

**MINUTES**  
**The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review**  
**Thursday, August 11, 2016 ~ 5:30 PM**  
**City Hall Council Chambers**

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

Absent Board Members: Carolyn Schoepf.

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. Steinecke 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.

**Old Business:**

There was no old business for discussion.

**New Business:**

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work – Consider permission to replace all of the twenty-two (22) original windows on the house as follows: Four (4) metal windows (two, twenty-paned metal windows and two (2) ten-paned metal windows, and eighteen (18) wooden windows (six over six paned); and all windows are being proposed for replacement with either wood or vinyl windows due to the fact they are either painted shut or in disrepair. Property located at 500 Pinckney Court, owned by Henry M. Foster.**

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, and a material cost sheet that was presented to each Board Member tonight as Exhibit B. She explained to the Board Members the owner would like to replace twenty-two windows on the house at 500 Pinckney Court in Hampton Heights with wooden windows. Ms. Rosario showed some slides of the house in order to show all of the windows; and she explained that eighteen wooden windows on the sides and rear of the house were original to the house; and that the four metal casement windows located on the front of the house (2 of which were 20 paned windows) and (2 of which were 10 paned windows) were probably not original, but had probably been replaced at a previous point in time. Ms. Rosario explained that regarding the four metal casement windows on the front of the house, that those type windows were very drafty and would break very easily, and that the light pattern was more important regarding those windows than the actual material; and she said Staff would recommend the four windows on the front of the house be replaced with the same paned windows that were on the front of the house.

[Editor's Note: Board Member Al Jolly arrived to the meeting at 5:35 P.M].

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 proposed replacement windows for the 6-over-6 paned style maintain the light pattern created by the current windows. The owner has proposed to replace the 20 and 10 paned windows with a different material (wood instead of metal), and the City Historic Preservation Consultant has advised that maintaining the light pattern created by these window styles is of utmost importance, along with the appropriate historic materials. According to the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts & Landmarks, the proposed window replacement must be in keeping with the guidelines as stated in Section 8.1.4 *Windows*.

**Section 8.1.4 Windows**

- Existing windows, including window sash, glass, lintels, sills, frames, molding, shutters, and all hardware shall be retained and repaired through routine maintenance whenever possible. When deteriorated elements must be replaced, new materials shall be compatible with original materials in terms of material, design and hardware. If it is necessary to replace an entire window, the replacement shall be sized to the original opening and shall duplicate all proportions and configurations of the original window.

- The addition of storm windows shall be accomplished without seriously compromising original window appearance. Storm windows shall not damage original window frames and shall be removable at a later date.
2. *The scale of the buildings* – Since the proposed window replacement does not propose to alter the scale of the openings on the house, the fenestration will remain the same.
  3. *The texture and materials* – The proposed windows will be made of wood and compatible to the historic period of the home's construction.
  4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – There are homes within the district that currently have original features such as the windows found at 500 Pinckney Court. The proposed changes are compatible with the historic characteristics 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 window replacements will keep the house harmonious to the surrounding structures but because the windows on the home are original to the house and are not in such a state of disrepair as to warrant total replacement instead of renovation, the proposed changes will serve to remove some of the historic value from the home.

Staff's Analysis:

Staff is of the opinion that not all of the proposed window replacements are the appropriate changes to make at this time, in order to preserve the historic character of the home. As the windows are original to the home and are not in such a state of disrepair that they require complete replacement, Staff advises that the homeowner seek out a repair service that can repair the issues with the windows (repair the weight and pulley systems, remove paint where it prevents the window from opening) before acting to remove and replace them all. Building Code does require that each bedroom in the home have at least one working operable window to serve as a fire escape in case of emergency. Additionally, the metal windows in the front of the home have been judged to add more value due to their window and light pattern than their material, which is thin and drafty, in addition to having been painted shut.

Therefore Staff recommends partial approval of the Applicant's request to remove and replace the windows on the home as follows: approval to repair or replace the two (2) twenty-paned metal windows and the two (2) ten-paned metal windows with metal or wooden materials, maintaining the same pane and light pattern as it has today, as well as approval to replace one (1) window in each bedroom to ensure fire safety. The house has four (4) bedrooms – plus the four (4) windows on the front of the house, Staff recommends approval for removal and replacement of eight (8) windows on the property, meeting all zoning and building set back requirements as stated.

Ms. Rosario informed the Board Members Staff was currently in the process of gathering information of finding companies or people to either fix the windows that could be fixed, or replace them with the proper materials. She explained the home owner was willing to do whatever the HARB asked; and that he could not be here tonight, but had asked Martin Meek to represent him at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Martin Meek the City of Spartanburg's Preservation Consultant came forward and was sworn. He explained the metal windows were more than likely a Post World-War II replacement window to what was originally on the house; which was a modern advanced window used right after the War. They were slightly warped and the latches did not work well; and he said from his personal experience in having them himself, they were very drafty and he thought they could look at the replacement of those. He explained that all of the other windows were wood, the condition was not deteriorated beyond repair and the house had been pretty well maintained over the years. Mr. Meek did not feel they could support the removal of that many historic fabric windows.

Board Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Koenig asked Mr. Meek if the homeowner wished to replace all the windows. Mr. Meek said the homeowner would like to replace all of the windows over the next year. Mr. Meek said he felt there was a six month limit on an approval; and if he was planning to replace the ones on the front first, and then more windows later the permit would be expired before he might get around to doing that, and then he would be back in front of the Board.

- Mr. Koenig mentioned they had said one window per bedroom needed to be operable; and he wondered if there was an insulation or efficiency issue. Mr. Meek explained the bedroom windows and all of the windows with the exception of the four on the front of the house were wooden, single-paned windows.
- Mr. Koenig asked was there any alternative to replacing the window that would accomplish the same thing. Mr. Meek explained there were techniques and there was a really good Department of the Interior Preservation Brief regarding repairing windows. Mr. Meek explained there were a number of companies that could be used to restore and replace windows.
- Mr. Koenig asked about the cost. Mr. Meek said it would probably be expensive.
- Mr. Jolly felt it would be very expensive.
- Mrs. Love explained they had windows replaced at their house and it was a lot cheaper to repair them than to replace them. She said the windows did not look to be in that bad of shape, and cutting them loose was not that hard of a task.
- Mr. Meek agreed with Mrs. Love; and he said a lot of the weights and ropes and rope channels were still intact.
- Mr. Trail asked if any of the windows opened. Mr. Meek said they did not try to open the windows.
- Mr. Steinecke asked Mr. Meek if they were able to see the windows from the inside of the house. Mr. Meek explained he and Ms. Rosario had inspected the windows from the inside. He said the homeowner could not get any of the windows opened.
- Mr. Steinecke asked other than being painted shut did they notice any obvious condition issues with the sashes, etc. Mr. Meek said no; that he felt the windows were in pristine condition in his opinion.
- Mr. Trail felt it may be just a matter of removing the paint and cutting them loose.
- Mr. Ringo asked if he knew the motivation behind the owner to replace the windows. Mr. Meek felt it was more advertising by window replacement companies that motivated a lot of people.
- Mr. Steinecke felt if the owner was noticing problems with the casement windows and drafts on the front, he may just assume all the windows need to be replaced.
- Mr. Meek explained the real problem with the windows was the casement windows.
- Mr. Steinecke asked Mr. Meek a question regarding the pane configuration of the metal casement windows being original; and he wondered if they should keep the same pane configuration.
- Mr. Meek referenced a slide and he explained they really had more than one style going on in this home; and since they could not find an original photograph so far regarding the original windows; he felt the configuration of metal window panes were the original configuration.
- Mr. Koenig asked if you could find a replacement window with that many panes.
- Mr. Meek said the interesting thing about those metal windows was that they had a lug on the frame which probably extended into the original wooden frame.
- Mr. Jolly asked a question; and Mr. Meek said that was what made him suspicious was they had a wooden frame and a casement window. He said normally originals were laid in to the stone or masonry.
- Mr. Jolly explained they were laid into the rock.
- Mr. Meek felt that look (pane) probably extended to a newer wood window as well.
- Mr. Steinecke wondered regarding the front windows, if the original casing could have been 6 over 6.
- Mr. Meek said they could measure the wood frame and see if it matches the size of the 6 over 6's.
- Mr. Steinecke said visually it looked about the same.

- Mr. Jolly referenced the smaller casement windows and explained if you did not make them casement windows it may not be proportional. He felt a casement window needed to be put back into the home; or it could be fixed with no operational parts.
- Mr. Jolly wondered if they were looking at the original woodwork on the outside of all of the double hung windows. He explained that the casing looked strange.
- Mr. Meek said they had been skimmed over with vinyl; and that what they would do would be a replacement sash and leave the original framing intact.
- Mr. Jolly explained there was a lot of casing on some of the frames that was not in replacement windows; and explained they needed to explain to the home owner he needed to keep his frames the same size if he went with replacement windows.
- Mr. Meek explained what they normally would do would be the replacement sash, and leave the original framing intact.
- Mrs. Love said it really did not seem like it was necessary to replace the wooden windows, but rather repair them, and maybe address the metal casement windows on the front of the house.
- Mr. Koenig wondered if they had confirmed they were after World War II.
- Mr. Meek said they could probably document that if they went to ownership of this house; and he really believed it had changed ownership sometime around 1946.
- Mr. Koenig asked another question regarding the panes; and Mr. Jolly explained how the casement windows were made; and the metal casement windows were not worth repairing.
- Ms. Rosario said the owner wanted to go with a replacement window on the front that looked like the casement window with the same configuration, but with wood instead of metal.
- Mr. Ringo asked was it common to have different styles of windows installed on a house at this time period.
- Mr. Meek explained there was different styles of architecture in the same house.
- Mrs. Love said it seemed to her that the question was do they say repair what they have, repair the back part of the house and replace the front. She also felt the front windows as they had discussed earlier tonight had been on the house now longer than the originals would have been; so did they want to say he should replace the front windows with exactly what was there.
- Mr. Trail felt that a wooden window to replace the ones on the front would be more accurate to what was on the front of the house.
- Mr. Meek explained there was some companies that had a wooden casement window with an exterior muntin that looked just like the metal.
- Mr. Koenig asked would the wooden window make that much difference regarding energy loss.
- Mrs. Love explained she had recently read an article regarding different types of windows versus energy loss; and did not think it made that much difference.
- Mr. Jolly explained during the time the metal casement windows were being used, they were considered a hot item and they worked. He did not believe anything had been taken into account the metal casement windows would lose energy like they did; and he explained no one thought anything about the cost of energy because it was so cheap.

Mr. Steinecke made a motion that the Board encourage the Home Owner to repair the wooden windows on the home; but that they allow for the replacement of the four metal casement windows with wooden windows of the same paned configuration that existed now; and he was seconded by Mr. Trail.

Discussion of Motion:

- Mr. Jolly said he was concerned about the bedroom windows.

- Mrs. Love said the homeowner had to repair those as such that at least one bedroom window be operable per bedroom.
- Mr. Meek said that needed to be added to the motion.

Mr. Steinecke made an amended motion that the Board encourage the Home Owner to repair the wooden windows on the home with the condition that at least one window be operable per bedroom through repair; and that they allow for the replacement of the four metal casement windows on the front of the house with the same paned configuration as what was on the front now; and he was seconded by Mr. Turner.

Discussion of Motion:

- Mr. Jolly said what about the length of time the motion carried.
- Mr. Meek said six months was how long the application was valid; and if the work was not completed within six months it would need to come back before the Board Members. Mr. Meek said he felt they were trying to say was the homeowner would replace the front windows right away, and have the other work done as they saw fit because the other was not considered a Major Work.

After more discussion regarding what was considered Major and Minor Works regarding time frames, etc.; Mr. Steineck re-stated his amended motion to allow for the replacement of the metal casement windows in the front of the home with wooden windows of a like paned configuration and to allow for the repair of the wooden windows throughout the rest of the home, with the condition that at least one window per bedroom be operable; and he was seconded by Mr. Ringo. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

**Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the July 14, 2016 Meeting – Natalia Rosario.**

Ms. Rosario said all the Board Members had received the list of the approved Minor Works by Staff since the July 14, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Jolly asked Mr. Meek a question regarding storm doors and windows. Mr. Meek explained that storm windows and doors could be approved as a Minor Work.

**STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Ms. Rosario informed the Board Members on August 8, 2016, the Mayor and Council approved the Solar Panels request to amend the Guidelines (to be considered as a Major and/or Minor Works) on First Reading, and that a Second/Final Reading would be held August 22, 2016.

Mrs. Love explained there was still one Board Member vacancy on the Board.

Mrs. Roland said Joshua Turner received his New Board Member Training since recently being appointed; and Mr. Steinecke would have a year in which to take his training and she would work with him to get that scheduled.

Mrs. Roland said all the rest of the Board Members would need to get their continued education credits sometime before the end of the year.

Mrs. Love asked would the Preservation Conference for 2016 count as continued education, and whether some of the neighborhood sessions they had talked about having could be counted as continued education.

Mrs. Roland said she did not know regarding the neighborhood sessions. Mrs. Love said they may could write something up regarding that.

Mrs. Roland also said the County of Spartanburg would normally hold continued education training at their facility near the end of the year for County and City Board Members that needed their three continued education training credits.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah Love, Chair

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant