

The City of Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design & Historic Review
Thursday, March 11, 2021 at 5:30pm
Zoom Meeting Minutes

The Board of Architectural Design and Review (HARB) met via ZOOM on Thursday, March 11, 2021 at 5:30pm. The following Board members attended this meeting: Anne Rodrick, Kenneth Brown, Melissa Walker, Ray Trail, Josh Lonon, Meg Reid, and Brad Steinecke. Absent were Kathleen Crowley and Rhiannon Leebrick. Representing the Planning Department were Martin Livingston, Community Development Director, Emily Thomas, Planner I, and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.

Roll Call

Mr. Trail, the Chair, called the meeting to order and stated that notice of this meeting was posted and provided to the media 24 hours in advance as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

Mr. Trail said six of the nine members of the Board were present, constituting a quorum, and he went over the procedure for the meeting.

Ms. Rodrick moved approval of the Agenda for tonight's meeting; and she was seconded by Mr. Brown. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Old Business – None

New Business:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 262 Carlisle Street in the Hampton Heights Historic District (TMS # 7-12-14-194.00). Owner is seeking permission to demolish a dilapidated addition in the rear of the house on a property in the R-8/SFD zone district. Heather Morrow, Owner.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, staff has received their Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works to consider the permission to demolish a dilapidated addition in the rear of a house in Hampton Heights district, at 262 Carlisle Street. Heather Morrow is the owner. The owner of the above referenced property is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works to demolish 184 square foot addition in the rear of the house. The project site is located approximately 6,500 square foot lot in the Hampton Heights district. The site is located on Carlisle Street, approximately 215 feet from the end of the street. The site currently contains one single-family home and a rear addition, which is not original to the home. The applicant is seeking permission to remove the addition in the rear yard. The addition is in poor condition, past the point of rehabilitation. There's been a hole in the roof for multiple years, causing significant water damage to the interior of the structure. Located in the rear yard, the structure cannot be seen from the right-of-way at the front of the house. But it is not original to the house. The structure does not match the characteristics of the Hampton Heights or the house on the property. As it is not original to the house, that's the addition, the addition does not match the characteristics of the Hampton Heights or the house or the property. The current addition is 184 square feet with dilapidated siding and windows which do not share the same profile of the house. The addition measures 16 feet by 11.5 feet. The owner's proposing to construct a new deck in place of the addition with dimensions of six feet by 10 feet, built in the same place as the existing addition. The porch will not be visible from the right-of-way. Here's the location of the property, close to the end of the street. This is a turnaround at the end of Carlisle Street. This is the front of the house. We have approved minor works to begin making repairs to the home. This is the addition. Here are the conditions of the addition. It's in pretty poor shape. Here's another part of the addition. This entire addition will be removed, does not match the existing structure. The character of the existing addition does not match the character of the house, nor does it meet the design standards for the Hampton Heights Historic District. Furthermore, the addition's in a poor condition with a hole in the roof, which results in significant water damage within. A

portion of the exterior is missing and the floor is rotting. The deck that will replace the addition will be 60 square feet and hidden from the view of the public right-of-way or the front of the house. Addition does not have the same original siding and windows as the house. The siding is a different material in poor condition with plywood covering some areas. The windows have one-over-one pattern, differing from the three-over-one grid pattern of the original house windows right in the house. The addition is not original to the house and does not meet the historic guidelines for new structures. As a result, it does not share the features of the structures in the immediate surroundings. If the addition is demolished and replaced with the deck, the alteration would be harmonious with the historic district. Since the addition is not original to the house, the demolition will not interfere with the historic integrity of the property. Since the deck is not in view of the right-of-way or from the front of the house, it will be harmonious with the historic district. Staff is recommending approval. I'll answer any questions that you may have.

Board Questions for Staff:

Mr. Lonon said Martin, I'm curious. If you can't see this from the front of the house, why is it before the HARB.

Mr. Livingston said it's before the HARB because demolition is typically approved by the HARB.

Mr. Brown said I have a question. It's a very minor thing. In my reading of the staff report, I think there was a typo and I don't think it's a substantive one, but it says the house was built in 1977. I kind of think that's not correct, especially-

Mr. Livingston said that's the addition.

Mr. Brown said oh, the addition was built in '77. Maybe I misunderstood. Thank you.

Mr. Livingston said yeah, I believe so. That's the addition.

Mr. Brown said all right, thanks.

Mr. Trail said okay, do we have any other questions for Mr. Livingston. All right, if not, we will move to the applicant.

Mr. Livingston said yes, we have Heather Morrow on the line.

Ms. Morrow was sworn. She said yes, sir. I am renovating 262 Carlisle Street and ya'll know me, I'll save just about anything; but this is beyond repair, so much so that just to get it off the back of the house, we're going to have to use a bobcat. You can't get anywhere near it. But it's not original to the house. The next door neighbor actually remembers when it was built. He thinks in the '80s, but '77 could have been fine. But anyway, none of the materials match the original house and I just don't think it brings any value whatsoever and so I'm just seeking to completely demolish it. Then we'll put a little deck back where the original porch was.

Mr. Trail said okay. Thank you. Does anyone on the Board have any questions for Ms. Morrow. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Morrow. We'll move to public comments.

Ms. Morrow said thanks.

Mr. Trail said Mr. Livingston, do we have anyone from the public who would like to speak.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, I do not see any raised hands or anything in the chat at the moment.

Mr. Trail said Okay. All right. Having none, we'll close the public comment section of the meeting and return to the Board for deliberation. Any thoughts or motions on this project.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Walker said this seems like a pretty straightforward case to me and I would move approval as staff recommends.

Ms. Walker moved for approval of the proposal and was seconded by Ms. Rodrick. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 297 Hydrick Street in the Hampton Heights Historic District (TMS # 7-12-14-166.00). Owner is seeking permission to replace all window sashes while maintaining the original casings on the interior and trim of the exterior due to high levels of lead. David Maher, Applicant, on behalf of Hattie MacPolafox, Owner.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, members of the Boards, staff has received their Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works; permission to replace all window sashes while maintaining the original casings on the interior and trim on the exterior due to high levels of lead at this property. The applicant is David Maher on behalf of Hattie MacPolafox. This property is located on Hydrick Street about halfway between the corners of Beta Club Way and Carlisle Street. Site currently contains one single-family home built in the 1920's. The applicant would like to obtain the Board's permission to replace the sashes of all windows with similar materials and design. Due to its age, many components and area of the house have high concentrations of ongoing deterioration of lead paint that was originally used. The interior and exterior of all the windows have been tested for high lead levels and ongoing deterioration, which is causing lead dust and chips to spread throughout the house and surrounding property. The owner's 18 month old daughter lives in the home and has elevated blood levels due to these ongoing conditions. The owner has applied for our City's Lead Remediation Grant Program. In order to reduce the current lead levels where the child lives and plays, the window sashes would be replaced while maintaining the original casings of the interior and trim of the exterior. The new windows would replicate the same design as the original. The owner is requesting replacing the sashes with vinyl due to her economic hardships. The vinyl sashes will cost approximately \$8,600 to replace compared to the wood sashes, which will cost \$11,890 to replace. The more expensive option would take funding away from removal of lead from the other areas of the home and place a greater financial burden on the homeowner. However, if the vinyl sashes cannot be approved, the applicant is willing to use wood. There are two different options for the wood sashes. The first option is the Windsor Pine Windows for \$11,000 with the sashes built in. The second option is Windsor Pine Windows with Stick Grills for the \$10,785 with inserts to create the grid pattern. Both options would mimic the four-over-one grid pattern of the original windows and would be painted the same color. Mr. Livingston said Okay. So this is permission to replace all window sashes at 297 Hydrick Street. The property is located between Carlisle Street and Beta Club Way, mid-block. South Spring Street is on the other block. This is the view of the front of the house. You notice the four-over-one windows. Again, four-over-one windows. You can see the deterioration. This is what a vinyl window would look like if they were to replace vinyl windows, but they're going back with wood. Here's the wood window that they're recommending. We'll go through the items. The new window will contain the same four-over grid pattern as the original windows, maintaining the historic integrity of the design. The original wood material of the frame and casing will remain, but the sashes will be replaced with vinyl, which does not comply with the design guidelines. If they were to use wood, the material would be appropriate. The windows on the houses on the immediate vicinity, nearby properties, are a mix of original wood windows and non-original windows. Of the non-original windows, the materials are either vinyl or aluminum. The property next door has vinyl windows with the same grid pattern of four-over-one. The alteration would be harmonious with the historic district, blending in with the surrounding character. The staff does not have a recommendation for the project. I'll answer any questions you may have.

Board Questions for Staff:

Ms. Reid said Martin, could you talk to us about the City's Lead Remediation Program. I'm unfortunately not, I've seen a sign for it, but I'm not really familiar with it. You said that this applicant is applying for that program, too.

Mr. Livingston said this applicant is. The City applied for this program back in 2019 and the City was awarded \$1.3 million for Lead Remediation and Healthy Homes throughout the City. The program has been used to assist property owners with making repairs to property that contain lead-based paint. Eligible

properties must be built before 1978 and must contain a child living in the home under the age of six years of age. The applicants must meet income requirements, as well.

Ms. Reid said is there any guidance in that program about if that order conflicts with standing neighborhood rules or guidelines like this neighborhood has.

Mr. Livingston said as a matter of fact, for the first case, Heather Morrow's, first case on Carlisle Street, and for this case we went to the National Park Service Guidelines and the National Park Service Guidelines overrules all other programs.

Mr. Brown said the descriptions of the wood windows weren't clear to me. It sounded like one had inserts for the mullions. Is the other one what I would call a true divided-light. Or do we know. Is there any way to know.

Mr. Livingston said I think one of them, yes, is a true divided-light. Yes.

Mr. Brown said so I think the one that I don't remember how it was described must be the true divided-light.

Mr. Livingston said there's two options that are presented before the Board. First, if the Board says yes, we agree that they want to go with vinyl, then they would go with vinyl sashes and there's vinyl inserts, which is not consistent with the design guidelines.

Mr. Brown said right.

Mr. Livingston said if you go with wood, you have wood inserts for the mullions or you have built-in mullions. We also should indicate if we go with wood, the wood is double-pane windows. Mr. Maher can explain that as well, provide some additional information.

Mr. Brown said okay, so we're reasonably comfortable that one of the options is more or less a true divided-light in terms of the visual.

Mr. Livingston said that's correct.

