

## MINUTES

### The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review

Thursday, May 14, 2020 ~ 5:30 PM

#### "Virtual Zoom Meeting"

Board Members Attendance: Sarah Love, Ray Trail, Brad Steinecke, Melissa Walker, Meg Reid, Josh Lonon, Rhiannon Leebrick, and Thomas Koenig.

Absent Board Members: Kathleen Crowley was absent.

City Staff: Natalia Rosario, Planner III; Rachel Grothe, Planner II; and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant. City Attorney Bob Coler; Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director; and Buddy Bush, Building Official also attended this meeting.

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

Mrs. Love asked the Board Members if they would like to amend the Agenda to include the disposition of the minutes from the April 9, 2020 Meeting that was not ready when the meeting packet was initially sent out; but had been emailed to them prior to tonight's meeting; if the Board Members felt good regarding the minutes.

Ms. Walker moved that the Agenda be amended to include the disposition of the April 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes; and she was seconded by Mr. Koenig. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 8 to 0.

#### Disposition of the April 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Steinecke moved approval of the April 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes; and he was seconded by Mr. Koenig. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 8 to 0.

#### New Business:

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works -348 W. Hampton Avenue in Hampton Heights - Owner/Applicant seeking permission to allow a rear porch enclosure that was done without the benefit of a Certificate of Appropriateness on a property in the R-8/SFD zone district TMS#7-16-02-005.00 from Lucille Mayfield, Owner.**

Ms. Grothe, Planner II was sworn; and she submitted into evidence the meeting packets the Board Members previously received by email and tonight's presentation as Exhibit A for both of tonight's cases. She introduced the request and showed a slide of the location map, and she explained the site was located on an R-8/SFD zoned lot on West Hampton Avenue between Pinckney Court and Timothy Street in the Hampton Heights historic district. A slide of the house was shown; and Ms. Grothe said the property was currently developed with a Hipped Bungalow that was constructed in 1910 and a small outbuilding. Ms. Grothe referenced another slide of the corner of the house regarding the enclosure of the porch; and she explained to the Board Members the applicant was seeking permission to allow the enclosure of a rear corner porch, that was mostly complete and was clad in vinyl siding except for a few panels. The enclosure was located at the rear right hand corner of the house (when viewed from the street). It was approximately 84 square feet in area. The side wall of the enclosure was approximately five feet and the rear portion was about 14 feet in width. Staff was made aware of the work being done without a Certificate of Appropriateness and immediately issued a stop work order. Staff was able to make contact with the property owner, Ms. Lucille Mayfield, who indicated she had not realized a Certificate was required for the enclosure due to its rear location. The Owner would like to remove the vinyl siding on the side and replace with wood to match the house and leave the rear siding as vinyl. The enclosure of the porch also included the removal of the back door which had been replaced with a window. More slides of the enclosed porch from various locations from the sidewalk were shown to better illustrate the request. Ms. Grothe said based on a review of the project against the five criteria listed in the Zoning Ordinance and the Guidelines, the project was in substantial conformance. The enclosed porch was not highly visible nor was it a character defining feature of the house. The siding that would be partially visible from the street would be wood to match the existing house. The rear vinyl siding would not be visible from the street. The Guidelines stated the enclosure of front porches, side porches and

porte-cocheres visible from the right of way were strongly discouraged. The document gave no mention of enclosing a rear porch. Ms. Grothe said Staff recommended approval, and that the applicant was also present.

[Editor's Note: The meeting packets the Board Members received via email prior to the meeting contained the following criteria for reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness:

1. *The character and appropriateness of the design* – The enclosed rear porch will not alter the character of historical integrity of the property as the rear porch is not a character defining feature and will not be highly visible from the street. Additionally, any portions seen from the street will be clad in wooden siding to match the existing house.
2. *The scale of the buildings* – The enclosed rear porch has filled in an area already defined by the existing house. It will not project out from the house or increase its bulk or mass.
3. *The texture and materials* – The vinyl siding on the side of the house will be replaced with wooden siding to match the existing house. It will also be painted to match the house. The rear siding will remain vinyl but is not visible from the street.
4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – The enclosed rear porch will not change the relationship between the existing house and those nearby. The enclosure is so minor and located at the rear of the property. It will likely not be noticeable from the street.
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 enclosed porch will blend harmoniously in Hampton Heights as not all the houses in the district contain rear porches. Additionally, it will be only slightly visible from the street and since the side will be clad in wood, will likely not be noticed as an enclosed porch.

Ms. Lucille Mayfield was sworn; and she informed the Board members she did not know she would need approval since the porch would not be seen. She did not replace the porch; and she wanted to secure her property. Ms. Mayfield said she might want to do something in the future like a pergola and perhaps a fence at a later date.

Ms. Grothe explained regarding a fence; and said she would also need to apply for a fence permit.

There being no questions at this time; Mrs. Love opened the public hearing and asked if anyone in the listening audience wished to speak in favor or in opposition of the request to raise their hand on the screen. There being no raised hands Mrs. Love closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

#### **Board Deliberation:**

Ms. Walker moved approval as presented that included the Conditions of Approval that had been included in their meeting packets; and she was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 8 to 0.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works –526 South Irwin Avenue in Hampton Heights – Owners/Applicants seeking permission to install porch railings on a house where none currently exist on a property in the R-8/SFD zone district; TMS#7-16-02-096.00; from Audrey Sperry and Eric Kocher, Owners.**

Ms. Grothe who was still under oath, showed a location slide, and said the site was located on an R-8/SFD zoned lot on S. Irwin Avenue near the corner of South Hampton and South Irwin in the Hampton Heights historic district. She showed a slide of the house and informed the Board Members the site currently contained one single family dwelling that was constructed in 1930. The house could be described as Craftsman style and was painted a sunny-shade of yellow with white accents. Like many of the homes in Hampton Heights, the house contained a prominent front porch; and she said the covered front porch was one of the character defining features of the Craftsman style home. Ms. Grothe showed a slide of the house at 250 Pinckney Court; and said the applicants wanted to install a porch railing much like the one on the slide. The railing would be 28 inches in height and the pickets would be approximately four inches apart. The railing would be painted white to match the existing trim and accents. The railing would serve to screen the lower portion of the porch, and would also act as a barrier between the drops from the porch to the ground. The owners believed that the railing would provide a bit of privacy and safety while they enjoyed their porch. Ms. Grothe said the house in the slide could also be described as a 1930s Craftsman style home. She showed another slide to show the location of the proposed railing. Ms. Grothe said Staff had determined the project was in substantial conformance with the

Zoning Ordinance and the Historic Guidelines. The new railing was an appropriate characteristic for a Craftsman Style home; and a major tenant of a Craftsman Style home was its porch, many of which included railings. The railing would be 28 inches in height and would not overwhelm the porch nor block any views of the house from the street. The proposed railing would be wood and painted white which would match the house in terms of material and color scheme. The railing would not be out of character with any of the surrounding houses. Many of the homes on South Irwin Avenue contained porches with similar railings. The Guidelines strongly discourage the enclosure of porches as it could drastically alter the front façade. The document gave no mention of railings. The railing would not enclose the porch but instead, would act as a barrier which would offer the property owners some privacy and safety. Ms. Grothe said the applicants were present.

Board Questions:

Mr. Koenig asked were there any historic pictures of the house.

Ms. Grothe said she was not provided any; and she had not been able to find any.

[Editor's Note: The meeting packets the Board Members received via email prior to the meeting contained the following criteria for reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness:

1. *The character and appropriateness of the design* – The proposed railing is an appropriate feature to add to a Craftsman style home. Porches are found on all Craftsman style homes, some contain railings, and some do not.
2. *The scale of the buildings* – The proposed railing will be 28 inches in height and will not overwhelm the porch. The height and the spacing of the pickets will not block any views of the house and can be removed without causing damage to the original structure.
3. *The texture and materials* – The railing will be made of wood which will match the materials on the house. It will also be painted white which will match some existing white accents.
4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings* – The proposed railing will be similar to nearby houses, many of which possess porches with railings. Additionally, S. Irwin Avenue contains a number of Craftsman style homes with porches and railings.
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 railing will blend harmoniously in Hampton Heights. Not only is it neighborhood appropriate, the railing is so minor, it likely will not be noticed by passersby. A staff survey of Hampton Heights revealed countless porches with railings, many of which are located on Craftsman style homes.]

Mrs. Love asked the petitioner's if they wished to address the Board Members.

Ms. Sperry and Mr. Kocher were sworn; and informed the Board Members they really liked the look and feel of the railings, and wanted to prevent someone from just stepping off the porch.

Board Questions:

Mrs. Love asked was there any evidence on the porch that originally railings had been in place.

Ms. Grothe showed the slide again that had the railings.

Mr. Steinecke had a question regarding the proposed railings; and Ms. Grothe explained.

Mr. Trail asked about stairs going down to drive; and Ms. Grothe explained.

Mrs. Love opened the public hearing portion and asked anyone in the listening audience who wished to speak in favor or the request, or in opposition of the request to please raise their hand feature on their screen; to be heard.

Victoria & Basel Qatawi, the next door neighbors at 512 S Irwin Avenue said they had no problem with the proposed railing.

Mrs. Love asked was there anyone else who wished to speak regarding the request. There being no one else to speak; Mrs. Love closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Koenig felt it would be very beneficial regarding the railings, and moved to approve the request as presented by Staff that included the Conditions of Approval; and he was seconded by Mr. Trail. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 8 to 0.

Update on 201 Caulder Avenue – Rachel Grothe.

Ms. Grothe explained she did not have anything new to report regarding this item.

Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the April 9, 2020 Meeting – Rachel Grothe.

Ms. Grothe went over the Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works that had been approved by Staff since the April 9, 2020, Meeting.

Ms. Grothe informed the Board Members Mrs. Alicia Kane who was new to Hampton Heights and had purchased a house at 200 W. Hampton Avenue was listening to the meeting to learn more about the HARB; and she explained she was putting together an application for the June meeting.

**STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Mrs. Love said the June, 2020 meeting would be her last meeting because her term would be up; and the Board Members needed to be thinking about a new Chair.

Ms. Roland said Mr. Koenig's term would also be up as of June, 2020. She said Ms. Walker and Ms. Reid's first terms would be up for consideration by the Mayor and City Council for another term if they so chose.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:02 P.M.

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

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant