

**MINUTES  
CITY OF AMES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Date: July 11, 2022	Edith Hunter	2023
	Susan Minks	2024
Call to Order: 6:00PM	Angie Kolz	2024
Place: Council Chambers	Mary Jo Winder	2024
	Matt Oakley*	2023
Adjournment: 8:16PM	Jesse David Chariton	2023
	Rosemary Dale	2025

[\*Absent]

CALL TO ORDER: Susan Minks, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: (Kolz /Dale) to approve the Agenda for the meeting of July 11, 2022.

*MOTION PASSED: (6-0)*

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAY 09, 2022:

MOTION: (Chariton /Hunter) to approve the Minutes of the meeting of MAY 09, 2022.

*MOTION PASSED: (6-0)*

---

PUBLIC FORUM: There were no public comments.

---

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR 802 BURNETT AVENUE**

Eloise Sahlstrom, Ames City Planner, gave a summary of the application that came in for a brick fence with extended features in the rear yard at 802 Burnett Avenue. She noted the house came before the Commission in 2018 for the front porch and other features that are now complete. Ms. Sahlstrom noted the proposed low hip brick wall would be detached from the home. The applicant noted the features of his request as a stone patio, appurtenances including a low hip brick wall (which the Planning Department considers to be a fence), a trellis consisting of three brick columns with inwardly stretching arms. The proposed elements would be in the rear yard, detached from the historic home. Chapter 31 does not regulate patios but does have regulations on the proposed fence.

Ms. Sahlstrom described the Zoning District the house is in. She noted the east and west setbacks are non-conforming. Ms. Sahlstrom noted this proposal would not extend the non-conformity. She explained what features are allowed in the setback, and said patios and fences are allowed. She said there are no compatibility standards that apply to patios or fences., A Certificate of Appropriateness can be granted administratively for fences in certain cases. The Planning director can refer applications to the Commission for review.

Ms. Sahlstrom noted the proposed structures will be visible from the street since the house sits on a corner lot. She described in more detail the beams and features of the patio. Chapter 31 does not include brick in the list of approved materials but brick is a material that has been used historically. The brick the applicant would use is from the porch reconstruction for their property. She commented she thought this would fall under the category of Other Fence Design. She noted elements of the design would reflect elements of the front porch. If the proposed columns are considered part of the Certificate of Appropriateness, they could not be more than six feet tall. Ms. Sahlstrom noted that the Planning staff believes the extended height of the trellis columns does not meet the fence criteria.

Rosemary Dale, Commission member, asked if the intent of the proposed trellis arms was to cover them in greenery. The applicant, Mr. Kolz, replied that in the future, they may be. The main intent was to define a sense of place.

Mary Jo Winder, Commission member, asked Ms. Sahlstrom if it was correct that the Commission cannot approve the height of the columns due to the zoning requirements. Ms. Sahlstrom replied that was correct. Jesse David Chariton, Commission member, asked if the proposed features need to be labeled differently by Planning, rather than redesigned. Ms. Sahlstrom replied that it is staff's opinion that it is a fence.

Ms. Winder said she would call it a new addition to a historic building. She said if the Commission approves what is proposed, Zoning would not be able to approve the height. She asked what would happen if the Commission approved it. Ms. Sahlstrom indicated that the options available to the Commission were listed in the Alternatives.

Mr. Chariton asked if the feature would be a fence if it was attached to the house. Ms. Sahlstrom replied that it would still be called a fence, and it is easier to review and approve since it is not attached.

Ms. Minks said pergolas and arbors have not been reviewed yet by the Commission. Ms. Sahlstrom said in 2012 there was one reviewed, but the code was revised in 2015. She said since that time there have not been any submittals for arbors or pergolas. Ms. Minks said in looking at the diagram the pillars mimic the front porch of the house. She said from the brick pier above it seems to be landscaping elements. She said it seems more like a pergola element and that the fencing is the brick wall and piers.

Ms. Hunter said she does not think there is anything on the masonry side that would go against code. Ms. Sahlstrom showed slides or pictures of arbors, pergolas, lattices, and trellises.

Dan Kolz, owner of 802 Burnett Avenue, said the idea was to echo the design of the front porch of the house. He said in his mind the features did not seem to be a fence. He commented if he

could not have it as shown, he could detach the trellis from the other feature to make it separate.

Ms. Minks asked if the angled part of the trellis would be at the same angle as the front porch. Mr. Kolz said it is supposed to match the mudroom in the back of the house.

Mr. Chariton asked how the uprights would be constructed. Mr. Kolz described they would be designed to provide stability to the structure.

Ms. Winder commented that this is difficult to evaluate. She thought the design differentiates from the neighborhood and would look good when constructed. Ms. Minks said the color of the columns in the rear yard matched the trim on the house.

Ms. Hunter commented that former Commission member, Ted Grevstad-Nordbrock, thought homes in the Historic District should honor the historic content but also be livable.

Ms. Minks then read aloud and discussed the alternatives in the staff report.

Ms. Winder asked Ms. Sahlstrom to clarify Alternative two. Ms. Sahlstrom explained in more detail Alternative's two and four.

Ms. Hunter commented she thought the height requirements were more for visibility, but this project did not seem to affect visibility at all.

MOTION: (Winder/Dale) to approve Alternative four to refer this request back to City Staff and the applicant for more information, by having this request go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for approval.

