

**MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION**

June 25, 2013

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

RYAN WEBB, CHAIR
JEREMY JORDAN
KERRY CARLIN

ALICE ARNOLD
DAVID HURSH

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: SETH LAUGHLIN, PLANNER II; ELIZABETH BLOUNT, STAFF SUPPORT SPECIALIST.

OTHERS PRESENT: BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY; JONATHAN EDWARDS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Chairman Webb stated that the applicant would like to table Item Number 2 under New Business. Mr. Hursh made a motion to amend the agenda as stated, Mr. Jordan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve the minutes, Ms Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

COA 13-02 submitted by the City of Greenville for roof repairs

Mr. Laughlin presented the findings of fact for the Certificate of Appropriateness for roof repairs of the Municipal Building located at 201 W. 5th Street. The work would include replacement of the roof membrane, removal of police radio tower and installation of a new outer layer of bricks over the vertical wall on the 4th floor of the building. The Commission had formerly approved this application in 2011 but mechanical upgrades delayed the project. The Municipal Building is a local landmark. The applicable portions of the design guidelines to the application are changes to buildings referencing roofs and masonry. Staff recommends approval with the clear understanding that all plans and modifications comply with the City of Greenville's Design Guidelines and with obtaining all required permits, inspections and design requirements of the City of Greenville.

Ms Arnold made a motion to approve the findings of facts, Mr. Carlin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve the COA, Mr. Hursh seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

FIG APPLICATIONS 13-17 through 13-20 submitted by Jack Richardson for wood repair and painting and 13-21 and 13-22 submitted by Matthew Scully for awnings

Mr. Laughlin presented Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) applications for 805 Evans Street (4 applications) - Jones Lee House. The sites are within the FIG eligible area. FIG for the Jones Lee House is to prep and paint wood siding and to replace rotten wood as needed. Total request is \$6,226.50.

Mr. Laughlin also presented the Façade Improvement Grant for 431 Evans Street (2 applications) - The Scullery Restaurant for the installation of awnings over windows and doors. Total request is \$1,888.63.

The grand total for all the FIG applications would be \$8,115.13. The DRC recommended funding applications 13-17 through 13-20 (repair of wood siding and repainting of the Jones-Lee House) in their entirety with the understanding that any paint color choices be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings for a Victorian home. The DRC is concerned that the proposed colors are not appropriate and may not adequately highlight the home's many siding design types.

The DRC recommends that the HPC fund Application #'s 13-21 and 13-22. The available amount of funding is \$31,800.50 which leaves \$23,685.37 in the fund account.

Attorney Little asked if the colors for the landmark have to be consistent with the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Laughlin stated correct.

Chairman Webb stated that the DRC asked about the contrast in the chosen colors and the applicant stated they would add a third color.

Mr. Laughlin stated that DRC was concerned that the colors selected by the applicant may not be consistent with Design Guidelines. The applicant is willing to work with DRC and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for appropriate color selection. SHPO suggested the main color be a light color and the trim be darker to highlight the multiple design features of the home. SHPO stated that the pink color paint was

probably not an exterior color used at the time the house was built. The paint was approved prior to the home becoming a local landmark.

Mr. Hursh asked if the paint selection is normally two colors.

Mr. Laughlin stated two or three colors that are earth tone or red is the norm. He suggested that HPC approve the application with the stated condition that DRC will meet with the applicant.

Chairman Webb stated that the DRC does not have to fund all sides since some sides are more visible than others and funds are normally awarded to the most visible sides.

Mr. Laughlin stated that each application should be looked at individually. The awarding of funds is setup so that multiple applications can be considered when dealing with limited funds.

Chairman Webb stated that awarding funding has to be budgeted since no funding was given for next fiscal year.

Mr. Laughlin stated that no additional funding was given for this fiscal year due to the current financial climate.

Mr. Hursh stated that not funding the back façade makes sense since the Commission is limited to existing funds.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the Commission could table the application until the DRC meets with the applicant or approve the application with the exception of the paint colors.

Attorney Little stated that the Commission could make a motion to approve the application with the exception of the paint colors and award the funding contingent upon the DRC approving the colors.

Mr. Hursh asked if the application is approved can it be for less than the amount requested.

Attorney Little stated that the Commission does not have to fill the amount requested but the reasoning why must be stated in the motion.

Mr. Hursh if funding was split between sides and denied the back what would be the reasoning.

Chairman Webb stated the back is not as visual and limited funds.

Ms Arnold suggested funding the entire application or none at all so that one side would not look out of place.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he suspected the applicant would still do the project and pay the cost for the side not funded.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve FIG applications 13-17, 13-18 and 13-20 for the amount requested, recognizing that the Commission discussed approving a smaller amount because the property is a local landmark and it is prominently located on Evans St with the conditions that the colors are referred to the DRC for approval, Mr. Hursh seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hursh asked how much money should be saved for the upcoming year.

Chairman Webb stated that the Commission is normally funded \$25,000 per year and if the applications are funded it would leave approximately \$23,000.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he took the proposed colors for applications 13-21 and 13-22 to SHPO and they approved the colors.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve applications 13-21 and 13-22, Ms Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Minor Works COA's

No COA's were issued for the month of June.

Rear Yard Parking Regulations and Enforcement Options

Mr. Laughlin stated that the University Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (UNRI) Taskforce has requested HPC input on the proposed rear yard parking standards (The City of Greenville's Zoning Ordinance currently does not address parking in rear yards)

- Additional rear yard parking guidelines are being proposed in the updated HPC Design Guidelines
- Once zoning ordinance and Design Guideline amendments are adopted, the more-restrictive standards will apply

The proposed rear yard standards for design guidelines update are as follows:

- New parking areas must be located as unobtrusively as possible in an area screened from public view
- Locating off-street parking in front yards is not permitted.

- Locating off-street parking in the side yard is not permitted if the area would be visible from the street or the front yard.
- All new parking areas must be screened from adjoining properties with fencing or shrubbery.
- Existing mature trees should be incorporated into new parking areas whenever possible, and new trees introduced to maintain the tree canopy.
- Large off-street parking areas encompassing so much of the rear yard that the residential character of the site is lost are not permitted.
- New driveways and parking areas may not directly abut the principal structure.

The UNRI proposed parking ordinance includes the following:

- Single family dwellings and two family attached dwelling units shall be limited to the parking and/or storage of four vehicles, boats, trailers, campers and the like total per site. This requirement is not intended to limit the occasional parking of guest.
- When rear yard parking and/or rear yard storage of vehicles, boats, trailers, campers and the like is utilized and are visible from adjoining properties from ground level screening is required. Screening materials can either be a fence at least six (6) feet in height that creates a complete visual barrier from adjoining properties or evergreen vegetative materials that will reach a height of six (6) feet and create a complete visual barrier from adjoining properties within two (2) years of planting.
- Rear yard parking areas shall be connected to the front and/or side yard parking areas by a driveway constructed of an all-weather material such as asphalt, concrete, brick, CABC or any other approved materials.
- Rear yard parking areas shall be contained and delineated by a barrier at least six (6) inches in height.

Mr. Laughlin read the Design Guidelines for opaque fencing.

Chairman Webb asked did the Design Guidelines trump the UNRI ordinance.

Mr. Laughlin stated whichever standard is more restrictive.

Chairman Webb asked would any owner wanting to expand their backyard have to get a COA.

Mr. Laughlin stated correct.

Chairman Webb asked what will be done to the existing areas that are out of compliance.

Mr. Laughlin stated that staff, code enforcement and some HPC members have discussed the current situations. Once both standards are adopted then actions will be taken in accordance to the standards to bring back the character of the backyard.

Chairman Webb asked how the Commission can ensure that additional progress is not taken before the standards are adopted.

Mr. Laughlin stated that if situations are brought to staff then they will provide appropriate action.

Chairman Webb asked if staff knew how many homes were not currently in compliance.

Mr. Laughlin stated that there are less than ten large areas not in compliance.

Mr. Hursh asked if the owners were aware of the changes.

Mr. Laughlin stated that one has been contacted and informed to consider the changes they would need to make to their property.

Chairman Webb asked if they are already out of compliance.

Mr. Laughlin stated correct.

Mr. Hursh asked if reclamation was an option.

Mr. Laughlin stated it depends on the adopted standards. The applicant can come to the Commission with their proposal.

Mr. Jordan asked if existing situations will be grandfathered.

Mr. Laughlin stated that once the standards are adopted then staff will contact the applicants and move forward with any reclamation options.

Mr. Hursh asked why staff has not acted on the existing violations.

Mr. Jordan stated that the Commission has acted on some violations.

Chairman Webb stated that he did not want the Commission to be driven by neighbors' complaints.

Mr. Hursh stated that some existing properties have multiple violations.

Mr. Laughlin stated that enforcement has been delayed so that property owners can make all necessary changes once the new standards are adopted.

Mr. Jordan asked if the Commission or the property owner had to prove when the work was done on a property.

Attorney Little stated that the owner would have the burden to show the work was in place before the changes and that they followed the grandfather rules.

Mr. Jordan asked if the parking was in place before the district was established then is the parking grandfathered forever.

Attorney Little stated correct and the parking under the UNRI would depend upon City Council's wording of the ordinance.

Mr. Jordan suggested that the Commission tell UNRI to pay attention to the grandfather part of the Design Guidelines.

Chairman Webb added that also a number of existing properties are out of compliance. He also asked if a property owner could re-gravel a backyard.

Attorney Little stated that the parking pad would have to meet the lot restrictions such as 40% of an area can be converted to a parking area.

Chairman Webb asked can a property owner maintain gravel and leave it graveled forever.

Attorney Little stated that it would have to be determined whether it is an approved or unapproved surface according to the definition. If the situation is a non conforming use, then the property is not grandfathered and a special use permit would not be allowed.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the main issue would be to address existing situations and possibly adding an amortization of one year to bring the situations to compliance.

Mr. Jordan asked if the UNRI had legal counsel.

Attorney Little stated he believed they did.

Mr. Laughlin stated that any ordinance would go to the City Attorney's Office prior to going to City Council. He suggested that the Commission make a motion to address their comments.

The Commission addressed keeping the character of the home, the number of vehicles being able to occupy the rear yard and existing violations.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the Commission can address each property individually that is in violation at the current time.

Mr. Jordan asked if the on-street parking had been approved by City Council.

Chairman Webb stated yes and delineated the area for on-street parking.

Mr. Hursh asked how many vehicles will be allowed to park on the street.

Chairman Webb stated any resident is allowed to get a sticker for on-street parking.

Mr. Hursh suggested that only four vehicles should be allowed per property.

Chairman Webb stated that he was not sure how the standards would be enforceable. There are other things in the Historic District that are not in compliance besides the back yard parking.

Chairman Webb suggested that the UNRI add the statement concerning keeping the residential character of the site to the ordinance.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to make a comment to the UNRI group to pay close attention to how the grandfather portion of enforcement is handled and that they add "large off-street parking areas encompassing so much of the rear yard that the residential character of the site is lost are not permitted." to their statement about four vehicles in the back yard, Mr. Hursh seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No one spoke during public comment period.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee did meet to discuss the Façade Improvement Grant applications.

Publicity and Selection did not meet.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the local landmark will be on next month's agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Laughlin stated that the Design Guidelines were dispersed to the Commission and comments were welcomed. The public input presentation will be next month. A PDF of the guidelines will be posted on the city's website and emailed to stakeholders and a mailer to the public.

Chairman Webb stated that Commission members should provide their comments to staff by the end of the week.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Carlin made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Hursh seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Seth Laughlin, Planner II