

**DRAFT OF MINUTES PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION BY THE GREENVILLE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

July 24, 2012

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:

JEREMY JORDAN, CHAIR
RYAN WEBB
JORDAN KEARNEY
DAVID HURSH

KERRY CARLIN
MAURY YORK
SARA LARKIN

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

OTHERS PRESENT: BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY; COUNCIL MEMBER MARION BLACKBURN, CITY COUNCIL; JONATHAN EDWARDS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the agenda as written, Ms Larkin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms Larkin made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, Mr. Kearney seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

HISTORIC PRESERVATION LOAN PROGRAM APPLICATION

Mr. Seth Laughlin presented one loan application submitted by Mike and Susan McCammon for their property at 206 S. Library Street. The application is for the driveway replacement and removal of adjacent tree. The estimate for repairs is \$7,244. All work can be completed by a minor work certificate of appropriateness. The Design Review Committee did meet concerning the application and granted the full 20 points and the \$10,000 for the loan. The budget remaining amount for loans after the award of this application is \$70,000.

Mr. Webb asked when the payments of the loan will be added back to the program.

Mr. Laughlin stated that payments have been made in the amount of \$1,200 and placed into a revenue account.

Mr. Hursh stated that the drawings were confusing and it appeared that the applicants were going with another option.

Mr. Jordan stated that the only option that would work would be to go with the existing design with modifications.

Mr. Kearney asked about the concrete slab located near the driveway.

Mr. Laughlin stated that it was the foundation of another structure.

Ms Larkin made a motion to approve the application, Mr. Webb seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Minor Works COA's

Staff reported three Certificates of Appropriateness issued: 530 South Evans St. (Sheppard Memorial Library)- replace roof membrane, 300 S Summit St. – replace HVAC unit, and 206 S. Library St. – replace driveway and nuisance tree removal.

No one spoke during public comment period.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee did meet and had the recommendation of the loan application.

Publicity Committee has not met.

Selection Committee has not met but needs to meet to discuss local landmark designation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Attorney Bill Little provided an update concerning the 3 unrelated occupancy standard. Staff is currently looking at all options and comprising a report for City Council. He stated the jurisdictional authority of the Historic Preservation Commission in relationship to the 3 unrelated standards will only apply to the exterior of a building. The 3 unrelated current standards deal with the interior use of a structure. Attorney Little stated that the Historic Preservation Commission may go to any town meeting or public hearing and express their opinion concerning the impact the 3 unrelated occupancy standards may have on Historic Preservation exterior structures. He advised the Commission that any resolution made may not have any effect because the Commission does not have interior use jurisdiction and the resolution may be perceived wrong by City Council.

Mr. York stated that the vehicles of the people in the homes may cause problems to the exterior of the home.

Attorney Little said another ordinance can address parking situations and Code

Enforcement has a method of addressing those situations.

Chairman Jordan stated that in the past the Commission has submitted resolutions and asked if the only action that the Commission could take was to state an opinion on the standard.

Attorney Little stated yes.

Chairman Jordan asked for an alternative method to the resolution.

Attorney Little stated that the Commission chair could send a letter to the City Clerk and asked that it be placed in the City Council notes for the August meeting.

Mr. York read the responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Commission concerning proposing changes to ordinances and offered the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF GREENVILLE REQUESTING NO CHANGES BE MADE TO THE
EXISTING OCCUPANCY STANDARDS**

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission was established to act as both a historic district and historic landmarks commission for the City of Greenville;

WHEREAS, a change in the current ordinance prohibiting more than three unrelated persons from living in the same dwelling, to allow a higher number of occupants, likely would have a negative impact on many of the historic homes and landscapes within the city's historic neighborhoods, particularly the College View Historic District;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Greenville that:

1. it respectfully urges the members of the Greenville City Council not to enact such change; and
2. the preservation planner shall communicate this resolution to members of the Greenville City Council

Mr. Hursh asked Mr. York would he object to putting the resolution into an opinion letter for City Council.

Mr. York stated the resolution was an opinion.

Mr. Hursh called for discussion.

Mr. Kearney asked does the city have a set limit of the number of people that can live in

one home.

Attorney Little said the city has a definition of family and an ordinance states that no more than 3 unrelated people may be able to live in one home.

Mr. York stated that the standard does not just affect the house but also the landscape, driveway and the entire property.

Mr. Hursh stated that the resolution is the opinion of the Commission and is not inflammatory. He said he would like the Commission to have another option versus the resolution.

Attorney Little stated that the other option would be an alternative to the motion of the resolution.

Mr. York made a motion to submit the resolution and pointed out that the motion required a second. Mr. Webb seconded. Those voting in favor: York, Hursh, Carlin, Webb and Larkin. Those voting in opposition: Kearney. Motion passed.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Kearney made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Webb seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Seth Laughlin, Planner II