*MOTION PASSED: (5-0) Angie Kolz abstained from voting.*

---

## **REVIEW OF CHAPTER 31, SECTIONS 31.7 – 31.9**

Ms. Minks read Section 31.7, the proposed changes that would be for clarity, and the corresponding staff comments. She went on to item 1, subsections A through E and read the corresponding staff recommendation.

Ms. Sahlstrom asked if regarding item 1, if the topic of diverse ownership is discussed anywhere else. She said she thought the chapter should note that it could be a single owner or diverse owners. Ms. Sahlstrom commented the Commission could come back to this question later. Ms. Winder said she thought the ownership did not have anything to do with a District and could be misconstrued.

Ms. Minks noted the sub areas under item 1 are criteria of what would make a nomination appropriate. Ms. Sahlstrom noted the difference between a building and a structure. She also made a comment on wording of principal structures. She did not think the word "buildings" needed to be added. Ms. Minks moved on to item D on contributing buildings and structures. Ms. Minks said they could take out the word "buildings" to align with C.

Mr. Chariton asked if the line about a property being 50 years old is required to be included. Ms. Winder indicated that yes, otherwise it would have to be of exceptional standard. Ms. Minks said item E recommends striking the size restrictions. Ms. Minks read staff comments about this item.

Ms. Winder asked why there was a size limit. Ms. Sahlstrom explained why the minimum of two acres was included. Ms. Winder discussed a landmark being a specific property and noted she was concerned about the lower number being set at two acres.

Ms. Minks asked if they needed size limits for the Historic Districts. Ms. Winder said she thought they should not be limiting it in either direction.

Ms. Hunter commented that the Old Town District is forty-seven acres. Mr. Chariton commented on item D and how an exception could occur. Ms. Minks said she did not think there is a way for something less than 50 years old to have an exception made.

Ms. Minks went to on to number two and noted the elements A & B. She asked about keeping language consistent on what a structure is. Ms. Hunter said based on the definitions of buildings and structures, the language needs to be added.

Ms. Minks went on to Section 31.8 and said there are sections 1 and 2. She said item one had A through H. She read what requirements would be needed in a submission. She then discussed petition language and staff comments. Ms. Sahlstrom asked a question about owners or property owners and asked if the Commission wanted to add language regarding City Council having the ability to initiate or propose a submission without property owners initiating.

Ms. Winder said a possibility would be that with a survey, a property could be eligible for the National Register. She said the Commission could then recommend to City Council that they nominate it for the National Register. Ms. Sahlstrom commented on the use of the word "petition" and suggested using another word.

Ms. Sahlstrom brought up item H and said Planning's question would be if the design guidelines might include something about vegetation which would not include Old Town as written now. She discussed why design guidelines would be proposed. Ms. Winder commented she thought the Commission was moving to having a standard set of guidelines that was separate from Chapter 31. Ms. Winder commented on design guidelines and wanting to simplify and consolidate them.

Ms. Dale asked if they thought these guidelines would change as districts did their own surveys. Ms. Winder said she thought it could be edited but would stay the same overall.

Ms. Minks went on to section two in 31.8. She suggested the Commission change language on landmarks and City Council could be a proposer. She said there was a comment from staff on boundary descriptions.

She then went to 31.9. She said there are two items and read what they were. She read comments from staff on the item. Ms. Sahlstrom commented that SHPO normally would review any edits to Chapter 31.

Ms. Minks suggested they just do Section 10 at the next meeting as it is a large section, and everyone agreed.

Ms. Kolz commented on adding Property Owner to petition for signatures for landmark. She discussed adding something about owner petitioning for it to not be landmark.

---

### **CLG GRANT UPDATE**

Ms. Sahlstrom said things are progressing well. She said the students are on board and doing well. She included in the report for the State the process the city followed to hire the students.

Ms. Hunter asked how many students the city hired. Ms. Sahlstrom replied two students were hired. Ms. Minks said she hoped the students would have an opportunity to do a presentation to the Commission when the survey is complete.

---

### **NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF PRESERVATION COMMISSIONS-MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSION**

Ms. Winder said she spoke with Ms. Baker-Latimer and that she would be the one filling out the application. If the Historic Preservation Commission joins the National Alliance, each commission member would get the publication. She said the cost was under \$150 since the cost was based on the population of the city applying.

MOTION: (Kolz/Chariton) to use a portion of the Historic Preservation Commission budget to become members of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.

*MOTION PASSED: (6-0)*

---

### **COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

Ms. Minks said at the next commission meeting she would like to discuss the 2022 Work Plan and if there might be other things the Commission could add to work on this fall.

Ms. Winder discussed the Preserve Iowa Summit she attended in June. She talked more about sustainability in the City's Climate Action Plan, and she thought the Commission should have input in that plan.

---

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

Ms. Sahlstrom noted that she sent a document to the Commission about changes to the Downtown Façade grant program. Ms. Minks commented the Commission would like to be made aware when items for the Downtown Façade Grant Program go to council.

### **MOTION TO ADJOURN:**

MOTION: (Winder/Chariton) to adjourn the meeting at 8:16PM.

*MOTION PASSED: (6-0)*

The meeting adjourned at 8:16PM.

*Susan Minks*

---

Susan Minks, Chairperson  
Historic Preservation Commission

*Laura Colebrooke*

---

Laura Colebrooke, Recording Secretary  
Department of Planning & Housing