

City of Spartanburg - Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review
Thursday, December 8th, 2022, at 5:30 PM
“In-Person Meeting” City Hall Council Chambers

The City of Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review (HARB) met in the City Hall Council Chambers on Thursday, December 8th, 2022, at 5:30 PM

The following Board Members were in attendance: Dr. Melissa Walker; J. Brandon Gaffney; Sylvelie Franke; Dr. Anne Rodrick; Kenneth Brown; Dr. Glory Boozer and Bill Michels. Representing the City of Spartanburg’s Planning Department was Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director; Nan Zhou, Planner I; and Tia Keitt, Planner II

Roll Call:

Dr. Walker: Good evening. I now call this meeting of the Historical Architectural Review Board of Spartanburg to order. In compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, public notification of this meeting was published, posted and mailed and in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and requirements of the City of Spartanburg Ordinance.

First item of business is, first of all, I've been asked to remind board members to speak loudly into the microphones so that that will be on the recording. And then I'm going to ask folks to introduce themselves, starting with Dr. Boozer over here on my right.

Dr. Glory Boozer: Thank you. Good evening, everyone, I'm Glory Boozer.

Kenneth Brown: I'm Kenneth Brown.

Brandon Gaffney: Good evening, my name is Brandon Gaffney.

Dr. Melissa Walker: Melissa Walker, the chair.

Sylvelie Franke: Sylvelie Franke.

Dr. Anne Rodrick: Anne Rodrick.

Bill Michaels: Bill Michaels.

Dr. Walker: Thank you all. Next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? If not, could someone move that we approve it?

Approval of the Agenda:

On a motion by Dr. Boozer, seconded by Dr. Rodrick the agenda was approved by a vote of 7 to 0

Dr. Boozer: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.

Dr. Rodrick: Second

Dr. Walker: All in favor say aye?

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Okay, thank you. The next item is to approve the minutes from our November meeting, and there were a few corrections. I understand that those corrections have been made. So are there any additional corrections to the minutes? Do I have a motion to approve?

Approval of the minutes of November 10th, 2022:

Mr. Gaffney: I move to approve.

Mr. Brown: Second.

Dr. Walker: All those in favor say aye?

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed.

On a motion by Mr. Gaffney, seconded by Mr. Brown the minutes of November 10, 2022, was approved by a vote of 7 to 0

Old Business: None

Dr. Walker: All right. We have no old business, so the first item of business on the agenda is a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works at 315 Hampton Avenue.

New Business:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 315 W. Hampton Avenue (TMS# 7-16-02-084.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows and change the roof design. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner: Julia Allen Snead / Agent: Heather Morrow.

This is a request for a roof design/window replacement as well as to replace the garage door on this property located at 315 West Hampton Avenue. I did want to provide some context for the board, at least to share some information. And then we also have the author of the Historic Designs here in the meeting who could probably share some additional information on this as well.

I know this printing's kind of small. I wanted to provide some context for the board first. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. There's four different standards, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. You can find this information on the Secretary of the Interior's webpage. It's a very useful webpage and we have used it for several of these cases because we had some questions about how the project should be treated. And so, again, we have the consultant that can provide some context and some assistance for you tonight as well.

So, the Hampton Heights guideline is a rehabilitation guideline. Those are the standards that we use. The Secretary of the Interior has standards and treatments for the rehabilitation of properties

and there are 10 requirements, and we've reviewed many of these core requirements. Part of the challenge in the requirements is typically item six, deteriorating historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. You will see that as a challenge as we are going through the process. Although, it makes the property or structure look nicer and appealing and more historic, we run into this challenge of the standard.

Next is standard number nine, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. We're going to run into this challenge with roofs. And there are two cases that involve roofs, and you'll hear the opinion of our consultant as well.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project site is located in the Hampton Heights District which has design guidelines for development. These guidelines are outlined in the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts and Landmarks. The purpose of the Manual is to provide property owners guidance for the preservation and protection of historic and architecturally valuable districts and sites in the City. The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance.

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. *The character and appropriateness of the design –*

The Hampton Heights Historic Guidelines states that the "roof design and pitch is an architectural detail that are required to be preserved and repaired rather than replacement." In this case the applicant has indicated that the rear bonus room roof design is not efficient and could cause leaks because of its slope. A more efficient design would allow for the preservation of the structure. The flat roof design also makes the space inconvenient for occupancy as a low ceiling is currently in the room. The applicant is requesting to extend the gabled roof over the bonus room area effectively replacing the flat roof design. The Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation indicate that "Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved" and "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment." The changing of the flat roof pitch to a gabled roof would visibly block the chimney in the rear of the structure currently visible from the street. Chimneys are an architectural defining feature of historic structures in the neighborhood.

The applicant is requesting to remove louvered windows and replace with six over six wood windows in the center of the wall over the garage and replace the four louvered windows in the rear of the structure with three wood six over six windows. The HARB has typically discouraged the removal of windows and replacement except when deteriorated beyond repair. The replacement of the louvered windows with six over six wood window would be consistent with the main structure of the house, but would not meet the rehab standards of the neighborhood design guidelines.

The replacement of the deteriorated wood 6 foot high privacy fence with a similar wood privacy fence and replace the deteriorated wood garage door with a similar design wood garage door – like for like materials is consistent with the character and appropriateness of the neighborhood and the structure.

2. *The scale of the buildings –*

The changing of the roof pitch to a gabled roof would visibly block the chimney in the rear of the structure which is currently visible from the street. Chimneys are an architectural defining feature of historic structures in the neighborhood.

3. *The texture and materials –*

The proposed roof design will have similar features and asphalt shingles as the flat roof design and no changes are proposed to the texture and materials. No changes are proposed for the texture and materials of the windows. The new windows will be wood windows versus the aluminum and wood louvered windows currently on the structure.

4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings –*

This property sits on the corner of two streets. Typically, changes to the design of the rear of structure would not be visible from the street. In this case the proposed roof design would be visible because the property sits on a corner lot. The gabled roof design would change the character of the structure but would create a more efficient design and useful living space. The proposed new roof design would assist in the long-term maintenance and preservation of the entire structure.

5. *If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –*

The proposed change in the roof design would not be consistent with the historic neighborhood rehabilitation standards. The change in the roof design from a flat roof to the gabled roof design would detract from the original roof design of the period. The location of the roof on a corner property would be visible from the street. The change in window design from louvered windows to six over six wood windows would be harmonious to the structure and the neighborhood since other structures in the vicinity do not have louvered windows. The replacement of the deteriorated wood 6-foot-high privacy fence with a similar wood privacy fence and replace the deteriorated wood garage door with a similar design wood garage door – like for like materials is consistent with the character and appropriateness of the neighborhood and the structure.

We looked at these five criteria's when reviewing historic properties and developing the staff report for the COA, for the Certificate of Appropriateness. The property's located here, showing the front elevation of the house. Majority of the changes in designs will be on the side of the house, the Pinckney Court side. So, there's a request to remove this louvered window, there's a request to replace this garage door to a wood garage door, and then to replace the louvers on the rear of the structure and install a fence. The fence can be installed as a minor COA and does not require approval by the HARB.

Here are photos street views of properties adjacent, down the street, as well as adjacent to the property, across from the property on Pinckney Court. This is a view of what is proposed. This is

existing, and this is proposed. This is the window that will be replaced with the windows in the corner it will be moved to the center, and then this garage will be replaced. And then these windows here are the three six-over-six windows located on the rear of the structure.

The other item that will be changed is the roof design. You'll notice this is a flat roof. The chimney is visible in the rear. This new design will block the existing chimney, and the standards do not recommend that you make changes like this to external structures. Again, others might be able to provide some context. This is an older section of the building. This is the original section of the property, this was added later. I don't know when that section was added later and that may have an effect on your decision.

Here's another view. Again, nothing else will be changed except for this section, the garage door, the windows, the window on this side, the one on the rear, and the roof pitch. Here's another view. Again, six-over-six. A double six-over-six window to the seven-over-seven. This is a six-over-six window, and these are the four louvered windows in the rear, showing the ceiling height, which is a challenge for the builder if they don't get approval for the pitch of the roof. And this is the Victor Built windows that will be installed.

Applicant is available to speak if you have questions and will answer the questions that you might have.

Dr. Walker: Any questions for Mr. Livingston?

Mr. Brown: I have one. This is Ken. The chimney in question, I couldn't figure from the graphics where it. Is it part of that, what we think might be an addition, or is it part of the original house?

Mr. Livingston: That's a good question. It looks like it's part of the addition based on the photo.

Mr. Brown: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Livingston? Okay, thank you. Is the applicant here?

Mr. Livingston: The consultant is here to provide his note.

Dr. Walker: Yeah, okay. We have Historic Preservation Consultant Architect Donnie Love here. And Mr. Love, if you could just, maybe it would be helpful, since we have so many items on the agenda, if you could read just the findings portion of your letter to us?

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Love: Do I need to swear myself in?

Dr. Walker: Could you give us your name and address and?

Mr. Love: Okay. Donnie Love, 608 Otis Boulevard. For this one, I think the synopsis for that was that the architectural design of it is fine, it just doesn't meet the guidelines. I think the guidelines state pretty clearly that you can't modify an existing or an original roof structure. And making additions look too much like it was built with the original house, which doesn't meet the guidelines or the standards, so that was the premise.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Questions for Mr. Love?

Mr. Love: I think if you were to do this now with the guidelines in place, you would set the wall of the addition inside the original wall, so that it would kind of step down. And then I think it would've been allowed that way. So, you can do additions, you just can't make them look like they are part of the original structure.

Mr. Michels: Could you do a step down at the roof line? I noticed the additional roof line in your proposal pretty much continues out.

Mr. Love: I'm saying if you drop it down, it's not going to cover the you'll almost have a flat spot.

Mr. Brown: Or the pitch will change, which is worse.

Dr. Walker: Yeah.

Mr. Love: Yeah. So I think for that. I thought about that. And you couldn't keep the same pitch because then you'd end up with a flat spot at the edge

Mr. Michels: Right, I see, because it comes all the way up.

Mr. Love: I mean, you can do that, but it...

Mr. Michels: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Does Mr. Love need to sign in this time?

Mr. Love: Any other questions for me?

Dr. Walker: Any other questions?

Mr. Love: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Okay, now we'll have the applicant. And would you give us your name and address and sign in for us please.

Ms. Morrow: Got to clean my glasses.

Mr. Brown: I know the story.

Ms. Morrow: I'm Heather Morrow, and my address is 500 Peronneau Street. Actually, I just want to clarify. Ms. Snead, I purchased the home from her last week. So, I have purchased the home and renovating it. So, I want to clarify, I usually come before you asking you not to alter things to a house, and I know this is a little bit out of character for me. But I feel like the intent behind the guidelines was to preserve the original portions of our homes, and that any addition are meant to enhance or be harmonic with the rest of the home. And I feel like this one is quite jarring from the road. If you take even a further step back, I mean, it literally straight down and flat roof.

So, I recognize that this is a little bit of a different request, but I wanted to say, first of all, I do believe that based on materials used on the inside and looking through the registrar and deed's records, I believe that this was maybe done late '70s, early '80s. And so that was very significant. The house was built in 1940. So you've got two very different periods, and in my opinion they had it done, they didn't do a very good job of complimenting the original home.

The other thing is flat roofs are very hard to maintain. I've had a next door neighbor and the former homeowner, he passed away earlier this year, I've had his relatives tell me that he was always working on that roof. And you can see from the picture that I mean, right now he has plywood up on it. Now, I'm going to fix it regardless, I was just hoping and to be quite frank,

what I'm proposing is far more expensive than leaving those louvered windows and doing the gabled roof. But my goal is always to have the best product and the most beautiful home as I can at the end of the day. So that was the reasoning I was bringing this before y'all.

The other issue that I have with the louvered windows, in that corner I had substantial termite damage, so something has to be pulled out and repaired regardless. Those louvered windows, to me, being back on the side, again, just don't I recognize that the Interior Standards say that it should be apparent which is old and new, but I think that this one is just so unsightly from the road, there's been significant damage over the years, and quite frankly, I just wanted to improve it the best way that I can.

I did want to clarify that chimney from the back. And also mention, this is a corner property, so you're catching me from two different sides. Whereas normally, if you look at it from the front, you still will be able to see that back chimney. And it was part of the addition, not the original house for sure. And you can see that from every angle from in the house and underneath as well. So, I believe that's it. Did y'all have any questions for me?

And I also wanted to mention the wood windows will match the original wood. I wouldn't do anything other than that. So my hope is just to make it a little bit more slightly from the road and the house as well. So thanks for the consideration.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Okay, I believe we can open the floor to public comment now. Is there anyone from the public who would like to comment on this project? Yes, ma'am, if you'll come forward? Give us your name and address and sign in please.

Ms. Burdette: My name is Donna Burdette, and I am the original board member and worked extensively with the national guidelines. And I just need you to know that at the time these were built World War II, materials were in short supply, people were getting what they could. They were trying to save money. There were school district issues. And there were not enough apartments. That's why we got all that veteran housing and high rises after the war. Because there was no place for people to live. So many people added additions and things, and they really didn't care whether or not it was compatible or it looked like anything.

Now, those guidelines that we use, they were excellent, they've traveled the whole country, and this is much more suitable. It is for better continuity and I just want to say I thoroughly endorse you allowing these. It might appear to be in conflict, but they're really not because they meet the intent of the whole purpose of the historic national standards that were established. Thank you.

Dr. Walker: So just to summarize, you think that this proposal meets the intent even though it doesn't meet the letter of the guidelines?

Ms. Burdette: Yes. Yes. Totally. That's right.

Dr. Walker: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Burdette: And at the end, sometimes that's what you have to go for. And I'm done.

Dr. Walker: Okay, is there anyone else from the public who would like to comment? Hearing none, I will declare the public comment closed and it's time for board deliberations.

Mr. Brown: I'll stick my toe in. This is Ken. First of all, I don't have a problem with chimney now that I know that it was not original. Second of all, I agree that the flat roof is always problematic. My third thought is that the windows that the applicant proposes to replace are desperately in need of replacement. I do think that this is an older addition than the '70s or '80s, but that's immaterial. I really wish that the original addition had not been set coplanar with the original house because that's the source of our dilemma here. If that addition were set back some number of inches or a foot, it would make it easier for me to say let's just go for it. But I can't really quite bring myself to go there yet.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Brown: I'd like to hear what other people have to say.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Mr. Michels: Bill. I'm going to agree with Ken on that, other than the fact that what is proposed, one year from now when we look at it, it will all look original. Whereas the addition that's on there now is obviously, apparently an addition. And I have to say poorly done. At the time it was done, it was done the way it was done. Also, being a corner lot, I might run into the same problem. I think we'd be less to think about this if you couldn't see it at all. But I'd be inclined to... even though it does not meet the letter of the law, to go ahead and approve it because the end result will be what we're looking to do with the neighborhood and keeping the neighborhood the way it's supposed to be.

And no one's going to know a year from now that portion was not the original house. We know because we're making this decision, but anything looks better than the current condition. I've looked at that property over the years. My wife actually knows the gentleman who used to live there before he died. And we've seen that house too, right to this point, and there's an opportunity here to make that a really beautiful house. And I don't want to penalize the owner or the developer because it happens to be on a corner lot.

Dr. Walker: Any other comments?

Dr. Boozer: I just want to make sure that as we deliberate in here, the ideas that come from the residents, that we're always cognizant when we're making the decision where it's not to the letter of the law. So, when the next person comes to us we can be as consistent as we are this time the next time.

Mr. Gaffney: I agree.

Ms. Franke: I appreciate that.

Dr. Boozer: Consistency is going to be very important and of course we want the best looking structure that we can have in the neighborhood, but we always have to be cognizant of how we can duplicate or replicate what we've done and treat everybody fairly. So, if we can do this and know that the next one comes we can use the same measuring stick to make the decision, we should be able to live with that.

Dr. Rodrick: This is Anne, and I completely agree with everything that's been said. And my only concern is to make sure we're not setting a precedent that we will regret. So, in the case of this particular property, I really love the proposal. Again, I'm thinking about historically, as we move forward if we're going to do this we need to do it really carefully.

Mr. Brown: I agree.

Mr. Gaffney: This is Brandon. I just have one question. Based on what's proposed, and Mr. Love, you may be best to answer this-

Ms. Morrow: Can you speak up just a little?

Mr. Gaffney: Okay. Based on what's proposed, Mr. Love, you may be the best person to explain this, what would be the difference between what is pictured and what would be... or meet the qualifications as far as what's presented?

Mr. Brown: That's a good question.

Mr. Love: What would meet the guideline?

Mr. Gaffney: Yes.

Mr. Love: Well, I think working with what you have there, I think it's going to be difficult to meet the guideline. Because, if you can't alter the existing roof, and you can't move the windows of the roof, then that pretty much takes all of the things that they're proposing off the table.

Mr. Gaffney: Gotcha.

Mr. Love: You see what I'm saying? So I don't know, I mean, like I said, I think if I were doing it from scratch and I wanted to meet the standards, I would've made the building a little smaller so that I could build a new roof that extended out over it and done it that way. But to make it meet the standard now, I don't... I'm not going to say there's not any way to do it, but right now I can't think of any.

Mr. Gaffney: Thank you.

Mr. Love: Welcome.

Dr. Boozer: So then based on your response and your question, there's no way to do it except realize that we can't meet the letter of the law.

Dr. Walker: There have been other cases where we didn't require the applicant to meet the exact letter of the law, but you're absolutely right that the most important thing here is that we treat everybody consistently.

Mr. Gaffney: Right.

Dr. Boozer: And I think if we always get to a point and say that it can't happen without the alterations, then maybe that would be our measuring stick. That there is no other way.

Mr. Gaffney: Right.

Dr. Boozer: But if there is an option, then we would look at the option. But when there is no option, we would be safe in saying that. With that being said, I move that we move forward with the request.

Mr. Brown: Second.

Dr. Walker: You mean to approve it?

On a motion by Dr. Boozer, seconded by Mr. Brown the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Dr. Boozer: I approve.

Mr. Gaffney: Second.

Dr. Walker: All in favor say aye?

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Then the motion carries unanimously. Thank you. All right the next item on the agenda is a COA for major works at 290 West Hampton Avenue.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 290 W. Hampton Avenue (TMS# 7-16-02-015.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rotted wood siding with Hardie Board siding. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Richard Brown.

Ms. Zhou: Good evening chairperson and board members. So, tonight we are looking at 290 West Hampton Avenue as a major case. The home owner is requesting to replace the vinyl wood siding with hardie board siding due to significant siding damage discovered on the second story area of the house. And again, the is the R-8 Single-Family Zoning District. And this is the aerial photo of the house. So, this is the current condition of the house, and as always, we're looking at the five criteria's, and then by looking at the character and the appropriateness of the design.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project site is located in the Hampton Heights District which has design guidelines for development. These guidelines are outlined in the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts and Landmarks. The purpose of the Manual is to provide property owners guidance for the preservation and protection of historic and architecturally valuable districts and sites in the City. The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance.

The project site has a zoning designation of R-8/SFD, Single Family Zone District, which allows for single family dwelling units. Section 510.6 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance list standards for reviewing Certificate of Appropriateness. Specifically, Section 510.6 (C)(2) states that in reviewing applications for new construction or alteration, the board shall consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the five criteria listed in the findings.

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. The character and appropriateness of the design –

There is no design for the Hardie Board replacement provided by the applicant. The character of Hardie Board is not comparable to the wood siding in terms of thickness and appearance. However, Hardie Board could be used to replicate real wood siding.

2 The scale of the buildings –

The scale of the building will remain the same (84' by 221'). Nothing will be added to or removed from the primary structure causing the building scale change.

3. The texture and materials –

Based on the applicant's statement, the "texture will stay the same, but the material will be changed from wood siding to cement board with the same size lap siding." Hardie Board siding, based on the information provided by the website (<https://www.jameshardie.com/why-hardie/superior-siding/fiber-cement-siding-vs-wood-siding?loc=refresh>), it is more weather, climate, water resistance, and environmentally-friendly as compared to wood siding.

4. The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings –

Both left side and right side houses have wood sidings on their properties. The houses across the street have wood sidings as well. The proposed project does not share similar features with the structures in the immediate surroundings.

5. If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –

Walking down and across Hydrick Street, majority of the houses have wood siding on their houses. Therefore, having a Hardie Board for the project site would not be harmonious with the Historic District.

So, based on my little research and provided by the home owner, there's no further detail I can mention about the design, but the character of hardie board is not comparable to the wood siding in terms of the thickness and the appearance. And then the scale is not going to change, but you can see some damage on the second floor.

And then this is the property to the right of the previous one. And then the texture based on the home owner's statement it says, and he said that the material will be changed from wood siding to the cement board for the same side's left siding, but the texture will stay the same. And then the relationship of such elements to similar features of the structures in the immediate surroundings by looking around and confirming with Martin So, all of the houses surrounding

this piece of property is they all have wood siding. So, which means that they do not share the same features with this changes.

So, this is the current conditions of the house, the different sides. And this is the according to the left, across from the street. And this is a better, some of the house on the street. Do you have any questions for me?

Mr. Brown: I have one. I think I recall a photograph from the original packet that you sent that I didn't see here, but I may be imagining it. I thought there was a closeup of the area of the damage? I think it was where the second floor met a roof? Am I thinking of the wrong project?

Mr. Brown: That's my recollection. That's why I'm asking. And I'll get back to it later.

Ms. Zhou: Okay.

Dr. Walker: And so the proposal is to replace all of the siding?

Ms. Zhou: Not all of the siding. It's just at the second, second story level.

Mr. Brown: Second floor only?

Dr. Walker: Oh, okay.

Ms. Zhou: And I mean, so there might be some at the rear, but the rear is minor so as long as it's not visible from the street.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you. Mr. Love?

Mr. Love: So on this one, and I don't think I've misunderstood, but I don't think they're replacing all the siding on the upper level. I thought it was just repairing the roof edges where the majority of the rot is. That was the way I understood it. But, I think in either case the opinion is the same. There's no real need to use hardie board here.

Mr. Brown: I agree.

Mr. Love: The guidelines don't allow the use of hardie board here, so there's no real reason to.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Mr. Love: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Is the applicant here?

Mr. Brown: Here.

Dr. Walker: Yes, sir. Would you come forward? Identify yourself for the record and sign in, please.

Applicant - Mr. Brown: Richard Brown. Address 290 West Hampton. So, I want to replace the lower portion of the siding in this picture here, on the front, on the left and right of those windows, and then also where this pointer is right there, up to the roof line, to the eaves. I'm going to replace the rear of the building with hardie board, and that is a wider thing. And I would like to have it all match. The whole top floor. The backside of it, there was pictures taken of it. I guess they didn't make it into this because it doesn't need approval.

But there's many roof lines. There's flat roof, there's just a lot of weird areas and there's a lot of moisture back there. And basically over the years it has rotted basically up the whole side of it. And to prevent that from happening again, and just because there's just so much moisture back there, it gets significantly less light. Because most of the sun comes around the side and the front of the house, so it just stays moist back there and it's just going to be more susceptible to rot. So I'm going to end up doing the back, I just want the front to match as well, and I'm going to try to do my best to match it and make it appropriate for the neighborhood.

Dr. Rodrick: So how about the sides? What was your plan for the sides?

Applicant - Mr. Brown: Same thing. The windows are roughed out at the level of the roof, so there's a lot of issues at the sills, but the siding is right on the roof. There's going to be a problem there no matter what, and the cement board I'm hoping will help prevent any further issues there.

Dr. Walker: But you're only talking about replacing the first four or five courses of the cement board, not all of the second floor cement... not all the second floor?

Mr. Brown: Yeah, that's what I'm not clear about.

Mr. Brown: So all the left side up to the top of the window there.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Brown: So we wouldn't be mixing and matching? Okay.

Mr. Brown: No. That wouldn't be right.

Mr. Brown: No.

Dr. Walker: Everything up to the fish scales basically?

Applicant - Mr. Brown: Yeah.

Dr. Walker: Yeah.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: And then keep those. There's not really moisture issues there. But everything along the roof line there is.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for the applicant?

Ms. Franke: Do you think that the wood right now that you need to replace is original? Like a hundred years old?

Applicant - Mr. Brown: I don't know if it's original because I think they may have added that peak to the front of it. It's hard to say. They did a lot, they did something upstairs and added something on. There was a fireplace chimney that went all the way through the center of that peak, about five feet into the room. Or maybe it just wasn't finished upstairs. Yeah, not quite sure.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you, sir. All right, is there anyone here from the public who would like to comment?

Ms. Burdette: I just want to...

Dr. Walker: Yes?

Ms. Burdette: Add a little context if you don't mind?

Dr. Walker: Yes, Ms. Burdette? You don't have to sign in again.

Ms. Burdette: We live in a moderate rainforest. And people talk about all of our old-growth, original growth got torn down mining way before we were a country. So what came back is all gone because you're looking at it. And we're very fortunate in that neighborhood because we're dealing with typically old, hard pine, which is hardy stuff. If we were meeting the code today, we'd have a piece of flashing that goes up eight inches above that, which I've had to do and I did on Vivian's house when we replaced that metal roof before it burned. And it's a little different but, we have to deal with the moderate rainforest and a very humid climate and that's never going to change. I will say, without saying replace all of it, there is something good, which is

why it was developed about particularly along that roof edge at the seal of those windows for considering allowing somebody to do something like a hardie board, we don't grow trees that big, they're not that dense. And if it took 50 years for it to rot on the original, it's going to take less than 30. So part of the conflict in consideration they have sometimes when you're dealing with this and using this intent is that you don't simply replicate as a story problem and create a disaster that continues for the rest of its history. I'm just adding that. So if you could just do it maybe along one area, otherwise you've got flashing up to that and protect that wood with metal flashing if you follow me. But you certainly can't replicate and not give every person who ever lives there a constant issue.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Ms. Morrow.

Dr. Walker: State your name, please.

Ms. Morrow: Heather Morrow. Sorry. I'm going to do another first and say that I wasn't planning to speak up on this, but I am also finding that there are two materials within historic preservation that are no longer made like they used to be when siding is one of those and the flooring for the porches is another. I've got porch floors that only lasted five years, they were brand new. So we have an issue with the longevity of this materials. I have also, and just to clarify, this isn't... Your siding isn't leveled, it's just the flat siding, so you won't be able to tell the difference. I mean I've seen that done in a couple of houses. I've seen a mixed wood with the hardie board and once it's painted you honestly cannot tell the difference. So I'm a purist at heart, but, I do think that there is some room for making sure that, especially on an area like this where it's going to continue to get rain, that hardie board might be the direction that has to go moving forward if that's an option. So thanks.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Anybody else from the public? Hearing none. We'll close public comment and begin board deliberations.

Dr. Rodrick: So this is Ann. I just want to clarify that the back of the house, that is a minor work that will be improved, correct? So there will be hardie board around the back of the house.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Brown: This is Ken. I still think I remember seeing a photograph that showed some of the damage in a closeup. And I think I've seen the region that I am referring to as to the right of the pair of windows on the second floor. That appears to be the most obvious damage based on-

Ms. Nan: You're referring to?

Mr. Brown: I'm speaking to this area here, but I thought I remember seeing a closeup of it. I may be confusing something else.

Ms. Zhou: I think I have this one.

Mr. Brown: All right. It's okay.

Ms. Zhou: Maybe it's not zoomed in in that... I mean if we go further up.

Mr. Brown: Maybe I zoomed in on my iPad.

Ms. Zhou: Yeah, you probably did.

Mr. Brown: Okay. I'm sorry. I don't mean to waste everybody's time.

Mr. Brown: Where I'm heading though is that I'm not all together convinced this is a question of how worthy the wood siding is as to how worthy the connection is between the roofing and the siding. I pretty much believe that if this house is built in the early 20th century and it's still standing there, if this is the original siding, it's already 112, 114 years old. I really think that the applicant should consider getting a professional opinion as to the condition of the porch roof where it meets the second floor because I really think that that issue is not so much the quality of the wood as the quality of the flashing and so forth.

Dr. Boozer: The lack of flashing.

Mr. Brown: My guess is flashing would be a whole lot cheaper than a hardy panel to the amount of scope we're talking about. But we're not here to talk about the economics, we can't address that.

Dr. Walker: Mr. Brown, I'll let you briefly address that.

Applicant - Mr. Brown: So the roof was just replaced and that's where all the stuff was found. So they reflashed it and they tucked it up underneath what they could.

Applicant - Mr. Brown: This is Richard Brown. So the reason all this damage was discovered was because the roof. Well, I mean you could see it before, but the roof was replaced and they reflashed it and they did the best they could by tucking it up underneath the existing siding, but most of it just kind of deteriorated. And what they did is you could see it there is they put some of their under their waterproofing, their ice guard, ice shield, or whatever and they kind of layered it and tucked it underneath the siding that was still intact

Mr. Brown: Without removing any siding?

