

MINUTES
The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review
Thursday, December 12, 2019 ~ 5:30 PM
City Hall Council Chambers

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

Absent Board Members: Josh Lonon was absent.

City Staff: Natalia Rosario, Planner III; Rachel Grothe, Planner II; 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 eight Board Members present constituted a quorum, and she proceeded with the guidelines for the procedure of the meeting.

Ms. Walker moved approval of the Agenda for tonight's meeting; and she was seconded by Mr. Koenig. The motion was approved by a vote of 8 to 0.

No Meeting Minutes Ready for approval.

New Business:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 0 N. Liberty Street in Beaumont Village – For permission to install a shed similar to the one at 782 N. Liberty Street; and permission to install a fence around exterior side yard area on a vacant property in the R-6 General Residential District. J. Gordon Cockill, Owner of 782 N. Liberty Street and Applicant, under contract to purchase the vacant lot from SCDOT, Owner.

Ms. Grothe, Planner II came forward and she was sworn; and she submitted into evidence the meeting packets the Board Members previously received by email and tonight's presentation as Exhibit A. She said this request was for a proposed shed and fence to be located on a vacant lot at the corner of N. Liberty Street and Isom Street (owned by the SCDOT) in Beaumont Village, that was adjacent to the applicant's property at 782 N. Liberty Street. The applicant hopes to acquire the property from the SCDOT, and place a shed on it for storage purposes; and he would like to place a 3 to 4 foot tall wooden picket fence around the property. She said like many homes in Beaumont Village, the property did not have a garage, and as such storage was quite limited. She showed a location map slide and aerial slide, and additional slides of the house, from Liberty Street and from the corner of Isom Street; a slide of the proposed shed that was on the applicant's property, and a slide of what the proposed fence would look like in order to better illustrate the request. Ms. Grothe said the site was about 3,500 square feet in size. The applicant's house was clad in vinyl siding and the applicant's shed in his backyard had been approved by this Board in 2016. The proposed shed will be approximately 100 square feet in area, nine feet in height and will be comprised of aluminum siding and a galvanized metal roof. She said he also wanted to do a traditional and vernacular type fence around the property (which she showed a slide of proposed fence). A slide was shown of the aerial slide of the property again; and she said the applicant would like to locate the shed where the purple box was on the slide, in front of the tree in the slide. Ms. Grothe explained on the same slide, that where the dotted line was shown was where he would like to put the fence. The proposed shed is consistent with the ordinance and the Beaumont design guidelines. It would match the existing shed in the backyard and would match the siding of the house. In terms of the fencing, staff believes it meets all the guidelines with the exception of the 18 foot setback; and she would defer that to the Board regarding its location. She said Staff recommended approval of the shed as submitted; and she would ask the Board to determine if the guidelines had been met regarding the fence. She said the applicant was not here tonight; and she would do her best to answer any questions they might have.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Koenig asked that the applicant was trying to get approval for the shed and fence before the bought the property.
- Ms. Grothe said that was correct; and the applicant would not purchase the property unless the Board approved the request. She said the applicant had been maintaining the vacant property, as the SCDOT would not.
- Mr. Koenig asked the reason it was a vacant lot was because it was not big enough for a house.

- Ms. Grothe said that was correct.
- Ms. Crowley asked about the location of the property again regarding the location map.
- Ms. Grothe said it was the one that said “0” N. Liberty Street.
- Ms. Rosario explained it was the little half circle portion, and it was part of the right-of-way right now because it was owned by SCDOT. She said it was kind of a no-man’s land parcel but it was attached to the applicant’s property.
- Mr. Koenig asked about the setbacks again.
- Ms. Grothe referenced page 25 of the Beaumont Mill Village Guidelines regarding Site Development, regarding Fences, Wall, etc.:

3.5 Historically in the Beaumont Mill Village, the front yards were open to one another. One should maintain the traditional character of a front yard. Many times fences and/or retaining walls served as property delineation or as a barrier to distinguish between a yard, sidewalk, and street. Using no fence at all is probably the best scenario to one’s front yard. Grass is the best option for the front lawn.

3.5.1 Front yard & corner lot fencing should have the following characteristics:

- Respect traditional materials, design and scale;
 - Be no taller than 48” in height & be set back 18’ from street frontage property line;
 - Have a rectangular pattern;
 - Wood is the most appropriate material;
 - Chain link, split rail and stockade fences are not appropriate in front yards, but may be used in rear yards not visible from public right of ways. Vinyl fencing is inappropriate in all areas;
 - Fencing should complement the building and not obscure significant features of the home;
 - Landscaping can be used to soften the look of fencing;
 - The show side of a fence will face the public right of way
- Mrs. Love asked Ms. Grothe that this owner had plans to do some plantings around the fence.
 - Ms. Grothe said he wanted to do it inside the fence, and he had already planted a tree. She said he was open to whatever the Board Members wanted him to do about the fence; and that he was not really sure he would be able to afford a fence in the near future; that he just thought it would look nice.
 - Mr. Steinecke referenced something regarding the location map and the proposed route of the fence going along the sidewalk and driveway or something.
 - Ms. Grothe said the applicant was not exactly sure about the exact route of the fence.
 - Ms. Walker asked so the whole curb was surrounded by a sidewalk.
 - Ms. Grothe said that was correct; and also she said under the tree line he had a wooden type privacy fence which you could not see well in the slide. She said initially that was what he had said he would like to do on the other property, but had changed his mind to go with something lower. She said there was also a chain link fence that sort of separated his property from the proposed property.

[Editor’s Note: One or a couple of the Board Members (I could not detect who or whom it was) were talking about if the wood fence complied with the 18’ setback].

Ms. Grothe said she had two residents who were concerned about that to call in about it, and took issue with the fence in the front yard area #1) because she did not think it was allowed by the guidelines and #2) someone had expressed some safety concerns. Ms. Grothe said in our ordinance was a site distance triangle at corners, and anything within that area needed to be lower than 48” which this would be. Ms. Grothe said she had not turned out from that particular intersection.

More Board Questions

- Mr. Trail asked if he planned to leave up the chain link fence.

- Ms. Grothe said that was her understanding.
- Mrs. Love asked Ms. Grothe was the applicant more concerned about the shed; or was he doing the shed and the fence together.
- Ms. Grothe said he was more concerned about the shed.
- Mr. Koenig asked if the shed met all the required criteria.
- Ms. Grothe explained that it did.
- Mr. Koenig had a question about where the new shed would sit and also regarding where the current shed sat that was approved by the Board in 2016.
- Ms. Grothe explained it would be set in because the applicant wanted it to be in front of the tree.
- Ms. Walker asked would it be possible to approve one portion of the request, and table the other portion until they had more information.
- Ms. Grothe said yes.
- Ms. Walker said she could see the concern about site lines, and drove that street several times a month; and she would like to go out there and see for herself what that would be like regarding trying to turn out of that particular intersection.
- Mr. Koenig asked would they be able to do it that way, and the applicant still be able to purchase the property.
- Ms. Walker said not if the applicant was more concerned with the shed as Ms. Grothe had said earlier. He just thought the fence would look nice.
- Ms. Grothe said that was correct; and she believed he would buy the property if he was able to put the shed on it.
- Ms. Crowley asked a question about voting on the shed and tabling the fence.
- Mrs. Love said the applicant could always come back to the Board with a definite plan, at which time he may be ready to build the fence. Mrs. Love said if there were no more Board questions; that they did need to hear some public comment as well before any motions would be made.
- Ms. Leebrick agreed with Ms. Walker about safety and not being able to see when you pulled out of that intersection; and she asked was there someone within the City who could do research on what it would be like to pull out of that particular intersection.
- Ms. Rosario said they had the City Traffic Engineering Department that could help them out with that; or she said Staff could go out there with something to show pictures of what that visibility would be like.
- Ms. Grothe said they could do something like that if the applicant wanted to come back and move forward with the fence.

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

- Mary Heatherly of 813 Isom Street came forward and said she was opposed to two sheds being on a property. She said they had been told when the guidelines were formulated (and she had been involved with the whole guidelines procedure) that once guidelines were put in place, that you should not start picking away at them regarding precedence setting. Ms. Heatherly explained to the Board Members that she would love to have a concrete barrier in front of her house, because when cars came up the hill from the outpatient surgical center on Isom and they turned off of Pine Street, there was a red light right up there, and if they got toward the top of the hill and saw that the red light was green, that vehicles would go 70 mph in order to try and make the green light, and was a big safety hazard. Ms. Heatherly said the picket fence the applicant wanted to do, even if it was set back, would block any vision of people trying to turn out on the street. She said there were a good many accidents there already. She had nothing against the applicant at all; but felt like the reasons she had just stated should be adhered to.

- Ms. Melinda Willard of 789 N. Liberty Street came forward and said she also liked the applicant, and he was a very nice kept his property very neat. She also felt the fence would be a big traffic hazard; and she explained the unsafe conditions of that intersection. Ms. Willard said the applicant already had a shed that was oversized and had been given permission for the shed in 2016; but she said the shed was almost as big as his house was. She was opposed to the fence and the shed.
- Ms. Ann Gray of 741 N. Liberty Street came forward and spoke about the bad traffic situation regarding Isom Street. They were very proud of their historic district and did not want their property values to go down. She was against the shed and fence.

Mrs. Love asked if there were any other people who wished to speak regarding this case. There was no one else who came forward. Mrs. Love closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Board Member Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Koenig asked by purchasing that piece of land; would that automatically become one unit with the applicant's property.
- Ms. Grothe said he would have to merge the two properties.
- Ms. Rosario explained he would need to get a survey done to merge the properties and submit it to the Planning Department for approval; after which time he would need to take it to the County Offices for recordation.
- Mr. Koenig felt one of the main reasons the applicant wished to purchase the property was to put a shed on the property; and he asked if it was its own property could it not have a shed on it.
- Ms. Grothe explained not without a principal structure or another accessory to it on the lot.
- Mr. Koenig asked then the applicant would first need to merge the parcel with his property; after which the entire property would fall under the Beaumont Guidelines, meaning there could only be one shed; was that correct.
- Ms. Walker asked was there a limit to the number of sheds in the Beaumont Guidelines.
- Mrs. Love referenced pages 22-24 of the guidelines, and she explained what was listed in the guidelines regarding accessory buildings; and said there did not appear to be a limit; but they had instructions as to where to put them.
- Mr. Trail said one thing about this piece of property, there was never a house there; and he thought the guidelines were written as to what to do with a shed regarding a house being on the property. He was not sure how to handle the shed or the fence for that matter.
- Mr. Koenig said for the applicant, it made only sense if he could integrate them into his property.
- Mrs. Love said he could not build the shed or consider the fence until he merged the property as his property.
- Ms. Rosario said for the fence permit he would needs the Board's approval as well as followed by a fence permit submitted to the Planning Department. She said depending on the size of the structure, if it was over 200 square feet, he would also need a Building Permit.
- Ms. Walker asked Staff to show the slide again that depicted where the shed would be located on the lot.
- Staff pulled up the slide.
- Ms. Walker said the guidelines said the shed needed to be behind the house, and she guessed that was open to interpretation as to whether the area where it would be located was beside or behind the house.
- Mrs. Love said it would be just to the rear of the house.
- Mr. Steinecke explained it was in line for a garage; but that was not what had been submitted.

[Editor's Note: Ms. Heatherly in the audience who had previously spoken during the public hearing asked could she say something after the public hearing had been closed; and she could not because that portion of the meeting had been closed].

- Mr. Steinecke asked was Isom Street a State road.

- Ms. Grothe said she believed it was.
- Ms. Crowley and Ms. Walker asked if they had any crash data information for that intersection.
- Ms. Rosario said they did not, but Staff could get crash data from the Public Safety Department. She said they could also check with the SCDOT to see if they had ever done any studies there.
- Ms. Leebrick said she drove that area a couple of times a day; and had not collected any data regarding Isom Street, but she knew that people really did go very fast in that area.
- Mrs. Love suggested they could table the fence portion of the request.

Mr. Koenig moved to table the fence portion of the request to the next meeting or a subsequent meeting, in order to get traffic data information regarding safety risks; and he was seconded by Ms. Crowley. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 8 to 0.

Mrs. Love said they would now move on to the shed portion of the request.

