

MINUTES
The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review
Meeting
Thursday, May 11, 2017 ~ 5:30 PM
City Hall Council Chambers

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

Absent Board Members: Carolyn Schoepf and Al Jolly.

City Staff: Natalia Rosario, Planner III; Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant; and Assistant City Manager Chris Story attended the meeting.

Mrs. Love, the Chair, called the HARB meeting to order at 5:30 P.M., and stated the hearing procedures. Mrs. Love recognized the six Board Members 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 February 9, 2017, HARB Meeting

Mr. Ringo moved to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2017 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:

I. Special Tax Assessment – Review and Certification of Special Tax Assessment Property– 187 North Church Street (Montgomery Building).

Ms. Rosario, Planner III came forward and was sworn; and she submitted all of the staff reports the Board Members had previously received in their meeting packets for all of tonight's cases, as well as the slides and presentations into evidence as Exhibit A.

Ms. Rosario explained City Staff had recently met with the Spartanburg County Assessor and County Attorney regarding the City's use of Special Assessment for Rehabilitated Historic Property as provided in SC State Code. Based on their review and feedback, City and County staff were now working to ensure that the administrative practices of each government appropriately sync with the other to remove any potential for error. She introduced tonight's case; and explained they were formalizing the Special Assessment for Rehabilitated Historic Property for the Montgomery Building Rehabilitation per their request; and she reviewed the details of the property before the Board for final or preliminary certification as follows:

1. Local Historic Special Assessment for Board Review:

Preliminary Certification – 187 North Church Street

- a. Interior and exterior work.
- b. Fair market value in 2016 was \$2,267,956.00 according to the Spartanburg County Assessor, with an estimated \$25,624,574.00 in rehabilitation costs.
- c. Has received approval from the US Department of the Interior National Park Service for phase 2 work (1-10-2017).

Donnie Love, Architect for the project came forward and was sworn, and said the Owner of the building, James Bakker was with him tonight as well should the Board Members have any questions. Mr. Love showed slides of what the building looked like when it was originally built, as well as numerous slides of the interior of the building from past to present, which he explained in detail all of the work that had been done regarding the restoration to present time. He also showed slides of the floor plans, which he also explained in detail to the Board Members.

Board Questions:

No Board Questions.

Mrs. Love asked anyone in the audience who wished to speak regarding the request to come forward. No one came forward.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Steinecke moved approval; and he was seconded by Mr. Ringo. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

II. Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 520 Hampton Drive in Hampton Heights – For permission to repair concrete walkway with like for like materials; and permission to remove existing concrete strips that were in disrepair and replace with 8 ½' x 36' solid parking area to accommodate two off-street vehicles, from Kristi and Shannon Webb, Owners.

Ms. Rosario came forward; and said there were two parts to the request as follows:

1. For permission to repair concrete walkway with like for like materials; and
2. For permission to remove existing concrete strips that are in disrepair and replace with 8 ½' x 36' solid parking area to accommodate two off-street vehicles.

Mrs. Kristi Webb of 520 Hampton Drive came forward and was sworn and referenced a couple of slides; and she explained to the Board Members the request was two-fold as follows: On the slide regarding the concrete walkway regarding strips that was in disrepair and where she could not get anything to grow; and on the slide regarding the parking area she informed the Board Members that pretty soon they would have an extra driver in the house. Her son would turn 15 on Sunday; and they needed to a place for to park his vehicle when they purchased it; which was the main reason for the request.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Steinecke asked if she was interested in having the two cars parked one in front of the other.
- Mrs. Webb said that was correct.
- Mr. Steinecke asked did the 36' extend beyond the current driveway.
- Mrs. Webb said it would be a total of 36' and she explained it would extend to the orange flag in the picture.
- Mr. Wingo said that would make it extend past the current driveway strip path.
- Mrs. Webb said that was correct.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor or against the request to come forward and state their name and address for the record. No one came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

Ms. Rosario came forward again and 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* – According to the City of Spartanburg Design Guidelines for the Hampton Heights Historic District, alterations to driveways and new parking areas that are visible from the street are considered a major work. The following guidelines apply to such a change:

10.2.3 Walks and Drives, Page 117 of the City of Spartanburg Design Manual for Historic Districts and Guidelines:

- a. "...Driving lanes, [are] a historic treatment that should be retained"
- b. **Recommendation-** the established pattern of walks and drives within the district should be continued. Existing paving materials of concrete, asphalt, and brick should be repaired, where feasible. New surfaces should be compatible with these predominate materials. The use of driving lanes, designed to facilitate only the car's wheels, is a historic treatment which is encouraged to retain porous surfaces".

According to the guidelines, removal of the existing driveway strips and replacement with a parking pad is not in conformity with the historic character of the property and district.

2) *The scale of the buildings* – n/a.

- 3) *The texture and materials* - The wheel drives and walkway are currently composed of concrete, and concrete is an appropriate replacement for both projects.
- 4) *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – There are other homes in Hampton Heights that retain their historic driveway tracks and which have concrete walkways that have been preserved.
- 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 alteration to the driveway will act to decrease the historic integrity of the neighborhood fabric, as the driveway tracks are one of the prominent historic features of the Hampton Heights neighborhood. The replacement of the front walkway with like for like materials will not negatively impact the district character.

Staff's Analysis

Staff is of the opinion that the replacement of the current concrete walkway with a new like-for-like concrete walkway is in keeping with the Historic District Guidelines and therefore recommends approval. Staff is of the opinion that the proposal to remove the driveway path feature and replace with a parking pad is not in keeping with the Historic District Guidelines. The Board may either approve, disapprove, table, or approve with conditions (such as approving replacement and extension of the driveway tracks with concrete so that additional parking space is created without damaging the character of the property).

Board Questions:

- Mr. Koenig asked to make enough room for the cars and keep within the Design Standards, would that mean the old concrete needed to be taken out and be replaced with another strip piece.
- Ms. Rosario explained.

Mrs. Love said she would like to see the Board Members take this request in two parts, with the walkway first, and the driveway second.

Mr. Koenig moved to separate the deliberation and vote into two parts; and he was seconded by Mr. Turner. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Part 1 re Walkway:

Mr. Ringo made a motion to accept the findings regarding the request to replace the walkway and that it be approved as presented; and he was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Part 2 re Driveway:

- Mr. Ringo said he did not know if there was anyone who could give historical background regarding the driving strips. He explained that was not one of the things that jumped out at him regarding historic features.
- Mr. Koenig asked if they had a number regarding how many houses had the strips.
- Ms. Rosario said she did not.
- Mr. Steinecke said there were a lot of homes like his own house that use to have them, that had now been covered over.
- Mr. Koenig asked about the replacement material.
- Ms. Rosario said it would be a concrete pad.
- Mr. Steinecke said he had no problem regarding extending the current strips, but he was hesitant to allow replacement entirely with a pad. He wondered if there was a way to address the area where she could not get grass to grow using pavers rather than poured concrete.
- Mrs. Webb explained they had thought about doing some pavers, and there was nothing consistent in the neighborhood on their block. She said there also use to be a garage on the rear of the property, and they were unsure if there had been concrete strips all the way back to that part of the property. She said they were open to suggestions as to how that might play out.

- Mrs. Love referenced a google historic analysis regarding historicalness regarding the driveway regarding the ribbon driveways; and she informed the Board Members it had come about because originally there were no driveways and the cars were moved off the streets and there were dirt ruts that were unsightly, and so they were paved. They were paved where the car's wheels went in the yard, so they would not create a big concrete pad in the yard. She said the problem was the heat from the car killed the grass; so where you were going to put the car you had to put some type of paver or brick to eliminate the heat causing problems to the grass.
- Mrs. Webb said they did not have brick anywhere on the house except on the foundation; and that had been a question also regarding whether or not that would be an appropriate material to use.
- Mr. Koenig felt if it would be some type of concrete slab, there should probably be some type of spacer to allow for the ground to move or the concrete might break; and wondered if there was any standard regarding that.
- Mrs. Love said that it was addressed.
- Mrs. Webb said they would maintain the left hand strip; and it would not go all the way to the concrete retaining wall.
- Mr. Koenig asked was there more people with the pavers in between or not.
- Ms. Rosario said she had not seen that many people that had them.
- Mrs. Love explained that her house had two strips that were grass; and where the cars sat they had found some bricks; and then there were some more grass; and if you put them just where your car sat it was not as expensive.
- Mr. Webb came forward and was sworn and said aesthetically he preferred the look of the strips.
- Mrs. Webb asked him what he felt about maybe doing a portion of brick and a portion of grass.
- Mr. Webb said he would be open to that or researching something else. He also felt brick pavers the whole way would be really nice, but it would be expensive.
- Mrs. Love said it sounded like they were very amicable to concrete strips and continue the ribbon driveway and extending to the length that would be required, finding something that would be appropriate.

Mr. Trail made a motion that the Board Members allow the petitioner to replace the existing strips and extend them to the part where the orange flag was, and leave it up to the petitioner to decide how she would do the center; and he was seconded by Mr. Turner.

Mrs. Love said to recap; there was a motion on the table to replace, extend, keep the grass, use some pavers to fill the middle that was not concrete or asphalt.

The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

III. Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 253 Hydrick Street in Hampton Heights – For permission to install a wooden railing to the front porch as a safety measure, from Michelle Child, Owner.

Ms. Rosario came forward and showed a slide of the property, and said the request was to add on to the front of the house regarding railing and pickets because the owner was concerned it was a bit unsafe regarding children and pets were able to easily climb over it, as it was several feet above grade.

Michelle Child of 253 Hydrick Street came forward and was sworn, and said she really did not have that much to add to what Ms. Rosario had already told them; unless they had questions. She explained there was some evidence to a railing prior; she did not know if it was original or not.

Board Questions:

Mr. Trail asked Ms. Child if you were standing on her porch, how high would it be from her foot to the wall.

Ms. Child said on the front about a couple of feet; and she explained that her child had jumped completely over it. On the right side it was not too big of a drop, but on the other side there was about a 10 foot drop.

Mrs. Love asked Ms. Child if her porch pattern continued on around.

Ms. Child said yes.

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

Ms. Rosario came forward again and 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* – According to the City of Spartanburg Design Guidelines for the Hampton Heights Historic District, alterations, or additions to existing buildings are a major work. The following guidelines apply to such a change:

8.1.3 Entrances and Porches, Page 91 of the City of Spartanburg Design Manual for Historic Districts and Guidelines:

Recommendation- Retain original porches and steps. Repair of porches shall not result in the removal of original materials (such as balusters, columns, hand rails, brackets, and roof detailing) unless seriously deteriorated. If replacement materials must be introduced, the new shall match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated, if possible, by documentary and physical evidence.

The proposed work does not alter or remove original porch and steps, and no repair to the original porch is necessary. The owner proposes to add a railing made of materials that are compatible to the historic character of the home (wood) and plans to paint them to blend in with the present colors of the house.

2) *The scale of the buildings* – n/a.

3) *The texture and materials* - The proposed wooden posts and their design are in keeping with the texture and materials generally found in the historic district.

4) *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – There are other homes in Hampton Heights feature similar porch railings. Examples include 247 Hydrick Street, which is immediately adjacent to the north of the subject property and 240 Hydrick Street, which is across the street to the north east of this property.

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 addition to the front porch will not act to decrease the historic integrity of the neighborhood fabric.

Staff's Analysis

Staff is of the opinion that the addition of the wooden railing to the front porch, painted to match the home, is in keeping with the Historic District Guidelines and therefore recommends approval.

Board Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Steinecke informed the Board Members he had gone through Vivian Fisher's book on the neighborhood and looked for other examples on Hydrick Street and Carlisle Street on that sort of stepped brick wall; and he could not find any other examples of where there was an addition with railing on top of it; and he felt like it would be stepping away from the historical feature. He believed that the Preservation Trust had sold the house to prior owners at one time. He explained there might be a way to solve the safety concern in a non-architectural way, possibly by using planters, etc.; but he understood the safety concern.
- Ms. Child said she needed more than just planters.
- Mr. Trail asked Mr. Steinecke about a question regarding the rail that may have existed at one time regarding height.
- Mr. Steinecke said he had not been on that porch in a long time.
- Mrs. Webb explained it would have had to meet the Code.

- Mr. Ringo asked where the Code came into play now regarding the house.
- Ms. Rosario said if the rail was to be put in place it would have to meet Code regarding 36" in height and a certain distance regarding spacing for the pickets, in order to deflect anything that might get thrown at it.
- Mr. Ringo asked if there was nothing there now it was o.k.; but if you wanted to add anything it would need to be done to Code.
- Ms. Rosario said yes.

A lady in the audience had her hand raised.

Mr. Steinecke asked had they already heard public comments. [They had already asked for public comment or questions and no one had come forward].

Ms. Love asked the lady to come forward and state her name and address.

- Ms. Tonya Daves of 230 S. Hampton Drive came forward and explained where her house was located, and had been built in 1910; and it had railings. She asked about the age of the proposed house; and how did they know that it did not have railings.
- Mrs. Webb said the proposed house was built between 1920 and 1930.
- Mrs. Love asked Ms. Daves if her house had the same style of porch configuration with the steps and low wall.
- Ms. Daves said no; but a lot of the homes had the rails on them for safety back in those days. She asked if the Board had any documentation to go back in time and see if it originally had rails.
- Ms. Rosario said City Staff did not have any.
- Mrs. Love explained on this particular house the way it was now was typical of the time it was built; and there were seven others like it without them in the neighborhood.
- Mr. Koenig asked Ms. Child about the holes she said she had found;
- Ms. Child said there were a set of four holes on all of the columns, and the rest of it was brick.
- Mr. Koenig asked about where the holes were regarding a top or bottom rail.
- Ms. Child said not in the brick itself.
- Mrs. Webb of 520 Hampton Drive came forward again; and explained when she was with Preservation Trust and had the house, there was a Code component to the house. She said the galvanized pipe would have been to Code at the time.
- Mr. Ringo felt the struggle was the petitioner was asking to install something that was not an original feature to the house. He felt something needed to be done, and it technically was not up to Code as it was; but the question was what should be allowed.
- Mrs. Love said they should look at texture and material as one component, and look at similar features in the surrounding area as that criteria and decide if what they had proposed met that criteria; and then look at the element itself and if it blended into the landscape of that street.
- Mr. Steinecke felt if the HARB before them had approved a galvanized rail; he would be more inclined to go with something like that.
- Mrs. Love did not feel that a galvanized rail would keep a toddler from falling, if they were discussing safety.
- Mr. Trail asked Ms. Child if she was asking to install the rail along the front and the sides.
- Ms. Child said yes.
- Mrs. Love asked would it be painted to match the porch trim.
- Ms. Child said yes.

- Mrs. Love said if it was painted to match the porch trim it would not stick out as much, as opposed to white.
- Mr. Koenig felt as it was right now it was a safety issue; and he did not feel the galvanized pipe would do the trick.

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve the request as submitted and he was seconded by Mr. Koenig. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Steinecke opposed.

IV. Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 620 S Irwin Avenue in Hampton Heights – For permission to demolish entire structure and rebuild to historic standards, from Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director on behalf of City of Spartanburg, Owner.

Ms. Rosario came forward and said Mr. Livingston was running a little behind and he knew most of the financial details, and she would go ahead and present this case until he arrived. The City owned the property and had brought this case to the Board Members before; and they were given permission for a partial demolition of the rear addition which was not original to the structure, and secure it and try to find a buyer. In the meantime Mr. Livingston had done his best to try and find a solution to try and preserve the home and find a buyer to rehab it. Mr. Livingston had now determined it would be more cost effective to demolish the existing structure, preserve the important aspects of it; and then rebuild it to historic standards, with the exception of the two front porch columns; and they would propose to make the existing porch columns round columns; and she mentioned a 2014 proposal done by Campbell, Meek and Associates. She showed a slide of the house as it stood now and the property. She showed more slides of where a tree had fallen onto the house and had caused major leaks to the structure. She said they would like to get the Board's opinion regarding demolishing the structure as she referenced above. Staff's intent would be to rebuild to historic standards.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Koenig asked if the floor plan would stay the same.
- Ms. Rosario said yes.
- Mrs. Love said the proposal was to change the front porch.
- Ms. Rosario explained regarding the columns that they would now become round, and they would also use hardi-plank shingles as opposed to asbestos.
- Mr. Steinecke said in the proposal the funding was sort of uncertain; and was there any more certainty behind that now.

Ms. Rosario welcomed Mr. Livingston who had just arrived to the meeting; and asked him if he would answer Mr. Steinecke's question.

Mrs. Love informed Mr. Livingston that Ms. Rosario had brought the Board Members up to the point that the request was now to demolish the entire house, rebuilt on the same sight with a change in the porch configuration; and they were now up to funding.

Mr. Livingston said regarding the funding source they had just received preliminary approval for funding from the Neighborhood Services Program (NSP), which came out of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, out of the SC State Housing Finance and Development Authority. He said they went through the process of having their inspectors come out and take a look at the property. One of the things the inspectors looked at while there was the cost for repairing the property; and their estimate had come up even higher than what staff had originally proposed. They are taking a look at the options for increasing the funding they had originally provided. Total they think it would cost less than \$150,000, maybe between 130,000 to 140,000; and if they repaired it and brought it back up to the quality where they could sell the home would be much higher.

Mrs. Love asked about the cost of demolition for the property.

Mr. Livingston said he did not have the exact cost but according to experience, demolition with no asbestos was close to \$7,000.00 for demolition.

Mrs. Love asked did the City have about \$91,000 to work with.

Mr. Livingston said correct; and they could probably add some more; and there was about three more thousand they had found to fix the hole in the roof, but had held off to hear from the state before they did anything else.

Mr. Steinecke asked if there was still a lien on the house; and if so what would happen to that.

Mr. Livingston said there was still a lien on the house, and it would remain until they sold it to an income qualified applicant; and the owner would then become responsible for it.

Mr. Steinecke asked would the owner have to pay the lien back.

Mr. Livingston said it would remain on the house for fifteen to twenty years.

Mrs. Love asked would the City be rebuilding the house.

Mr. Livingston said the City would be rebuilding the house.

Mrs. Love asked how they would reconcile the cost for all of that.

Mr. Livingston explained once they put bids out, the state would find the additional funding to make it work.

Mr. Koenig said if they in any way wanted to recover their money that whomever bought the house would have to live there fifteen to twenty years, or if they wished to resale it pay back a portion of it and then make enough to what they paid plus the 30,000 came into play.

Mr. Livingston said that was correct; and he explained the size of the house would be closer to the 1400-1500 sq. ft. footprint that was originally there, for the marketability of the house. They felt it would be closer to the gap in what the City spent on it and what the home buyer would buy it for, and they would still have the gap. Their funding source did not consider the gap relevant. He explained they would sale the home for an appraised value.

Mr. Trail asked regarding when the Board Members had previously addressed this request; they had approved demolition of the rear and had tabled the matter for a year, and he thought they were about halfway through that originally it would have come back to the board members in October, 2017.

Mr. Meek ^{Livingston 812} said full disclosure; this was a historic property using Federal Funds and the Feds would have to approve the demolition as well. If they did not approve it, they were back to square one.

Mr. Steinecke asked where the Federal Funds came from again.

Mr. Livingston said NSP, and typically whenever they do work in historic neighborhoods it would normally come before the HARB Board, and the State Historic Preservation Office and the Federal Government had to also approve whatever work they were doing as well.

Mr. Ringo asked what was the original number again.

Mr. Livingston said it was \$30,000.00.

Mr. Turner asked would that be an issue in terms of someone trying to purchase and finance this house.

Mr. Livingston said it would not become an issue; and he explained.

Mr. Koenig asked did it not matter who bought it; they just had to live there for fifteen to twenty years.

Mr. Livingston explained they had to meet the income requirement first; then there would be a lien placed on the property to the City and the State for the term that were normally from fifteen to twenty years. The intent was so they did not sell the property and get a big cash out.

Mrs. Love asked how this played into their originally tabling the request to October of this year.

Mr. Livingston said their intent was not to demolish houses in historic neighborhoods, and they went through the process of seeing if there was any way they could make it work to demolish the rear and do the rehab. They then learned they had a funding source who was willing to provide money if they could not make it work; and after looking at all the figures, that it would be more reasonable.

Mrs. Love asked what would happen to the funding if the Board decided they had rather look at this in October instead of now.

Mr. Livingston said the City would find some other use for it somewhere else in Spartanburg.

Mr. Koenig asked if they needed Federal approval for the demo.

Mr. Livingston said he did.

Mr. Koenig asked could he ask the Feds for approval without a decision from the Board.

Mr. Livingston said he could, but it may take thirty to sixty days.

Mr. Koenig felt it would be good to know up front if the Feds would approve the demolition before we spend a lot more time discussing the issue.

Mr. Steinecke asked if the funding would remain earmarked for this project if they were to table the request.

Mr. Livingston said he could ask, he thought they were trying to use the money right away; but he could certainly ask.

Mr. Steinecke said he really appreciated all of Mr. Livingston's work along with the rest of Staff's work regarding this process.

Mr. Koenig asked historic wise, how was it that now we had air conditioning, additional cabling, etc.; if that would all be met by that design.

Mr. Livingston said yes; but that the chimney would be an issue because it was a challenge to find someone to do them properly.

Mr. Trail said if they approved the request, they would probably have to do it conditionally based on the funding to demolish it and the funding to replace it.

Mr. Livingston said that was correct.

Mr. Koenig said if they approved the demo today that would earmark the funds.

Mr. Livingston said the funds were earmarked for \$91,000 for this project.

Mr. Koenig asked about the forty-five days the Feds needed was not an issue.

Mr. Livingston said they still needed Federal approval, that the State Historic Preservation Office needed to review their request; and if this was approved they would make a request next week for them to review it; and they would let them know in 45 days from the date of his request.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak regarding the request to come forward and state their name and address for the record.

- Tonya Daves of 642 S Irwin came forward and said she lived two doors down from this home and she would like to see the home demolished as long as they got all of the approvals needed. She said regarding the rendering that was proposed by Campbell Meek and Associates, regarding the number of doors proposed, it looked that it could possibly be made into a duplex; and she thought if it potentially looked like a duplex, that it would take away from trying to sell the property. Also she mentioned in a bedroom where there was no closet and without a closet it really would not be a bedroom and that would cause the house to be harder to sell. Also she did not see any allocation for a laundry room. She felt without the things she had mentioned would be much harder to sell.
- Vivian Fisher of 269 Hampton Avenue came forward and said she was confused about some things. She said two things were happening here: demolition and building a new house. To her the home was a very graceful home; and even if it was changed she hoped the rebuilt home would be very pleasing. She said if the house becomes smaller as proposed and went back to more of the original footprint of the home; that the house did have small rooms and would have some issues that a buyer might not like. She wondered if this went forward were they stuck to the proposed design or was it something that could come up for discussion; and number two was if the City were to pay back the \$30,000 lien, did that mean the house was then free to be sold to anyone.
- Mrs. Love said she felt once the lien was paid the property would be free and clear and could be anything.
- Mr. Livingston said that was correct.
- Mr. Ringo asked what the restrictions were for the \$91,000 for the State.

Mr. Livingston explained it was the same restrictions he explained earlier. He said also that the \$30,000 to \$35,000 lien amount had always been the main issue.

He said regarding the portion that was not visible from the street they could certainly work on changing those things.

- Ms. Daves asked the square footage cost to rehab versus rebuild.

Mr. Livingston explained.

Mrs. Love asked if there were any more questions or comments from the audience.

- Mrs. Heather Morrow of 256 Hydrick Street with Heather Homes came forward and said she was very much in favor of the request. She felt because the funding sources were willing to offer the money for the rebuild and take a loss and that neighborhood got a new house was a positive thing.
- Mr. Keith Shambaugh of 546 Cecil Court came forward and said last summer he and some others met with Mr. Sidney Ferguson and Mr. Kennedy, and he thought there was some kind of time limit regarding the restrictions and then they would fall off; and he asked if that was correct.

Mr. Livingston explained his understanding of the restrictions and the explanation that was given to him that this was not land banking, because the house still stands on the property. He said the seven year restriction or ten year restriction only applied when they put a home owner in a home.

- Mr. Phillip Stone of 246 S Spring Street came forward and thanked all of City staff for all the work on the home. He was in support of the request as a best option in this case
- Mr. Richard Hauptman of 611 S Irwin Avenue came forward; and said he had to redo his house. He felt that keeping the character of the house was important; and he also felt that putting in a closet or a laundry room would be a good idea as well. He was inclined to believe if someone purchased the home they would take better care of it than someone who rented.
- Mr. Scott Clausen came forward and said he lives across the right-of-way from this house; and one of his concerns was if the house was demolished and rebuilt; if the house did not appraise at the level the homebuyer could purchase the house at, what would happen.

Mr. Livingston explained they had to sell the house at what it was appraised for; and they would provide a gap to the buyer which might mean the buyer would have to stay in the home longer.

Mr. Koenig asked was there a number of years someone would have to stay in the house for getting so much assistance.

Mr. Livingston explained there was.

Mrs. Love asked if there were any more comments or questions. There were not. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Trail said he would be inclined to approve the request if he knew the Feds would give approval for demolition and the funding approved.

Mrs. Love said she would like to see the discussion done in two portions: one being the demolition, and the other the approval of the design of the proposed house.

Mr. Koenig made a motion to table the request until Staff had heard whether or not the demolition would be approved by the Feds; and he was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

[For the record, Board Member Brad Steinecke had to leave the meeting at 7:15 P.M.]

- V. **Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work at 117 Phifer Drive in Beaumont Village** – For permission to make various exterior removal and repairs to the structure, from Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director on behalf of City of Spartanburg, Owner.

Ms. Rosario came forward and said the City owns the property and she explained the case to the Board Members. The request was to allow for removal of siding in the rear to replace portions of damaged siding in the front and other portions of the rear of the house. Additionally the Owner requests permission to remove the siding around the chimney in order to repair the leaking roof, and approval to remove the rear window to accommodate a new

bathroom tub, approval to install a wood colonial revival 1942 6-panel wooden door, approval to install gutters on all sides, and replace windows with like for like wooden 6-over-6 double hung windows.

In addition to these major work items to the exterior of the house, the City proposes to stabilize and repaint the exterior of the home, clean the exterior using nonabrasive methods, build a 6' x 6' landing, steps, and rail in the rear of the property to Building Code, repair the foundation, reroof and re-shingle, remove existing wooden fence and chicken wire on the lot, and removal of the existing metal awning on the front porch. Slides were shown in order to better illustrate the request.

Ms. Rosario came forward again and 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* – According to the City of Spartanburg Design Guidelines for the Beaumont Mill Village Historic District, the above listed major work must abide by the following guidelines:

3.7.6 Exterior Siding, Page 34 of the City of Spartanburg Beaumont Mill Village Design Guidelines:

Large Areas of Replacement Siding: *Should it become necessary to replace the siding, then the new boards should match the existing boards in width and any characteristics, such as corner boards. If more than 50% of non-original siding will be replaced then the type of replacement siding must match the historic style siding. Appropriate new material should be wood or cement fiberboard – brick veneer is not recommended as an option to replace siding.*

The intent for the siding is to move the asbestos siding that is still in good condition on the rear of the home, to other parts of the home where the siding is damaged. This will provide a coherent appearance and preserve the historic character where it is most visible and where it is possible in the rear. Replacement hardi plank siding are planned to fill in the areas where the original asbestos siding in good condition is moved from.

3.7.5 Roof Pitches and Roofing Materials (including chimneys and dormers), Page 33 of the City of Spartanburg Beaumont Mill Village Design Guidelines: *Chimneys are important features – the brick on these should be maintained. They should not be covered with stucco or any other material. Chimneys that are no longer in use shall remain intact and uncovered.*

The proposal includes rebuilding and repairing the chimney using as much of the original brick as possible, and replacing missing brick where necessary. It will also be reflashed.

3.7.2 Windows, Page 30, of the City of Spartanburg Beaumont Mill Village Design Guidelines: *If it is determined that the windows are in such deteriorated condition that they must be replaced, you should select a new window with extreme care. Make sure the following details should be compatible when selecting a new window: size of window, shape and size of sash, window pane size and configuration, muntin and mullion profile shape, location of meeting rail. Wood and aluminum clad windows are the most appropriate replacement materials. Other window materials to be evaluated by the HARB.*

The proposal includes removal of the original wooden windows and purchase and installation of the exact replicated type of wooden, double pane, double hung, six over six; including window sash, screen, snap-in mullion, hardware, weather stripped.

3.7.1 Doors, Page 28 of the City of Spartanburg Beaumont Mill Village Design Guidelines: *After looking at the options of replacing or repairing a door and it is deemed that the door is so deteriorated that it cannot be repaired, then a replacement is in order. Replacements should be in the same configurations, material, size, and light pattern.*

The proposal includes disposing of the existing door and frame and replacing it with a pre-hung six panel wood colonial revival 1942 6 panel door.

- 2) *The scale of the buildings* – n/a.

- 3) *The texture and materials* - The proposed texture and materials includes preserving as much of the original siding and placing it in the most visible areas of the home, and replacing the portions that have been moved with appropriate hardi plank siding. The intent is to preserve and repair as much of the chimney as possible,

and it will remain uncovered. Additional brick will be added where necessary. The replacement wooden windows and doors are to replicate the existing windows and historically appropriate features.

- 4) *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – The property will be rehabilitated to historic standard; many homes in the Beaumont Mill Village Historic District feature similar materials and architectural characteristics. Others have lost some of their historic integrity over time.
- 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 alterations to the house will help restore the property to historic status as well as make it a safer and more desirable home to live in. The proposed alterations will be harmonious with the Historic District..

Staff's Analysis

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed work will not have a negative impact on the historic character of the Beaumont Mill Village. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the work as proposed.

Board Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Ringo asked if the City was fixing up the house to sell.
- Ms. Rosario said yes.
- Mr. Koenig asked if the house had financial issues.
- Mr. Livingston said the City had to bring the house up to City Code; regardless; and they had to take into consideration they were selling to a buyer and did not want them to end up with any problems. He felt they could probably get about \$85,000 for the property; and they had purchased it for about \$30,000.00, and he thought they would put around \$50,000 to \$55,000 in the house...
- Mr. Livingston said he did not see it listed in the proposal, but the City also planned to remove the awning.
- Mr. Ringo asked how the City ended up with this house in the first place.
- Mr. Livingston explained.
- Mrs. Love asked regarding windows, that some of the windows looked to be 6 over 6; and some looked different.
- Mr. Livingston explained there was a window on the rear of the house that was different that would be covered over.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or against the request. No one came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Ringo moved to approve the request as presented; and he was seconded by Mr. Trail. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the February 9, 2017 Meeting.

- The Minor Works approved from the February 9, 2017 meeting were in the reports.

Staff Announcements:

Mrs. Roland said there was still one current Board Member vacancy on the Board that was never filled from last year; and on June 30, 2017 there would be a second Board Member Vacancy open. Also on June 30th they would have two Board Members whose positions would be up for reappointment by the Mayor and Council; and both members had turned in their forms for consideration.

Ms. Rosario said she had talked to one person who had submitted a new Board Member Form for consideration by the Mayor and Council; and possibly a second person was also interested.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 P.M.



Sarah Love, Chair

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant