

MINUTES

The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review

Thursday, July 14, 2016 ~ 5:30 PM

City Hall Council Chambers

Board Members Attendance: Sarah Love, Ray Trail, Will Ringo, Joshua Turner, Thomas Koenig, and Brad Steinecke.

Absent Board Members: Carolyn Schoepf and Al Jolly.

City Staff: Natalia Rosario, Planner III; Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant; and Martin Meek, Preservation Specialist.

Mrs. Love, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. and stated the hearing procedures. Mrs. Love recognized the six Board Members currently present constituted a quorum, and she proceeded with the guidelines for the procedure of the meeting.

Mr. Ringo moved to approve the Agenda for tonight's meeting; and he was seconded by Mr. Trail. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Disposition of the minutes from the June 9, 2016 Meeting of the Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review.

Mr. Turner moved to approve the minutes from the June 9, 2016 Meeting, and was seconded by Mr. Koenig. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Old Business:

Election of Vice-Chair of the Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review.

Mr. Steinecke nominated Mr. Trail as Vice-Chair, and there were no other nominations. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

New Business:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work – Consider the installation of a six (6') foot by twelve (12') foot wooden deck and steps off side back door. Property located at 526 South Irwin Avenue, owned by Mr. Eugene Spiess.

Ms. Rosario came forward and was sworn; and she submitted the report the Board Members had previously received in their meeting packets, as well as the slides and presentation into evidence as Exhibit A. She explained to the Board Members the owner would like to install a wooden deck and steps located in the sideyard of the property near the southern property line. Since a portion of the proposed deck is visible from the public right-of-way, it falls under the purview of the Board. The proposed structure is a six (6') foot by twelve (12') foot wooden deck measuring not more than 24" from the ground, and therefore would not require a handrail. Slides were shown in order to better illustrate the request. She explained on one of the slides was a wooden guardrail the Building Department had required the home owner to put up to protect the staircase that went down to the basement area for safety precautions.

Ms. Rosario went over the following list of criteria for the Board Members to consider when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness that they also received in their meeting packets; and she explained as follows:

1. *The character and appropriateness of the design* – The installation of the proposed deck is appropriate for the design of the structure and the layout of the house. Being situated in the side yard beside the house and recessed along the back length of the home ensures that the deck's construction will not negatively impact the main features of the house from the front or the side. The deck will be stepped down from the door and will not exceed 26" in height. A wooden guardrail around the staircase entry that leads down into the basement as required by building codes will limit visibility of the structure as well. According to the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts & Landmarks, the proposed accessory structure is in keeping with the guidelines as stated in Section 6.3.1 *Additions to Historic Buildings*:

Section 6.3.1: Additions to Historic Buildings

- Additions to historic buildings shall not be added to the main historic façade or facades of the building. Locate the proposed addition away from the principal public view, possibly to the rear of the building. Respect the proportions of the building to which it is being added, so the addition does not dominate its historic environment. Do not obscure character-defining features of the historic building with the addition.

- Additions must respect the character and integrity of the original buildings and should incorporate design motifs that relate it to the historic building. No matter what its design, it should be of quality workmanship and materials. The addition should be designed so that at a later date it could be removed without compromising the historic character of the building.
 - While the addition should be compatible, it is acceptable and appropriate for the addition to be clearly discernible as an addition rather than appearing to be an original part of the building. Consider providing some differentiation in material, color, and/or detailing and setting additions back from the historic building's wall plane.
2. *The scale of the buildings* – The proposed addition does not interrupt the scale of the buildings.
 3. *The texture and materials* – The proposed deck structure consists of wood material.
 4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – There are homes within the district that currently have uncovered decks that are either in compliance with the Design Guidelines, or not. The proposed deck structure is fitting with the historic characteristic of the property and the overall district.
 5. *If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District* – The proposed deck will be harmonious to the surrounding structures and will not detract from the house, surrounding structures, or historic district.

Staff's Analysis:

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed deck structure is appropriate for the property and meets the intent of the Design Guidelines with regard to the additions to historic buildings. Therefore Staff recommends approval of the Applicant's request to place the proposed wooden deck and steps on the property meeting all zoning and building set back requirements as stated.

Mr. Eugene Spiess of 516 Semillon Lane, Moore, SC came forward and was sworn. He said to clarify the slide Ms. Rosario had just referred to regarding a guard rail; that it was not so much a guard rail, but a rail that would have one inch pickets that was required by the Building Department regarding safety. He referenced another slide in order to show the way it was when he bought the home; and the City had asked that something more substantial be put up instead of two by fours. When he purchased the house the steps were not there; but he had to install temporary steps before he could get insurance on the property. He referenced a small inset on the other side of the proposed deck dimensions and said if the Board Members wanted him to take the deck all the way to encompass the inset area he would be happy to do that which would make the deck between thirteen/fourteen feet instead of twelve feet; and he explained he would have a rail around it.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Steinecke asked Mr. Spiess about the pickets. Mr. Spiess explained regarding safety issues there would be one inch pickets every three to four inches.
- Mr. Trail asked would he be planning a hand rail down the steps. Mr. Spiess said the City indicated it was not a requirement. The only reason he was not considering it was due to getting things down the stairwell for storage.
- Mr. Trail asked how far the top rail was before the inset area. Mr. Spiess said it was probably about eighteen to twenty inches.
- Mrs. Love felt that leaving that little bit of space may become awkward at some point and felt he should take it all the way over.
- Mr. Turner felt it would look better aesthetically if he encompassed the inset area.
- Mr. Trail said he believed the actual deck would not be high enough to require a rail. Mr. Spiess explained he planned to put a rail around it with pickets to match.
- Mr. Steinecke asked if the foundation of the deck would show at all. Mr. Spiess explained he planned to put in posts.

- Mr. Koenig asked was there a requirement to have steps down from the deck. Mr. Spiess explained there needed to be three steps, according to Code.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request, or in opposition to come forward. No one came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

Mr. Koenig made a motion to approve the request as the property owner had verbally amended to make the deck between thirteen to fourteen feet long in the side yard of the property in order to match the wall of house where it juts out into the side yard, rather than the proposed twelve feet in length, which would not extend to the existing break in the wall; and he was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the June 9, 2016 Meeting – Natalia Rosario.

Ms. Rosario said all the Board Members had received the list of the approved Minor Works by Staff since the June 9, 2016 meeting.

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mrs. Roland welcomed new Board Member Brad Steinecke to the HARB Board; and she said there was still one vacant position on the Board.

Mrs. Roland updated the Board Members regarding their Continued Education Training Credits for 2016.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.



Sarah Love, Chair

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant