

**Minutes**  
**The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review**  
**November 12, 2020**  
**Virtual Zoom Meeting**

**Board Member Attendance:** Ray Trail, Anne Rodrick, Kenneth Brown, Kathleen Crowley, Rhiannon Leebrick, and Brad Steinecke. Absent were Meg Reid, Melissa Walker, and Josh Lonon.

**City Staff:** Rachael Grothe, Planner II, Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant, and Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director. City Attorney Bob Coler also attended the meeting.

Mr. Trail, the Chair, called this meeting to order on November 12, 2020 at 5:30 P.M.; and he stated the hearing procedures. He recognized the five Board Members currently present constituted a quorum, and he proceeded with the guidelines for the procedure of this meeting; and he had all the Board Members introduce themselves for recording purposes.

Mr. Trail said the first thing I want to do before we get into our agenda is just give a few guidelines for the meeting, if you would. I'm going to ask the Board, if you are asking a question or making a comment, please mention your name, so the people recording this will know who made each comment as the Rev Services tend to mix up the speakers at times; and if a person states their name before each time they say something; it will be noted and the minutes can be made more accurate.

And as for the meeting, guidelines for the meeting, the City will present each application to us that will be Rachel will be presenting those to us and then the applicants or their representatives will have a chance to address the Board, and we'll be able to ask them questions and then we'll take questions from the public and the City and the applicant will need to be sworn in for the meeting. The public, anybody calling from the public will not need to be sworn in, but I will ask you that you would tell us your name and your address, and please limit your time to two minutes if you would.

[Editor's Note: Board Member Kathleen Crowley signed on to the meeting].

The first item on our agenda is the **agenda itself**. Everyone on the Board should have a copy of that and do we have any questions or any concerns about the agenda.

Mr. Steinecke said I have one small one in the minutes for the last month, it referred to tabling the Hydrick Street, new construction. I thought perhaps, maybe that application was actually withdrawn from the applicant ending a revision of the second of a two story or some change. But since it was formerly mentioned as being tabled until this meeting, I wanted to clear that.

Ms. Grothe said Mr. Summey asked for an additional month to get his materials together for that project. It was on the agenda initially, but I took it off.

Mr. Steinecke said that's fine. As long as he's aware and I think everybody's on Board with what's going on there.

Ms. Grothe said yes, but the project has not been withdrawn.

Ms. Crowley moved approval of the agenda for tonight's meeting; and she was seconded by Ms. Roderick. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

**Disposition of the Minutes from the October 8, 2020**

Mr. Trail said the agenda is approved and the next item will be the disposition of the minutes from the October 8th meeting. I know that was a lengthy meeting, a lot of stuff in those minutes. So, does anybody have any questions or concerns about the minutes from the last meeting.

Mr. Steinecke said I noted a couple of very small changes that they could accurately reflect what happened there. I'll just refer to the pages in the packet that they're on. Page two, there's a line that says "water leaks into the scene." And it's spelled like the scene of a movie, that should be the seam, like

between two surfaces there, again, just a minor thing. On page 10, there's a quote in there for me. I say, "I cannot find the part that Sylvie referred to. So that's a small change. And then on page 15, oh, it was about the tabling, the Hydrick house, which we've talked about now. So just those two changes on page two and page 10.

Mr. Brown moved approval of the minutes as amended; and he was seconded by Mr. Steinecke. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

#### **New Business**

**Nomination of Site to Local Historic Pending List-201 Caulder Avenue former Mary H. Wright School- Applicant requesting the Board to determine if the site is an appropriate candidate for local historic designation. Toni Sutton, Applicant.**

Ms. Grothe, Planner II was sworn; and she entered the PowerPoint presentation, and meeting packets into evidence as Exhibit A. This is for a nomination of a site to a local historic pending list. It's 201 Caulder Avenue, which is the former Mary H. Wright School. There's a bit of history with this, and I know some of the Board members were with us when some of this happened and I know we have some new folks. On August 8th of 2019, the Board heard from the African American Heritage Committee regarding the historical significance of the former Mary H. Wrights School site. The site was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2007, the Board then at that meeting directed the staff to place the item on the next agenda and advertise the matter as a public hearing item to consider local designation. And then at the next meeting, which was September 12th, 2019, at the request of the African American Heritage Committee, the Board tabled the local designation decision in order to give the interested buyer time to complete their due diligence. And the Board requested that updates be given monthly on the site for how things were going. So currently, plans for the site include the conversion and adaptive reuse of the existing building, as multifamily. A rezoning request was heard by planning commission in October and then just at our recent City council meeting two days ago, City council approved the rezoning at its First Reading and then the Second Reading for this is scheduled for the 23rd, so later this month. The site is approximately a 9 acre site that contains the 58,000 square foot former school. The school was constructed in 1951, expanded in the 1960s and a gym renovation was done in the 1980s. The site was added to the National Register of Historic Places on August 3rd, 2007. The register's description of the property indicates that the school is significant for its association with the statewide struggle over racial equality and education during the 1950s and there's a remarkable local example of how the community attempted to implement the state's initial response to the legal challenges brought against South Carolina segregated educational system. The school is named in honor of African American civic leader and educator, Mary H. Wright who launched the Carrier Street School in 1909. The school was one of the first separate but equal institutions in the state and is among the last standing formally segregated local schools that served African American students. I went out and took a bunch of pictures of the site. This was from when it came last year, I still have a bunch of photos that were good. So, for everyone to sort of see what's out there. This slide shows some of the major differences between national and local listing. Some of the biggest differences between the two have to do with alterations and demolitions. The bottom line is that the real protective power of historic resources is found on the local level. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 enabled local governments to establish review agencies. These powers are reserved for local governments because of the underlying philosophy that each community should determine for itself, what is significant, what is the value to the community and what steps should be taken to provide for it. I've listed this here, some of the differences, and then moving on to the criteria that we have in our ordinance. The process of designating the Mary H. Wright School as locally historic, can be initiated by the Board as a whole, by City council, by any 10 residents of

the City or the owner of the property. In this particular case, a request was submitted to the Planning Department by a local South Converse resident, Ms. Toni Sutton. Ms. Sutton included a petition, which was electronically signed by, if I counted correctly, approximately 522 people. It's unclear exactly how many of the signatures garnered are from City residents. However, my cursory review of it reveals that there are more than 10 signatures shown to be City residents. In order to be designated, the school will need to meet one of the seven criteria shown on the slide here. A staff review shows that the subject site meets five of the criteria. The school has become a valuable part of the development heritage of the surrounding community as it served the African-American residents of the surrounding neighborhood and Spartanburg as a whole. The school was the site of one of the "separate but equal" institutions for African American students. The school is named after Mary H. Wright. She is an educator, activist and civic leader who was a fierce advocate for the education and equal treatment of African Americans in Spartanburg. The school exemplifies the direction the City is currently headed in recognizing the valuable input from of all past and current residents while being sensitive to past racial injustices imposed upon the African American community. And the school has been a fixture and focal point, in the local community since 1951 and has become a familiar feature in the neighborhood. Next steps for y'all to consider, if the Board determines that the site may be an appropriate candidate for designation, it may be added to the list of sites considered appropriate for further investigation, deliberation and possible recommendation to City council. The addition of any site to this list shall constitute its designation as a Pending historic site, effective when the Board reports such designation to the Planning Department. A site shall continue as Pending until either the Board determines not to recommend designation as historic or City Council designates or rejects the site as historic or until the expiration of one year. Should the Board choose to nominate the site as historic to Council, the Board is required to hold a public hearing to receive comments from interested members of the public concerning the proposed designation. Within 30 days after the hearing, the Board shall recommend to Council if the site is appropriate for designation as a Historic Site. At that time, City council may choose to accept or decline the Board's recommendation by the adoption of an ordinance. This concludes my presentation. I'm available to answer any questions; and I believe Ms. Sutton is on the call as well.

**Board Member Questions for Staff:**

Mr. Trail said if we do the nomination about the public hearing, is that separate from this public hearing.

Ms. Grothe said that's correct.

Mr. Trail asked if we want to approve or ask for the nomination, we would just do that tonight and there would be a separate hearing. Is that correct.

Ms. Grothe said should y'all choose tonight to nominate the site as historic to Council then there needs to be another public hearing in which we will receive comments from the community.

Mr. Steinecke said my question would be about the specific guidelines that would govern this site, because we have separate guidelines for the Hampton Heights Historic District. We have different guidelines for the Beaumont Historic District, but we haven't so far had, at least that I can recall, any individual sites in the City come under our purview. Although there was some discussion about the Alumni House across from Converse College and the City's role on that. But I don't think it actually ended up being on the local register, is there's a separate easement that governs historic issue preservation issues with it. When will be the time when we would set those guidelines if we were to customize them. Would that happened at this meeting, or would that be at the, you said there's a public hearing and the public hearing, does that happen through HARB or is that a public hearing at Council.

Ms. Grothe said that will happen through HARB and then it will go on to Council. Y'all make a recommendation to Council and within our historic preservation section of the ordinance, there's

certain criteria that are listed out that talk about how historic properties should be treated. I mean, it gets a little bit more specific in sort of the design guidelines documents that we have like for Hampton Heights and for Beaumont where it's a bit more prescriptive. We do have something, I guess, sort of in place right now for that site, for how it would be treated. So, let's say it does go through and the same thing is true that any major projects, exterior alterations, that sort of thing would require a COA in the same way that the residential projects in Hampton Heights and Beaumont require a COA in terms of maybe some things site specific, I think that would be up to this Board, for if they wanted to come up with some specific guidelines.

Ms. Crowley said I kind of had a question out of the gate where, this is an unusual thing for Spartanburg. It's unprecedented in a way and so I think that if we take a step back for a second and think, are we trying to preserve the integrity of Mary H. Wright or the structural entirety of without a doubt; and if you're going to put in an apartment building in an old elementary school or middle school, there's going to be structural things that we've gotten in debates of Hardie Board and all that kind of stuff. And I think that we should all kind of get on the same page of what is the intent of what we're trying to do here, preserve the integrity of Mary H. Wright and acknowledging the history and glorifying it in a way. But I'm kind of confused. I'm kind of on two different fields because it's like we could argue about a concrete foundation. I mean, the HARB is an evolving thing and so I think that we should be very clear about what our intent is for the site before we make any claims about what it should or should not be.

Mr. Brown said if I remember Rachel, your review or your report also indicated that the original building was apparently X amount of square footage and so forth, there were two additions and then an outbuilding was built at a later date. I think there was some reference in your report that the outbuilding would not really qualify or be included in whatever historic designation we might consider. This sort of tells me that we're considering the building itself to be historic and that would be my position. One of the criteria that you showed a while ago that you said that you didn't say that it qualifies for, I believe was engineering or architectural style, and I'm not trying to grow the list, but I think you could actually make an argument that the architectural style is an important element from that era. I would sort of designate it or identify it as International Style, worthy of preservation.

Mr. Steinecke said I agree with that, Ken, this is Brad. I was thinking that was point item five, I think in the list. I thought it fit that one as well. If I'm understanding really what's in front of us tonight, we're saying that we agree that it meets any one of those criteria and that we just engage into the next step, if we agree with that here.

Ms. Grothe said it only needs to meet one of those seven. And I guess anyone could probably argue that it meets all seven of them. This was just sort of my review of it, but so long as y'all can agree that it meets just one, then there's the potential for qualification.

Ms. Toni Sutton applicant agreed with the presentation by Ms. Grothe and all of the previous comments and did not have anything further to add.

Mr. Trail said he would open up the public comment portion of the meeting; and he asked anyone who wished to speak from the public to either please raise their hands on the computer or if they were listening by phone to the meeting they could be unmuted if they wished to speak either for or against the request; and if possible to please limit their time to two minutes each. He also asked each person to please state their name and address for the record.