Mr. Trail said okay, Martin. I have a question. If the applicant has applied for this grant, is there a possibility that the grant would pay for the windows.

Mr. Livingston said yes. The grant would pay for the windows, yes.

Mr. Trail said okay. That's what I wanted to know. All right. Any other questions for Mr. Livingston.

Mr. Lonon said how likely is it they would get the grant. Can you give an opinion on that.

Mr. Livingston said very likely.

Mr. Lonon said and how long will that take.

Mr. Livingston said you mean, take before they can start.

Mr. Lonon said right. I mean, take before they had the money.

Mr. Livingston said as soon as the Board makes an approval, they will start the process. It has to come before the Board for approval first.

Mr. Lonon said okay, so there's really no hardship request here.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Maher can explain the cost differential because of the program guidelines, and he could explain the reason for the hardship request.

Mr. Lonon said okay, I'm sorry, so there is a hardship request. The request is that putting in the windows that are full-in wood would present a financial hardship. I just want to make sure I fully understand what we're considering.

Mr. Livingston said that's correct. It would.

Ms. Walker said so I'm understanding that the grant would not cover the full cost of the wood windows.

Mr. Livingston said the grant would cover the full cost of the windows with shortfalls in other areas. The windows are the priority. They have the highest lead concentrations.

Ms. Walker said okay, thank you. This is Melissa, by the way.

Mr. Trail said all right. Any other questions for Mr. Livingston. Okay, hearing none, let's move to the applicant. We have the applicant with us.

Mr. Livingston said we have. We have David Maher and Ms. MacPolafox on the line.

Mr. Trail said okay. Good evening. I need to swear you in before you make some testimony. Do you swear that the information you're about to give us to be the truth.

Mr. Maher said that is correct.

Mr. Trail said okay. All right, please tell us about the project.

Mr. Maher said as Mr. Livingston mentioned, this is the lead project that was started with the City when they received a grant back in late 2019, and we've been working with it this entire year. In this particular case, we had Ms. MacPolafox, her daughter, and granddaughter apply. Of course, the realization of the location of the house was that it was in the Hampton Heights Historic District, so we went ahead with the help of planning staff to be able to look into the situation, and to go even further, she is fully qualified at this point and approved for the program. So basically, this meeting before your committee is pretty much the next main thing that we had to overcome to find out which style of window we'd be able to go with. HUD does put a cap of \$20,000 on the lead work that we do, and in the case of the most expensive part of this situation, which would be the full wooden windows with both the four-over as included in the entire window, would be \$11,800 versus the grids which I think Mr. Brown mentioned, the mullions would be inserts. That would get us down to \$10,200. Or the vinyl, which would be \$8800. When they approached us, what we do is we've already had a lead assessment done by a procured person that the City, for this program, has gotten. Based on their assessment, we go after what would be affecting, especially, the child in the house. In this case, these windows are over 200 years old. It's pretty much the same paint that is literally dripping off of them. Basically, this is one of the biggest efforts that we could make within the interior of the house to help with both the interior, where the child lives and is going to play in all the rooms, as well as the cost of window both the interior and exterior parts to the house. So you can't change one without the other. Some things have been mentioned about painting. Unfortunately, HUD does not like to go backwards with projects. They like to go forward. They would rather see the condition of the windows either changed to something new relative to the original style, rather than take the original 100 year old window and either have it dipped, stripped or whatever, which is actually a lot more expensive than us purchasing the windows which would hopefully now, at this point, the way they're built and manufactured, will last another 100 years in this house. Basically, we've got some options. The money that we take away from one thing to use for another will basically just mean that we'll have to find other means to fix other things. All of the wood floors in the house will have to be completely done because there's such a high concentration, after the windows, of lead in those floors that they can't be cleaned to get what's called a clearance, which is a chemical dust wipe test to be sure that after we've done this work, that the child isn't playing around or getting dust from something else that we weren't able to touch. It would be ridiculous to fix the windows without being able to fix the floors because all we would be doing is just aesthetically making and somewhat making the room better. But because all these rooms do, if you've looked at some pictures, have double windows because of the age of the house, the light coming in was great at that time period because there are two large windows to every room. If we don't do both of those options together, we're not really getting rid of the problem that has been created over the years with people's unknowing knowledge of having lead in the house.

Mr. Trail said all right. Thank you, sir. Do we have any questions from the Board.

Mr. Lonon said I'm sorry. It's late in the day, so I apologize. I'm being a little bit daft this afternoon, but I just want to make sure I'm clear. If we require wood as opposed to vinyl, that will be more expensive, meaning that there's a give and take. There might be less lead remediation somewhere else in the house.

Mr. Maher said yes, that's correct if you're addressing myself, yes. Our cap is \$20,000 on the lead side of the program, so if we use up \$11,800, then we're going to have to try and find a solution... Be it known that these prices will have to go out to bid, obviously, with the City. But we feel that they're not going to change that much since we have to go to custom window builders. We've gotten some of the prices from one of the company's right here in town, Neely Windows, to be able to start. They've been gracious enough to provide us with what we were looking for and give us a starting point for price. And the other one came from, as you probably saw, from Window World, as far as the vinyl goes. So yes, to answer your question, some of the things we'll probably lack as much as we'd like to do, so we have to do the most important things, but the windows are one of the larger effects of the situation.

Mr. Trail said any other questions for the applicant. All right. We will move on, then, to public comments on this situation. Mr. Livingston, do we have anybody from the public that wishes to speak.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, I don't see any raised hands and I don't see anything in the chat, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Trail said okay. We'll close the public comments section. Return to the Board for deliberations. Thoughts or questions from the Board.

Mr. Lonon said I can see why the City didn't make a recommendation here because this is a hard one. I'll just offer my two cents and what I'm struggling with here. My sense is that this is an economic hardship situation at its core. I'm not aware of any time that the HARB has approved vinyl windows on any other house. Perhaps I'm mistaken. I think the HARB has generally taken the windows in these houses very seriously and makes sure they're replaced with like materials. I would be open, I think, to an economic hardship argument, but I was looking at the ordinance, and there's very specific information that we have to consider in order to take that into account. It may sound callous, and I don't mean to be, but we haven't been given any of that information and we don't typically assume that someone can't afford to do the things that we would normally require in repairing these houses.

Mr. Brown said echoing Josh, I don't want to sound hardhearted, but I've only been on the Board now for maybe five or six months. In all the cases I can remember that came before us, at least one was pretending to be a hardship case, even though they didn't use that term, and we denied that. This does sound like a true hardship and again, I don't want to sound hardhearted, but I don't see how we can accept vinyl windows and not expect to be setting a precedent for every replacement project down the line.

Ms. Reid said I was going to echo both the counter set of arguments, that I live two doors down and my mortgage was held up by lead paint because we have a lot of it too. And actually, similarly, my house is on a slant just like this house is, so the windows are actually 10 feet off the ground on two sides of the house. I think the thing that I'm struggling with is not whether there's need or whether this is something, like lead is dangerous, but instead that all of the houses in this neighborhood have this. And so I do think we need a little... I would need more guidance from the City on making a decision here because I think this would implicate every single house in the neighborhood because they were... Actually, they're not 200 years old; the speaker said 200, they're all roughly 100 years. They were all built around the same time and they all used the same materials, obviously, so this doesn't seem like an instance of this house being particular to the style and the materials that were used commonly at that time. I'm sitting probably in a similar... Unless there's documented, they used some special materials that were extra specially high in lead, so I do have concerns about this being a path for making a lot more vinyl windows in the neighborhood.

Mr. Trail said I would agree with those comments. I think that using the vinyl would set a precedent for the future, and it's pretty clear in our guidelines as far as how we should represent the community as far as vinyl windows goes.

Mr. Lonon said this is Josh. I'll just point out there are quite a few people in the neighborhood who've requested to have vinyl windows that were told no consistently.

Ms. Reid said there is also an option for some. Martin, wouldn't there be an option for the back and sides that are blocked by the trees and not visible from the street to be vinyl, and then the front windows, the main thing, would they have to all be done the same way.

Mr. Livingston said they all have to be wood, yes; according to the guidelines.

Mr. Trail said well, one good thing in this, it sounds like the windows would be paid for, so that would be a super plus to get new windows and have the cost taken care of. I know the applicant mentioned some other things that needed to be done. We don't really get into what it's going to cost for other additions or redoing floors or whatever, but we have to look at this one situation, which is the windows. And again, a good part of it is it looks like they would be paid for.

Ms. Reid said to echo Josh, the numbers went by really quickly, but there's only a \$1200 difference, correct. Between the vinyl and the wood. Or is it higher than that. I heard \$8800 and \$10,200.

Mr. Maher said its \$11,800 for the full higher window, so it's about \$3,000.

Ms. Reid said but only two between the middle two. Okay.

Mr. Maher said yeah, just the different mullions is about \$1100.

Mr. Trail said all right. One thing we have to consider if we don't go with the vinyl, and we're not allowed the vinyl, we have to choose between the other two options that we have. So that would be the price difference that we would be looking at there. Are there any other thoughts, any motions. Comments.

Mr. Brown said this is Ken. I have one more comment. My recollection from prior applicants in my short time on the Board has been that we've expected true divided-lights, as well as wood. Again, I don't want to be setting a precedent where we have everybody who came before us having a true grievance because we've made exceptions for whatever reasons. Again, I hate to sound hardhearted, but it's not our job to deal with the economics of the situation. It's our job to keep the spirit of the ordinance.

Mr. Lonon said I would make a motion to deny the request, but due to the fact that this involves the health and safety of a child, I think I would invite the applicants to come back to us with an argument for economic hardship for us to consider under ordinance 510.7, in which we can, and I don't know how the rest of the Board feels about it, but if this is a true emergency, I would consider a special Board meeting for that. So to put that in the form of a motion, I would deny the motion with a request for the applicant to return with an economic hardship argument and information if that was what they sought for us to consider.

Mr. Trail said anyone else have a comment on that.

Mr. Brown said I have a question. Josh cited a provision, I presume in the historic guidelines. Or is this in the City zoning ordinance. The hardship clause.

Mr. Lonon said it's in the ordinance. It's 510.7. I won't read the whole thing, but in applying for a certificate, the owner may request the Board consider economic hardship affecting the request. Before making their decision, the Board may solicit expert testimony or require the applicant to submit any information relevant to the decision. And then seven different things that can be requested. I suppose you could read it that it's in our discretion whether to require any more information at all, but I'm not in a position to make any assumptions about anyone's financial resources.

