

The Minutes of the City of Ocean Springs  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Thursday, October 14, 2021

1. Call meeting to order

A meeting of the City of Ocean Springs Historic Preservation Commission was called to order by Chairman Joanna Worch at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 14, 2021. Members present were Michael Burns, Matthew Pavlov, Carlos Barbosa, and Charlene Roemer. Karen Chewning and Michael Doster were absent. Also present were Wade Morgan, City Planner, and Amanda Moser, Planning/Grants Coordinator.

2. Old Business

3. New Business

- a) 505 Washington Avenue / PID# 60137230.000 – Tall Architects – Request for Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to construct an education pavilion building.

Madison Tally, Tall Architects, introduced the proposal. Madison handed out renderings of the proposed building.

M. Pavlov entered the meeting.

J. Worch asked about the blue-looking grass on one side. M. Talley explained it is meant to a children's room to transition to the outside landscaping. J. Worch asked if the building will be seen easily, or mostly hidden behind the front cottage. M. Tally explained the structure will be mostly hidden.

C. Barbosa expressed his feelings on the proposal not being historical at all. He loves the design, but is adamantly opposed to the agreeing to the fact that it could fit in a historical district in any way. J. Worch added clarification of preserving historical buildings as well as adding newer style structures to incorporate today's world with the historic.

Julian Rank, Executive Director of the Walter Anderson Museum, applicant, addressed the commission. He spoke of the intent of the project and museums being more modern in general. M. Pavlov added ne buildings can be constructed and incorporated, but the façade should keep within the historic area and feel.

M. Burns agrees a separation should be between the old and the new, however, the corrugated [metal] siding, he, "doesn't see a difference." He also noted the new

structure proposes two (2) commercial stories, and feels it will be seen from, “every beacon,” [in the city]. He asked how tall the structure is projected to be. M. Talley replied 30 feet.

M. Talley explained she wasn’t under the impression that the construction, “ didn’t necessarily have to ‘fit’,” because it was behind the cottage. C. Barbosa clarified that every meeting there are discussions on type of materials are used for windows, door, etc. and no part of this proposal fits any of those descriptions.

J. Worch expressed her concern of the 30 ft. proposed height of the new construction.

A motion was made by C. Roemer seconded by to recommend tabling the request for a COA for 505 Washington Avenue to allow the applicants an opportunity to consider making some changes to their application. The motion was carried unanimously.

- b)** 501 Rayburn Avenue / PID# 60137584.000 – Tall Architects – Request for COA to demolish the existing single-family residence and construct a new residence.

M. Tally introduced the proposal. A COA was recently approved to renovate the primary structure, however, due to FEMA regulations, the best course is to demolish the existing structure and construct a new single-family residence. The elevations will match the dwellings across the street on Cleveland.

J. Worch asked what the elevation will be. M. Tally answered top-of-floor elevation will be 21 ft. The style will be compatible in gable, etc.

M. Burns asked the elevation from the lot to the bottom of the first floor. M. Talley explained it is elevated due to FEMA regulations. She believes it is ten (10) ft.

Materials were discussed: Hardi siding, metal roof, aluminum-clad windows, screening element on the bottom of the house, and a gabled roof.

C. Barbosa inquired of the window placements and their historical value. J. Worch added if an Ishee house were to be approved, there would be a few quirks that would be incorporated, not necessarily historical-style.

A motion was made by M. Pavlov seconded by C. Roemer to recommend approval of the COA. The motion was carried unanimously.

- c)** 1101 Iberville Drive / PID# 60119164.000 – Kim Mitchell – Request for COA to add a 9’x9’ deck with handrails, move two (2) windows for an addition, and replace an existing door with a window.

Chris Hase, Versmax, contractor for the applicant introduced the proposal. Two (2) existing windows will become a door, and one (1) existing door will become a window. J. Worch asked if most of the work is in the back or front of the structure. C. Hase explained some is on the back and some is on the west (left) and east (right) sides. The intent is to have four rentable units on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and the owners will live upstairs.

J. Worch asked what materials will be used. The proposed door will be single-wide to match the double-wide on the front. He added it will be wood and most likely will be custom made.

A motion was made by C. Roemer seconded by M. Pavlov to recommend approval of the COA for 1101 Iberville Drive per the application with the added requirement of the door material be similar to the existing front door.

J. Worch noted a deck will be constructed [on the west side]. The contractor confirmed the material will be KDAT pine and painted to duplicate the front porch.

C. Roemer added to her motion the deck which will be similar in appearance to the existing deck. The motion was carried unanimously.

**d) 107 Iberville Landing Drive / PID# 61155004.000 – Craig Smith – Request for COA to construct a new single-family residence.**

Craig Smith, contractor for the applicant introduced the proposal. It will be an elevated house using Hardi plank and brick. The roof will be galvalume - silver. The porch will be constructed using Aeratis materials. The windows will be Anderson clad with the front door to match. The house will be painted white dove and the brick style has not been decided on.

A motion was made by M. Burns seconded by M. Pavlov to recommend approval of a COA for the construction of a dwelling at 107 Iberville Landing Drive as described in the application and the plans included with the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

#### 4. Approval of Minutes

**a) August 12, 2021**

A motion was made by C. Roemer seconded by M. Burns to recommend approval of the minutes as submitted. The motion was carried unanimously.

#### 5. Administrative Approval

6. Audience Request

7. Adjourn

A motion was made by C. Roemer seconded by M. Pavlov to adjourn the meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.