

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

July 26, 2016

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 6:00 p.m. in the Room 337 of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JEREMY JORDAN-CHAIR

DAVID DENNARD

ALICE ARNOLD

WILLIAM GEE

MYRON CASPAR

TYRONE WALSTON

JAKE POSTMA

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: COLLETTE KINANE, PLANNER II and AMY NUNEZ, SECRETARY

OTHERS PRESENT: BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY and DONALD PHILLIPS, NEW ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Chairman Jordan requested to add an item number 3 on the agenda for Consideration of Pokémon Go per the request of Councilmember McLean Godley.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to accept the amended agenda, Mr. Walston seconded. In favor: Jordan, Postma, Arnold, Walston, Dennard, and Gee. In opposition: Caspar. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Postma made a motion to approve the June 28, 2016 minutes, Mr. Dennard seconded, and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works COA's

2016-09: 407 S. Jarvis Street; Ben Beachum; Mechanical change-out – Approved

2016-10: 905 E. Fifth Street; Justin Edwards; Exterior repair – Approved

2016-11: 605 E. Fifth Street; John Gill/EUCU; Removal of dead/diseased shrubs – Approved

2016-12: 1001 E. Third Street; Roberson's Heating & Air; Mechanical change out – Approved

Mr. Caspar asked if the repair on 905 E. Fifth Street was due to rotten wood.

Ms. Kinane stated yes. It was to replace wood on porch and painting.

Mr. Postma stated that a trashcan is seen in the picture of 407 S. Jarvis Street.

Ms. Kinane stated she took the picture on trash day.

COA #16-09 – 508 W. 5th Street

COA#16-09 – 508 W. Fifth Street by Zeta Tau Alpha/DesignCo – Window Replacement

Ms. Kinane presented the Staff report. She stated the Design Review Committee did meet on this application. She stated the property is the E.B. Ficklen house and is a representative type of the Queen Anne Style and is one of the most elaborately detailed homes of its type in Greenville. The house was constructed in 1902 as a single family dwelling for E.B. Ficklen, a prominent Greenville tobacco businessman and founder of the E.B. Ficklen Tobacco Company. This two-story frame dwelling features an exaggerated hip roof with a circular corner tower capped by a conical roof, projecting gable, and a complicated porch configuration including a first floor wraparound porch with three Ionic order columns at each supported location. Most windows contain the typical one-over-one sash; however along the front façade there are a number of ornamental windows. Originally containing stained glass, several of these windows have semi-circular transoms and one is oval in configuration. The double leaf entrance has a transom which also once contained stained glass. Since 1980, the property has been rented to or owned by a fraternity or sorority, beginning with Sigma Tau Gamma. The property was nominated to the National Register in 1984 and declared a Local Landmark in 1988. Previous COA's are:

10/2008 – fire sprinkler backflow preventer & hotbox. APPROVED.

03/2001 – remove two mature trees. DENIED.

02/2000 – enlarge front window to comply with fire code. APPROVED with conditions.

The applicant proposes the replacement of 40 windows (excluding the tower and transom windows) with wood windows that exactly match the style of those that are currently on the property. Thirty of the windows are one-over-one, two are picture, one is a diamond grille casement, and six are fixed windows with either a four-over-four or eight-over-eight. The six fixed windows are specified for the sunroom, where they visually match the existing windows; however, these windows do not match in type or function, as the existing windows are potentially operable casement windows. At some point these windows were nailed shut and are effectively fixed, inoperable windows, thus the change to fixed windows for the replacement. Many of the currently existing windows are original to the house – with two documented exceptions on the front façade that were modified in 2000 to comply with Fire Code. After touring the property it is evident that many of the windows had the glazing replaced with Plexiglas, either before the Local Landmark designation or illegally without a COA. Several windows have either been replaced or had grilles (though this is unlikely) since the 1982 National Register of Historic Places report. The primary Design Guidelines to consider are Chapter 2 Windows & Doors numbers 1-5 (though several others apply). It is vitally important that repair and maintenance be first considered prior to replacing original windows. Additionally, the Guidelines state that it is not appropriate to substitute a contemporary stock item that does

not match the original element, or to eliminate a detail rather than repair or replace it. Though the contemporary items do match the original element in composition and detail, there will be a visible difference in the historic and new glass. Several windows have been modified to meet Fire Code and provide a safe, accessible exit if necessary. This should be taken into consideration.

Recommendation: The HPC should review the applicable Design Guidelines and make an appropriate determination. Many of the windows do not feature glass glazing and replacement would improve security, energy efficiency, and appearance; as well as return a historic characteristic. The change of the sunroom windows to the fixed style from the casement style should be discussed. The current casement windows were nailed shut for safety concerns and have not been operable in decades. Though the specified windows will simulate the appropriate look, it should be considered if this change would detract from the historical integrity of the property. If the application is approved, the windows must match the original in every dimension and muntin profile exactly, as specified in the application.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael Moore, applicant and owner of DesignCo, spoke in favor of the request. He stated all the wood windows are one-over-one. The few at the rear are six-over-six. The windows in the tower will not be replaced. He stated the sunroom windows were previously screwed/nailed shut for security reasons. They are requesting fixed sashes not active casements.

Mr. Postma asked how different will the replacement in the sunroom look like.

Mr. Moore stated that the casement in the middle will be smaller but it will look similar because it is all wood.

Attorney Little asked if they would be fixed or snapped in.

Mr. Moore stated all are fixed with individual panes.

Mr. Caspar asked if the replacement would look the same.

Mr. Moore stated the current windows are a two pane in one window. The replacement will be 2 one-pane windows and are not as wide. They will be fixed and inoperable.

Mr. Caspar asked if they were currently casement windows.

Mr. Moore stated yes and they would swing out if they weren't nailed.

Mr. Caspar asked why it couldn't be replaced with another casement window.

Mr. Moore stated it can be done on new construction but he is not sure if it can be done on replacement like this.

Chairman Jordan stated that was the concern of the Design Review Committee. Although the current windows were nailed shut, they are operable and could open. The concern is whether or not to replace operable with fixed.

Mr. Moore stated that the windows would have locking mechanisms.

Ms. Arnold stated she understands the need for security and why the windows were nailed shut.

Mr. Moore fixed he's prior statement about the casement replacement with another casement window. He stated it could be done. It was already done on the third floor.

Chairman Jordan mentioned historical accuracy. He referenced Design Guidelines Chap 2 #17: *New windows must be compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, size, materials, and details.* He stated if it can't open and replaced with a fixed sash it is a major detail and a big change.

Ms. Arnold asked if the windows have good secured locks.

Mr. Moore stated the double hung windows have just one lock. He stated there is a window at the rear of the property that has a security screen.

Mr. Caspar stated that would be considered a non-permanent change to the structure.

Chairman Jordan stated that the old guidelines and general historic practices state not to do anything that cannot be undone.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing and opened board discussion.

Attorney Little stated the bottom line is if the proposed windows meet the Design Guidelines and if the replacement of a fixed window with a casement window is congruent with the guidelines. The safety issue is not part of the Design Guidelines. The exterior needs to match.

Chairman Jordan asked if the casement windows could be considered separately from the rest.

Attorney Little stated a vote can be made to approve the windows minus the casement windows. Then another vote can be made regarding the casement windows with the conditions of how it meets the Design Guidelines. Only one finding of facts is necessary with the stated

conditions or qualifiers. The approval of the application can separate the windows with the conditions.

Chairman Jordan read the Findings of Facts for application #16-09, 508 W. Fifth Street.

The COA application was completed and submitted on July 23, 2016. The COA application is for replacement of windows. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on July 18, 2016 and July 26, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on July 11, 2016. This hearing was held July 26, 2016. Ms. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Mr. Michael Moore presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-18 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors are applicable. The replacement of windows with the exception of the sunroom casement window is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to adopt the findings of facts, Mr. Postma seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jordan stated the sunroom casement windows are not congruent with Design Guidelines Chap 2 #17: *New windows must be compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, size, materials, and details.*

Chairman Jordan stated a major change is that a casement window can open and a sash can't.

Ms. Arnold asked about the price difference between casement and fixed windows.

Mr. Moore stated that casement windows would be about 25% more.

Mr. Postma stated the detail is visual and function has nothing to do with it.

Chairman Jordan reference the Staff Report mentions that a decision needs to be based on the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Kinane stated that the casement position falls under guideline #17 that states: *New windows must be compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, size, materials, and details.*

Mr. Caspar the replacement of casement windows with fixed sash windows would not be appropriate with the Design Guidelines.

Chairman Jordan asked for a simple vote on if single sash replacement for the sunroom windows is congruent with Design Guidelines. In favor: Dennard, Postma, Walston. Opposed: Arnold, Caspar, Gee, and Jordan.

Chairman Jordan read the Findings of Facts for application #16-09, 508 W. Fifth Street regarding the sunroom casement windows only.

The COA application was completed and submitted on July 23, 2016. The COA application is for replacement of windows. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on July 18, 2016 and July 26, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on July 11, 2016. This hearing was held July 26, 2016. Ms. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Mr. Michael Moore presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-18 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors are applicable. The replacement of the sunroom casement windows is found to be not congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Caspar made a motion to adopt the findings of facts for the sunroom casement windows only, Ms. Arnold seconded. In favor: Dennard, Walston, Arnold, Caspar, Gee and Jordan. Opposed: Postma. The motion passed carried.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the COA application to replace the windows with real wood, permanent mutin windows as proposed with the exception of the sunroom windows, seconded by Mr. Caspar and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Caspar made a motion to approve the replacement of the sunroom windows with real wood and mutin casement windows as currently existing or with compatible designed windows that meet the Design Guidelines as approved by Staff with SHPO's recommendations, seconded by Ms. Arnold and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the COA application regarding the replacement of sunroom windows with the condition they be real wood and mutin casement windows as currently existing or with compatible designed windows that meet the Design Guidelines as approved by Staff with SHPO's recommendations, seconded by Mr. Caspar, and the motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of Pokémon Go

Chairman Jordan distributed to members a copy of an email he received from Councilman Godley regarding Pokémon Go. Councilmember Godley read a newspaper article that stated Savannah Georgia has incorporated their historic society with the Pokémon Go game. Chairman Jordan stated that the game is played on cell phones and people "catch" mythical creatures at PokeStops.

Councilman McLean Godley, Councilwoman Kandie Smith and City Manager Barbara Lipscomb felt it would be a good way to promote Greenville's Historic Preservation.

Chairman Jordan recognized Councilwoman Smith in attendance. He stated the members would need to decide if this request fits within the HPC's purview and possibly have the publicity committee research it.

Attorney Little stated that a simple motion to refer it to the publicity committee for research and to report at next meeting.

Mr. Caspar made a motion to continue Pokémon Go until the next meeting in order to find out more information about it. Seconded by Mr. Postma. No vote taken.

Mr. Caspar stated that fads come and go. By the time the game has run its course it might be a waste of time for the HPC. He stated he does not think it is appropriate for the HPC.

Mr. Dennard stated he would like to have the publicity committee bring the research back to the Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Caspar made a revised motion to continue Pokémon Go to the next meeting and have the publicity committee bring a report. Seconded by Ms. Arnold and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No one spoke for public comment.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they met for the COA on tonight's agenda.

Publicity Committee

Mr. Postma stated they met and discussed a Communications Plan to educate owners, renters, and students of properties in the Historic District.

Selection Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they did not meet.

Chairman Jordan asked on the status on a designation of a local landmark.

Ms. Kinane stated she is still writing letters.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Kinane stated that HPC Annual Report will be presented by Chairman Jordan at the August 15th City Council Meeting. She stated that Secretary Klutz will be potentially speaking at this meeting to thank the State for historic tax credits.

Ms. Arnold passed a flyer of a renovated historic property by Dr. Beverly Harris that is for sale.

Mr. Postma stated he is working with the group that will select an image to be placed as a mural on the owner donated space at 718 Dickinson Avenue. He also stated he counted 83 trashcans, 5 cars and 7 satellites in front yards today in the College View District.

Attorney Little stated that they can't fight the FCC regarding satellites because their guidelines supersede the City and state you cannot tell them where they can or cannot place the dish.

Chairman Jordan stated that this was Attorney Little's last meeting with the HPC. He is retiring at the end of the month.

Councilmember Smith stated she is the liaison to the HPC. She thanked members for their hard work. She sees the lack of education in the historic district. She encouraged members to have an open mind on ways to draw people to historic properties. She stated Pokémon Go could be a very good idea if it can be done safely and cost effectively. She stated there are always new ways to do things and she appreciates the members' passion.

Mr. Dennard asked if City Council is aware of the HPC importance. He stated that the HPC has been left out regarding downtown development.

Chairman Jordan stated that the HPC does not know things that City Council knows and Council never asks for the HPC opinion.

Mr. Postma agreed and stated the HPC should have been involved with the historic church on the Town Commons.

Councilmember Smith stated she will share this information with her peers. She stated that sometimes Staff doesn't know everything but will encourage that the HPC be included in more.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Dennard made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Arnold, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:22pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II