Ms. Walker said I would just add that in the case of the person who was claiming economic hardship about roughly six months or a year ago, we did require that person to come back with some financial documentation.

Ms. Rodrick said is there any possibility of another source of some kind of funding from another community pot, so to speak, that would cover the difference here. I know that's not our bailiwick, but I am curious to know whether there is another way for this family to proceed if we insist upon the wood windows and not the vinyl.

Mr. Livingston said a question for me or for David.

Ms. Rodrick said whoever. I'm just trying to raise another possibility here.

Mr. Livingston said yes. There is an additional funding source that could be eligible to the family.

Mr. Brown said have they applied for it. I'm sorry, this is Ken.

Mr. Livingston said it's all rolled into one, so the lead program is fixed. They would need approval for that second program in order to proceed with that program.

Mr. Brown said so they can't be assured until after the first step.

Mr. Livingston said that's correct.

Mr. Brown said so it's a crapshoot.

Ms. Walker said and I just want to be sure I understand. They will get the lead funding, but as a Board, we have to approve some way forward before they can do that.

Mr. Livingston said that's correct.

Ms. Walker said okay. Thank you.

Mr. Trail said I know Josh has made a motion. Do we have any other motions from anyone.

Ms. Walker said we would need a second on that motion.

Mr. Brown said before we go to that stage, can I ask Josh to repeat the motion. I apologize. I was trying to grasp it all, but time got away from me.

Mr. Lonon said if it's the case that we have to make a decision on one of the three choices before they can even move forward to get the funds, I'm not sure... I may want to retract my motion. I want them to be able to move forward and get these funds, and I don't want us to hold that up. That sounds like the case; I'm sorry, this is Josh. That sounds like the case, right, Martin.

Mr. Livingston said yes. We have to have an approval of the windows. It has to be wood, according to the historic guidelines. The question is, unless a hardship case is requested, it has to be wood; the question is, do we want true divided-light or not.

Mr. Trail said okay. So Josh, you are retracting that motion that you made earlier. Is that correct.

Mr. Lonon said yes.

Ms. Walker said Mr. Trail, this is Melissa. I just wonder if, is it appropriate at this point to ask Ms. MacPolafox to weigh in about where she feels it's... Would it be more important for her to get the hardship exemption or more important to move forward as quickly as possible. Is it appropriate to ask her to speak at this time.

Mr. Trail said we can do that. Okay, we're going to return to the applicant, if they would answer that question, please.

[Editor's Note: Board Member Brad Steinecke signed on to the Zoom Meeting at this point of the meeting; and said since he was so late; he would recuse himself from any votes on this case.]

Ms. MacPolafox said hello. We actually, I think, would really like for David to weigh in on this also. Of course, the child's health is important and the latest lead report is she increased by about 0.7 on her blood levels. So she originally was at a 5.3 and now she is at a 6.

Mr. Trail said any other questions. All right. Thank you, ma'am. Okay, I'm going to return to the Board here. Do we have any motions at this time.

Mr. Brown moved for approval of the proposal and was seconded by Mr. Lonon. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0 with one abstention by Mr. Steinecke due to his late arrival.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 251 West Hampton Avenue in the Hampton Heights Historic District (TMS # 7-16-02-110.00). Owner is seeking permission to construct a two-car garage at the rear of the house. Laura and John Ringo, Owners.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, we received the Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works. The owner is seeking permission to construct a two-car garage in the rear of the house. Laura and John Ringo are the owners. The project site is an approximately 26,300 square foot lot in the Hampton Heights Historic District that is located on the south side of West Hampton Avenue between Peronneau Street and South Irwin Avenue. The site is currently occupied by John and Laura Ringo, owners since 2007. The residence currently on the property is a two story Craftsman-style structure featuring a prominent forward porch. Like many of the houses in the Hampton Heights, the property does not have a garage. As such, storage space is limited. The applicant is proposing to install a 672 square foot garage in the rear yard. The garage would be located behind the house in the rear left side yard area. It would be located at the end of the existing driveway, an existing concrete parking pad. The structure itself will measure 24 feet by 28 feet. This is slightly larger than a standard two-car garage, which measures 20 feet by 20 feet. This will reduce the need for future storage structures. The owner has noted that the concrete parking pad may need to be slightly expanded in order to accommodate the new structure. The garage will be a stick-built structure with horizontal siding to match the main house. Two carriage-style doors will be used for garage doors. The roof will be a gray architectural shingle, which will again match the existing residence. Knee braces on the eaves of the garage will further help the structure blend in to the property. The owner has indicated that it will likely be painted to match the colors currently found on the house. A slight expansion of the existing concrete pad will be required in order to accommodate the garage. This is the garage location behind the house at 251 West Hampton Avenue. This is a photo of the front of the house. The garage will be located to the left and, based on this screenshot, will be minimally visible from the street and the sidewalk. The garage will look like this, located at 259 Hydrick Street. It will be the same design, except it will be two doors instead of one, with the knee braces. Here's a photo of the carriage-style garage with a median separating the two garage doors. Let me go through this. Requirements. The proposed garage will complement the existing house's structure by its design and proposed materials. A Craftsman-style garage is an appropriate design for the site and will complement the existing residence with the overall natural and uncomplicated design. The Design Manual emphasizes the importance of recognizing the prevailing character of the existing development. The proposed structure recognizes the existing character of the house and respects it by not mimicking its design, which would create a false sense of history. The proposed garage is an appropriate scale for both the site and the surrounding neighborhood. It would be relatively low height in comparison to the existing house. The decision to increase the depth rather than the width of the garage increases its utilization without making itself more prominent along the streetscape. The garage will be clad in HardiePlank horizontal siding. This will complement the existing horizontal siding on the house without creating an inappropriate sense of history. A gray architectural shingle roof will complement the roof on the existing house. The proposed garage will have similar features to the existing house, chiefly the knee braces and the carriage-style doors. It is not dissimilar to any other garage which could be found in any residential neighborhood, including Hampton Heights. The proposed garage will blend harmoniously with the existing neighborhood in the Hampton Heights Historic District due to its design and location on the property. A staff survey of the Hampton Heights reveal a number of garage and accessory structures. The proposed garage is within the existing garage types. As such, it will complement the district. Staff is recommending approval. I'll answer any questions you may have.

Board Questions:

Mr. Brown said do we know for sure that it's in compliance with zoning.

Mr. Livingston said yes. It is in compliance with zoning.

Mr. Brown said okay, thank you. And the second question. In the absence of any drawings; I mean, I saw the photograph of the similar garage that has a wider door, but what my question is, and I don't mean to belabor this, but my second question is; does the applicant propose any other openings, like and windows and doors, aside from the garage doors.

Mr. Livingston said no. Not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Brown said all right. Thank you.

Mr. Trail said okay. Any other questions for Mr. Livingston at this time. All right, let's move to the applicant. Do we have the applicant with us.

Ms. Ringo was sworn. She said I think Martin covered it well. We'd like to add a garage. We would also like to include a door that faces the yard, but otherwise I think everything is as Martin explained.

Mr. Trail said okay. Questions for Ms. Ringo. Okay. Hearing none, we will move to public comments. Do we have anyone from the public, Mr. Livingston, that would like to make a comment.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chairman, I don't see anything in the chat or any raised hands, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Trail said okay. Thank you, sir. All right. Public comments will be closed and we will return to the Board for deliberation, questions, comments, and motions. Any questions. Comments. Do I hear any motions.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Brown said yes. This is Ken. I'm comfortable with it, frankly, with the understanding that there's no other openings that we would have to pass judgment on and with the satisfaction that it satisfies zoning, I'm prepared to move that we approve it.

Mr. Brown moved for approval of the proposal and was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Discussion re Council Action – 201 Caulder Avenue – Historic Designation

Mr. Trail said at this time, we're going to move to a discussion referencing the last City Council meeting in regards to Caulder Avenue, the Mary H. Wright School. I can give you a little bit of what happened at the City Council meeting because I was there and Mr. Steinecke was there and we both got to address the Council. The condition that was approved, it was a recommendation by the City to change one thing in our guidelines to where we would not have to be a second motion to an approved project that is approved by SHPO. We looked at this pretty hard. We actually had a meeting with our Attorney and the City Supervisors. We had this before we went to Council, so we had a good idea of what we wanted. We didn't have any problem with the proposal as far as us not being a second to the SHPO concerns. I could see, in a way, how it would deter an applicant if they follow, if they would have to get something approved by SHPO and then come to HARB and get it re-approved through us. I certainly couldn't think of any instance where we would go against something that was recommended by SHPO. In our previous dealings with them, they are very meticulous in what they do. All their projects that I'm aware of have been done, and I mean to a T, so I didn't have any problem with that. Also, it's going to set a future precedent for other people who want to restore projects and it won't be a discouragement to them. That was the last thing in the world we wanted to do, was discourage anyone from restoring an historic property. We did make clear at the Council meeting that what we did want to do, though, we wanted to go ahead and get this building, after that motion approved that we wouldn't have to be a second to SHPO, we did approve the project to be added to the Local Historic Register. We wanted that done because the main reason is to keep the property from being destroyed in the future. So that's one difference between the National Guidelines and the State Guidelines and our Local Historic District. In the future, we still want the projects to go and be restored. We want to save them if we can, so hopefully this will make things a little bit easier in the future. Brad or Martin, do y'all have any comments on this as well. Brad, maybe you have something to add.

Mr. Steinecke said well, I think that there was a recognition among the City staff that were present at that prior meeting and among Council at their meeting that really, so much of the key to a successful historic rehabilitation is identification and utilization of incentives, usually in the form of property tax benefits. That tool is available to the City through a piece of State Legislation called the Bailey Bill. In the past, I think, the City has been willing to give those tax benefits to rehabilitations of historic sites without any sort of insistence that it also receive a Local Historic Designation. I think there's been a way that either

the HARB hasn't stepped up into that role in the past or that the City hasn't just fully utilized the ability of the HARB to safeguard that for the future. So I think that there's a better communication between the different segments of the City in this situation at the end of it. That was my takeaway from this situation.

Mr. Trail said I would agree with that. The good thing is that the project was approved and it will move forward, so the Mary H. Wright School will be saved. It will be on our Local Historic Register and Mr. Montgomery is going to proceed with this project. Hopefully it's going to be a big boost for the south side of Spartanburg as well. I think this will just be a beginning to what can happen in that area, so I was pretty pleased with the outcome. Does anybody have any questions for us.

Ms. Walker said if somebody has specific questions or comments about that instance, I don't want to jump in front of anybody, but I would like to talk about what we, as a Board, might want to do moving forward in being more proactive in getting some other properties, significant properties, designated as Local Historic sites moving forward because we've talked about that some. I know that Brad and Sarah Love and a couple of other people had worked on a list, but we've never actually taken that kind of proactive approach, and it might be time to do that.

Mr. Trail said that's a really good point, Melissa. I think it was mentioned somewhere along the way that we do have the authority to make a recommendation to Council for approval for any historic property, so we can do that. Council can do that. Or an applicant can do that, so there's three ways it can go through. If there are properties within the City that we feel are important to save, and really, that's to me one of the biggest things, that we know these properties will be saved for the future, that's something we need to look at. I would also suggest, I know we have not had an opportunity, at least in my time on the Board, just to have a discussion meeting just of the Board. I would love to sit down with just the Board one evening and not looking at any cases, but just discuss some possibilities like you mentioned, Melissa. Maybe make a list of places, why we would want them approved to be part of our local designation, and then we could decide if we want to bring that forward at a meeting. We would vote on it at the meeting and send it to Council for approval. I think that would be a really good thing for the future. Now, there's a lot of places that really need to be under our guidelines. I really do believe that. I remember, Melissa, you talking about when Sarah was here. We did talk about it and there was a small list of places that we thought that should go on that. We did get a list in our packet of some places that are on the historic register. Some of them, I did not know they were on there. They were on there since, or put on there in 1998 or something like that. So it's way back there. I think it's good that we keep aware of what properties are on there and what properties are not. Look at them that are in the City and move forward. But I think we could do a lot of good, just as a Board, as far as approving places for the future, or recommending their approval. That's a good point, Melissa. Very good.

Mr. Lonon said Mr. Chair, this is Josh. I agree that that is an absolutely laudable effort and something needs to be done and we can't continue to play Whack-A-Mole with these properties where we only talk about designating them when they are getting renovated or, most often, about to be demolished. I'll just express publicly that conversations, in what I've expressed to several Council Members and Administrators, is that this effort needs to be backed by not only the HARB, but also the City Administration and Council itself. We need to be very aware that those designation attempts will be treated and responded to differently by different property owners. There are some who would voluntarily have their property designated. There would be quite a few who would be very offended just by the request. I don't think it's productive for us to, as a Board, go after these properties. Maybe that's not a good choice of words, but to have them designated without knowing that if we designate them, that the City Administration and the Council are going to support us because in the end it's the Council's decision. All we can do is just recommend. So there really needs to be, this needs to be a group effort beyond just the Board.

Mr. Trail said I would agree with that. I'll say, Josh, I know Brad mentioned early the incentives from SHPO and also the tax credits. There's an incentive there to go through there. And there's really not an incentive to go through the local registry and get on a local registry. That's not something we could do,

but I really feel like that's something the City and the Council should probably look at. You know, is there some small incentive that would make it worth your while to include the Local Historic designation in your restoration project. Up to this point, I've seen a couple of projects that came to us early on. I guess I won't name any particular project, but came to us early on and told us about their project and everything, and initially appeared that they wanted to be put on the local historic registry. Then when they got the help from SHPO, they just kind of went their own way and left us in the dust, so to speak. So I would love to see something in there, some incentive, to be listed on the Local Historic Registry.

Mr. Steinecke said Mr. Chair, I'd like to add I think certainly if we have a list of sites and that's presented to the City, whether it's in the form of a specific, through-the-channels of a motion and a second and a vote through this body, the formal process of nominating those to be on the Local Register; or whether it's simply a list to alert staff to our interest in ensuring that properties that may in the future be renovated, that part of their negotiations that happen with those potential developers includes the idea that Local Historic designation would be sought for that. I think that would give everybody a heads up that we're on the same page in looking at these properties as being valuable to the City. As Josh points out, there are going to be some folks who are totally fine with this and others who would be wary of it, and I think that those ones who might be wary of it would come to understand the necessity of it early on in the process of it, not caught off guard or think that we're coming after them as a body or something like that. I think that was part of the concern with this, is it may have felt personal for some folks.

Mr. Trail said I understand that. I did think, though, at the Council meeting the Council was real supportive of the HARB and it was clear they were concerned about future restoration projects and saving buildings in Spartanburg. I did appreciate the feeling of the concern from them. They were also surprised that a couple of buildings were not on our Local Historic Register. Regarding the Montgomery Building and the Aug W. Smith Building; we were presented a presentation on both of those buildings early on and it never came back to us for a vote or anything. Both of those projects were, I would give them a 10. Out of a one to 10, they were both a 10, particularly the Montgomery Building. They went way above and beyond what would have been a requirement of a restoration project. Anyway, I feel like the support's there, so if we can come up with some good plan for future incentives for people to put their property on the register and not feel like we're coming after them for some reason, then that would be great.

Ms. Walker said Mr. Chair, if I could just add, those are great projects. The problem is because they don't have that Local Designation, 50 years from now, if those buildings have been allowed to deteriorate, there is nothing to stop them from being torn down.

Mr. Trail said that's exactly right.

Ms. Walker said that's the valuable thing about the Local Designation.

Mr. Trail said we did mention that to Council, in fact, about the Mary H. Wright Building. We certainly know Mr. Montgomery's going to put a lot of money in that project and he's not going to demolish it any time soon; but who's to say what's going to happen 50 years from now. He could move on to something else or sell the property and he has nothing to do with it in the future. The tax incentives are basically for the restoration. They're not anything going way down the road like that. So by putting it on our Local Register, then that would ensure that it would be safe for the future. Okay. Any other comments on that. If not, we'll move on.

Mr. Livingston said Chairman, in anticipation of additional listings, we've updated the applications and the petitions, so they're available for your use.

Disposition of Previous HARB Meeting Minutes

(Please note that only Board Members that were Present at a Meeting may vote on their approval)

January 14, 2021

Members Present – Mr. Lonon, Mr. Brown, Ms. Reid, Ms. Walker, Mr. Steinecke, Ms. Crowley, and Mr. Trail.

Ms. Walker moved for approval of the minutes for the January 14, 2021 Meeting; and she was seconded by Mr. Brown. The minutes were approved by a vote of 7-0.

January 9, 2020

Members Present – Ms. Reid, Ms. Walker, Ms. Leebrick, Mr. Lonon, Mr. Trail, and Mr. Steinecke.

Ms. Walker moved for approval of the minutes for the January 9, 2020 Meeting; and she was seconded by Ms. Reid. The minutes were approved by a vote of 5-0.

November 14, 2019

Members Present – Ms. Walker, Ms. Leebrick, Mr. Trail, Mr. Lonon, and Mr. Steinecke.

Mr. Steinecke moved for approval of the minutes for the November 14, 2019 Meeting; and he was seconded by Mr. Lonon. The minutes were approved by a vote of 4-0.

October 10, 2019

Members Present – Mr. Trail, Mr. Steinecke, Ms. Reid, Ms. Crowley, and Mr. Lonon.

Mr. Lonon moved for approval of the minutes of the October 10, 2019 Meeting; and he was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The minutes were approved by a vote of 4-0.

June 13, 2019

Members Present – Mr. Trail, Mr. Steinecke, Ms. Reid, Ms. Walker, and Ms. Crowley.

Ms. Reid moved for approval of the minutes for the June 13, 2019 Meeting; and she was seconded by Ms. Walker. The minutes were approved by a vote of 4-0.

November 9, 2017

Members Present – Mr. Trail, Mr. Steinecke, and Ms. Reid.

Mr. Steinecke moved for approval of the minutes for the November 9, 2017 Meeting; and he was seconded by Ms. Reid. The minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0.

July 13, 2017

Members Present – Ms. Reid, Ms. Walker, Mr. Trail, and Mr. Steinecke.

Ms. Walker moved for approval of the minutes for the July 13, 2017 Meeting; and she was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The minutes were approved by a vote of 4-0.

November 10, 2016

Members Present – Mr. Trail.

Mr. Trail moved for approval of the minutes for the November 10, 2016 Meeting; and he seconded the motion; and he approved the minutes.

Staff Updates

Ms. Roland said okay. I did check with Jennifer at the ACOG and right now, they don't have anything online to offer but she said they're figuring out what they're going to do. I know Brad Steinecke did attend something with the SHPO or the Historic Preservation Office, along with Martin and Emily and maybe one of our other Board members, March 2nd and 4th, so they have their Continued Education Credits for the year already. Anybody else, we'll keep you updated as we get any new emails or anybody should send any more information.

Mr. Steinecke said I don't know if it's possible to have this count for Continuing Ed, but we had a recording of the sessions that Martin, Emily, and I attended. It was through the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions and it was, I felt, a very high quality series of a couple of days of presentations. It was a lot of very well-articulated understandings about the value of preservation from many different angles and had a good understanding of how other Boards deal with some of these issues. So, since those recordings have been posted, I don't know if those can be sent out to anybody else who

still needs Continuing Ed time in that count, but I just wanted to mention that as a possibility since that is available to me, anyway.

Ms. Roland said sounds like a good idea. I guess we can see.

Mr. Steinecke said so I could forward that, if anyone's needing hours and wants something that's maybe a bit more relevant than the typical ACOG Continuing Ed stuff, I'd be happy to send that to you. Just let me know.

Mr. Trail said okay. Does anyone have any other questions, comments, or concerns before we adjourn.

Mr. Livingston said Mr. Chair, I'd like to recognize Emily Thomas and Logan Witter for preparing the staff reports for these three projects.

Mr. Trail said we do give our thanks to both of them for their effort and we look forward to working with y'all in the future. Thank you so much.

Mr. Steinecke said I have a question. There was talk of applying for a grant that would do a... Potentially hiring someone to do a survey of the properties within the Hampton Heights Historic District. Is there any updates about it, about that, or context you want to give us for that.

Mr. Livingston said sure. Logan Witter contacted the State Historic Preservation Office regarding a grant to, as a match grant that would require a 50% match to update the Hampton Heights Guidelines. We've received a couple comments, including expanding the survey of the historic districts, expanding it south to Crescent Avenue. Logan will be updating those guidelines, updating the grant application probably tomorrow and Monday, and then we should be ready to send that out some time this month. It's actually due in April and we've gotten a favorable response from the State Historic Preservation Office.

Mr. Steinecke said very good. Thank you.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM.



Ray Trail, Chair

Minutes edited by Julie Roland and Logan Witter