**Public Comments:**

Ms. Sandy Battocchio from W. Hampton Avenue said you mentioned the word site and you call it a nine-acre site that you were going to recommend as historic. Is that as a whole, or are you just

recommending the building. Because in the meeting the other night, he was talking about having additional apartments built off the back end of the site. I was just getting for you all clarification on what you are designating. That's all.

Ms. Crowley said I appreciate that comment in the sense that I truly believe that there's a way to respect the integrity of the Mary H. Wright School, but if it's not going to be a public school anymore, we can have control of what it will potentially be. Which means what we kind of have to have a little bit of leeway. I've looked through all of our HARB stuff and it's hard to determine because it's unprecedented in a way. So, this is up to us in a way. I'm not going to speak personally, but I hope you understand what I'm saying.

Mr. Steinecke said I think it's important to note that our Board is focused on architectural harmony and integrity and less on use. The exact way that the site gets used is determined in other ways. But in terms of, as we previously discussed, saying that this site is significant that's what we're doing from an architectural sort of perspective and an historic. That's what we're doing from an architectural sort of perspective and just generally historical perspective. And Ken, you made a comment also about the period of significance, noted on some of the different sites in there. I think that's something that we ought to be considering as COA's come to us relating this site. So, if the 1980 edition, which is outside of that period of significance were to be demolished, that's something that we'll discuss in the next iterations of this as we figure out next steps.

Mr. Trail said this is some new territory for us to explore and I think our job tonight is clear if we want to nominate it and then we're going to have some further work to do at a different time.

Philip Stone of 246 South Spring Street said I just wanted to make two quick points. The City's Design Manual, Section 7.0, does refer to commercial institutional rehabilitation guidelines. So, you've got something there to work with, even though this is, as you all know, kind of new ground, if this had been the actual public hearing to support the nomination, I certainly would have spoken in favor of that. And I can say that I think if you look at the text of the ordinance that which you have done, I think it certainly meets that. And I almost think it's your duty in a way. I've been through one of these before several years ago when we consider Bon Haven. That was the most interesting night of my life, that hearing. But when you look at the text of the ordinance, I think it meets those. And in fact, we haven't really recognized sites in Spartanburg significant to the black community and I think that's going to be important. I hope you will put it on the pending list as well as prepare to nominate it to City Council.

Monique Watson said she lived on Marion Avenue and I'm going to have to say ditto to what Mr. Stone said. He really articulated what I would have said very much. I'm very much in favor of having this icon set before Council for approval for historic designation.

John Montgomery of 1150 Woodburn Road said I do have the property under contract. I am the proposed developer of the rehabilitation of the historic building. I'm certainly in agreement that this property checks all of the boxes of what makes a property significant in this community. And that is why I have decided to pursue the redevelopment and preservation of this property because of its historical significance. I have spent the last year and a half pursuing the redevelopment of this project. Spent significant dollars to hire consultants and architects to study the property and to design it in a way that is in keeping with the historical integrity of the building. And I have already initiated conversations with the National Park Service and the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office. I have put the property on the National Registry. I completed the part one application, as well as the part two application, which is the architectural, which is really the development plan and the architectural guidelines we're following. I have successfully been approved by the South Carolina State Historic Preservation office, as well as the National Park Service. Those are important steps as a developer when

you're doing an adaptive reuse and historic redevelopment because these projects are very expensive and the only way you can make them make financial sense is to utilize historic tax credits. They help in funding the cost of construction because I'm spending over \$11 million to renovate this building. Since getting those two hurdles cleared with the State and National Park Service, I entered into a discussion with the City of Spartanburg about one, rezoning the property. It was zoned as institutional because it was a former school and then the Housing Authority had it as an office building. I have recently gone through Planning Commission and was approved to go R6PDD. So that's a Planned Development District, which has significant oversight from the Planning Commission on the redevelopment of the property. They will have intimate visibility and oversight of the construction, the site plan, landscaping, and parking. I've recently been approved, by the City Council, as recently as Monday, on a Development Agreement of which I have agreed in writing with the City to redevelop it to historic standards, as well as provide affordable housing for the community in this residence building. So, I said all that to let you know that I'm incredibly committed into preserving the historic nature of this building, to honoring the community, to honor Ms. Mary H. Wright, who the school's named after. I'll be putting up a historic monument on the property, as well as an informational display inside the leasing office so that people understand the historic significance of the property. And while you're correct, putting it on the national registry doesn't prohibit me from demolishing it. Certainly, if I were to do that, I would lose the tax credits and then the project would become financially untenable. I'm very motivated obviously to follow the strict guidelines, which I've already presented and plan on adhering to, in order to make sure that I meet the requirements of the National Park Service and the State Historic Preservation office. So, you can rest assured that the property is going to remain as is. I'm not planning on doing anything to the exterior of the building other than one, small, window that was bricked up. I'm going to take the bricks out and put the window back like it originally was, but the exterior facade of the original school building will remain exactly as this, aside from fixing all the broken windows that we've had recently. It's certainly my intention to move with the redevelopment of the property. I do not own it. The owner is in Ohio, they're not connected with this community. They did write a letter earlier this year when the HARB was previously requested to consider this, and they were opposed to any restriction on the property. They still maintain that position. I do want to remind you or point out that the gymnasium that was mentioned earlier, that is not considered historic. The National Park Service and the Historic Preservation Office would not allow that to go on the National Registry because it is new and it does not comply with the standards that they have. Want to make sure you're aware of that. We'd love to engage in a conversation about preserving around the existing building. Because that to me is where I think the HARB would add value and an input in making sure that it's preserved and not the non-historic components.

Mr. Trail, the Chair said thank you for your comments Mr. Montgomery; and I'm sure we will be talking with you later on probably at our next public hearing. Mr. Trail asked if there were any other comments from the listening audience. There being none; Mr. Trail closed the public comment/public hearing portion of the meeting; and we will go into Board Deliberation.

Mr. Steinecke moved to approve the applicant's request; and he was seconded by Mr. Brown. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Mr. Trail said the vote was unanimous. So we will approve to nominate or send a nomination for this site to be on the Local Historic Pending List. And Rachel, I assume you will let us know about the later hearing.

Ms. Grothe said she will keep the Board apprised. I'm going to get this scheduled; so this will be coming back in front of you again pretty soon.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work-546 Pinckney Ct. In Hampton Heights-Owner seeking approval for chimney removal for a chimney that was removed without the benefit of a Certificate of Appropriateness on a property in the R-8/SFD zone district. Susan Dean, Owner.**

Ms. Grothe shared her screen and said this is for a demolished chimney at 546 Pinckney Court. The project site is located two lots down from the corner of South Hampton Drive and Pinckney Court, on Pinckney Court in Hampton Heights. You have the property there highlighted. So, the site currently contains one single family dwelling. After a recent storm, the roof was replaced and a rear chimney was removed. Unfortunately, all of this was done without the benefit of a building permit or a certificate of appropriateness. Prior to the removal of the chimney, the house had two chimneys. The first is prominently located at the front of the house and the second chimney. The one in question was located roughly in the middle of the house, on the rear roof slope. It protruded slightly above the roof line, making it visible from the street. It is Staff's understanding that that chimney is no longer functioning and was only existing to add character to the house. These were some photos I took and you can see the front chimney. And then I pulled this off of Google Street View and then did a little zoom in there. So, you can see that second chimney in the back. So, the zoning ordinance and design manual both state the importance of preserving character defining features. Staff has determined that chimneys are an important defining feature of a house. So, when damage or repair work occurs, the ordinance and manual require property owners to replace using in-kind materials, in order to match the original design. And then I went ahead I pulled that out of our City of Spartanburg Historic Districts and Landmarks Book. So, the guideline pertaining to chimneys states "Original chimneys are often character defining features of historic houses and shall be properly maintained. A prominent chimney that is no longer in use, still functions as an important element in the overall composition of a house and shall not be covered, removed or replaced."

So, Staff is in support of the reconstruction of the removed chimney provided that it matches what was removed in terms of materials, design, location, texture, color, and brick work. And I recommend that the Board approve the reconstruction as stated above. I'm available to answer any questions that you all may have.

**Board Member Questions for Staff:**

Mr. Steinecke said Rachel, I have a thought. One word in the text that you quoted that jumped out to me was a prominent chimney. Are there, it's totally our determination of what constitutes prominent or not.

Mr. Brown said did you say that this work was done without a permit.

Ms. Grothe said that's correct. They did not apply for a building permit. So you're supposed to get a roofing permit for a reroof and then even for minor projects. So, a reroof requires a minor certificate of appropriateness, neither of which of those were applied for prior to the work starting. This came in as a violation. And then we were obligated to look into it and do something about it. After the fact, they did come in and apply for the reroof permit and for the certificate of appropriateness for the reroof and for the chimney removal. So, removal of a chimney requires, that's a major project, permission by y'all to say that's okay or not.

Mr. Brown said so pending our decision tonight, whatever we decide, the applicant will be able to go back and assuming we agree on one or another solution, get a permit and then rectify the situation. Ms. Grothe said that's correct; and to an extent they're on the road to that. They have submitted the paperwork for the reroof, the building permit and the certificate of appropriateness. So, they're on their way to doing so.

Mr. Trail reminded all of the Board Members again to please state who they were before asking a question or making a state for proper identification for record taking. Mr. Trail asked if there were any other Board Member questions for Ms. Grothe. Hearing none; Mr. Trail opened up the public hearing/public comment portion of the meeting.

**Public Comments:**

Donna Holcombe Burdette said I spoke with Ms. Grothe about my significant history and the creation of the HARB and the staff, and the local ordinance. And I'm very concerned about this chimney being considered significant. It's not just 546 Pinckney that has an old kitchen cook stove and cooks and laundry stove chimneys on the rear of houses and what used to be around 400 houses and now that I understand this down to 375 in Hampton Heights. They haven't been in use in seventy-five years. And I would like to point out under that guideline, that original chimneys are often character defining features. There is a chimney on that site and many of those houses that are English Tudor style, that are character defining. They're the front tapered, Tudor style chimneys that are prominently on the front. We have quite a few of them in the neighborhood and no one, including the owner of this property would ever consider demolishing them. However, all styles of these houses that were built prior to 1940, really before 1920, and I won't try to belabor it, but there are four different distinct periods in this district. And from that one and the teens in the twenties particularly, there are a lot of these, what I consider laundry chimneys that are of *no* significance. And if you're a homeowner, they are quite the problem. When they're demolished, they're never missed. And yes, this is slightly visible from the street, but not enough to make it a prominent feature. What's the prominent feature on the sky line is in fact, the ridge of that house. It is much higher and most prominent feature of a house on that street, because it did take the style of being parallel to the street, not perpendicular to the street.

Mr. Trail said Ms. Burdette, I apologize for doing this, but I want to make sure, are you speaking as a representative for the owner or are you speaking from the general public.

Ms. Burdette said yes, I am. The permit that got scattered is the owner of Susan Dean. When the roof was damaged in the tornado and a major tree fell, and a lot of this damage was done. She struggled to find a contractor and being an old family and a native of Spartanburg, the folks that actually finally came through, our Pickens Roofing Company. Now how their installation crew and their permitting crew, which were two different because everyone was racing around town, doing roof renovations because of that storm, didn't get the permit surprises me because the company that did this roof is in fact is the company that was formed in 1904 and probably installed 95% of all the original roots in this neighborhood.

Mr. Trail said Ms. Burdette, now that it's clear to me that you're representing her, I do need to swear you in that the testimony you're giving to me to be the truth. Ms. Burdette was sworn in; and she continued to explain in detail why she did not recommend any of these type non-significant types of chimneys needed to be re-built.

Mr. Trail asked if anyone on the Board had any questions of Ms. Burdette. There were none at this time. Mr. Trail asked Ms. Burdette if she had anything else to add before he continued with the public comment portion on this item.

Ms. Burdette said the only thing is I want to emphasize is there needs to be some clear recommendation to the staff that when they're considering chimneys and its original chimneys are often character defining, that we do focus on those that are character defining and not the miscellaneous ones that got tacked on the rear of the houses and the sides of houses up until the change in technology.

Mr. Trail thanked her for her comments; and said at this time he would turn it over to public comment. He asked was there anybody with us from the public that wished to speak on this.



There not being any raised hands or anything in the chat box, or anyone else to speak; Mr. Trail closed the public hearing/public comments portion of the meeting. He asked were there any comments or questions from the Board Members.

### **Board Comments/Deliberation**

Mr. Steinecke said as far as directing staff, I think it's appropriate for staff to defer to us about whether chimney is considered prominent or, or they often that's referred in there. I think that's a Board decision. So, if a chimney gets removed, I think it's appropriate for us to decide whether to act on that. I think in this case, it is not a character defining feature for that house. I think that the ridge line as Ms. Holcombe Burdette pointed out as the skyline feature, plus the very prominent fireside chimney in the front of the house. So, my personal opinion is that we allow the chimney to remain removed and not compel them to rebuild it.

Mr. Brown said I would like to say that I agree with everything Brad just said. I do not think that chimney is particularly important to the integrity of the architecture of the house, frankly, or the neighborhood.

Mr. Trail asked were there any other comments or a motion.

Mr. Steinecke moved to approve the applicant's request; and he was seconded by Mr. Brown. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

### **Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work-150 W. Hampton Ave In Hampton Heights-Applicant seeking approval to remove existing entrance feature and construct a new porch on a property in the R-8/SFD zone district. Niko Gilman, Owner.**

Ms. Grothe shared her screen and said this is major work at 150 West Hampton Avenue. The project site is an approximately 8,700 square foot lot located near one of the main entrances of Hampton Heights. So approximately 70 feet from the corner of West Hampton Avenue and South Spring Street. The site currently contains one single-family home that was constructed in approximately 1932 and can be described as a Vernacular Colonial Style Bungalow with a Dutch hipped roof. The front facade contains a front gabled entrance stoop with overhang. The owner is proposing to remove the existing entrance feature and construct an eight-foot-deep porch across the entire front wall of the house. The porch will be a low pitched standing seam metal shed roof with a gabled front entrance. This gabled entrance will match what is currently existing. The new porch will be supported by wooden columns which will match the existing support columns. Here is a side view of the proposed porch, just to give you all a bit of perspective.

So, when considering an addition, the design guidelines ask us to think about three questions: 1)Does the proposed addition preserve significant historic materials and features. 2)Does the proposed addition preserve the historic character. 3)Does the proposed addition protect the historic significance by making a visual distinction between old and new. She said the porch is proposed to be added on to the front of the house and it will not overwhelm the front facade nor take away from the front gable or Dutch hip roof, which can be described as the character defining features of the house. When viewed from the front of the house, the porch addition will not significantly alter the look of the house as it utilizes a low pitch shed roof and the distinctive gabled entrance will continue to be prominent. The porch roof will be differentiated from what is existing and that it will utilize metal, which will allow it to be compatible yet discernible from the existing house, which is currently roofed with asphalt shingles. The addition of the porch will match the look of these surrounding homes. Both of the homes on either side contain large usable inviting porches. Furthermore, all of the homes in the immediate vicinity all contain porches. And then broadening the scope, a survey of West Hampton Avenue revealed that out of the dozens of homes on the main Avenue, that there are only a couple that don't have porches and

this being one of them. So, this is a street view of the subject house and the adjacent homes so you can see it, the little yellow house in the middle there. So, the addition of the porch will match the look of these surrounding homes. Both of the homes on either side contain large usable and inviting porches. All the homes in the immediate vicinity all contain porches. I am recommending approval of the project as submitted. I don't know if Ms. Sylvelie Franke is on the line. I think her contractor is Nico Gilman, but I'm available to answer any questions that y'all may have. And the two of them are here as well to answer questions if you have any.

**Board Question for Staff:**

Nico Gilman of 460 Hampton Drive was sworn in and said this house is a little bit strange in its position on the street. Just because it's surrounded by all these houses on Hampton Avenue, which are just these massive imposing houses all the way down. And then to the West and then to the East, they're these bungalows on the same side street, but they all have some characteristics to them like the porches and then the brick one with the arches. And then you've got the Dutch Colonial catty-cornered to it and right in the middle of all this is this house which is very, it's just very simple and it doesn't have anything fancy, no molding, no porch, no big eaves. The eaves are very small on it. And the other thing is it sits above the street and it's imposing in its puniness, I guess, it's very plain. It doesn't really fit with all the rest of the houses, which have some kind of character to them. The other thing about it is the design is pretty simple. It's just moving everything out and putting columns to support it. But it doesn't really look lived in. And this is the design that this is really made to be a usable porch. It sits far enough away from the walk and say, it's high enough up that it'll be separated from the foot traffic and not enough to let the foot traffic bothered to people on the porch. And it also allows a better use of the existing screen porch to the left. And the other thing is it's designed to fit the house. It doesn't protrude closer than the houses on either side the new porch won't be poked out farther towards the street and we're keeping the front gable exactly as it is. And the other thing I would say about this, is that while the picture that we've shown you has this standing seam roof in the front of it, at a very low pitch. So that's why we have to use metal because it's a very low pitch and the shingles won't do it. But the effect of that is that you would have to be several hundred feet away probably to be able to see the top of this roof or in the neighbor's attic or something like that. It's only eight feet deep and the other thing is it sits above the street very well. So, the only thing that you're going to draw your eye with this is the gable in front, which already exists. And now probably the B2 Board ceiling that we plan on putting in. So, it's like the simpleness of it. It's going to fit everything. We're going to use this exact same column that are on the little gable, underneath the little gable in the front. And the gable will only protrude a couple more feet because it already sticks out a couple of feet. What we want to do is put on a simple porch that makes the place more lived in and lend some a little bit of massiveness to it. And that really makes it look lived in, and it's less obtrusive than some of the other porches that have been approved. And I think with will fit the house. It will fit the neighborhood a lot better with a porch on it than without.

**Board Questions for Applicant:**

Mr. Brown said, I was thinking of other standing seam porch roofs in the neighborhood. And so far, I want to say that I very much agree that a porch without it seems like, it's asking for a porch, but so there's a standing seam metal roof over the porch of the house that on the corner of North Irwin and West Hampton that Heather Maura recently worked on across from Vivian's at that site. There's a small sort of eave or something that the standing seam porch goes under. I guess what I'm asking is what does the transition between the shingles to the metal look like in this project.

Mr. Gilman said I'm going to have to flash it properly. I want to put the metal seam behind the existing fascia Board that's up there. I'll probably replace the fascia Board to be honest, just because it'll be taken off and probably get damaged doing that. But the point is, to lower the roof so that you can either

see that white Board across or depending on what we plan on re-roofing this we'll get a permit for that, but we plan on reroofing this with a different color. And depending on the color of the new roof, we may make that seamless directly below the shingles so that you won't see that white Board, just so it doesn't break it up in the middle there. That's what we're planning on doing. It's obviously, raising it up higher gives us a better pitch. We didn't really want everybody to be focused on this roof in any way. So, we didn't want to put it up on the current roof halfway up or something, which gives us plenty of pitch. But then you see this, you'd have to put siding on the side of this shed roof anyway. So, the current thing is we're planning on doing is removing that Board and either putting it under and behind that or putting it directly to the bottom of the shingles so that it flows directly from the top roof. Either way I don't think you'll see it too much because you have to be pretty far away to be able to see over an eight foot protrusion out of that thing.

Mr. Steinecke said I don't mind seeing the differentiation between those two different roofs, but I understand that there's a challenge there to achieve the pitch that you need over the porch roof and not have to alter the current roof in any sort of way. Because you said there's basically no eaves protruding so much from the house. It's very good.

Mr. Gilman said on the front of the house it's less than a 12-inch protrusion. So, we don't want to change on the front of the house, that'll change on the sides there's no eaves at all. And on the new porch that we're building, we will put an eave on it because otherwise it'll just ruin the wood underneath it on the floor. So, we'll put some eaves on the front. I'm fairly comfortable with being able to get it lower by the time we get to the outside. I can use different ways to attach the roof to the beam that supports it and I can probably lower that another four inches or something. Water will flow off of it, especially on a metal roof. So, I'm not super worried about that. Really, it's a matter of do we want to see a white line in between this. Or do we want to just have it seamless, maybe black to black or something like that on this roof.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Gilman was he the owner or owner's representative.

Mr. Gilman said I'm the owner and the builder.

Mr. Brown said are you a roofer; and Mr. Gilman said yes.

Mr. Brown said you're not bringing in other another roofer; and Mr. Gilman said no.

Mr. Brown said I'm an architect. I would pose to the rest of the team here that as the builder and the owner, are you going to reside there; Mr. Gilman said no.

Mr. Brown said but you're going to depend upon it for revenue. I would propose that or I would suggest that you probably know what you're doing in terms of the detail where one roof meets the other. It's not our place to tell you how to detail it. And my biggest concern would be a failure. But since you say you're the builder, the owner, and a roofing expert, I would suggest everyone else that we defer to you regarding best practice on that.

Mr. Steinecke I think it is a design question whether that white board would show up in the middle of two black roofs. And thinking through it, it shouldn't be prominent right there because then it really looks like an added-on porch whereas if it were black to black; and it probably would seem more evenly, I guess.

Mr. Trail said I think our discussion has been mostly about the roof. What about the bottom of the porch and the flooring. Can you tell us about that.

Mr. Gilman said It'll be the same as the ones on either side and every pretty much every other house in the neighborhood. It'll be the three-and-a-half-inch tongue and groove. Three quarter thick pine Boards

and not exactly sure whether they're going to be painted. They might be stained. I don't know that yet, but there it'll be wood.

Mr. Trail asked if there are any other questions from the Board for Mr. Gilman or from the public. Hearing none, Mr. Trail closed the public comment for the meeting.

**Board Comments/Deliberation:**

Mr. Steinecke said what do y'all think in terms of the design of whether a break should be visible or not. I understand Ken, I think what you're saying that is a detail level thing that he might need to refigure out as he's doing it. But I think there is something overlooked from the street to the other house I was referring to with the standing scene that I looked at more closely does have a very noticeable differentiation between the porch roof that's the metal and the asphalt shingle portion, which is above there. And there's probably yet a difference of foot or so in those, in that space.

Mr. Brown said I heard the applicant say that they're from the street, it's almost invisible. And I heard him say, he's going to flash it properly. And my thought is that based on how you flash one roofing system to another, you really aren't going to have a whole lot of room for an exposed fascia board in my humble opinion, because otherwise you're compromising that very interface where the two meets. I'm comfortable in this case just because it's the way that the site's described it's almost invisible until you're up in somebody else's attic. I'm comfortable that he's going to do the right thing because he's the owner of it.

Mr. Brown moved to approve the request as submitted; and he was seconded by Ms. Crowley. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work-187 Carlisle St In Hampton Heights-Owner seeking approval to construct a new house on a vacant lot on a property in the R-8/SFD zone district. Lucy Lynch, Applicant.**

Ms. Grothe shared her screen and said this is for a new house at 187 Carlisle Street. So, the project site is an approximately 7,000 square foot lot in the Hampton Heights Historic District. The site is located where Hydrick intersects with Carlisle Street. The new house will be approximately 1,370 square feet across two stories. The style is best described as a Front Gabled Cottage with some craftsmen style elements. A primary bedroom and bathroom will be located on the main level with two additional bedrooms and one bathroom upstairs. Two access points are proposed. The first is located at the front with the porch that extends out eight feet. The porch features four Wellington style columns and a hipped roof. The second is located on the left side with a small porch and small portico. So due to the grade of the site and elevated foundation will be necessary, which will be covered by parched concrete. In terms of materials, the applicant is proposing to clad the house in cement fiber siding, specifically James Hardie, Hardie Plank lap siding using the smooth product. So James Hardie offers two different types of Hardie Plank lap siding. There's the Select Cedar Mill and the Smooth. The front facade will feature several architectural elements, particularly at the peak of the gable. All trim elements are to be painted wood. Exposed rafters are present along the porch and main eaves. The windows will be all wood with true divided-lights of three panes over one. The front door is proposed to be a solid wood Craftsman style with a true divided-light three panes over one. The roof will be comprised of asphalt architectural shingles. The applicant has chosen a complimentary color scheme so Williamsburg-Apollo Room Blue for the body of the house. Sherwin-Williams Alabaster for windows and trim and Historic Charleston Green for shutters and accents. The front door will be stained a natural wood color complimentary to the rest of the home. So then here is the proposed site plan and street view. You can see where the house is going to sit on the lot. And then a little bit of rendering of what it's going to look like between the two existing houses and this was included in y'all's packet. New construction requires

the project conform with Section 6.0 in the Design Manual. I've listed the criteria on this slide and I'm just going to go through it. One of the things that's important to look at is the prevailing character. The prevailing character of the homes near the subject property can be described as Bungalows. The proposed house fits within this character, as it can be described as a Front Gabled Bungalow. And then another thing to look at is setback, building setback and orientation. So, orientation and setbacks of the proposed house will match those of the surrounding houses. A house shall be required to meet the R-8/SFD district standards and additionally, they can utilize front yard averaging to match the setbacks for the porch at the front of the house. Another thing to look at is a directional emphasis. The proposed house will have a horizontal directional emphasis. This is compatible with the directional emphasis of the surrounding homes; and then shape: the roof pitch of the proposed house will be a 12, 12. So a compatible ratio for the area immediately adjacent bungalows use a lower slope roof, but do not feature a second level. The homes that do feature second levels do utilize steeper pitches such as the one proposed. And then the porch form, this is pretty important. The 24 foot by eight-foot porch of the proposed house will be similar to those of the surrounding homes. All of the surrounding homes have similarly shaped and sized porches.

The building elements of the proposed house will be compatible with those of the surrounding homes. The windows will be the same shape and material. Lap siding will be used and a decorative window will adorn the roof above the porch. And all of these elements will be compatible with the surrounding homes. And then moving on to massing, so the proposed house will have a massing that is similar to those of the surrounding homes. The massing includes the main body of the house, roof, overhangs and porches. And then moving on to proportion. The height of the proposed house will be mostly compatible with nearby structures, but will be somewhat taller due to the second level. The height appears to be similar to that of the two existing two story homes located on Carlisle. And then moving on to rhythm. The rhythm of the proposed house will be symmetrical to that of the surrounding houses, so building elements will be located in the same place on the proposed house as those of nearby houses, thus creating a symmetrical facade. And then lastly is scale and height. The proposed house will have a similar scale to that of nearby houses as it will be roughly the same size and height.

This is probably one of my favorite parts of my job is getting to walk around and take pictures, and it's convenient too, because it's right close to our office. So, Julie and I took a walk through up and down Carlisle, and I crept around and took pictures of everyone's house. So, we'll go on a field trip view of all the houses. I think I got all of them, on the street, just to sort of give you all a feel for what's out there. I feel like the street is underrated. Julie and I don't walk on it enough, but I was impressed when I was on it. And I didn't realize how steep it was in some parts. So, that concludes my presentation. I am recommending approval of the project as submitted. I'm available to answer any questions that y'all may have. The applicant is Lucy Lynch, who is an architect. I do not see her on the meeting, but Shane Knight is the owner and he is on the meeting.

**Board Member Questions for Staff:**

Mr. Brown said in the last couple of meetings, we've had a lot of discussion about windows and new construction. And I was going to ask about these windows, because I just saw it tonight. It looks like its painted wood divided, true divided light windows. And I just want the record to show that, or I want this to be in the record so that we don't spend a lot of time discussing it.

Ms. Crowley said where was under the same impression.

Mr. Trail asked if there were any more questions for Staff at this time. There being none, he said we'll hear from the applicant or their representative, Shane Knight.

Mr. Shane Knight was sworn in and said I wanted to thank Rachel. I think that was a very complete and great evaluation of the project as we have it planned, and appreciate the Board's consideration tonight. And I don't think we have anything additional to add.

Mr. Trail opened the public hearing/public comment portion of the meeting and asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to make a comment.

Bill Michels said that he and his wife Mary Jane, live at 259 Hydrick Street right up the street from this one. He told Ms. Grothe that sign was in the wrong yard. One of the neighbors must have moved it next to the duplex. Now, who's going to build next to a duplex. But with that said, just for the Board, I do not know what was on this house street. I know the one where the sign was, it had a house that had burned down decades ago. I spoke to the neighbor next door, Ms. Bruton. I don't think there's ever been a house on that lot, at least maybe in the past 40 years or so. I did notice one minor thing other than the ugly duplex three up from there, it'll be the only two-story house on that street. Everything else has one story. They have rear elevations that are two story high, obviously, on them. The south side of the street, because of the land it sits on. But with that said about being a two-story street, I did notice when I looked on the assessor's site on the map, that house will be at the very bottom of Hydrick Street. So, if you're on Hydrick Street, at the top of the hill, and you look down the street, that's the house you're going to see. So, regardless of whether or not she intends to live in this house or sell the house, I mentioned a couple of months ago that I thought will start happening over here. And that'll be a very prominent house and feature to have in our little two block area that we have over there. It's kind of separated from the rest of the Hampton Heights, so I'd be really excited if you guys would approve it as she presented it. It looks really good.

Ms. Sandy Battocchio said in our past conversations, we talked about the slabs and the Hardie Board. And I noticed in the description that this is planned for this home. And Hydrick Street, like we've said, I've learned from Vivian, was the main street that was proposed when they were trying to get the historic documentation or whatever they need and everything. So, I think it would be very important that it fell into following the wood and all the other things that we've talked about to keep it historic. There was no crawlspace. When she showed all those pictures of all those houses, they all weren't on slabs. They were on some kind of foundation.

Ms. Syvelie Franke said I was going to bring up the same thing that Sandy just mentioned, which is that concrete foundation. I saw that on the design, and looking at all the other streets on Carlisle, it would be great if the owner could at least consider changing that to match the other houses, because the concrete foundation, I don't think there's any other houses in the neighborhood that has that. The second point that I had was kind of a follow up of last month meeting, when we were trying to introduce new houses to the neighborhood. And there was the discussion about guidelines for new constructions. And I know you guys went back and forth, and Rachel also brought it to City Council, and it's moving forward. But those guidelines, of course, will not be in place for the approval of that house. It would be great if we could somehow speed this process as much as we can on our end so that those new constructions do follow the guidelines that you guys recommend, because there are no guidelines right now, really clearly written for new constructions. And the reason's because there were none. Houses were not made to be condemned and destroyed. So, I think that would make sense to just have that conversation maybe as that new house is coming in front of the Board for discussion. Thank you.

Mr. Trail asked if there any other questions from the public. Hearing no more; he closed the public hearing; and we will move into Board Comments/Deliberation.

**Board Comments/Deliberation:**

Ms. Crowley said I think that in the recent past, yes, we have discussed integrity of materials and things like that. And it might be too bold to say, but Hampton Heights is in a transition period. And I know the builder from a personal standpoint, but it comes down to whether we want to develop the historic. There's going to be a crux between people either impeding development or abiding by the guidelines. And so, since we haven't given these certain guidelines, I think that we should approve this project with contingency on the fact that we can say, "We need to know the certain types of materials," and stuff like that. But Bill Michels spoke earlier, and it was an empty lot. And so, if you want it to be continually an empty lot, we can try to find more developers to come in and find the perfect solution for that house, but it's kind of here or there. And I'm speaking that personally to you guys as the Board who I come to know, and I'm just saying if you want progress, you might have to give and take a little bit.

Mr. Trail said this is where I was going to make the comment that in some recent actions that we had, there was some development using the Hardie Board. And I know this was discussed. I know Rachel had contacted somebody with the state for information on that, and it's pretty much commonplace now. I think we're okay with the Hardie Board. And I know we had comments that it's actually better than wood and lasts a lot longer, so less maintenance. So, I think we're okay with the Hardie Board. He asked the other Board Members if they had an opinion on Hardie Board.

Mr. Brown said I'm completely on board with it.

Mr. Steinecke said I also feel like for new construction that there's not much of a reason to say no to it. I think it holds up much better and helps in many ways. There are situations in which I question it on an existing historic structure as a replacement for something that's older, especially if the woods not deteriorated beyond repair, but for new construction guidelines, I don't see much of a reason to oppose a Hardie Plank, especially with the different finish options that they have for the Cedarmill or the Smooth. I think we can tailor that per project.

Mr. Trail asked were there any other comments and would anybody like to make a motion.

Ms. Crowley moved to approve the request; and she was seconded by Mr. Brown. The vote was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Ms. Grothe said I just had one thing, and y'all can clarify what you want to do. I had put in the conditions of approval for this project that they utilize, because I talked about the two different types of Hardie siding, either the Cedarmill or the Smooth, and they have proposed the smooth. In my opinion, I feel like the Cedarmill would be a little bit better, so I've put that as a condition of approval, so I just want to know what y'all think about that. If you say, "Approved as submitted," or, "Approved with the conditions of approval."

Mr. Brown said please clarify what the condition was again. I read it, but I don't remember. It was submitted as Smooth.

Ms. Grothe said yes, it was submitted as Smooth. And so, number seven, the last condition is, "The structure shall utilize Cedarmill Hardie Plank lap siding, and shall be painted as proposed."

Mr. Brown said for my part, I don't really have a strong preference.

Mr. Trail said would anybody like to change the amendment or motion. Because if it carries, it will be Smooth. So, anybody have a problem with that.

Ms. Crowley said I will say from an architectural standpoint that Hardie Board, when you choose the smoother texture, it does look more like true wood siding in a way, because if you use too much of the Cedarmill type of Hardie Board, it can look kind of artificial, in a way. And so, depending, I would trust the design aesthetic of the architect, and whatever will be most true to Hampton Heights, I think would

be the best. And so, depending on the number of materials she's going to use, I think that approving Smooth, if we don't have a preference, it's about the aesthetic of the house. It's not the material we're so particular about.

Mr. Trail said Rachel, I'm hearing we're approving it as written with the Smooth.

Mr. Brown said I have a question actually about the project that we just approved, but just a point of clarification, the foundation level, I guess. So, the basement level, what material is exposed on that. Rachel, do you know if it specifies in the plans as submitted.

Ms. Grothe said yes, concrete is correct.

**Staff Approved Minor Works since the October 8, 2020 Meeting:**

Ms. Grothe said the Meeting Packet the Board Members received that list prior to the meeting if anyone had any questions. There were no questions or comments.

**Staff Announcements:**

Ms. Roland said it's getting towards the end of 2020; and Ray, Brad, and Kathleen according to her records still needed to take the On-line Continued Education Training for 2020. Rhiannon Leebrick is a new Board member appointed about a year ago or maybe less, but she has her New Board Member Training materials, and I don't know if she's finished with that yet, but she would need to go ahead and finish it. Kenneth and Anne are the newest members; and have one year's time from being appointed to take their required New Board Training. Melissa Walker and Meg Reid have completed theirs. But if you would, the regular Board members, Ray, Brad, Kathleen, I need you to do that before the end of the 2020, if possible. Please call or email myself and I will get you set up and registered.

Ms. Leebrick explained to the other new Members the problem she had when taking her new training regarding having to start over again; and then losing all the previously entered information. She said if you scrolled through to other pages it would really slow down the process as well. Ms. Leebrick said she was still working on her training.

Ms. Grothe said I just wanted to update y'all. Ms. Franke had mentioned it, so we did hear everyone's concerns about the design guidelines for new construction. And we approached the City Manager about it, "How should we handle this moving forward." And so, we were told that we can go ahead and start looking for grants to pay for a portion of that, and then start looking for a consultant. So, it is on our radar. It's something that we would like to see happen, so I just wanted to give you all that update.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:19 P.M.

  
Ray Trail, Chair

Minutes edited by Latise Savoy and Julia Roland