

**MINUTES**  
**The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review**  
**Meeting**  
**Thursday, February 14, 2019 ~ 5:30 PM**  
**City Hall Training Room**

Board Members Attendance: Sarah Love, Ray Trail, Josh Lonon, Brad Steinecke, Melissa Walker, Thomas Koenig, and Kathleen Crowley.

Absent Board Members: Meg Reid.

City Staff: Natalia Rosario, Planner III; and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.

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

Mr. Steinecke moved approval of tonight's Agenda; and he was seconded by Ms. Walker. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Disposition of the Minutes from the January 10, 2019 Meeting.

Mr. Trail made a motion that the January 10, 2019 minutes be approved as submitted; and he was seconded by Mr. Lonon. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

**Old Business:**

There was no old business.

**New Business:**

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 336 W. Hampton Avenue in Hampton Heights -For permission to maintain an accessory structure (approx.. 8' x 10' wooden playhouse) in the rear yard that did not receive original permission from the HARB Board for Construction. Phuoc Do, Owner.**

Ms. Rosario came forward and she was sworn; and she explained the case to the Board Members.

[Editor's Note: Board Member Kathleen Crowley arrived to the meeting at 5:34 P.M.]

Ms. Rosario showed a location map of the property and of the play house in the rear yard. She went over the following list of criteria for the Board Members to consider when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness in the Hampton Heights Historic Neighborhood the Board Members had previously 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 Neighborhood:
  - a. **10.2.6 Accessory Buildings:** – New accessory buildings such as garages and storage houses, shall be located in rear yard spaces and visually buffered from adjacent and property owners and the public right-of-way. Accessory buildings that complement and/or duplicate the architecture of the adjacent residence do not require the same level of buffering but may remain more visible within the local district.  
  
The accessory structure is located behind Mr. Do's house in the rear yard, and is only visible from the right-of-way due to the location of the adjacent yard (on the far end of the parcel instead of near the front like most homes in HH) and the location of the shared driveway between the two properties.
2. *The scale of the buildings* – The scale of the building is appropriate in context with the site and the surrounding properties.
3. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – There are not many visible accessory structures or play-houses in the immediate vicinity of W. Hampton Avenue – that said, throughout Hampton Heights one may find a variety of exterior sheds, garages, project rooms, and storage buildings.
4. *Appropriate materials in coherence with the historic character of the district* – The play house is constructed out of wood, with wooden shingle siding. The window panes in the structure mimic those of the main house.

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 building is harmonious with the character of the district.

**Staff's Analysis:**

Staff recommends that the Board approve the request as presented.

More slides were shown and explained in order to better illustrate the request. Ms. Rosario said she would like to enter the meeting packets the Board Members had received via email, tonight's presentations and slides on all of tonight's cases into Evidence as Exhibit A.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Koenig asked if the structure was already in place.
- Ms. Rosario said it was; and if the Board was truly unhappy with it, they could request he tear it down or make some modifications. She said regarding the visual impact, that it was not very much from the street. She explained it was actually brought to her attention by a neighbor; and she wanted to make sure she was being fair to everybody by bringing it before the Board.
- Ms. Crowley asked if it had been brought to her attention as a complaint.
- Ms. Rosario said that it was basically; and that it was non-permitted and had not come before the HARB Board.

Mrs. Love asked if the petitioner would like to come forward.

Mr. Phuoc Do, property owner came forward and was sworn. He informed the Board Members when he had put the play house in, he did not realize it would need a permit because it was not really visible from the street. He asked that the Board please grant approval.

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

- Ms. Angela Viney of 309 W. Hampton Avenue came forward and said the petitioner was a very good neighbor, and she was in support of the request.
- Ms. Beverly Bourgeois of 491 Pinckney Ct. came forward and said they were very delighted to have Mr. Do and his family as neighbors; and was in support of the request. She had lived in Hampton Heights since 1986 and had seen a whole lot of changes. She also suggested to the Board Members that maybe some of the rules needed to be reviewed and/or even changed, and also made clearer regarding what were major/minor works as well.

Mrs. Love asked would anyone else wish to speak. No one else came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

Board Comments/Deliberation:

- Mr. Steinecke agreed with Ms. Bourgeois in that it was a very delightful building.
- Mr. Trail felt from the slides that had been shown the building would be very hard to even see; and he did not see a problem with it.

Ms. Crowley made a motion to approve the request as presented; and she was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 259 Hydrick Street in Hampton Heights -For permission to construct a new garage with the same elevation as the front of the house; and replace the existing chain-link fence with a 42" wooden picket fence; and permission for the installation of a new front door to historic standards, in order to replace an undersized door that is currently installed. Bill and Mary Jane Michels, Owners.**

Ms. Rosario came forward and she was sworn; and she explained to the Board Members Mr. Michels was in the process of renovating the interior of the home so they could move in to the home; and as part of the renovations they would like permission to do the work as listed above. Slides were shown of the location, existing property

slides, plat, proposed garage, fence, and door in order to better illustrate the request. She said Mr. & Mrs. Michels were present; and the Board could hear from them first or she could go over her report.

Mrs. Love asked Ms. Rosario when she went over the report, if she could go over the items in three different portions.

Ms. Rosario explained that she would.

Mr. Bill Michels came forward of 384 S. Fairview avenue, property owner; and he was sworn. He explained to the Board Members the reasons for appearing before the Board; and that as soon as they had gotten their renovations completed they planned to move in to the house.

#### Board Questions:

- Mr. Koenig asked was the picket fence common for the neighborhood.
- Ms. Rosario said the quick answer right now was the guidelines did not like to see any fences in the front yard, but over time it had happened some in the neighborhood; but in this case she felt the craftsman style or something similar to match the house would be appropriate, being the existing condition of the chain-link fence was as it was; and that it was not as attractive as what could be there. She showed slides of some of the craftsman style wooden picket fences. Ms. Rosario said Mr. Michels would have it custom made; and it would either be a 3' or 4' high fence. On some of the other fences they had seen in the front yards, the homes were more victorian style, and it had been appropriate for wrought iron in those front yards. She said the guidelines did not really make a distinction between the type of house and the type of fence, they either called for no fence or wrought iron; but she said they had some middle ground that could be approached.
- Ms. Crowley asked if the fences were frowned upon in Hampton Heights, what about the other chain-link fences that were there.
- Mr. Steinecke said most of those were in place prior to the guidelines being approved.
- Ms. Crowley asked would the picket fence be painted white.
- Mr. Michels said yes.

Ms. Rosario explained she would go over the analysis for each one separately regarding the list of criteria for the Board Members to consider when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness in the Hampton Heights Historic Neighborhood they had 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 Neighborhood:

- a. **10.2.6 Accessory Buildings:** – New accessory buildings such as garages and storage houses, shall be located in rear yard spaces and visually buffered from adjacent and property owners and the public right-of-way. Accessory buildings that complement and/or duplicate the architecture of the adjacent residence do not require the same level of buffering but may remain more visible within the local district.

The proposed garage will be custom built in the rear northeast corner of the property, where an accessory structure was previously located. It will complement the existing home in material, architectural design, and color.

- b. **10.2.4 Enclosures: Fences** are discouraged in the front yard spaces of the district but are appropriate in rear yard spaces and along side yard boundary lines. Rear yard fences shall be coordinated with existing city codes. Suggested materials for rear yard fencing include vegetation, wood and chain link. Vines are suggested to soften the appearance of chain link fencing. If wood fencing is used, the paint color and design shall be compatible with the architecture of the adjacent residence. Fence heights can range from 4' to 6' depending on the reason for the enclosure.

The fence at this property is existing chain link. While the preferred treatment per historic guidelines would be to remove the fence and not replace it at all – however, the owner has a pet that he would like to allow to maintain use of the yard, and he would like to improve the curb appeal of the property as well. Staff is of the opinion that a custom wooden picket fence to match the home will be preferable to the existing chain link fence and recommends approval.

- c. **Retain original doors unless deteriorated beyond repair.** Screen and storm doors shall not detract from the character of the house and shall be designed to be compatible with original doors. In the case of a replacement for a deteriorated door, the new door shall be similar to the original in design and materials. Original door openings shall not be infilled on facades visible from the public right-of-way.

The original door was removed sometime prior to the ownership of the Michels. The existing door is too small for the frame and is not the correct historic treatment for the home. The applicants are suggesting to replace with a correctly sized, wooden (mahogany), craftsman style door.

2. *The scale of the buildings* – The scale of a one-story, two car garage in the rear corner of the lot is appropriate for the site and the nearby residential properties, some of which feature modern garages that detract from the character of the district, and others which are either original or have been constructed to mimic the materials and construction of the original time period.
3. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* –

**Garage:** See above.

**Fencing:** Nearby homes along Hydrick and Beta Club Way feature front/side yard chain link and wooden stockade fences. Other homes in the neighborhood occasionally feature block walls or wrought iron fencing in the front yard (Victorian Style homes) as well.

**Door:** Some doors in the neighborhood remain original or have been replaced with doors to historic standards. Others feature non-original doors, and in some worst-case scenarios feature ill-fitting doors of the wrong material and style for the home.

4. *Appropriate materials in coherence with the historic character of the district* –

**Garage:** The building will be custom built (although the final design is not prepared just yet) and will mimic the color, material, and architectural style of the home.

**Fencing:** The HH Historic Guidelines call for wooden, chain link, or block/stucco fencing/enclosures in the rear or side yards, and wrought iron in the front yard. Staff is of the opinion that in this case, if any fence is to be placed in the front yard, then a wooden picket fence of up to 4' in height is appropriate.

**Door:** Mahogany is an appropriate historic material.

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 are in harmony with the historic district. If approved, Staff will distribute the architectural designs to the Board prior to release of permitting.

#### **Staff's Analysis:**

Staff recommends that the Board approve the request as presented.

#### **Board Questions:**

- Mr. Lonon said he was just curious whether the Board would have the power to do anything or not if they approved the request before seeing architectural designs.
- Ms. Rosario said her intention was to send them via email to the Board Members, and if they saw a real issue with anything she would bring it back to the Board for approval.
- Ms. Walker asked did the drive way come in off of Beta Club Way.
- Ms. Rosario said it did.
- Ms. Crowley asked would they be demolishing their existing pad.
- Mr. Michels said the pad was still there, but he has not had anyone come out yet to see if the existing pad could be used, or if it would have to be broken up and a new pad put in to have a solid structure to build on.
- Ms. Rosario said the garage regarding the size would require a building permit from the City Building Inspections Department.
- Mr. Steinecke asked was there a driveway as part of this packet.

- Ms. Rosario said it was existing.
- Mr. Steinecke asked so there would not be any concrete poured.
- Mr. Michels explained there would need to be a little more concrete in order for it to be a little wider at the back.
- Mrs. Love asked so it would just be to connect with what was already there.
- Mr. Michels said that was correct.

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

- Dr. Phillip Stone, Jr. of 246 S. Spring Street came forward and said he was in support of the request.

Mrs. Love asked was there anyone else who wished to speak regarding this portion of the request. No one else came forward.

Board Deliberation re garage portion of request:

Ms. Walker made a motion to approve the garage portion of this request as presented by staff; and she was seconded by Mr. Lonon. The motion regarding the garage portion was unanimously approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Ms. Rosario came forward again, and said they would now move on to the fencing portion of the request; and she explained as follows:

Ms. Rosario read her analysis again beginning with fences that began at the bottom of on page 3 through 4 of the minutes regarding fences.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing regarding the fence portion of the request. There was no one to speak regarding the fence portion. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

Board Comments/Deliberation re fence portion of request:

Mr. Lonon said he was curious; and asked about the reasoning behind the discouragement of fences.

Ms. Rosario said in the past when Hampton Heights was first built, most of the homes did not have fences, and the view from the street was generally of grassy plains, and that the fences broke up that view. Ms. Rosario said a lot of time had passed and some chain-link fences had gone up; and that some looked better than others.

Mr. Steinecke said he was a little bit concerned about this; and he thinks some peoples' fences had gone too far in the neighborhood; and that they could become a visual distraction. He felt however, that a wooden fence was far more preferable to what was currently there. He wanted to vote for the fence, but felt he needed to find a justification for it so it would not slip out of control. He also felt that fences were like a bit more closer to an urban space type characteristic; so that might be a way to understand a justification for this – with this portion of the neighborhood being the closest to downtown.

Mrs. Love said they had looked at fences before that did not come in front of the house, but that started maybe at where the porch ended at the side of the house and did not come across the front so that they did maintain the streetscape; and felt that was the original intention on those guidelines had been a way they had compromised on that issue previously.

Mr. Trail said he looked at it – if he was asking for a new fence without an existing fence there he could certainly understand not approving it; but all he was asking was to replace the existing fence that was not in good condition, and if they did not allow him to replace it; it was going to look a lot worse.

Mrs. Love agreed.

Mr. Trail moved to approve the fence portion as presented by staff; and he was seconded by Ms. Walker. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

Mr. Lonon asked if they could add to the record the justification they had just heard.

Mrs. Love explained it would be in the minutes.

Ms. Rosario came forward again and said the last part of the request was the door; and she went over again the door portion noted on page four of the minutes, and she showed more slides.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing regarding the door portion of the request; and she asked anyone who wished to speak regarding the door to come forward. No one came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing portion regarding the door.

Board Deliberation re door portion of request:

Mr. Steinecke made a motion to approve the door portion of the request as presented; and he was seconded by Mr. Trail. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 505 Peronneau Street in Hampton Heights -For permission to construct a new accessory structure (detached garage) in the rear yard of the property out of historic materials. Susan Myers, Owner.**

Ms. Rosario came forward again and said this request was to construct a two-car detached garage in the rear of the property made of historic standard materials and mimicking the architecture and light pattern generally found in Hampton Heights. She reference a slide of the old Sanborn Map, and a survey of the property; and she pointed out on the slide and explained there was a concrete wall on the side and rear. She showed some slides of examples of the proposed materials and style to be used. She showed a slide of two properties across the street and said they also had two nice two-car garages made of historic materials and painted to match the existing houses.

Ms. Susan Myers of 505 Peronneau Street came forward and was sworn. She explained to the Board Members that her boyfriend also lived there and had a background in construction, and they were looking for more storage area to accommodate a large amount of tools. Ms. Myers said it would also act as a workshop.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Koenig asked that it would not be used as a place to park the cars.
- Ms. Myers said probably not.
- Mr. Koenig asked was that a seven foot line on the left of the building.
- Ms. Myers said yes, and she explained it was very narrow.
- Mr. Steinecke asked if she planned to have a patio on the side of it.
- Ms. Myers explained they planned to extend the roof-line of the garage down a little, so there would be an overhang. She said they were not going to put concrete in that section, that it would be something after the fact like pavers or something, for when the dogs needed to go out in the rain. She said later when they had the opportunity they hoped to stretch it out a little bit.
- Ms. Crowley asked if there were other metal roof structures in Hampton Heights.
- Ms. Myers said they did drive around and had found all kinds of things, i.e. metal roof structures and metal structures; but she did not know whether or not they had been approved by the Board.
- Ms. Crowley asked was there something in the guidelines regarding wood framing.

Ms. Rosario explained the exterior materials should reflect the character of the districts; and as far as metal roofs some homes did have metal roofs; and the redeeming factor in this case would be you could not really see it from the street. Ms. Rosario went over the following list of criteria for the Board Members to consider when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness in the Hampton Heights Historic Neighborhood they had 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 Neighborhood:
  - a. **10.2.6 Accessory Buildings:** – New accessory buildings such as garages and storage houses, shall be located in rear yard spaces and visually buffered from adjacent and property owners and the public right-of-way. Accessory buildings that complement and/or duplicate the architecture of the adjacent residence do not require the same level of buffering but may remain more visible within the local district.

The proposed garage will be only partially visible from the right-of-way, as it is located in the rear yard of the property and is mostly obscured by the house itself. It will abut or be near to a concrete wall along the side.

2. *The scale of the buildings* – The scale of a one-story, two car garage in the rear corner of the lot is appropriate for the site and the nearby residential properties, some of which feature modern garages that detract from the character of the district, and others which are either original or have been constructed to mimic the materials and construction of the original time period. Ms. Rosario said Ms. Myers had said she would be sure and get doors that would reflect the character of the neighborhood.
3. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surrounds* – Several homes across the street from this property feature two car garages. One is a two story with the potential for a unit above the parking area, and one is a simple one story. Both feature more modern garage doors, but overall blend in well with the street and properties upon which they are located.
4. *Appropriate materials in coherence with the historic character of the district* – The metal roof and wooden board and batten siding are appropriate materials for the historic character of the district.
5. *If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District* - The proposed alterations are in harmony with the historic district. If approved, Staff will distribute the architectural design to the Board prior to release of permitting.

#### **Staff's Analysis:**

Staff recommends that the Board approve the request as presented.

#### **Board Questions:**

- Mr. Steinecke asked a question about the metal trusses that would be supporting the roof would only be supported on the two side walls, regarding long term and if the back alleyway ever had to be used again; and if someone ever had to cut through so there would not be something blocking that.
- Ms. Myers explained that was correct.
- Mr. Koenig asked Ms. Rosario to reference the Sanborn Map slide again; and asked about a building that use to be in the back corner.
- Ms. Rosario said correct; and she pointed out on the map that two lots had been combined today, but the original outdoor accessory structure was now gone.
- Mr. Koenig said it looked very close to the property line.
- Ms. Rosario said correct; and it would need to be at least five feet from the property line per building codes standards.
- Ms. Crowley asked about a setback on the next lot up.
- Ms. Rosario said at that time in this neighborhood and in Converse Heights setbacks just were not a thing to consider.

Mrs. Love asked if there were any more questions. There were no more questions.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing and asked if anyone had any comments. No one came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing.

#### **Board Comments/Deliberation:**

Mr. Trail moved approval of the request as submitted; and he was seconded by Ms. Crowley. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

- **Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the January 10, 2019 Meeting – Natalia Rosario.**

Ms. Rosario went over the Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works that had been approved by Staff since the January 10, 2019 Meeting.

## STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mrs. Roland said there was still one vacant Board Member Position.

Ms. Rosario reminded the Board Members they would have the next meeting on Wednesday, February 27, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. She explained to the Board Members where they were right now regarding the Cleveland Hall; and that a petition had been put forth and signed by ten citizens of the City to ask that the HARB Board recommend placing the house on the Pending List of Historic Sites in the City. If the HARB Board does vote in favor of this, then the responsibility moves to City Council to take it up, or they could choose not to take it up. Ms. Rosario said if Council took it up and placed it on the Local Pending List – it would mean that any changes to the exterior of the house would need to come before the HARB Board just like any other case that did now in Hampton Heights and Beaumont Village. Or she said Council could vote not to place it on the Local Pending List, which in that case it would just remain on the National Register like it currently was. She informed the Board Members she did not know this for a fact, but there was word that a couple had approached Mr. Montgomery, Owner; with an offer to purchase the house and restore it in order to live in it; which if this did happen she felt it would be the best possible outcome of it all. Ms. Rosario said otherwise, unless everyone that signed the aforementioned petition rescinded their signatures from the petition; that the case would still come before the HARB Board on February 27, 2019; and they should see some paperwork regarding Staff Report and Staff Recommendation in a week or so.

Ms. Crowley asked was this a formality.

Mrs. Love, the Chair, said this was just the first step in the process.

Ms. Rosario explained City Council ultimately had the power to decide whether or not they would consider it; and she referenced Bon Haven a few years back; and she asked Dr. Stone, former HARB Board Chair and Board Member to explain regarding Bon Haven.

Dr. Stone came forward and explained what went on regarding Bon Haven.

Ms. Walker said she would like to clarify the HARB Board Member's role regarding determining whether or not it met the criteria to be designated as a historic structure.

Mrs. Love said that was correct, and there were six or seven features listed in the Ordinance, which the petitioner's present to the Board why they think it fits one or more of those categories; and if it does she said the Board had to say that it did.

Ms. Rosario said it was already on the National Register, and it pretty well much met all of the requirements; and she said she would describe more in depth in her Staff Report, which the Board would receive in a week or so. Ms. Rosario said this was a good segue into something Mr. Steinecke would like to briefly talk about.

Mr. Steinecke said that often times these measures seem to be them reacting to a situation that suddenly everyone was frantic about; and he felt it would be more appropriate as a Board for them to be more pro-active regarding other historic sites that are within the City. He presented each Board Member with a list of National Register of Historic Places sites in the City of Spartanburg; and said it would be something for them to start looking at; and for the Board Members to start considering should one of these ever come to the Board. Mr. Steinecke said he would like to see people come to them to argue those cases on an individual basis.

Mr. Lonon asked Mr. Steinecke if the Board Members could make that motion on their own as a Board.

Mr. Steinecke said they could; and that it did not require the consent of the property owner; or that ten citizens could sign a petition like in the current case.

Mrs. Love explained the specifics were on page 238 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Rosario said just to clarify as a Board, they could vote to consider the sites on the list Mr. Steinecke had just distributed to force a vote, or another role which she felt the Board Members played was advocacy; and what she would recommend would be to consider the ones on the list that were highest priority first, and perhaps herself and the Chair and/or Vice-Chair would try to reach out to the property owners to see if they could make a case. She said they certainly did not want to impose restrictions and some of those on the list had been well-preserved using historic tax credits. She felt they should first concentrate on the ones they had the most concerns about in terms of preservation.

Mrs. Love felt it would be important for them to dispel the myth that the Board Members were punitive and that really they are a body that protects, and there are some definite benefits would be a good avenue for that advocacy and that it would be fabulous if the owners could be encouraged.

Mr. Steinecke said he could send out links by email as well.

Mr. Koenig asked if these were recent cases to the National Register.

Mrs. Love said some of those had been on the list for forty years or so; and she said Pine Street School was the newest addition to the list.

Ms. Walker asked as clarification, was the Duncan Dupre House the one that had been moved over to VCOM.

Mr. Steinecke said yes.

Ms. Walker asked had that knocked it off the National Register.

Mr. Steinecke said it was currently still listed on the National Register; and as to whether or not they would need to do another phase of an application if they were to try to go for Historic Tax Credits, that he was not sure.

Ms. Crowley explained how the State of Louisiana required listings under both National and Local Registry.

Mrs. Love said the Montgomery Building did get historic tax credits, and it was not locally designated.

Ms. Rosario said speaking of the Montgomery Building, she had finally remembered to speak to Mr. Bakker and schedule a time for the building to be toured to make sure it met everything they had said it would, so they could wrap up their Local Special Historic Tax Credit Application with the County. She said she knew Monday, February 18<sup>th</sup> was a holiday; but she had arranged for as many that wanted to take the tour at 1:00 PM and for whomever all could meet to please let her know; because if they were to have a quorum that she would need to get an ad to the paper the next day regarding they would meet as a Body regarding the tour. She said if there were Board Members that this was not convenient for she would also work on a second tour as well. Ms. Rosario said she would also follow-up with the five other buildings at a future time the Board would also need to tour regarding the same credits; and that they had kind of taken their time with these because the County had been working on the exact language for the paperwork that needed to be on the final document to be signed by the HARB Board; so up until now it had not been an immediate need.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.



---

Sarah Love, Chair

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.