



City of Greenville
Design Review Board – Neighborhood Design Panel
Minutes of the **September 3rd, 2020** Regular Meeting
Webex Virtual Meeting
Meeting Notice Posted on Tuesday, August 18th, 2020
Minutes prepared by Matt Lonnerstater

Members Present: Fred Guthier, Jermaine Johnson, and Allison Tucker
Members Absent: Monica Floyd, Matt Tindall
Staff Present: Jay Graham, Planning and Development Manager, Logan Wells, Assistant City Attorney; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Courtney Powell, Kris Kurjiaka, 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. The minutes of the August 6th, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously. The agenda for the September 3rd, 2020 meeting was approved unanimously. All affidavits were received. No conflicts of interest were cited. Lonnerstater called out to the public to gather names for public comment.

Old Business:

A. None

New Business:

A. APL 20-395

Application by **TIM KEARNS** to **APPEAL** the administrator's decision on CAS 20-386 to approve with conditions exterior modifications at 126 James St. (TM# 003000-01-00100).

Planner Kurjiaka presented the application for an appeal of the administrator's conditional approval of CAS 20-386. CAS 20-386 was approved with conditions on July 15th, 2020 and involved proposed exterior modifications to the home at 126 James St.: paint stucco/exterior brick and replace metal columns on the porch to wood craftsman-style columns. The staff condition stated, *"The request to re-paint the existing brick to Benjamin Moore 'Dove White' is not approved as the request fails to satisfy Design Guideline HR 9.C: "Brick that was not painted historically should not be painted."* The appeal relates to the applicant's desire to paint the brick.

Tim Kearns, applicant, 126 James St., stated that the main reason for the request to paint the brick relates to the fact that the existing home features four different types of brick; the white paint would provide a more uniform look. Mr. Kearns presented a picture of the existing brick. Mr. Kearns claimed that there are six houses on Earle St. that have painted brick: 210 E. Earle St., 222 E. Earle St., 116 E. Earle St., 26 E. Earle St., 9 E. Earle St., and 331 W. Earle St.

Chairman Guthier asked the applicant to clarify which side of the home features multiple brick types. Mr. Kearns stated that the front features two types of brick and the back features multiple types of brick. Mr. Kearns stated that there is no structural/integral damage to the existing bricks.

Chairman Guthier opened the floor up for public comment.

Lisa Perkinson, 123 James St., spoke in opposition of the proposed white paint, claiming that there are no other homes on James St. with painted brick.

John Michael McCauley, 122 James St., spoke in favor of request to paint the house, but against the proposed white color. Staff confirmed that Mr. McCauley's written letter had been received by the Board.

Chairman Guthier closed the floor for public comment.

Allison Tucker agreed that several homes on Earle St. had previously been approved to be painted but acknowledged that Earle St. and James St. have different characters. Tucker stated that she is torn on whether to approve the paint if no other homes on James St. are painted.

Jermaine Johnson stated that additional information would help with the discussion. Johnson's initial response is to deny the appeal based on a strict interpretation of the guidelines. The provided photos do not provide enough evidence regarding the existing brick.

Chairman Guthier stated that James St. is unique in that a majority of the homes are brick. Guthier stated that additional photos/evidence should be provided to show the different types of brick on the house. Guthier stated that he defers to staff's report. The proposed white color would potentially be out of line with the colors on James St.

Allison Tucker asked Assistant Attorney Wells to provide clarification on the process for acting on this appeal.

Assistant Attorney Wells clarified that the appeal only relates to the brick being painted. Planner Lonnerstater clarified that the request for the window trim and porch columns had already been approved by staff; the only item being appealed is the condition that the house cannot be painted white. Lonnerstater stated that, if the board were to deny this appeal, they would be upholding the administrator's previous decision.

Mr. Kearns asked if action on the appeal could be postponed until the next meeting so that he can come forward with additional information, renderings and photos. Assistant Attorney Wells clarified that the process for an appeal is different from that of a Certificate of Appropriateness; an opportunity to provide additional information could be granted under a new Certificate of Appropriateness.

Allison Tucker moved to uphold the administrator's conditional approval of CA 20-386. Seconded by Jermaine Johnson and approved 3-0.

Other Business (Not a Public Hearing):

A. RHP 18-604

Application by **THE FURMAN CO.** for a **FINAL CERTIFICATION FOR TAX ASSESSMENT FOR REHABILITATED HISTORIC PROPERTIES** at 556 Perry Ave. (TM# 012300-17-00100).

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for Final Certification for Tax Assessment for Rehabilitated Historic Properties relating to 556 Perry Ave., known as Poe West. Poe West received preliminary certification approval on August 2, 2018. A site visit with staff and two members of the DRB took place on August 21, 2020. Lonnerstater overviewed the four criteria for approving final certification and, citing compliance with these 4 criteria, recommended approval to the board with conditions.

Robert Poppleton, Furman Co., applicant, thanked staff and the DRB for supporting the tax assessment program.

Chariman Guthier stated that he and Matt Tindall, along with staff, visited the site. Guthier stated that the applicants have done a good job with the improvements.

Jermaine Johnson moved to approve final certification of RHP 18-604 with staff conditions: 1) The project shall remain consistent with the approval conditions of the National Park Service's approval letter; 2) Any changes to the scope of work shall be submitted to the DRB for review as a modification; and 3) All project work shall be completed within five years of issuance of the preliminary certification. Motion seconded by Allison Tucker and approved 3-0.

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 3:55 p.m.