Board Comments/Deliberation on the shed portion:

Mr. Steinecke said he had a procedural question; and he asked if he could ask a question of anyone in the room.

Mrs. Love said yes.

Mr. Steinecke asked Ms. Heatherly what her comment was that she had wanted to make after the public hearing portion had been closed.

Ms. Heatherly of 813 Isom Street came forward again and explained there was not anywhere for the applicant to put another garage on his property. She said it was not allowed that he be able to put one at the end of his driveway either; and they had a few people who had wanted to do that; but they had to be in the backyard. She explained they have had people buy into the neighborhood that were not told by the sellers they needed permission to do certain things regarding the neighborhood and for that she was sorry. She would like to put up something that just covered your car; but she could not do that either. She felt if one person had to adhere to the guidelines that everyone in the neighborhood should too.

Ms. Crowley felt if there were no limits on structures in the guidelines, it was their job to enforce the guidelines.

Mr. Steinecke said Staff had not found any conflict with the guidelines.

Mr. Koenig said if you looked at his property and his main entrance and driveway came from Liberty Street, that technically it would be considered behind the house.

Mr. Steinecke asked that a previous Board in 2016 had approved the request, and the applicant had not acted on it?

Ms. Grothe said the applicant's current shed in his yard had been approved in 2016.

Mr. Koenig felt he remembered the case and the shed was almost up against the neighbor's fence; and he remembered that was an issue at the time; and if he remembered correctly it was only possible because there was a structure in that place before.

Mrs. Love said looking through the Beaumont Guidelines further, she did not see anything that limited the number of outbuildings.

Mr. Steinecke moved to allow the building on the new lot contingent upon the lot being properly merged with the current parcel; and he was seconded by Mr. Koenig. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 to 1, with Ms. Leebrick opposed.

Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the November 14, 2019 Meeting – Rachel Grothe.

Ms. Grothe went over the Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works that had been approved by Staff since the November 14, 2019, Meeting.

Update on 201 Caulder Avenue – Rachel Grothe.

Ms. Grothe said she did not have an update at this time; but she may have one next month.

Update on approved COA at 235 Brookwood Terrace in the Hampton Heights District – Rachel Grothe, No votes.

Ms. Grothe said at the last meeting the Board Members directed her to reach out to the owners to see what was going on, and she typed a letter and attached it to an email, and sent it to the property owners and she had not received a response. In her letter she had let them know that their previously approved Major Work permit would expire if no work had begun by the next day; and if they would get in touch with them, the Board would extend it. She said she did not receive a response. Ms. Grothe said this was regarding former window approval.

Mrs. Love asked Ms. Grothe to give the Board Members a little background again on which house this was.

Ms. Grothe said it was sort of a red house, and they had wanted to replace all the windows.

Ms. Reid said nothing had happened regarding the windows; that she walked by there all the time.

Ms. Rosario said today they had done some tearing out of landscape work and it was all sitting at the edge of the curb; so they were doing some things, but not regarding anything with the windows.

Mrs. Love asked had they sought a permit for the windows.

Ms. Grothe said no.

Mrs. Love said they would need to come back and reapply.

Ms. Crowley felt Ms. Grothe should send another letter letting them know if they wished to proceed with the windows at this point, they would need to come back to the Board.

Ms. Grothe said she would send the property owners another letter tomorrow.

Ms. Rosario informed Mrs. Love that she had asked the City Attorney, Bob Coler to come to the meeting tonight to explain to the Board Members regarding the legal ramifications regarding a Stop Work Order that had been issued on a Mr. Todd Sill, homeowner at 276 S. Spring Street.

City Attorney Bob Coler came forward and said Ms. Rosario had asked him to come and speak to the Board Members about the legal ramifications they found themselves in regarding Mr. Sills who was sitting in the audience. He said what Mr. Sill had done was to proceed with some remodeling without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The City Attorney said he had begun to remove the roof of the home which had historical importance; and the City had discovered that and had issued a Stop Work Order. He said Mr. Sill had removed the historic roof, and it was down to the sheathing and tar paper; and his plan had been to proceed with an asphalt shingled roof that would probably not meet the Board's requirements; and he did not have a Certificate of Appropriateness. The City Attorney said the legal ramifications were #1) he was in violation of the Code for not seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness, and he was potentially in violation of the Property Maintenance Code. The City Attorney said you could not leave a construction project half done regarding the roof gone and down to the tar paper and sheathing. He said Mr. Sills told him and Staff the motivation for doing regular shingles over a historic metal roof was due to the price of a new metal roof being around \$65,000 versus \$11,000 for a regular roof. The City Attorney said he had wanted the Board to hear this regarding the legalities and to also sort of treat this as an informal review. Mr. Coler said he informed Mr. Sill that at some point he was going to have to ask for a Certificate of Appropriateness; he was going to have to bring some proposal to Staff who would either have to recommend an approval or denial; and ultimately this Board would be tasked with either granting or denying his request. He also said he informed Mr. Sill this Board was subject to an Appeals of the Circuit Court; and there was a process. The City Attorney said if any of the Board Members wanted to engage with a brain storming discussion with Staff or Mr. Sill regarding alternatives the Board may consider, that nothing they talked about tonight was binding upon the Board; but if they wished to talk to him about what they may allow him to do in order to achieve his desire to weather tighten the house, perhaps in an economically or reasonable fashion that met the Board's requirements. The City Attorney said he and Ms. Rosario would just sit back; and the Board could make any comments they had directly to them or Mr. Sill.

- Mrs. Love said she would begin, and referenced Page 94 of the Hampton Heights Guidelines regarding roofs, Section 8.1.5 – Its shape; features such as dormers, cresting, and chimneys; slope; material and color; and patterning is an essential and character-defining feature of a building. They were also essential to the building's preservation; and the guideline stated to retain the original roof form. No addition to a house shall greatly alter the original form of a roof or render that form unrecognizable. Original or historic roof dormers shall also be

retained. She said skylights were not relevant, so she would skip that portion. Mrs. Love said historic roofing materials, such as clay tile and slate, should be repaired rather than replaced, if at all possible; and she said it should be done with like materials. Mrs. Love said it should be remembered that life expectancies of more costly roofs such as slate had a greater life expectancy (slate was 60 to 125 years and longer; clay tile was over 100 years) and was considerably greater than most replacement materials.

- Ms. Rosario said all she had to add was she was happy to work with Mr. Sills; and perhaps it would be possible to get some tax abatement through the income producing property's portion that SHPO had. She said he had done the research and had gotten back to them with the two different costs. She said they were happy to work with him, but she would like to get a sense of where the Board kind of was right now. Ms. Rosario said they had just heard what the Guidelines stated; and they would kind of like to know what to work towards; and it was not a vote, but any feedback or advice they could give would be appreciated.
- Mrs. Love asked why the original roof was removed.
- Ms. Rosario said she believed Mr. Sills had desired to make the property look nicer; and she referenced a slide and said part of the original roof was still there, but had greatly rusted away. She said his desire was to make that property conform with nearby properties in terms of having the same materials. It was one of the only homes in Hampton Heights that still had the original material of its roof, although it was not in the greatest condition.
- Mr. Koenig said his question was regarding like with like for each individual house.
- Ms. Rosario said like for like with each individual material that was there, if the material was original that was what the guidelines called for. Mr. Rosario said losing one of the last metal roofs in the district was not good; but with that said it was not in that great of condition. She said if you took the costs out of the equation, the only other option was to put a brand new metal roof on it. Ms. Rosario said they did need to filter in the cost into the equation; and \$66,000 was quite a bit of that property's value even though property costs had risen. She said justifying that cost along with some other financial constraints were what Mr. Sills was confronted with. She said again, she was happy to do research work with Mr. Sills to try and get him to the finish line on this; and she asked the Board Members if there were any specific types of metal or any knowledge they might have to share with them, would be appreciated.
- Mrs. Love said a quick google search told her that an asphalt roof could last 12 to 20 years, while a metal roof could last 70 years; and she said theoretically you would need three \$11,000 roofs to span the same period of time as the one metal roof.
- Mr. Steinecke said a roof was something that everyone expected would have to be replaced at some time, and it was almost a temporary feature of a building, as opposed to the form of the architecture overall. In his opinion there was a little more wiggle room with the roof material than with other portions of the guidelines in terms of its dormer positions and things regarding the form of the house overall.
- Ms. Rosario said Mr. Sill inherited the house; and it had been in his family since it was built, and he was just trying to bring it up in terms of its aesthetic value and pretty much all of the houses on the street had undergone a good bit of renovations. She said he wanted to do a service to the neighborhood, but had certain cash restraints.
- Ms. Walker had concerns about leaking since the roof was obviously not in the best condition, and that would only get worse, and could lead to the deterioration of the house over all.
- Ms. Rosario said that was correct, and she had failed to mention there were already leaks in the roof as it stood right now, and the applicant wanted to stop the leaks.
- Ms. Walker agreed with Mr. Steinecke regarding there was more wiggle room on the roof material, especially when you looked at all the houses around it that all had asphalt roofs.
- Mr. Koenig said regarding the fact that it would take three asphalt roofs to cover the life span of the metal roof; that it was the upfront costs that made this affordable or not.
- Ms. Rosario referenced Section 510.7 Economic Hardship on Page 240 of the Ordinance and read it as follows:
When applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the owner may request the Board to consider any economic hardship affecting the request.

- A. Before making a decision on the request, the Board may solicit expert testimony or require that the applicant submit any information relevant to the decision such as:
1. Estimates of the cost of the proposed alteration, demolition, or removal, and an estimate of any additional cost that would be incurred to comply with the requirements for the issuance of a Certificate;
 2. A report from a licensed engineer or architect with experience in rehabilitation as to the structural soundness of any structures on the Site and their suitability for rehabilitation;
 3. Estimated market value of the Site under the following conditions: in its current condition; after any changes recommended by the Board; and, in case of a proposed demolition, after renovation of the existing structure for continued use; (and she said she knew this was not a demolition case)
 4. Amount paid for the property, the date purchase, and the party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner of record or application and the person from whom the property was purchased, any terms of financing between the seller and the buyer;
 5. [Editor's Note: She skipped this section since the property did not involve a demolition].
 6. If the Site is income producing, the annual gross income for the previous two years, itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous two years, and any depreciation, deduction, and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period;
 7. Any other information considered necessary by the Board to reach a determination as to whether the Site yields or may yield a reasonable return to the owner.
- B. After the hearing, the Board shall review all of the evidence and determine within 30 days whether the denial of a Certificate will deprive the owner of reasonable use of, or economic return from the site. If the Board determines that economic hardship had not been properly proven by the owner, the application for a Certificate shall be denied. If the Board determines that unreasonable economic hardship will occur to the owner, the Board may delay its decision for 90 days in order to investigate and make recommendations regarding alternatives. If at the end of the 90 day period the Board has found that, without approval of the Certificate, an unreasonable economic hardship still will occur, then the Board shall issue a Certificate.

- Mrs. Love asked Mr. Sill before he removed the roof, if he had contacted someone about repairing what was there.
- Mr. Sill said he did not. He referenced a slide of the house regarding how bad the roof looked; and he explained at one time his house was in very good condition; and he sat back and watched as others on the street and neighborhood had houses that were not in as good of shape had to make a lot of repairs to their homes so they would look nice; and now it was his house that was deteriorating. He was a home builder and during the previous recession period he was just hanging on, doing everything he could do just to be able to make his payments and keep the house. Unfortunately he was unable to do anything to the roof during that period of time. Mr. Sill said he had finally gotten to the point where he could put a roof on it now; and his primary purpose was re-roof it to stop his personal embarrassment because he felt his house was pulling down the value of all the other houses on the street. He referenced a slide of the portion of the roof he put asphalt shingles on; and he said his neighbor had commented to him that it really looked a lot better. Mr. Sill said the roof he put on was the same as all of the other houses on the street had, as well as all of the other houses on the street behind him. He said there had been a few leaks before he had started the re-roof; and he explained that there were some even bigger ones, as it was right now waiting for proper approval and permits. He explained he had done roofs in the county and did not have to get a permit; and he did not realize he needed one in the City, for which he was sorry.
- Mr. Koenig asked Mr. Sill, that right now the roof only had the boards and paper on it.
- Ms. Sill referenced slides of the house; and he explained the highest levels of the house did have shingles on it; but the porch portion only had wood and the paper on it, waiting for the next step. He said the next slide depicted the left side of the house with the unsightly roof.

- Mrs. Love said his next step would be to put together a proposal and bring it to the Board Members and if economic hardship was something he wanted them to consider; that he needed to come with those items Ms. Rosario had mentioned earlier.
- Ms. Rosario said again that she was happy to sit down with Mr. Sills and they could reach out to Mr. Brad Sauls, with the State Historic Preservation Office to see if there were any options in terms of any tax abatements. She thanked the Board Members for letting them bring this to them tonight. She explained if it continued to just sit, at some point Code Enforcement would start putting fines on the property.
- Ms. Walker felt it was important to be able to have these kinds of conversations.
- Mr. Coler, City Attorney said the only thing he would add would be while the Board Members' mandate was to preserve history where they could, there was broad discretion to them to apply the guidelines as they saw fit; and there was no legal binding precedence if they approved something with this case, the next case could not come up and say that this was done for this house. He said each one would be considered on its own.

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Ms. Rosario said one last thing she wanted to talk about was there was a grant they as a City could apply for from the State Historic Preservation Office that could cover surveying, planning, and any number of items other than actually investing in the physical portion of a structure, unless it was a National Registry Property that was a major and needed some work. The grant was due by April 30th; and if they could think of any proposed projects or knew of anything that could use some studying or assistance, to please let her know. She said if no-one had any ideas that she had one which was the cemetery on Cemetery Street, which she explained was a Historic African American cemetery that was in neglected shape. Ms. Rosario said this was not the only project they could do; and she went over a list of others, regarding criteria as well.
- Mrs. Love said at the last meeting they had talked about Continuing Ed Credits for those of them, as well as some of the Planning Department's other Board Members who had not been able to obtain their 3 Credits for 2019. She said Ms. Rosario had sent them a link regarding some of the MASC web based material, and meeting as a group in order for those that still needed their credits to be able to do so.
- Ms. Rosario said Staff's idea would be to have a movie day where those that needed credits could attend; and it would need to be something the MASC would approve. She said if the Board Members wanted to look at the list she had sent out and vote on something they could do that; or if anyone had something they wished to meet regarding; she would need to be sure and verify with the MASC it was something they could be approved for regarding continued education credits.
- Mrs. Love felt if there was anything related to preservation, or no more rainwater runoff, or etc.
- Ms. Rosario said she would need to look and see; and she would check on other sources such as American Planning Association who had a lot of various educational topics.
- Mr. Koenig asked did this not need to happen fairly soon since they were near the end of the year.
- Ms. Rosario said this would be something that would happen in 2020.
- Mrs. Roland said there was always the ACOG approved Continued Educational meetings they could attend if they wished.
- Mrs. Love asked could they use something from the traditional Building Conference; and she said there was one about repairing historic windows.
- Ms. Rosario said she would check and see; that they had to have State approval; and she asked Mrs. Love to please send her that link and she would check with them and see if it could be used for approvable continued education credits.
- Mr. Koenig asked didn't they have some sort of conference coming up next year. He said he and Phillip Stone, along with Josh Henderson when he was with the Planning Department had attended one in Columbia, SC that had been excellent and very interesting, and was the coolest thing to attend. He said Mr. Henderson had also driven them down to the conference.

- Mrs. Love said he was talking about the State Historic Preservation Conference.
- Ms. Rosario said Staff would send that invitation out to the HARB Board Members when it was received; and even if she did not get to attend; the Board Members could certainly go if they wished and Staff would register them.
- Ms. Leebrick asked could that be used for her New Board Member Training.
- Mrs. Roland explained it could not; but she could certainly go if she wished.
- Ms. Reid said she had recently attended a seminar at the Montgomery Building, Carolina Theater Web Management Consultation; and she explained a consultant had talked about the theater regarding revitalization/renovation that was really fascinating and interesting; and there was going to be another one held in February, 2020; and they had invited any HARB Board Members if they wished to attend. Ms. Reid said she would send something out to the Board Members regarding the February meeting.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.



Sarah Love, Chair

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant.