested that the “Installation of storm windows” section on page 159 and the “Installation of an exterior storm door” section on page 160 should have “Does not require approval of the SHPC” in their respective “Action Required” columns, and the Commissioners unanimously agreed. Commissioner Jones suggested that the “Action Required” column for the “Installation of shutters on a building that does not currently have shutters” section at the top of page 161 should be revised to read: “Requires approval of the SHPC through the COA process.” Vice-Chairman Hamilton suggested that the “Repairing of existing porches, including replacing damaged components, with the same material” section at the bottom of page 161 should have “No COA approval required” in the “Action Required” column and the Commissioners unanimously agreed. Another discussion began regarding the “Installation of a new fence or wall” section at the bottom of page 162. It was unanimously agreed by the Commission to add the words “where visible from the street” at the end of that sentence for clarification and to be consistent with that particular section of the proposed design guidelines.

PLANNER REPORT

City Planner Ben Griffith reported that the MDAH recommendation of approval of the downtown historic district had been forwarded to Washington, DC, and that they were now waiting for final

approval. He stated that Assistant City Planner Pamela Daniel had attended the “Historic Preservation Boot Camp” training the previous week and that there had only been about 15 attendees. Mr. Griffith asked for some clarification regarding the election of officers memo he would be preparing for the next meeting. Finally, Mr. Griffith reminded the Commissioners to be mindful of all *ex parte* communications and to contact the Planning Office with any questions regarding any items on upcoming agendas.

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that there was no further business to discuss, Vice-Chairman Hamilton adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:45 PM. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be Tuesday, July 25, 2012 at 5:30 PM.

Maxine Hamilton, Vice-Chairman

Ben Griffith, AICP, City Planner