Applicant - Mr. Brown: Some of it just fell off. They had to remove some of it.

Mr. Brown: Okay.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: And basically tucked up the ice guard, ice shield underneath the good siding and lapped it over so that way... And they're flashing-

Mr. Brown: In place of what they took off, they put wood or... You said some of it fell off.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Yeah, they didn't put in any siding back they did the roof.

Mr. Brown: Okay.

Dr. Walker: Yeah. What we're seeing is the underlayment from the roof.

Mr. Brown: Yeah. But are there gaps in the siding now because I can't discern them. Is there siding that's missing?

Mr. Brown: Yeah.

Mr. Brown: Okay. Could somebody clarify where it is because it's not clear to me. Oh, okay. All right. All right there. I'm sorry. I keep looking at the front.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Yeah. So a lot of where they tucked it underneath and it fell apart is off to the sides of the roof. And then on the left and right side of the house.

Mr. Brown: I was looking in the wrong place. Okay, thank you for the clarification. So the porch roof where it meets the peak, is there siding missing there because I can't discern it?

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Where the porch... Where it meets-

Mr. Brown: Where that pair of windows is over the front door.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: No, they tucked up the flashing underneath there. It didn't fall apart.

Mr. Brown: So the worst damage is in that corner on the left hand side?

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Left hand and definitely the left and right side of that house but basically they had to pull the window off and they tucked it underneath of that.

Mr. Brown: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Michels: Question before you leave. I think I'm confused a little bit. I know you do in the back, I'm not concerned about the back. We're talking about matches, which makes me believe you want to tear all that wood off and replace all with hardie board.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Of the top second floor?

Mr. Michels: Right.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Yes.

Mr. Michels: As opposed to just replacing rotted board through at the bottom that have rotted over time because water splashes back on them, water gets underneath and that's why they're rotted.

Mr. Brown: Yeah.

Mr. Michels: I do not want to be ripping all the wood off the entire second floor of that house when on these small mounts they're rotted.

Mr. Michels: Maybe around the window frames a tiny bit and along the roof line.

Mr. Michels: That's my question is, I mean the rest of the wood to me based on photos it looks like it needs to be painted but it doesn't look like it's rotted or anything.

Applicant- Mr. Brown: So I mean the pictures don't really do it justification. All the lap siding on the front of the house there on the second floor, it needs to be replaced, it's all water damaged, because I mean it wasn't painted for so many years. A previous owner let the house go. I mean most of the inside was falling apart and a lot of the outside was. I mean you had the flat roof in the back that just literally poured water right over the back so..

Mr. Michels: So you saying all that wood rotted and not fall off?

Applicant- Mr. Brown: Yeah.

Mr. Michels: That whole front?

Mr. Brown: It stuck out. So it needs to either be replaced with low quality woods, what you're going to have these days or cement for siding and it's the last to what I adhere to.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Well, it's board deliberation.

Mr. Brown: I'm not shy. This is Ken.

Dr. Walker: Could you speak a little more louder?

Mr. Brown: I'm sorry. I'm reluctant to permit a wholesale exchange of siding irrespective of the rear of the house, which we have no way to control or desire from my point of view. I'm reluctant to see us do a wholesale change on the second floor. I think that maybe we should consider using hardie plank, I believe is the technical term, only where the worst damage is and have some kind of assurance through whatever motion we may make or approve that they will be painted to match. The texture at the second floor is less critical to me because you got to get up on the roof to see it. But it's more important to me that we preserve as much as possible and solve the problem to the best of our ability with the least amount of hardie plank that can be introduced.

Ms. Franke: Yeah, I agree with Ken. I mean the guidelines are very clear. As far as the siding of the house should be maintained to wood strongly no cement, siding strongly discouraged. So I think only in the area that there's a clear problem and maybe it would be okay to do should say good.

Mr. Brown: All right. I'll throw one more thing out there. I would like to propose before I or someone else makes a motion that we attach to our, assuming we approve it, a requirement that a graphic be produced that explains the extent of the proposed amount of hardie plank in the portions of the second floor that we have a voice in.

Dr. Walker: And would you want that graphic before we approved or would you leave it at the discretion of staff?

Mr. Brown: I think I would leave it at discretion of the staff. If I make a motion, it'll have the word minimize in it or minimal.

Dr. Walker: Any thoughts, Mr. Livingston?

Mr. Livingston: So that would be an approval with conditions.

Mr. Brown: Or a condition?

Mr. Gaffney: So Ken, this is Brandon, you're basically saying to keep the integrity of the house, you only think we should do only hardie plank should be used in those areas that are prone to water damage?

Mr. Brown: Only.

Mr. Gaffney: Okay.

Mr. Brown: With the exception of the rear, which we don't have any.

Mr. Gaffney: Gotcha.

Mr. Brown: Okay.

Dr. Walker: Yes, Mr. Love

Mr. Love: Right there on the left hand side, there's not really a good way to do that because the roof slopes up. So in order to only replace the board at the roof you'd have to cut every board and then replace a piece of it. And so then you have all these slice pieces as you go up the wall. I mean I think if you're going to do it, you should let him do it like he wants to do it and replace all of it. But I don't really think there's justification for that.

Mr. Brown: I agree.

Mr. Love: I think you're trying to piece it together up the side of the wall is a mistake and we need to probably stay away from piecing it together. And that was really part of the objection to begin with it, is that you're piecing a couple of boards in at the bottom, but then you're going to leave the rest of it as wood and it doesn't all look that way.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Mr. Brown: That's why I was asking for a graphic. I think that this is an opportunity to get some proper flashing.

Dr. Walker: I'm sorry, public comment is closed. So thank you.

Dr. Boozer: It's either siding or flashing that will be exposed to siding.

Dr. Walker: Do we have a motion?

On a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Dr. Boozer the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was approved with a condition removal and replacement of siding only where absolutely necessary. Removal of all wood siding is not allowed by a vote of 7-0.

Mr. Brown: I'll give it a shot. This is Ken. I move that we approve on the following condition that the hardie plank be used only where absolutely necessary that it be considered an opportunity to improve the flashing and that it not be undertaken until a graphic has been submitted to the staff which identifies the proposed scope.

Dr. Boozer: Second.

Dr. Walker: All those in favor say aye.

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Okay the motion carries. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Brown. Okay. Next item on the agenda, a COA for major works at 247 Hydrick Street.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 247 Hydrick Street (TMS# 7-12-14-208.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to keep existing railings that were installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Tomas P. Rojas.

Ms. Keitt: Good evening. Tia Keitt Planner with the City of Spartanburg. The address is 247 Hydrick Street. It's located right here in Hampton Heights. And this is the zoning map. These are the findings that we use to create a staff report. And this is the property. So, on October 27th, the property owner, Thomas Rojas, received a zoning violation letter notifying him that replacing the original pickets are, I think I pronounced that incorrectly, was not allowed without a COA. The owner submitted a COA Application on November 3rd following and a list pending was filed on the property November 4th, 2022. So, staff researched the history of the property.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance. In reviewing applications for new construction or alteration, the Board shall consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the following criteria:

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. *The character and appropriateness of the design –*

There is a distinct difference between the original balusters & rail and those currently installed.

2. *The scale of buildings –*

The scale of the home was not impacted by installation of the pickets.

3. *The texture and materials –*

The currently installed balusters are made of wood, painted white.

4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings*

There are quite a few homes in Hampton Heights with pickets / balusters and rails to enclose the front porch; therefore the updated version installed on this home continues to be

similar to other homes. The balusters on this home are different from his neighbors, which is noticeable when focusing on the baluster's attachment to the rail.

5. *If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –*

The finished product appears to be harmonious with the Historic District.

Mr. Rojas acquired the property in August 2016 and has worked to bring the property back from condemnation. It looks like the current balusters and rails were installed at some point in 2020, and that comes from using tax assessors page for research. So, this is the property here, this is what we're talking about. This is from 2020. This is from 2017, and this condemned or about to be condemned, just more pictures. This is of course from Google Maps, I like this picture because you can see the door here. This is a close up of the balusters.

Mr. Brown: Balusters.

Ms. Keitt: And one of the questions asked, the relationship has such element, similar features and structures. So, I took some pictures of other balusters and you can see these look original to the house. And the extent to this alters to this structure would be harmonious with historic district is just photos comparing of older picture with the newer picture. And that's it, any questions?

Mr. Brown: I have a question. This is Ken. When we, meaning the city, we went to visit this property, were any other deviations identified or was it just the rail and it was just because someone complained?

Ms. Keitt: I believe so, yes.

Mr. Brown: All right. So we can take it that all the other improvements were permitted and approved. Okay.

Ms. Keitt: I did talk to the owner and he shared that he talked with planning staff in 2020 and he felt he had approval

Mr. Gaffney: This is Brandon, I have a question. So, when the plans, because obviously it's been renovated, were submitted, was the railing that's on the house now part of the actual plans for approval and how did that get passed? That's kind of where I was going.

Ms. Keitt: So, if he's doing inside work, it would not have triggered a COA.

Mr. Gaffney: Okay. All right.

Ms. Keitt: So, if there was no exterior work...

Mr. Gaffney: Gotcha.

Ms. Keitt: To some degree now does the building department, should they be mindful of maybe at that point maybe him replacing the balusters came after her meeting was done.

Mr. Gaffney: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Mr. Love

Mr. Love: I think with this one, similar to the one we saw a couple weeks ago with the rail in the design and this time I tried to describe the construction of the rail a little bit better in the letter. And also I've provided you with a link to a better graphic for what I think more appropriate rails are supposed to look like. And so I think this, again, is that similar kind of what I call

Mr. Brown: I agree.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Love: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Is the applicant here? Yes sir. Would you come forward, give us your name and address and sign in please?

Mr. Rojas: Thomas Rojas 247 Hydrick Street. I thought everything was clearly written I was communicating with on some many works, some not many words. I thought everything was right on paper. So, sorry.

Dr. Walker: So you were communicating with Natalia?

Mr. Rojas: Yes, I only communicated with her, yes.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Rojas?

Mr. Brown: Are there any records of those correspondences or those meetings?

Mr. Rojas: I come here sometimes for approvals, Josh Lennon was in the committee. Natalia and miss Julie.

Mr. Michels: I remember one of his meetings when he came in, but I was not on the board. I remember one particular meeting he was here, he referred to the front door he got to replace.

Dr. Walker: So I definitely...

Dr. Walker: Yes. We appreciate that you were acting in good faith and you thought you had approval. Any more questions for Mr. Rojas? Okay, thank you. Okay, we'll move into the public comment portion of the meeting. Is there anybody from the public who would like to make comment?

Ms. Barbara: I'm not an expert. My husband was the architect and he's passed. My name is Barbara Campbell. And the only thing that's bothered me about that house is the door, which I guess got approved. It does not look historic today. That's the only thing I need to say.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Thank you. Anybody else from the public who would like to speak? Hearing none. We will close public comment and move on to board deliberations.

Mr. Gaffney: This is Brandon. Seeing that Mr. Rojas has obviously come before us trying to make sure he did things right, I would take a chance at making a motion that we table this to next month to see what correspondence he can prove to this document. I mean this particular item, so we don't cause any unnecessary hardship.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Brown: I agree with you.

Dr. Walker: Is that a motion to table?

Mr. Gaffney: Oh yes. A motion to table until the next meeting, allowing Mr. Rojas to bring any correspondence relating to the property, especially the railing on the fence. I mean the railing on the front porch to help us make a better decision.

Mr. Brown: I second.

Dr. Walker: Okay. All those in favor say aye.

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Okay. Mr. Rojas, what we've done is delayed action on this and we would ask you if you have any emails or anything related to anything written related to your conversations with Natalia or any other city person about the porch railings.

Mr. Rojas: About the porch railings, I don't have any.

Dr.. Walker: You don't have any.

Mr. Rojas: About the door and the entrance and stuff, that's what I was talking about.

Dr. Walker: And I believe we agree with that.

Dr. Walker: I suppose then we. Ma'am.

Ms. Zhou: So, this is the start. So, when he came in and so he came as for the railings because based on the building code it is required that once the elevation is higher than 36 inches, it is required that he needs to meet the Building Code and then when he came here to ask for the building permit from the building department and then after Tim Wilson and Mr. Petty Bush, after they discussed about the railings and then they feel like, okay, it's good to go for the railing. And then he interprets that is, it's all okay. And then they didn't check whether he has the COA for this building or not. But because they said, "Well it's good to go," so he thinks that we communicate between the Planning Department and Building Department. So that's why the person came out says, well it's okay. And then he just went ahead and changed so that's the story that I verified with the Building Department and him but we didn't have the file, but he filed for everything else except for this. So that's why he is here today.

Dr. Walker: Thank you for that clarification. Thank you Mr. Rojas. So I think we need to withdraw the previous motion.

Mr. Brown: I make a motion that we withdraw the previous motion I stated.

Mr. Gaffney: Second.

Dr. Walker: All in favor of withdraw, say aye.

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: All right. You may be seated Mr. Rojas, and we'll deliberate again. So it sounds like the breakdown was with city staff.

Mr. Michels: This has happened before. I know how to make it better and I think it's anything better, that they're going to have a database. But this has happened on numerous occasion not as much as we used to, we're still filling up on the regular basis.

Mr. Brown: I'm going to add a thought. I'm not ready to make any motion. The photograph on the right, I seriously doubt that's the original rail. I don't remember how old this house was, but it looks pretty old. I would say at least turn of the 20th century. But I'm here to tell you the rail that's there now would look more at home on somebody's deck in the distance suburbs. It bears no resemblance to what I think we would find if we had his photographs of this house from a century ago. So I'm not comfortable with what's there now. I'm not sure what exposure the city has for miscommunication, but we need to find a way to have it done properly or in an acceptable manner.

On a motion by Mr. Michels, seconded by Mr. Brown the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was denied by a vote of 6-1.

Mr. Michels: I'll make a motion on denying this request and that Mr. Rojas approach the City again to get approval for historically accurate railings for this residence.

Dr. Walker: Is there a second?

Mr. Brown: Second.

Mr. Gaffney: You can have third.

Dr. Walker: Are you ready to vote?

Mr. Gaffney: Yes.

Mr. Brown: Yes.

Dr. Walker: All those in favor say aye.

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed, I oppose. So the motion carries. Thank you. Okay. COA for major work at 262 Carlisle Street.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 262 Carlisle Street (TMS# 7-12-14-194.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint the brick foundation. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Alexander Lorenz.

Ms. Zhou: Good evening board members. So right now we are looking at another major case at 262 Carlisle Street. So the owner is requesting for a seeking approval to paint the foundation red, bringing back to its original state based on what's in the building official book, it was red. So

again, this isn't how historic building this is R-8/SFD this the picture looking from the aerial photo. And then this is the front of the viewing. As you can see, it's already white painted. So again, we are looking at five criteria. There's no design on based on Hampton Heights design guidelines not permitted on historic structures unless it's already painted is not going to change. And then the texture will remain the same and then...

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project site is located in the Hampton Heights District which has design guidelines for development. These guidelines are outlined in the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts and Landmarks. The purpose of the Manual is to provide property owners guidance for the preservation and protection of historic and architecturally valuable districts and sites in the City. The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance.

The project site has a zoning designation of R-8/SFD, Single Family Zone District, which allows for single family dwelling units. Section 510.6 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance list standards for reviewing Certificate of Appropriateness. Specifically, Section 510.6 (C)(2) states that in reviewing applications for new construction or alteration, the board shall consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the five criteria listed in the findings.

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. The character and appropriateness of the design –

There is no design in regard to masonry painting. However, according to Hampton Heights Design Guidelines, painting is not permitted on historic structures unless it is already painted. Therefore, the character of the proposed work violates the Design Guidelines.

2. The scale of the buildings –

The scale of the building will remain the same (134' by 51') since nothing else will be added to or removed from the building.

3. The texture and materials –

The texture and materials of the brick foundation will remain the same with mortar and primer applied on the brick.

4. The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings –

The property to the right side of the project site has a gray painted foundation. Two houses to the left side of the project site have their foundation painted. Having the masonry painted would make the project site have similar features to its immediate surroundings.

5. If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –

Walking down and across Carlisle Street, there are houses that keep the foundation in its original color and status and there are houses that already had their masonry painted to match the color of

the primary structure. Given the fact that the property owner painted the masonry without Board approval violating Hampton Heights Design Guidelines, if opportunity could be given to the property owner, allowing him to bring masonry back to its original color and state would be harmonious with the rest of the neighborhood along Carlisle Street.

Well by looking at the other houses surrounding this one, like what I mentioned in the staff report is if you look at the ones on the left they're painted they're foundation, I mean the foundation, regardless of whether it's concrete or brick. And then this one is also painted, but if you... These are some of the other houses on Carlisle Street that have their foundation painted. But there are some houses that remain as original. These are the houses that have some of the original foundation. So that's some of the observation that I noticed.

Dr. Walker: Are you saying that it was painted red before?

Ms. Zhou: Well, it was red before not painted. So what-

Mr. Brown: On the natural color of the brick.

Ms. Zhou: Yes.

Mr. Brown: Okay. Thanks for the clarification.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions?

Mr. Brown: Do we know when it was painted white?

Ms. Zhou: I think it's recent, right? Is it? Yeah, it is recent.

Mr. Brown: Should that have come before us?

Ms. Zhou: Yeah, because he was caught

Mr. Brown: I'm sorry, what did you say?

Ms. Zhou: He was caught. Yeah.

Mr. Brown: Oh, you're the... Okay.

Ms. Zhou: Because they probably, they didn't know painting is a major case.

Mr. Brown: Yeah. Because when I saw that it was red, I thought it was painted red.

Ms. Zhou: No, it's the original brick.

Mr. Brown: Okay. So it was in the recent past, it was painted from original to a white? Okay. I'm glad I asked.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for staff? Thank you. Mr. Love

Mr. Love: Yes. And just to clarify, that was my understanding too, the brick was painted as a part of this painting project where they're painting the rest of the house and it was painted without a COA. I did was just to go back and confirm that the unpainted brick is not allowed by the guidelines.

Mr. Michels: Mr. Love, you looked at that. Did you make the observation that I did that that was primer.

Mr. Love: It looks like primer.

Mr. Love: It appears to be primer.

Mr. Michels: It's a primer.

Mr. Love: And I think the process to get it off is the same as it would be if it had been completely painted. Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Thank you, Mr. Love. Do we have the applicant here? Would you like to speak? Give us your name please and please sign in.

Mr. Lawrence: My name is Alex Lawrence, 262 Carlisle. So the goal is to bring it back to the red color where it was before. I repaired some of the brick that... When the house was condemned, it had fire damage on it. Parts were stucco up or there was... Whoever worked on it just put things like concrete on there. So, I just found some brick underneath the house and placed those. There was mold on it and moss.

So, when I pressure washed the house, it started to... look like some of the other brick, it's 100 years old, started to fall apart. And it's sand based, what's between the brick so whenever you put pressure on it, it just went straight and I got some of the stuff you put between them and that's gray. It's not yellowish, sand-ish, so, it just ended up looking funny. We decided the first COA said external can be painted so, I just assumed that external is external.

And so, this is a primer on it. What you see is the first coat. The second coat is... I would like to use just a regular red brick paint for bricks to seal the brick so they won't continue falling apart. I'm not adding anything. I'm not taking things out. That's it. Do you have any questions?

Mr. Michels: Is this a picture of the house prior to painting it?

Mr. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Michels: And that exactly the color

Mr. Lawrence: Yeah.

Mr. Brown: Can you share that?

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for the applicant?

Mr. Brown: I may have one after I see the photograph.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Lawrence: So I guess it was red and gray. On the left side of the house was the major damage when it was burned. It's still condemned, the house..

Mr. Brown: I have a question.

Mr. Lawrence: Yes, sir?

Mr. Brown: I think I heard you say this and I don't want to put words in your mouth so correct me if I'm wrong, you had an understanding that it was okay to paint the exterior of the house and you therefore thought that included the foundation.

Mr. Lawrence: Yeah. So when we drove the road, most of the houses are painted so I just... At this point, I'm painting the house myself. A lot of the work, I'm doing, and so I just assumed that painting the wood and everything... Exterior for me was just painting it the same. And the paint that you see here is the same paint that was... The wood paint is the same and the light is all the same.

And so, I figured I'd paint the brick also red so that it looks original but nicer, I guess. And I'm not painting it pink or gray or anything. That was my mistake so here we are.

Mr. Brown: When did you go to the City? At what point?

Mr. Lawrence: So, last year, the first COA, that's what we did for kind of fixing up some of the windows. And I got another minor work. I was talking to Nan about adding something in the

back. So, typically, when I want something major done, I go to the City first. And so, when this came up, I called the City right away we talked over email and all

Mr. Brown: So, your position is you thought you were acting in good faith, but you learned that you had committed a violation?

Mr. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Brown: All right.

Mr. Lawrence: Right. So, I just want to make sure that I'm doing correct things in restoring this house to its beauty that it once was.

Mr. Brown: My last question. Is the green color, the new color because I-

Mr. Lawrence: Yeah, it is-

Mr. Brown: I saw on one of the photographs, it was white on one side or the other.

Mr. Lawrence: So, that you mean the wood?

Mr. Brown: The siding. Yes.

Mr. Lawrence: Yes. So that, it was-

Mr. Brown: That's the new color?

Mr. Lawrence: Yes, the new color. That's the original. It was like a mix of this and that's as close as I could get when I was going to them.

Mr. Brown: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions to the applicant. Okay, thank you, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. Lawrence: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Is there anyone from the public who would like to comment?

Mr. Michels: My house is painted green. I can't stand it. In fact-

Dr. Walker: Hold on. Hold on. We're not in-

Mr. Love: Oh, I'm sorry.

Dr. Walker: Is there no one from the public who would like to comment. Then, we will close public comments and open it to board deliberations.

Mr. Michels: I don't like painted green. Anytime we can preserve it, I think we should. It's unfortunate you made that error. Luckily, we're in a very thin primer coat as opposed to a latex coating, which is more elastic and will be inside the grout lines and it's also white, which worry about the grout lines. That's my opinion on it. And it was done basically in about the last month and a half.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Michels: Sorry. There are many homes on that block that do have painted brick foundations and there's two or three in a row that I know of they still have the original brick foundations.

Mr. Brown: This is Ken. I think I saw when Martin highlighted the letter from Mr. Love. And if I didn't see it, I may be making this up, but I think I'm on solid ground. Trying to remove that primer coat at this point in time would be pretty destructive. No?

Mr. Love: Well, if we go back to the conversation we had at the last meeting, it's not destructive to the brick. It just doesn't always come off if you use chemicals to try to get it off. And so that is the problem with it is if you can get most of it off, but then it doesn't all come off. Then, you have to go back around again and keep trying until you get it all off.

And we discussed the other option of lightly blasting it with a soda or some other non-destructive medium that will take the paint off. And that works a lot better, but it's-

Mr. Brown: Okay, I have a question for you.

Mr. Brown: I think I heard the applicant say that he had tried to pressure wash it, which I think was prior to the painting...

Mr. Lawrence: That was prior to...

Mr. Brown: Prior to. Okay. But that was pretty much destructive of the grout. Is that correct?

Mr. Love: Yeah, pressure washing it with a lot of pressure

Mr. Brown: All right. So what is your opinion about preserving what's left of the grout?

Mr. Brown: By using one of the methods that you described?

Mr. Love: Well, the grout issue needs to be addressed first to get the loose grout out. And that can be tough and re-pointed to replace the loose and damaged grout with new grout that matches the existing in its consistency. Once that's done, then the brick really then should be waterproof on its own unless it has additional problems with the face. But generally, now that it's painted, you can still go back and cut point the brick, but you still have the issue of getting painted.

Mr. Brown: So, right now, we have a primer coat that's covering the brick and the grout, to re-point the grout would leave the primer on the brick.

Mr. Love: Yes.

Mr. Brown: But we could, in your opinion, come back with one of two methods to remove that.

Mr. Love: Yes.

Mr. Brown: All right, thank you.

Dr. Walker: And just for some context, Ken, we've had multiple hearings of a house in Beaumont with this problem. And our finding was that we asked the applicant to remove part of the paint.

Ms. Burdette: As another historic architect, let me just remind you, this is, before 1940, brick manufacturing changed here, so this is very soft brick.

Ms. Burdette: Oh, I'm sorry. We all have great changes in our foundations in various stages of whatever. But you have to understand, this is lime and sands mortar, not the engineered mortar today. You hit that with a blast of water pressure or other, it's coming out.

And of course, people don't know the difference and so they go to those and buy the new mortar and if you don't also help them understand when they come to the city that you need to make a compatible mortar, because if you repoint with the engineered mortar, all it does is makes the

whole situation worse, because it has a different freeze that causes motion and it further destroys the mortar and further can destroy the brick.

And you have to be very careful with this brick because it's early brick. It's not the engineered brick we have today. It has only a hard face. The interior is much softer. And so once you hit it with a blast and you crack that surface, then it soaks it up like a sponge. And that's why, for decades, every time they did something on the downtown mall, you saw brick crumbling all over the place. Because once they cracked the face, that soft interior crumbled away because it can't take it.

Dr. Walker: Thank you for that.

Ms. Burdette: Yeah. So you're going to have to help them-

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Ms. Burdette: A little bit to get them to do what you want. And plus guys, it's going to wear off-

Dr. Walker: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Burdette: I can assure you.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Any other thoughts from the board?

On a motion by Mr. Michels, seconded by Mr. Brown the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was denied by a vote of 7-0

Mr. Michels: I make a motion to deny the application.

Dr. Walker: Is there a second?

Mr. Gaffney: Second.

Dr. Walker: All those in favor of denying the application, say, "Aye."

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Thank you, Mr. Lawrence. We're trying to be consistent with all the homeowners too. And we had a case like this the last month, so definitely trying to be consistent. Thank you. Okay. COA for major works at 277 Hydrick Street.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 277 Hydrick Street (TMS# 7-12-14-229.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing front door. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Willie Jones.

Ms. Keitt: Tia Keitt Planner with the City of Spartanburg. 277 Hydrick Street right here.

Ms. Keitt: This is the zoning map to confirm. These are the five criteria's and this is the door in question. So, owner, Mr. Jones, shared that the original door is deteriorating and giving way to this building. Mr. Jones shared that he would like to install a new door that would provide better insulation to his home.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance. In reviewing applications for new construction or alteration, the Board shall consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the following criteria:

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. The character and appropriateness of the design –

Staff cannot determine the character nor appropriateness of design as we have not received photos. Staff did talk with the owner who shared he would install "the same door". The owner was able to find a similar door at Home Depot and asked if fiberglass would be allowed. The Planning Department advised Mr. Jones that wood is highly recommended.

2. The scale of buildings –

The scale of the building will not be impacted by replacing the door.

3. The texture and materials –

Unable to determine at this time.

4. The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings–

Unable to determine at this time.

5. If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –

Unable to determine at this time.

So, originally, I only had pictures of the outside and then Mr. Jones was able to send us some pictures. So, these are pictures that he sent. A couple of them, I took from the outside. So, these are just enlarged pictures that he sent here. He came by the office, and at the end, I have photos of doors he would like to replace them with.

So, because in the staff report, I couldn't provide any details. I didn't have any images at that time. But this is the door. These are the images here. It's more images. You can see the crack here.

Ms. Keitt: It's some challenges here. It's a little bit of air. This is a close up here. This picture was taken from the tax assessor's page. And this is one here. These are images of doors that he's favored from a local retailer, Home Depot, and whatever. So, Mr. Jones, he wants to replace the

door. He's willing to take suggestions from the HARB. And whatever is suggested, will be painted black to match the posting of the house.

I did warn Mr. Jones, I said everyone on the HARB owns an old house, so don't come with the sob story, but he is here. So, this is the end of my presentation. Any questions?

Dr. Walker: Hey, Mr. Love.

Mr. Love: Apologize

Dr. Walker: Oh, sorry.

Mr. Michels: I'm going to ask you a question. I want to ask a few questions. Does that door look like it's original to the house?

Mr. Love: Yes

Mr. Michels: It does?..

Mr. Love: I think the guidelines don't allow you to replace the door unless the door is not repairable. And I've seen the door. I didn't look at the door really closely, but I did see the up close pictures that they had and I believe the door can be repaired. I have seen other doors in a lot worse shape than that that were repaired.

And I think when you think about, even if you replaced one board on the door, then you've still got the remaining rest of the door that's original to the house as opposed to, you've got one board that needs to be replaced and you throw the whole door away. So to me, unless there was something really, really bad I can guarantee that it can be repaired. Questions?

Mr. Gaffney: This is Brandon. I'm hearing what you're saying? I just want, for my edification. Can you replace the door without replacing the door frame?

Mr. Love: Yeah, you can take the door out of the frame, but I think he's just... I don't know. He may be planning to buy a pre-hung door but you can easily replace just the leaf.

Mr. Gaffney: Okay.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Any other questions for Mr. Love? Okay, thank you.

Mr. Love: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Is the applicant here?

Mr. Jones: Yes, I am.

Dr. Walker: Sir, you'll come forward. You'll give us your name and please sign in.

Mr. Jones: Willie Jones, 277 Hydrick Street. My pictures didn't come through because those pictures are not really doing any justice as far as the door, showing the damage of the door.

Showing the damage of the door. That's the outside of the door, but on the inside the door, you can see all the damage.

We painted the outside the door. You can't really see the damage. Where the seams come together. Do you have any more picture of the door on the inside? The top door. Will you roll it back up? Right there is where the door is just, it's just deteriorated over time where it's been kicked in, beat on, or whatever so that going down.

I've got some more pictures where it's closed a little bit more. I got some on my camera on my phone. And the seams where that window's at, it's coming apart on the inside. You see that gap right there where crack is that's a gap that you can see on the inside.

You can actually see the split where it's actually coming apart, where the door is actually coming apart. And the bottom there is with the door closed. That's the difference in the height of the door. Closer to the right, it's touching the floor like it should be, but that other side is just..

And that's just the joints with the door closed. The gap is in between them and that's how critters will come in, air is coming in, and everything else. Do you got any more pictures? That's the glass that's in there. It's actually cracked from over time, closing and opening the door.

And that's the gaps in there when it's closed the previous people that lived peeping in or however, pry it open. And that's the gap on the top with the door closed. And that's air and everything's coming in. That's just part of what's going on. And that's the door. You see the crack, I mean the light, that door is closed and locked, but you still see the light that's coming in and that's a problem.

And that's the top with the door closed, the same issues. Over in the left hand corner, that's where the door is actually coming apart. Not over there, right there! That's where the door is actually breaking the seam, breaking away from the actual door.

This is the issue with that door. And those are just issues that I'm having with that door. And the door that we're asking to replace it with is similar doors. It has the same structure, same thing. It's just sealed door . It has the three slashes like original door and it has a glass in the window and everything.

I've talked with Cook and Cook, Cook is a wood workshop that works on doors over off 295. He said they was three months out before they could do it. He said they could. He said it would cost just as much as one of those doors and they would have to take and bondo it back because it said glue. I mean not glue. He said that wood filler does not hold. Opening and closing the door, it will fall out so he would have to take the door apart and glue it back.

Dr. Walker: Any questions for Mr. Jones? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jones. Is there anyone from the public who would like to speak? Okay, hearing none, we'll close it to public comment and open the floor to board deliberations.

Ms. Franke: I mean, it's the original door. It's not beyond repair I mean I wish my door would be as good. The glass needs to be fixed, that's for sure, but the rest can be fixed too. The wood can be fixed. To me, it's not beyond repair so I think it can be kept.

Mr. Michels: I think that's why first off if it was the original door because if it wasn't, I wouldn't have had a concern. But because it's the original door and it is repairable, and pretty much about the same price as a new door, I would imagine that that might be. Ken?

Mr. Brown: I wanted to let other people speak first because I've been speaking a lot. I saw the issues around the perimeter of the door where you can see daylight. Those are easily solved. Those problems can be easily solved. I've got the same problem in my own house, which is 102 years old. My house is settled. I got the impression that that floor was the problem, not the door.

So, I agree. I think the door can be repaired. I'm not really going to go anywhere near guessing how much it would cost. But I don't think that's the issue here and it's not for us to decide. I agree that the glass can be replaced. I think if the door may have to be deconstructed at some point and then reconstructed, I don't see a reason why we can't expect it to be reused or continue to be used.

Mr. Gaffney: I guess we need to make a motion

Dr. Walker: I think so if we're ready for a motion.

On a motion by Dr Rodrick, seconded by Ms. Franke the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was denied by a vote of 7-0

Dr. Rodrick: I move we deny the request.

Dr. Walker: Is there a second?

Ms. Franke: Second.

Dr. Walker: All those in favor say, "Aye."

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Okay, motion carries. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jones: I've got a question. So, I can't put up a temporary door, right, until they get my door fixed?

Dr. Walker: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Jones: Do I need to get a thing for that?

Dr. Walker: Does he need to get permission for that?

Mr. Livingston: Just request a Minor COA

Dr. Walker: Thank you. All right. A COA for major works at 313 Hydrick Street.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 313 Hydrick Street (TMS# 7-12-14-222.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a temporary handicap ramp in the front of the house. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Vera Gossett.

Ms. Zhou: Good evening. Right now, we're looking at another major case at 313 Hydrick Street. Again, so the homeowner is requesting to install temporary handicap ramp for approximately one year, but there is a potential that that could be a long term on the left side of the house.

So again, this is the R-8, Single Family Zone. This is the aerial of the house. So, this is the current. The ramp is already there so the character and appropriateness of the design so, there's

no further too much detail in regards to the design of the ramp. But, the ramp is about 20 inches in height, extending to 10 feet in length and five feet in width.

The applicant is not going to change. The texture of wood. The relationship, so none of the houses, as you read in my staff report, has such ramp in the immediate surroundings, but in both walking down and across Hydrick Street, there are many houses that has have the handicap ramp. The ramp installed currently on the primary structure.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project site is located in the Hampton Heights District which has design guidelines for development. These guidelines are outlined in the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts and Landmarks. The purpose of the Manual is to provide property owners guidance for the preservation and protection of historic and architecturally valuable districts and sites in the City. The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance.

The project site has a zoning designation of R-8/SFD, Single Family Zone District, which allows for single family dwelling units. Section 510.6 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance list standards for reviewing Certificate of Appropriateness. Specifically, Section 510.6 (C)(2) states that in reviewing applications for new construction or alteration, the board shall consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the five criteria listed in the findings.

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. The character and appropriateness of the design –

There is no further information provided by the applicant in regard to the design of the handicap ramp.

2. The scale of the buildings –

The scale of the building will remain the same (64' by 114'). The temporary handicap ramp will be added over to the existing exterior stairs leading to the driveway.

3. The texture and materials –

The texture and materials of the temporary handicap ramp will be wood.

4. The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings –

Neither left side nor right side (vacant land) has a temporary handicap installed on the side or front of the house. Adjacent properties in the immediate surroundings do not share similar features with the project site.

5. If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –

Walking down and across Hydrick Street, there are no houses that have a handicap ramp installed currently on the primary structure. Installing a temporary handicap ramp would not be harmonious with the Hampton Heights Historic District. However, given the circumstances of the property owner's physical condition, having a temporary handicap ramp will allow her to ingress and egress the house conveniently, averting difficulties caused by inaccessible home.

So, installing a temporary handicap ramp will not be harmonious with the Hampton Heights Historic District. However, given the circumstances of the property owner's physical condition, having a temporary handicap ramp will allow her to ingress and egress the house conveniently, averting difficulties caused by inaccessibility.

So, this is my own opinion. The photo shows business the vacant land to the right also house to the left. This is the house across the street. This is some of the other houses across the some of the other houses going around and that's all.

Dr. Walker: Any questions?

Dr. Boozer: I'm curious, what did you find during your research for ADA requirements for handicapped?

Ms. Zhou: I didn't do this research. So..

Dr. Boozer: Okay. So does anybody have the federal government rulings for ADA handicap?

Mr. Love: What's the question, specifically?

Dr. Boozer: How does this line up with the ADA rulings?

Mr. Love: Well, I mean it looks like it meets ADA in terms of being able to get from grade up to the porch in terms of the slope and the protective railings. I think, and y'all can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the building department has approved the ramp construction-

Mr. Brown: That was going to be my question.

Mr. Love: The design and whether or not it is appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Michels: I saw buddy out doing that. If you look at the ramp, what I know of coding's Christmas in Action that used to build handicap ramps. That ramp is a temporary ramp. It is built as a temporary ramp. If you'll notice, it doesn't have any foundation. It's basically pier set on a... Basically piers set on wood on lumber. So hopefully, for Vera, Heidi misses you for a whole lot.

I think the intent is for it to be temporary. If it were to be permanent, you would probably have to come back before us again because that would not be permanent code for handicap ramp. And we are approving a temporary ramp, specifically for a year.

Mr. Livingston: Yes. One of the questions that was asked of staff is could the City require that it be temporary or if it's longer than temporary, could the City require that it be removed, let's say, at the sale of the property or some other change in ownership. And my understanding from the City Attorney is yes, we can do that. That can be a conditional approval, as part of the

conditions, and this document would be filed that would notify any potential purchasers that they would have to remove the temporary ramp if necessary. So it can remain there 20 years if necessary, but whenever the property changes hands, it would have to be removed.

Mr. Love: With that said, I don't think handicap ramp 20 years in a temporary state. Did he get a timeline for a temporary state or did Buddy, per se?

Mr. Love: He did not?

Mr. Livingston: I didn't get any information on what's considered temporary.

Mr. Brown: Well, I just know the building. It's built temporary.

Mr. Livingston: The request was for one year.

Mr. Brown: Right.

Mr. Livingston: But whatever the board decides, even if it's longer than one year, that can be allowed if necessary.

Mr. Brown: I was going to ask this question of Nan, but I'll ask it of you, Martin. If this was permitted and constructed, why is it before us tonight?

Mr. Livingston: It is before you because there is no standards in the HARB requirements that we're aware of that would allow for handicapped ramps. And we tried to do some research on that. I tried to find something on the Secretary of Interior Standards for handicapped ramp in historic property. We couldn't find that.

And then, Love provided some comments as well. We were hoping it would be a Minor COA since it was temporary. But that was not the case. It had to come before the HARB.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Mr. Brown: I've got one more question, your honor. So, it was permitted and approved. It's safe to assume that it meets whatever design guidelines the International Residential Code has for ramps?

Mr. Livingston: For a temporary one.

Mr. Brown: Temporary.

Mr. Livingston: Yes. The Building Codes Department was involved in making sure that it was built to standards.

Mr. Brown: Okay, so all we have to deliberate is whether we will permit it or not? Or that's not the right word because it's permitted, whether we approve it or not.

Mr. Livingston: Yeah.

Mr. Brown: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Mr. Love, do you have anything to add?

Mr. Love: Well, the only thing I was going to add is something that Martin touched on was just that our guidelines are fairly old and so they don't really address accessibility in historic districts. And so, I did do some research for some other neighboring cities that have historic guidelines.

And so, there are some things in there. And even that is for permanent ramps. I agree with Mr. Michael that this is constructed as a temporary ramp. And so that's why I feel like it's okay like it is, assuming that they're going to paint it. But even that, I think it's really at y'all's discretion. It's just for a year.

As to further discussion whether paint it or not. But I think that's one area where, if we do have some discussions next year about updating the guidelines, then that may be something that we're going to try to address.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Mr. Love: Any other questions for me?

Ms. Franke: Can this type of wood be painted?

Mr. Love: I'm sorry.

Ms. Franke: Can this type of wood be painted?

Mr. Love: The treated lumber can be painted, but often, it takes a while to dry.

Dr. Walker: Yeah

Mr. Love: To dry before you can paint it, so you kind of have to let it dry but it can be eventually painted.

Dr. Walker: I have a porch right now like that and I've been told six months before painting. Thank you, Mr. Love. Is the applicant here?

Ms. Gossett: Yes ma'am.

Dr. Walker: Yes, ma'am, would you come forward as best you can and...

Ms. Halifax: I'll help her speak. I'm sorry. And I'll write her name-

Ms. Halifax: And mine as well. I helped her. She was in the hospital and out of it when all this happened. But I will put both of our names. My name is Hattie Halifax and this is my sister.

Ms. Gossett: I'm Vera Gossett.

Dr. Walker: And I'm sorry. Would you repeat your name?

Ms. Gossett: Vera Gossett.

Dr. Walker: Thank you, Ms. Gossett. Okay. What would you like the board to know?

Ms. Gossett: Hopefully, this will be different. Hopefully. I don't know how long, but I need to get in my house.

Dr. Walker: Yes, you do. Any questions for Ms. Gossett?

Ms. Gossett: And we did go through I mean, when I initially called Ms. Tia was like, "Okay, we got to get this done." And she's like, "Oh, they don't have another board meeting until December." So, we went through the steps that we felt was the best and then we do have some questions to you guys. And if you do have any questions about the construction, Mr. Allen has built ramps before can I don't know but he was the one that helped and he was very helpful with that. Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, they came out and they looked.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Ms. Gossett: So, if you have any questions about that part, I think he was the factor to make sure we had everything.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. And as long as the City has approved the construction, then we feel good about that. We don't need to second guess that.

Ms. Gossett: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Any questions for Ms. Gossett? Thank you so much for being here. I'll open the floor to public comment. Are there any members of the public who would like to make comment? Hearing none, I will open it to board deliberation.

On a motion by Mr. Michels, seconded by Mr. Gaffney the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was approved with conditions to allow temporary handicap ramp to remain until no longer necessary by a vote of 7-0

Mr. Michels: I'll make a motion that we approve the Certificate Of Appropriateness for the ramp, with the only stipulation so long as Ms. Vera Gossett needs the ramp. We remove if she does not need it any more. Pass the motion.

Mr. Gaffney: Second.

Dr. Walker: So that's a motion to approve with a condition?

Mr. Michels: With the only condition being it will be there for as long as Ms. Gossett needs it and then we-

Mr. Gaffney: Second. This is Brandon.

Dr. Walker: Okay. All those in favor, say, "Aye."

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed?

Dr. Boozer: But I do have a question. Do we need to add with that condition that if the property is sold or she's no longer there-

Ms. Michels: I think pretty much as long as she's-

Dr. Walker: All right, thank you. Thank you, Ms. Gossett. Okay, COA for major works at 400 Hampton Drive.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 400 Hampton Drive (TMS# 7-16-02-141.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing steel framed windows in the front, rear, and sides of the structure. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Phuoc Do.

Ms. Keitt: Tia Keitt, 400 Hampton Drive. This is the address here, Hampton Drive. It is a Multi-Family building. This is the zoning. That is the view of the property. So, formerly known as the Alexander Apartments, this structure was built in 1956. The current owner has made significant façade improvements and upgraded the interior for new residents.

At present, the owner shared that most of the existing windows leak and are malfunctioning. Finding parts to operate the classic window type is a challenge, specifically cranks to fit the window style are no longer made and the owner expressed he has exhausted his options to keep these windows operable.

Fortunately, the owner has been able to keep the current windows on the first floor by fitting new windows, picture window and sliding windows, in the windowsills slash frame. The first floor window frames are wide enough to add a new window without having to remove existing windows. The new windows offer insulation and tenants can manage the control of air into their units.

They have to open the older windows from the outside but have protected screens to prevent bugs from entering. However, the second floor windows do not offer the same frame or windowsill width as the first floor. In order to offer the second floor tenants the same comfort and control as the first floor tenants, the owner would have to fully replace the existing nine panel windows.

The owner is asking to replace 14 steel frame windows on the top floor with four picture windows facing Hampton Drive, three sliding windows facing West Hampton Drive, three sliding windows the opposite side, which is on Hampton, and then four sliding windows in the rear of the property.

So, we're talking specifically about this top floor here. And if you look at the second floor, you can see the windows that were added in. And so he wants to remove these windows and replace them with either a picture window or a sliding window.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance. In reviewing applications for new construction or alteration, the Board shall consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the following criteria:

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. *The character and appropriateness of the design –*
The proposed windows to be installed are not historic.

2. *The scale of buildings –*
The actual scale of the building will not be changed.

3. *The texture and materials –*
Typical fiberglass material for new windows.

4. *The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings*

Two glass panels in a single frame is not an unusual site within Hampton Heights, however they may have a wooden frame. Adjacent properties have a combination of two glass panel windows, along decorative windows to define the historic character of the homes.

5. *If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –*

This structure seems to comfortably fit in as a multifamily home in a single family residential district. Fortunately the owner is able to maintain some original character by not removing the first floor windows. Compared to adjacent properties, the alteration of windows on the 2nd might not be inharmonious within the Historic District. If approved, the new 2nd floor windows would match the 1st floor windows.

So, here's a prime example here, so you can see he added the window here. You can also see that you have to open up these windows, if you want to let in some fresh air. So the first floor versus second floor. This is the first floor versus second floor and this is if you're standing on Hampton Drive. The other question is, does it match to the surroundings? You know the neighbors across the street, they have sliding windows as well. That's it, any questions?

Dr. Walker: I just want to be sure I understand that what he's done on the first floor is just added a new window inside?

Ms. Keitt: Correct.

Dr. Walker: Gotcha.

Mr. Brown: And I have a question for you, Tia. It was in the report but I didn't understand it there either. You mentioned picture windows and sliding windows. I know what a sliding window is. What is a picture window? How is it operable, or is it?

Ms. Keitt: That's a good question. I didn't think so but the owner is here and so he can specify.

Mr. Brown: Okay, I'll ask that question later.

Ms. Keitt: But, yeah, how can they-

Mr. Michels: That'll be a non-operable window.

Mr. Brown: If it's a non-operable window-

Mr. Brown: At least in this condition, it's a non-issue. But would this have needed to come before us?

Ms. Keitt: He wants to remove existing windows.

Mr. Brown: No, I'm talking about the ones that are on the first floor, that are already-

Mr. Michels: They're inside.

Mr. Brown: So that's-

Mr. Michels: They're inside.

Mr. Brown: Okay, barely.

Mr. Brown: I've got one more question. They're asking for permission to replace all the second floor windows, but do we even have say so on all 14 of them? It's a corner lot, if I'm not mistaken.

Ms. Keitt: It is and they're all visible.

Mr. Brown: So we've got the front and one side that we do have control over.

Mr. Brown: Okay, all right.

Ms. Keitt: This is on Hampton Drive.

Mr. Michels: That's from the park. That's the park next-door.

Mr. Brown: I see.

Dr. Boozer: No, that's the side yard-

Mr. Michels: That side?

Ms. Keitt: I see yeah, that's Hampton Drive.

Mr. Michels: And there's the park. The ones on the back are the park.

Mr. Brown: Okay. All right.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Ms. Keitt?

Ms. Franke: You had a picture up at one point of what a sliding window is downstairs?

Ms. Keitt: Sliding?

Ms. Franke: Yeah. It has a big vertical bar.

Ms. Keitt: Yeah, right, but it's hard to tell from image.

Ms. Keitt: These are sliding windows.

Ms. Franke: So that's what's inside right now, right? So it's two vertical panel and then it slides like that?

Ms. Keitt: Yes.

Ms. Franke: Okay.

Ms. Franke: What material are they made out of, those inside windows?

Ms. Keitt: I think fiberglass or plastic.

Ms. Franke: Plastic?

Mr. Michels: Vinyl.

Ms. Keitt: Vinyl. Yeah.

Ms. Franke: Yeah, vinyl?

Dr. Walker: So he's talking about replacing the uppers with wood, is that correct?

Ms. Keitt: No.

Ms. Franke: So we're talking about replacing the upstairs with what's inside, downstairs? Is that right?

Ms. Keitt: Correct.

Ms. Franke: Okay.

Ms. Keitt: Removing the steel frames and putting the sliding glass up there. Because the second floor does not have the width to do what he did on the first floor.

Mr. Brown: The wall thickness is less?

Ms. Keitt: Yes.

Dr. Walker: So basically it's downstairs.

Mr. Brown: I understand.

Dr. Rodrick: Also, if you have to open those outside windows downstairs from the outside, you wouldn't be able to do that on the second floor anyway.

Mr. Brown: You can't do it on a lot of them on the first floor, because you've got to get up on a ladder anyway. Sorry, I was going to go there later, but I've got some thoughts.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Any other questions for Ms. Keitt? Mr. Love?

Mr. Love: I think this one is pretty straightforward too. The guidelines don't allow me to replace original windows unless they can't be repaired, and I think they probably can be repaired. I'm not saying it would be easy to do it, but it is doable.

Dr. Walker: Any questions for Mr. Love?

Mr. Brown: I do. I'm talking more tonight than I've talked in two years. I'm sorry. Mr. Love, do you think there's a potential solution on the interior to modify in such a way as to add a window, not unlike what was done on the first floor, and rather than worrying about operating the original windows, just take the glass out and leave them in place?

Mr. Love: I mean, it's possible. You'd have to find something that was really thin to fit. If it's just a frame, the wall thickness, there's not going to be a lot of depth to it.

Mr. Brown: Well, where I was going with that, I wasn't trying to lead you down the road, but maybe you build a frame on the interior that may be resting on the floor and attached to the ceiling but it provides thickness as on the first floor.

Mr. Love: I think there's a possible way to do it, yes.

Mr. Brown: I didn't say it would be pretty or cheap.

Mr. Love: Well, I mean, one of the suggested ways guidelines talks about is adding a storm window on the inside, which is a very thin frame and it's not going to give you the same depth of glass and the operability that you get from a sliding glass window, but it's still a barrier between you and the outside. So I mean, something like that, I think he could probably do without too much difficulty.

Mr. Brown: I can assure you that those windows can be repaired, but they will never give you the kind of thermal comfort that you might expect. Because I've lived in a house with those for 10 years. If you have two candles on the dining room table, one burned down at a faster rate than the other because of the draft.

Mr. Love: But now those, as I mentioned, depending on how thick the frame is, those can be up-fitted with a thin piece of insulating glass that would help some with the comfort in the room, which you don't really lose-

Mr. Brown: But it's the closures that's the problem.

Mr. Love: All of your heat through the windows anyway. You lose most of your heat through the ceiling.

Mr. Michels: That's historical significance of those five windows. It was built after the war.

Mr. Brown: That's the '40s.

Mr. Michels: After World War II. I do notice that on Church Street, on the green building, I forget what they call it now, they changed the name of it. The skyscraper-

Mr. Michels: They re-did.

Dr. Walker: The Schuyler Building.

Mr. Michels: The Schuyler Building. That they did keep all of the crank windows in that building. I was in that when they were doing it because I was curious and I noticed they managed to keep all of them. And I think the Schuyler Building was built with the same kind of window. Is that the historic significance of those type of windows and that type of building about when it was built?

Mr. Love: Yeah, there was a period of time where steel windows were the most modern type of windows there were. People tried to get away from the wood windows just because it's... not only because of the maintenance of it but also because that this was a more modern window so that was what you saw in the more modern buildings.

And so, that's why in the '30s and '40s and '50s, you saw a lot of windows like that get put into buildings. I do think that they can be repaired. Most of the ones that I've seen repaired on the projects that I've done, they don't make them modern. They repair them. They close them and they fix them shut so that you don't keep opening them because that's what. They typically get stuck open and you can't close them.

And either that or they rust out and you have to replace a little of each piece. You don't have to replace every piece, but you have to replace one or two pieces on every sash in order to have a full window, and then they put the full window back in.

Mr. Michels: I wouldn't have no objection to that one was my only concern. I know it's not the Schuyler Building because it's multi-storied and zoned differently, but this is only a few story building. How do you have egress from bedrooms if you can't open the windows?

Mr. Love: Well, I don't think you can exit you- can't exit out of those windows at all.

Mr. Michels: You can't egress anyway?

Mr. Love: I don't think so. I mean I don't remember exactly what the area requirement is for the bedrooms.

Mr. Michels: It's likely below it.

Dr. Boozer: But they're too high. They won't be...

Mr. Love: And they're probably not close enough...

Mr. Brown: This is not for you. I'm sorry.

Mr. Brown: You can close those but you can't get them all the way closed. You can't latch them. They're going to be drafty.

Mr. Love: But they can be repaired to do that. I mean I know they rust and all that but you can clear the channels out and clean them enough to where they open and close.

Dr. Walker: Okay. I believe the applicant is with us. Mr. Do, would you like to come and speak? Would you tell us your name and sign in please?

Mr. Do: My name is Phuoc Do

Dr. Walker: And many of us were on the board when you brought other requests for us and the building looks great.

Mr. Do: And we replaced the window upstairs. The reason is that it's leaking, like he say. How many years you lived in these houses?

Mr. Brown: Sorry.

Mr. Do: How many years you lived in house?

Mr. Brown 10.

Mr. Do: 10?

Mr. Brown: Nine too many.

Mr. Do: Do you like it in the winter?

Mr. Brown: Oh, no.

Mr. Do: Causes leaking from the outside, even though I tried the best I can I'm asking for approval to request replace windows

Dr. Walker: So you're asking permission to replace those upstairs windows?

Mr. Do: Yes.

Dr. Walker: Did you stay with wood?

Mr. Do: With wood yeah

Dr. Walker: With wood. Okay.

Mr. Do: Outside windows with the wood inside.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Ms. Franke: So I have a question. So it would be a wood window, but how would it look like? Would you have the nine panels or would it be long ones?

Mr. Do: It's just have square because we can't open up the windows.

Ms. Franke: So the COA mentioned that you have four picture windows-

Mr. Do: Yes

Ms. Franke: And then three sliding windows and then... So-

Mr. Do: Actually, we can show you the sliding windows on the side. That is Hampton Drive. You can see the picture windows.

Dr. Rodrick: Can I ask how big? This is Anne. How big are those picture windows? I think

Mr. Do: Picture windows will be 37 high and 52 wide

Dr. Rodrick: When I hear picture window, I think huge.

Mr. Do: 37 high and 52 wide.

Mr. Brown: Single panel?

Mr. Do: Yeah. Yes. But I think it make sense because in the panel the panel, you cannot use window. When you look through it, you won't see a single level the outside of the porch there when you look at the porch you not able to see it. And why not improve efficiency for the building.

Ms. Franke: So do you have a picture of how the window would look like?

Mr. Do: I do have a picture slide.

Mr. Do: But the frame will be white.

Mr. Brown: So inoperable?

Mr. Do: Yeah, the-

Mr. Brown: Fixed.

Mr. Do: Fix it for the front. So it's very hard to distance between that on the side. You can see the sliding window. You can see in the park

Dr. Walker: I think the folks on this side need to see that photo.

Ms. Franke: Yeah, can we see the picture, We want to see the picture.

Mr. Do: Oh, I'm sorry.

Ms. Franke: Oh, I'm sorry.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Doe.

Ms. Franke: So yeah, I still have a question. So downstairs there will still be nine panels and upstairs there'll be one big panel, is that correct? As far as the look of the window, would there be nine panels on top or not?

Mr. Doe: No, they're sliding windows. You can open them.

Dr. Walker: So it'd be-

Mr. Do: Upstairs, they will be removed. Upstairs, all window can be removed and replaced with new windows.

Dr. Walker: So it would not be the same

Mr. Brown: So nine panels on the bottom and one panel on top?

Mr. Michels: Well, two on the sides.

Ms. Franke: Two on the sides-

Dr. Boozer: Which is actually what's on the bottom as well. Those are two panels

Mr. Brown: Understood, but they're behind the nine panels.

Dr. Boozer: That's two panel behind the nine frames.

Dr. Walker: Yes, we understand that. Any other questions for Mr. Do?

Mr. Do: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. Okay, we will move into public comment. Is there anyone from the public who would like to speak about this? Yes, sir?

Niko Gilman: I'm Niko Gilman. Do I have to swear in or anything?

Dr. Walker: Yes, you need to sign in please.

Niko Gilman: I'm signing in. I've been before the board plenty of times and I've been denied for windows for actually replacing identical windows with wooden windows that were rotten, but I had to go ahead and repair them and I do live next door to this, but that's not why I'm here.

I would just say that this is a... What's being asked is a huge departure from what is currently on the house and it's not this particular one. I mean this is always going to be ugly but it's that somebody's going to come up soon, ask to change windows in his house and by granting a huge departure on something like this, I think the board might want to think about the next person, not necessarily this project. That's all.

Dr. Walker: Thank you, Mr. Gilman. Anyone else from the public who would like to speak?

Ms. Burdett: I love Niko. I live across the street. I've looked at this ugly building for 40 years. And first of all, I need to tell you that initially it should never have been built there. We didn't have an ordinance. We didn't have a code. We didn't have anything in the City.

Dr. Walker: But that's not before us today so-

Ms. Burdett: And let me say this-

Dr. Walker: For the sake of time-

Ms. Burdett: And as a result-

Dr. Walker: Could I ask you to stick to this proposal?

Ms. Burdett: Yes, and so as a result, we were placed with a Multi-Family housing built in industrial basic materials with steel windows that were rusted out and had been tried to be repaired and made operable way before Phuoc bought the property.

As long as I've seen them, they've not closed. And all I suggest is that. I'm grateful at the time that. First of all, the roof is not original. It was a flat roof building. It leaked like crazy. Their solution was to put in a residential roof. The front porches that weren't big enough for two people to pass were not safe although they were original material because it was an impossible and an ugly situation.

What he's done at the front has added great value and finally made that at least partially compatible with the rest of the surrounding neighborhood. Thank you, heavenly father. If we'd had to leave this thing and put it on the national register in its ugly original form, it would still be a problem because it is totally incompatible with the four periods of the district, with the intent of the district, and the intent of everything.

I suggest to you that, thankfully, between the roof and the addition of the large porches that you give, unlike Niko's right. I know you can't treat people differently, but the reality is, these are not a significant element on that building. It's just one ugly square shoebox that has been worked on.

So I suggest, I'm not trying to set a precedent forever because I understand his concern. But when you've got a bungalow or a 1940s house or any of the four districts that are on the national register for a purpose because there's enough pattern, there's enough rhythm, there's enough lightness, that you want to maintain that integrity.

There's, thankfully, only one thing similar. And after the Schuyler building, they did the ugly buildings on Morningside Drive that further detract from the neighborhood so-

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Ms. Burdett: I realize it's not my normal, but I'm saying take them out. Let them put something of residential scale that is compatible with the neighborhood and not keep this ridiculous pieces of steel that were never intended for residential use in the first place.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Ms. Burdett: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Is there anyone else from the public who would like to speak?

Dr. Walker: Yes ma'am. Yes ma'am, you must.

Ms. Campbell: I just agree. Barbara Campbell. I agree with everything she said that I have lived here. My husband is an architect. For so many years, that man has worked so hard on that place and that looks phenomenal and there are other things that like the door on Hydrick that doesn't look historic. So I don't understand. I just think that this can go ahead.

Dr. Walker: Thank you, Ms. Campbell. Anyone else? Okay. I will close public comment and proceed with board deliberations.

Mr. Love: Can I answer

Dr. Walker: Yes, sir.

Mr. Love: The one thing I wanted to add real quick was, if the guidelines would allow you to replace the original windows and they don't, there's more than one way to replace that window with a window that looks like it. There are replica steel windows that the National Park Service will approve.

There are new steel windows that you can buy and have them put back in there and they will be the exact same thing, the exact same size. So even if you could approve it, you would at least want to approve it with a window that matched the original window and not with something that doesn't look like it at all.

Dr. Walker: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Franke: The only thing I was going to add is when I printed the guidelines for the first time, I've never done that before, there's actually a section in it. It's A4, non-historic infill. A number

of non-historic and sometimes incompatible buildings have been constructed in the Hampton Heights neighborhood over the years.

The majority of these are apartment buildings that have provided immediate housing in Spartanburg like Donna said. Several of these buildings were constructed in the '40s shortly after World War II and will soon be 50 years old so it was written a long time ago, right?

Many of these building have been neglected. Rehabilitation treatment should follow the design guidelines provided in section A1. So it's very clear that even if it is non-historic, it is supposed to follow the guidelines, which is to repair the windows to be as similar as possible to what we have here.

Mr. Brown: This is Ken. Again, first of all, I think it's a shame that we didn't have any say on what got done on the first floor because I really think that that's the wrong solution. As much as I dislike these windows for my own personal reasons, I don't think we've heard a compelling argument to replace them wholesale.

I would consider giving the applicant an opportunity to come back to us with a window that doesn't just resemble this, but essentially replicates it. And by that, I mean has the nine panels, the casement, if not the steel, at least steel on the outside frame so that it looks like an original steel window.

I have no interest in seeing, what I call a fixed single panel window, which you guys are calling a picture window, over something that's nine panels with something else behind it. I think that's just turning this into a hash. And that's my opinion.

Mr. Michels: To Ken's point, they do make triple casement windows with the outside windows opening and closing in wood with a metal exterior can mix well. So they are available in 21st century technology, still being very similar in style to what was obviously built around World War II.

Mr. Brown: I've seen them around town.

Dr. Boozer: If everybody's had their say, I would like to move that we ask the gentleman to come back before the board with the 20th century style replica of those windows.

Mr. Brown: Don't you mean 21st century?

Dr. Boozer: 21st century.

Dr. Boozer: 21st century replica.

Dr. Walker: Mr. Do, would you be amenable to that?

Mr. Do: Would you give me the source for the window?

Dr. Walker: I'm sorry.

Mr. Do: Will you give me the source for that?

Dr. Boozer: Can he have the source-

Dr. Walker: Yes.

Dr. Walker: yes. We can.

On a motion by Dr. Boozer, seconded by Mr. Michels the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was tabled to next meeting to allow applicant to provide examples of replacement windows by a vote of 7-0

Dr. Walker: Okay, so I think we would need to table this and give you an opportunity to come back next month with some proposals.

Dr. Walker: I'm sorry, no, but the public comment is now closed

Mr. Michels: I will second your motion table it and have Mr. Do be able to come back and present us with something that we would approve.

Dr. Walker: And I know that Mr. Michel found a possible source for you, that Ms. Burdett might have some ideas on sources.

Ms. Burdett: Just won't be able to create those thin lines. Everything is going to be a lot thicker.

Mr. Michels: I disagree.

Ms. Burdett: It's going to be a lot thicker, but you just can't replicate that.

Dr. Walker: Mr. Do?

Mr. Do: They can make it for you.

Dr. Walker: We would like to give you the opportunity to investigate that rather than just vote it down. So we have a motion to table and give you the opportunity to come back with some examples of windows that would look more like the original windows. All in favor of that motion?

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed?

Ms. Zhou: Who made the motion?

Dr. Walker: Dr. Boozer.

Mr. Brown: And who seconded it Bill.

Dr. Walker: Okay, thank you. We'll see you next month, Mr. Do. Finally, a COA for major works at 252 West Hampton Avenue.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Works – 252 W. Hampton Avenue (TMS# 7-16-02-041.00) in the Hampton Heights Historic District. Applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair the side and rear of the structure and change the elevation and roofline of the structure to be consistent with other surrounding historic structures. The property is located in the R-8/SFD Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Owner/Applicant: Barry Whitfield.

Mr. Livingston: Madam chairman, members of the board, staff received a Certificate Of Appropriateness for major works for 252 West Hampton Avenue. This is a case for redesign of the roof, another roof, staircase removal and column redesign.

And this is the zone map showing the location of the property on West Hampton Avenue and Hampton Court. This is actually listed as a street, SCDOT's road so it is on a corner properties,

similar issue as some of the previous cases. A two story structure, it also has some other structures in the rear. We'll look at these five criteria's for making decisions on the requirements. Again, rehabilitation standards are you will be reviewing whether you're meeting the letter of the law or the spirit of the requirements. This is a photo of the structure. This is the front of the house and this is the damage that occurred several years ago. And so the owner is trying to repair the flat roof, which is this portion of the structure. And this is the main part of the structure, this flat roof and gable roof from the inside.

We know that this portion of the building is different from this portion of the building and that there are some examples where this portion was built with a roof above it and so likely, during the time of the structure, this section was added with a roof, and then some of the rear porches were enclosed so dealing with a lot of those challenges.

Analysis

Zoning Ordinance and Historic Design Manual Consistency

The project site is located in the Hampton Heights District which has design guidelines for development. These guidelines are outlined in the Design Manual for the City of Spartanburg Historic Districts and Landmarks. The purpose of the Manual is to provide property owners guidance for the preservation and protection of historic and architecturally valuable districts and sites in the City. The project is also subject to Section 510 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation. This section allows the Board to review applications involving historic structures and districts and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the Standards listed in the Ordinance.

Findings

Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 510.6 (C)

1. The character and appropriateness of the design –

The Hampton Heights Historic Guidelines states that the “roof design and pitch is an Architectural detail that are required to be preserved and repaired rather than replacement.” The Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation indicate that “Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved” and “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” In this case the applicant has indicated that the second-floor structure was not typical of the period and the elements of the structure and distinct differences of the siding indicate that there are two periods associated with the second floor and first floor of the structure. The applicant has provided photos of other structures roof design but intends to keep the second floor and replace the roof design. Portions of the second floor appear to be part of an exterior balcony of the original floor plan and the second-floor enclosure appears to be an addition to the structure after the original structure was built. The applicant is seeking approval to change the hip roof of the rear and side portion of the structure to a cross gabled roof connecting the roof to the main roof which does not appear to be consistent with the Hampton Heights Historic Guidelines. The change in roof design would help preserve the existing maintenance of the roof as rain from the main roof structure sits in the crevices of the current hip roof and main wall. Changing the design would help with preservation of the structure but would not be consistent with the approved neighborhood guidelines.

The applicant is also requesting to remove a rear exterior staircase which is not consistent with the original design of the home. The rear staircase indicates that the property was previously used as a multifamily structure. The removal of the rear staircase would improve the design of the structure and would be consistent with the Single-family design of the original structure.

2. The scale of the buildings –

The scale of the proposed main structure would not change, but the roof pitch and design would change and would not be consistent with the historic rehabilitation guidelines. The removal of the rear staircase would add to the scale of the building and would not diminish but add to the structure.

3. The texture and materials –

The proposed roof materials would be architectural asphalt shingles which is consistent with the other roofs in the neighborhood and with the asphalt shingles currently on the main roof and this portion of the structure.

4. The relationship of such elements to similar features of structures in the immediate surroundings –

This property sits on the corner of two streets. Typically, the rear changes to the design of the structure would not be visible from the street. In this case the proposed roof design would be visible because the property sits on a corner lot. The cross gabled roof design would not be consistent with other roof designs included as part of the application and structures in the neighborhood. The proposed roof design would assist in the long-term maintenance and preservation of the structure. The removal of the rear staircase would improve the design of the structure and would be consistent with the design of the original structure.

5. If the property is in a Historic District, the extent to which the alteration or construction would be harmonious with the Historic District –

The proposed change in the roof design would not be consistent with the neighborhood standards. The change in the roof design from a hip roof to the crossed gabled roof design would detract from the original roof design of the period. The location of the roof on a corner property would be visible from the street. The removal of the rear staircase would improve the design of the structure and would be consistent with the Single-family design of the original structure.

Here, another photos of the roof and then the staircase that will be removed, photos from the street. This is the Captain Court photos across the street, apartments across the street. This is the design provided by the applicant, showing the flat roof and the gable roof, and then here is an example of trying to do a combined gable roof, where this portion of the roof would extend and connect to the main roof.

Another view of what was proposed. There is steps in the rear that would remain, but the staircase would be removed. Here is a photo showing what's proposed. Again, the columns. The owner is requesting that these columns be a solid column all the way to the porch deck. From the porch deck, here's another photo, and that this portion of the structure be rebuilt, and be recessed. Right now, it's enclosed and screened, and this portion has been added-on to. It's showing some other examples of the changes in the roof peaks, and the applicant can explain what's occurring here.

And then here is what's on the front porch right now. It's a brick column with the three columns in the brick.

Then here, is an example of what was proposed. Here's a photo that shows what the original house looked like. It would be columns coming all the way down, and the owner's proposal to do something similar. I believe this was to confirm from the book, the original book that the Hampton Heights Historic District.

So, any questions you may have?

The guidelines do allow you to, if you have an original photo, it would go back to the original, as long as you could provide proof that that's the way it looked. So again, some of the Department of the Interior standards for rehabilitation do not apply to the structure, and so if you apply the letter of the law the roof would not be changed, and the columns would not be changed, unless we could have something to show this photo is included as part of the process. And, we can make copies, as well.

Dr. Walker: So he's not proposing to up new porch rails, to match the originals?

Mr. Livingston: I did not see anything in the requirements to say the porch rails would be added, but that's a good question for the applicant.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Livingston?

Mr. Brown: Yeah, a quick one. I think read a reference to a screened-in area that's going to be returned to its original state, or am I imagining that?

Mr. Livingston: You're correct. This is the screened-in area.

Mr. Brown: Okay.

Mr. Livingston: And it also has an area that where the structure was currently this portion here, goes all the way out to the front, at the side. So, it's almost as if this area was added as an extra living space, but the original house had it set back.

Mr. Brown: So what's the final condition going to be?

Mr. Livingston: So right now, all of this is screened-in with brick, the path column and three wood columns. So, all that is in deteriorated condition.

Mr. Brown: So what we're looking at, is what we think we're going to get?

Mr. Livingston: This is what the applicant is proposing.

Mr. Brown: All right, thank you.

Mr. Livingston: The applicant is here to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Brown: I have one last question. In the rear, I think I understood there was an original stair that led up to the first floor, and then the other one goes to the second story?

Mr. Livingston: Yes.

Mr. Brown: And the only demo, is that upper stair?

Mr. Livingston: Yes. The only demo is this, and the roof.

Mr. Brown: All right.

Mr. Livingston: It apparently was a Multi-Family, an allowed one family on the first floor, and then another family on the second floor. It's now being combined into a Single Family house.

Mr. Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Livingston: Which, the zoning designation does allow it to be converted back to single family.

Mr. Brown: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Livingston? Okay, Mr. Love

Mr. Love: I don't think the columns are part of what I've addressed in the letter. The two things I would say about the columns, really quick, is it does kind of look like they're probably the original columns on the house, that they were just cut off, and then put back on top of the pedestals. So, I think since redoing that would be considered new work, then that should come back before the Board, and be reviewed for the proportion. This is really important when you're looking at the full columns, as well as the material, and make sure that they are wood, and not aluminum, or something like that. I think that would be the two things I would say about the porch columns. But other than that, I don't have a problem with extending them back down to the ground like they were.

For the roof part, I think the roof, for me, is the same as any other one, where we're modifying an original roof form. We know that that part of the building on the rear looks like it was extended up at some point, but I still feel like that building was extended during the period of significance for the house, and so that it really has gained its own sense of historical significance, and so you really should treat it in the same way that you would treat the remainder of the house. And so, I think by changing the roof form, and trying to make the roofs blend together a little bit more, to me, doesn't meet the guidelines or the standards for the reasons that we discussed earlier.

I think, and just as a side note, to me, I think they stopped it before they got to the original eave, for a reason. I feel like that it's going to crumble if they try to build it up on top of the other roof, myself, I think they would be better to leave it like it is, because... But, that's just my opinion.

Any other questions?

Dr. Walker: Questions for Mr. Love?

Ms. Franke: There's the removal of the stairs, there's the roof connection, and then there's the front porch revivification, right? That's it? Three items?

Mr. Love: The stair to the second floor, it was clearly an addition, so it was perfectly fine for taking it out.

Dr. Walker: Thank you, Mr. Love.

Mr. Love: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Is the applicant here? Please give us your name, and sign in.

Mr. Whitfield: My name is Barry Whitfield. I would like not to disrespect what he said. He's told me from about the roof line being better the way it is. There are three, separate roof lines for the different additions that come together, and it's always lift. The roof that I proposed, is almost certainly, although it's a story higher, is almost certainly the same roof line that was confirmed what is the kitchen.

So, sometime around the '30s, based on the pictures that was in there, maybe the '40s, the roof was taken off. The second story was added, and it was turned into an apartment for that side of the house. Then, at some point the porch was closed in, and the upper porch was added, and then eventually closed in. So, the roof line that I proposed, is identical to the two neighboring houses, over their back half of the fence.

Somehow, those roof lines need to come together, and that seemed to be the most visual way of doing it. And, the roof is the main thing I'm concerned about. I would like to be able to take the front porch back to its original, but the roof is... Right now, there is no roof. And, although it's not flat, it's virtually flat, and it does... Actually, the roof that's on it, even though not flat, it has the exact same shape as the roof I've proposed. Just as much wood.

Dr. Walker: And you are proposing to restore, to add columns that look like the original columns, but no porch railing?

Mr. Whitfield: I do not do the porch railing, because I'm not sure I could afford that at this time. And, when the house was built, the porch was actually much higher from the ground than it is now, because at some point it was terraced and filled in. At some point I would love to do the porch railing, but it's a very unique porch railing. If you look at that picture a bit more. Like a cross, it's got...

Dr. Walker: Yeah.

Dr. Walker: Okay, other questions for the applicant?

Ms. Franke: What about the porch? The material that can be used for the porch?

Mr. Whitfield: Whatever we thought is as close to the original material as possible.

Ms. Franke: It's a metal roof, right?

Mr. Whitfield: Over the porch, yes.

Ms. Franke: Yes. It's a metal roof?

Barry Whitfield: Right.

Ms. Franke: You would redo that too?

Mr. Whitfield: Yes. At some point, one side of the porch was a wrap-around porch. It was completely closed in, even with the front of the house. The other side just came up to a window, and on the...

I don't know if you can factor it in, in one of the pictures I sent, but there is an oval-shaped window that's in the stairwell. That's one reason I would like to take the side that's fully enclosed, and move it back. Not completely take out that enclosure, but move it out, so then that oval window is then, again, visible from the street. It would also add some symmetry back to the house, because with all the additions, obviously at that time period they sought a new room. They didn't think about the symmetry of they took in the porch.

Mr. Whitfield: The line of the house. Which is true for the back of it. There was no thought given to the line of the house.

So again, that particular roof line is identical to the two neighboring houses. It's just they're all one story, and this is a two story.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Whitfield?

Mr. Whitfield: And the ugly staircase was probably added in the '70s, I assume. Also in the proposal, I don't think it was mentioned, that staircase clearly leads to a door. That door would be closed off again. That's not visible from the street.

Ms. Franke: I know what I was going to ask you. As you plan on fixing the roof, do you expect to have a lot of rot, from two-and-a-half years of all the rain?

Mr. Whitfield: What the contractor has told me, is pretty much they have to take off the existing roof and repair it, because there's also probably mold inside.

Ms. Franke: All right.

Dr. Walker: Old houses.

Mr. Whitfield: Well, when you have a hundred-year-old tree fall through it...

Dr. Walker: That's right.

Mr. Whitfield: If it had not been an old house, the tree would have been in the first floor, I would guess, but being a sturdy house, it stopped it.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Whitfield?

Mr. Whitfield: I don't feel like we need to divide this as three, separate things, or what. What is the biggest priority, is the roof.

Dr. Walker: Yeah, we will talk about that in more deliberations, so stay tuned. Okay, is there anyone from the public who would like to comment on this proposal?

Ms. Burdett: I would like to say, I think Barry's done a wonderful job.

Mr. Brown: You need to step up.

Dr. Walker: You must step up to the podium.

Ms. Burdett: I'm sorry.

Dr. Walker: Otherwise, it doesn't get in the minutes.

Ms. Burdett: I understand. I just agree, as I told you, part of the explaining. All the additions happened as suddenly they needed... Returning family members that needed a place to live. They put it up as fast as they could. They couldn't have cared less, about how it looked, quite frankly.

Dr. Walker: Yes.

Ms. Burdett: So I do think that restoring it and replacing a roof on it which is very compatible. And the fact is, it's... On the floor that he's talking about, it isn't visible for anything. And hands off to them, for trying to restore the front porch.

Dr. Walker: Thank you.

Ms. Burdett: Thank you.

Dr. Walker: Anybody else for public comment?

Okay, and now we'll close public comment, and open it to board deliberations.

Why don't we take it as three, separate things?

Removal of the rear staircase. Is there any discussion about that?

Mr. Brown: Piece of cake.

Dr. Walker: Okay, I think we have consensus that we're all for that. All right.

Let's talk about the roof, because that's the next more critical thing.

Mr. Michels: Taking into consideration historic value of it, I was looking at the old roof lines, and it looks like it was basically a mish-mash of roof lines. I would imagine, water somewhere is seeping in, even from when it was originally done.

I've been by that property. This is on the back of the house. It's on an alley that really I think one time was a driveway, but is a City street, apparently, or a State road. You cannot see that at all. Even if you're looking for it, you can't see that. I don't think it's going to be jutting out past the side the house. Going by the side, jut out to the roadway. Considering the massive undertaking it appears it's going to be already, due to the giant tree falling through the house, I think the contractor is doing the best they can, to make sure that they have a water-tight project, and do not end up with two more roofs, or three more roofs coming together, and ending up leaking like they always did.

Mr. Brown: I want to pick up where you were, Bill. From the graphic that I was looking at on my iPad, three or four days ago, I wondered why we were classifying this as a corner? I'm sure that there's probably a way to say that that's a public right-of-way, even though it leads to nowhere. It's like a dead end, in the middle of the square.

Mr. Love: It goes down to Brookwood Terrace, to there.

Mr. Brown: I'm sorry?

Mr. Love: It goes down to Brookwood Terrace. It goes to another road.

Mr. Brown: Oh, it looked to me like it. It looked discontinuous to me, on the-

Mr. Michels: It goes down to Brookwood.

Mr. Brown: I'm sorry.

Mr. Whitfield: I believe that originally it was just access to the back of their property, but because there were two houses built on the back of the lot, "it's now my property." I guess it became a street. It's still an alley. I don't care how you do it, but it is that.

Mr. Michels: But it is listed as a road.

Mr. Whitfield: It is, yeah.

Mr. Brown: So, it's a public right-of-way?

Mr. Whitfield: Yeah.

Mr. Brown: It's what, 12-, 15-feet wide?

Mr. Whitfield: If that.

Mr. Brown: Yeah, all right. I really have a hard time considering this a corner property, even though technically it may qualify as one. I think it's a stretch for us to use that as a reason to deny.

Dr. Walker: Your argument being that it wouldn't have otherwise come before us?

Mr. Brown: Agreed, yes.

Dr. Walker: Got you.

Mr. Brown: If that little alley, even though it may be continuous and designated as a public right-of-way, if it were not there, all 12 feet of it, I don't think we would be talking about this.

Mr. Whitfield: I do have a 3-D CAD model that I can show you.

Dr. Walker: Do you feel you need to see the 3-D? Okay. But, we appreciate the offer. Do we feel like we've got some consensus on the roof, and we want to move to the porch?

Attendees: Yes.

Dr. Walker: Okay. The proposal for the porch, is to tear off the screen porch, and the little, tiny, enclosed area on that right side as you face the house. Open that back up, and then replace it with full-length columns that look like the original columns. And, what we don't know from the proposal, is the materials for the columns, and the proportions-

Dr. Walker: Of the columns.

Mr. Michels: I think Mr. Love made a point on that. It appears that those are the original columns, they were just cut, so I would imagine you would expect the new column to be exactly the same as the columns that are there now, standing to the right. The same materials, the same ornate design on the column. But, I don't know how ornate they were.

Dr. Walker: They were pretty simple.

Dr. Walker: Anyone prepared to make a motion? I'll help keep us on track for the three parts.

Mr. Michels: I'll make a motion.

On a motion by Mr. Michels, seconded by Dr. Boozer the Certificate of Appropriateness for major works was approved with conditions: Allow the removal of the rear staircase, Repair roofline similar to other adjacent properties, Repair rear roof as presented to HARB, Replace front columns as presented from ceiling to floor using wood materials with the same proportions as existing columns, Replace damaged metal standing seam room on front porch with like materials and design, Remove screen porch and repair front room and setback of front porch as presented to HARB by a vote of 7-0

Dr. Walker: I think it sounds like we're having a motion to approve with conditions? Is that correct?

Attendees: Yes.

Dr. Walker: Okay.

Mr. Michels: I'll make a motion, and divide them into one, two, three.

Motion 1. a) is they can remove the castle entrance, better known as the staircase on the back. The staircase on the back.

1. b) is the roof line. The roof line being repaired as to the plans that you have from your contractor. We will approve that.

1. c) the front porch column replacement be approved with new columns going to the porch, of the same materials and the same proportions as the current columns believed to be the original columns.

Dr. Walker: And the removal-

Mr. Brown: The screen porch.

Mr. Michels: And removal of the screen porch, and the small, side room, to expose the upper window, and to the wall. That's the proposal.

Dr. Walker: Did we get it all, Mr. Livingston?

Mr. Livingston: An email about roof on the front porch.

Mr. Michels: I don't think we did we talk about replacing the roof? I didn't see that in there.

Mr. Whitfield: Actually, I didn't realize that was a thing, so I don't think. It needs to be replaced too.

Mr. Michels: Then 1. d)-

Mr. Brown: Does it have to come back, before us?

Mr. Michels: It's a metal, standing, same roof.

Mr. Brown: Okay.

Mr. Michels: I'll say, since we're here, an addition would be, 1. d), so the motion would be to allow the replacement of the front porch standing, same roof, with like materials.

Dr. Walker: Is there a second to that motion?

Dr. Boozer: I second the motion, as stated.

Mr. Brown: Clearly.

Board: Thank you for getting it all down. A, B, C, D.

Dr. Walker: Okay, all those in favor, say "Aye."

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Any opposed? Okay, thank you all very much for all of your help tonight. Okay, we have updates on COAs for minor works.

Mr. Livingston: There was only one item for minor works, and that was for 728 Reynolds Street, tear off and replace asphalt roof. So there's not a whole lot for minor works.

Ms. Franke: Last week there was a gentleman who came. He was going to be presenting this week, his case for window replace on Carlisle Street. Did that not happen?

Mr. Livingston: He did not submit the application on time, and so he has submitted an application coming before the Board in January.

Ms. Franke: Okay.

Dr. Walker: Thank you. And then we have staff updates.

Mr. Livingston: Staff updates. A couple of updates. You should have, as part of the packet, part of the documents we sent, we received a letter from Buddy Bush, regarding the demolition of 645 Isom Street. It's in pretty bad shape, by Buddy Bush's letter. It was fire-damaged. This was located in the Beaumont neighborhood. Buddy provided a letter so that we can proceed with the demolition of that structure. Because in the historic district, we have to make you aware of it, but the building official has determined that it's unsafe. It has to be demolished.

Mr. Michels: Was it 10 years ago? A lot is still standing there. After a fire, I'm surprised it's still standing. I've been in it.

Mr. Livingston: So, just wanted to make you aware of that a letter that was sent to a council member, regarding the property located at 397 Gentry Street, and the owner sent that letter, and you should have a copy of that letter in your packet and a copy was sent you. We sent that out to the Board, so that you're aware of it, but it's a letter concerned about the painting of the chimney and the masonry at 397 Gentry Street.

I discussed this issue with the City Attorney. The applicant does have until December 16th to appeal, before, I believe the Circuit Court of Appeals, but they do have the opportunity to appeal the case. After that time period, I will be issuing a summons to the property owner. I just wanted you to be aware of it, because the Lis Pendens has already been filed.

Mr. Michels: How soon ruled on?

Ms. Franke: Can you explain how that works, once the summons, what happens?

Mr. Livingston: Once the summons happens, we issue the summons to the property owner. I can tell you what happened with the property next door, which is 399 Gentry Street. We filed a lis pendency on the property. We sent the notice of the violation. We sent a copy of the Board's decision. We sent all property owners a copy of the Board's decision, which is known as the Mandatory Findings of Fact, signed by the Chairman and a Staff member. We send that to the applicant.

After 30 days, the applicant has up to 30 days to file an appeal through the legal process, the court process. At the end of that 30 days, if they have not filed an appeal, more than likely, they will not be able to appeal the Board's decision.

Typically, at the end of that 30-day period, Staff will issue a summons. In the case of 399 Gentry Street, we issued summons to all three property owners, and then we've learned that they removed the structure. So, we will remove the lis pendens. We will cancel the summons. The original summons was for them to appear in January. We will cancel the summons, and the issue goes away.

If they do not remove the structure, we will take them to court. The judge would render their decision. If they're found guilty, we would issue another summons, and continue to do so, until they are in compliance.

The same will occur with 397 Gentry Street. If nothing is being done, we will issue a summons, and issue a summons until they're in compliance.

I'll answer any questions that you may have.

Ms. Franke: An additional question to that. 252, that we just approved for the roof, and the porch, and all that, they have had a summons. So, what happens in relation to us approving now, the COA. Is that summons overwritten, because it has now a COA?

Mr. Livingston: The summons remains intact until they have completed the work.

Ms. Franke: And the work is removing all the ivy, and all of that, right?

Mr. Livingston: Yes. It's completion of the work.

Ms. Franke: Okay, I just wanted to make sure that didn't start back to zero, because there was COA. Okay, good.

Mr. Livingston: It doesn't start back at zero. They have to complete the work.

Ms. Franke: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Walker: Any other questions for Mr. Livingston?

Ms. Franke: I thought we were going to get dinner for free?

Ms. Franke: I know. I'm very impressed.

Dr. Walker: Thank you all for a second, marathon meeting this fall. Thank you to the Staff. I know this has been some really challenging cases, lately.

Mr. Michels: And Mr. Love, I thank you for being here.

Dr. Walker: Yes, thank you very much.

Mr. Love: Thank you all for allowing me to be here. I've enjoyed it.

Mr. Michels: I want to thank the Staff members, and all their spouses and significant others for allowing them to come in to speak. Mine's already hitting me up, twice.

I'll make a motion to adjourn.


Mr. Brown: I second it.

Dr. Walker: All in favor, say, "aye."

Attendees: Aye.

Dr. Walker: Okay, we are adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 PM


Dr. Melissa Walker, Chairperson