



City of Greenville
Design Review Board – Neighborhood Design Panel
Minutes of the **January 7th, 2021** Regular Meeting
Webex Virtual Meeting

Meeting Notice Posted on Wednesday, December 23rd, 2020
Minutes prepared by Austin Rutherford

Members Present: Fred Guthier, Matt Tindall, Jermaine Johnson and Allison Tucker

Members Absent: Monica Baretta

Staff Present: Jay Graham, Planning and Development Director; Logan Wells, Assistant City Attorney; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Courtney Powell, Planning Administrator; Kris Kurjiaka, Senior Development Planner; Harold Evangelista, Development Planner; Ross Zelenske, Development Planner; Austin Rutherford, Development Planner; Edward Kinney, Senior Landscape Architect; Kevin Howard, Senior Development Planner

Call to Order:

Chairman Fred Guthier called the virtual meeting to order at 3:00 PM. He welcomed those in attendance and explained the procedures for the meeting. Board member Monica Baretta was absent. The minutes of the December 3rd, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously. The agenda for the January 7th, 2021 meeting was approved unanimously. All affidavits were received. No conflicts of interests were cited.

Old Business

A. CA 20-348

Application by **BRUCE FELTON** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** to demolish an existing single-family residence at 108 Wilton St. (TM# 000900-04-00200).

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a rear building addition at 108 Wilton Street, located within the Heritage Preservation Overlay District. The proposal is to demolish the existing single-family home. The application was previously heard at the Board's August 6, 2020 meeting with the application being deferred to a later date over concerns that the applicant had not provided required materials for approval. The applicant has supplied an inspection and damage report, financial documents, and rehab cost estimates and analysis. Mr. Lonnerstater outlined staff's recommendation for denial as submitted.

Jermaine Johnson asked what the size of the existing home and the parameters of an economic hardship were. Staff noted that the definition of an economic hardship is that it does not limit a complete economic return upon the property or the ability to improve a property. Chair Fred Guthier noted continued discussion should be completed after the applicant completes their presentation.

Matt Tindall asked for the proposed square footage of the replacement home. This was noted on the plans by staff.

The applicant, Bruce Felton with the Sadler Company, address 107 Vanoy Drive, noted the conditions of the house, the costs of stabilizing the home, and the costs of remodeling the home. He also noted the home is not a contributing structure nor does the house have architectural features featured in contributing structures within the district. He noted the owner will redesign the replacement home but wanted assurance the existing home could be removed before investing in new plans.

Chair Fred Guthier asked for confirmation on the square footage of the existing home. Bruce Felton noted it to be 952 sf.

Chair Fred Guthier opened the floor to public comment:

Barbara Baker, of 8 Neal Street, asked for approval of the demolition as the existing home does not have historical significance and the neighborhood would be better served with its removal. She noted there is a new, small 2-story home being built across the street. She said she would not want to renovate such a home in its condition.

With no further speakers, the chair closed the floor for public comment.

Allison Tucker asked what the chief concern was from staff. Planner Lonnerstater noted the proposed replacement home did not meet the setbacks for the district and that staff always notes that the guidelines' first notion is to repair and renovate structures and if that is not an option, to move the structure. Demolition is the last option.

Allison Tucker asked if there are specific criteria on what constitutes an economic hardship. Assistant Town Attorney Logan Wells noted that the term the ordinance uses is unreasonable hardship instead. This exemption is a separate process.

Matt Tindall noted his view of a hardship due to the costs associated with a renovation and new construction. He believes that there is justification for the demolition but has concerns of the proposed replacement home.

Chair Fred Guthier noted that they had not approved demolition without also approving the replacement structure in the past, but noted that if demolition is approved, the replacement home should come back to the Board.

Planning Administrator Courtney Powell noted that in the past, the Board had approved demolition based on the existing structure itself but conditioned the replacement structure to come back to the Board for approval.

Chair Fred Guthier asked for how many stories the home under construction was across the street. Planning Administrator Courtney Powell noted it was a story and a half.

Matt Tindall moved to approve CA 20-348 with the condition that prior to any demolition upon the property, the applicant shall apply for a new certificate of appropriateness for new construction that meets the design guidelines and is approved by the Board. Motion seconded by Allison Tucker and approved 4-0.

New Business

A. CA 20-777

Application by **MATTHEW HIMLER** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for exterior building modifications and construction of a detached accessory structure at 23 Rowley St. (TM# 003400-01-02600).

Planner Rutherford presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new rear yard accessory garage, pool, and repaint of the existing home at 23 Rowley St., located within the East Park Preservation Overlay District. The proposed accessory garage features a flat roof with a shed roof second floor for living space and unroofed porch; the pool features a concrete and wood patio with wood fencing; and the repainting of the home to match the proposed colors of the accessory garage. Rutherford outlined staff's recommendation for denial as submitted.

Matthew Himler with Bloom Design Studio, architect for the project, presented revised plans to the Board. The revised plans show a hipped roof for the accessory structure and vertical fencing. The reason for the original shed design was to keep the height down. Painting the brick is due to the owner's not approving of the brick design of the home. The darker color ascent trim was due to the darker colored windows.

Chair Fred Guthier asked how the applicant is to address the fencing sight triangle. Mr. Himler noted the fence line could be altered in the rear to meet the sight triangle.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. There was no one who wished to speak. Therefore, the Chair closed the floor for public comment.

Matt Tindall asked if the fence design would need to be addressed during the permitting process. Planner Rutherford answered in the affirmative.

Matt Tindall noted this home was an anomaly and the newest structure in this district. He pondered why and how this home was approved. Given the home's design, this allows for an accessory structure to relate to the house. He further believed the original shed roof design was more appropriate than the revised hipped roof design.

Jermaine Johnson moved to approve CA 20-777 with the condition that the accessory garage retain its original shed roof design with a change in fence design and sight triangle. Motion seconded by Matt Tindall and approved 4-0.

Other Business (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None

Advice and Comment (Not a Public Hearing)

A. None

Informal Review (Not a Public Hearing):

A. None

Adjourn:

Having no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.