



**City of Greenville**  
**Design Review Board – Neighborhood Design Panel**  
Minutes of the **August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020** Regular Meeting  
**Webex Virtual Meeting**  
Meeting Notice Posted on Wednesday, July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020  
Minutes prepared by Matt Lonnerstater

---

Members Present: Monica Floyd, Fred Guthier, Jermaine Johnson, Matt Tindall and Allison Tucker  
Members Absent: None  
Staff Present: Jay Graham, Planning and Development Manager, Logan Wells, Assistant City Attorney; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Courtney Powell, Senior Development Planner; Brennan Williams, Community Development Division; Kris Kurjiaka, Development Planner; Emilie Hegarty, Economic Development Division

**Call to Order:**

Chairman Fred Guthier called the virtual meeting to order at 3:03 PM. He welcomed those in attendance and explained the procedures for the meeting. The minutes of the July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously. The agenda for the August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting was approved unanimously. All affidavits were received. Matt Tindall cited a conflict of interest for case CA 20-376. Lonnerstater called out to the public to gather names for public comment.

**Old Business:**

A. None

**New Business:**

A. **CA 20-348**

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

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing non-contributing one-story single-family home within the Heritage Preservation District and construct a new two-story single-family home. Lonnerstater outlined the Land Management Ordinance standards for approving demolition in Preservation Overlay Districts and highlighted several design guidelines relating to demolition. Lonnerstater explained staff's findings: the applicant did not provide detailed financial reports regarding rehabilitation costs and existing conditions; the primary plane of the proposed façade reads as a two-story structure and is not compatible with existing one/one-and-a-half story homes on the block; and the proposed structure fails to meet RM-2 rear setback standards. Based on these findings, staff recommended denial of the demolition request.

Bruce Felton, applicant, stated that he did not provide a cost analysis for repairs/home rehabilitation. Mr. Felton maintained that, while there are no two-story homes on this block, two-story homes can be found within the Heritage Overlay District. Mr. Felton maintained that the two-story home would provide a good transition into the neighborhood given the approved townhouses next door. Regarding the proposed demolition of the existing house, Mr. Felton stated that the existing home does not fit in with the neighborhood given its lack of detailed architectural features.

Matt Tindall asked why the existing home could not be renovated.

Mr. Felton responded that there is a termite infestation and questionable plumbing on-site. Mr. Felton stated that the home inspector hired by the property owners would not enter the home due to water in the crawl space.

Matt Tindall asked how the applicant would respond to the fact that the proposed structure does not meet setback requirements.

Mr. Felton explained that the garage would require a setback variance.

Chairman Guthier opened the floor up for public comment. No one spoke in favor or against the application. Chairman Guthier closed the floor for public comment.

Monica Floyd stated that the economic report should be provided as it is required by the ordinance and design guidelines. Floyd commented that the two-story element does not bother her, but that the setbacks would need to be revised.

Alison Tucker commented that the two-story element is not a problem, but the economic/financial reports would need to be addressed. Tucker stated that the DRB cannot guarantee the approval of a variance.

Matt Tindall stated that the burden is on the applicant to provide the required financial reports regarding the existing house. Tindall commented that there is still room for repair and renovation of the existing house. The design of the new home does not meet the setbacks and he does not see a hardship to allow a variance; if a variance is not granted, the design will need to be modified. Tindall commented that, regarding the proposed design, he did not see historic qualities typically found in a historic district.

Jermaine Johnson commented that there is an existing two-story home on the corner of Wilton and Stone.

Chairman Guthier commented that the existing house does not exhibit many historic qualities, but that there are advantages to renovating the house rather than demolishing it. Guthier commented that a setback variance is not guaranteed and that a new home should be compatible with the scale of existing homes on the street. More evidence needs to be provided to support demolition.

Assistant Attorney Wells commented that, if desired, the applicant should voluntarily request deferral of the application. Mr. Felton commented that he is willing to defer the new proposed construction but would like to proceed with the request for demolition.

Planning Manager Graham commented that the applicant should provide a response to each of the seven standards for demolition outlined in the Land Management Ordinance.

Mr. Felton agreed to defer the entire application to a later date.

**Monica Floyd moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to a later meeting date. The motion was seconded by Jermaine Johnson and approved 5-0.**

Matt Tindall recused himself from the meeting, citing a conflict of interest with the next case, CA 20-376.

**B. CA 20-376**

Application by **MATT TINDALL** for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for a building and deck addition at 21 Harcourt Dr. (TM# 003700-01-01500).

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a pantry/deck addition towards the side of the existing home and enclose the existing screened-in porch at the front of the house. The existing home is located in the East Park Historic District but does not contribute to the district. Lonnerstater presented staff's findings that the application satisfies the Design Guidelines; staff recommended approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mel Middleton, Tindall Architecture, outlined the plans to add a pantry addition and covered porch and enclose the screened-in porch to create a brick entry with paneled wood doors/windows. Ms. Middleton stated that a modified brick may be requested in the future.

Chairman Guthier opened the floor up for public comment. No one spoke in favor or against the application. Chairman Guthier closed the floor for public comment.

Monica Floyd inquired about an existing large tree on the property. Ms. Middleton stated that the existing tree would likely not be impacted by the proposed improvements.

**Monica Floyd moved to approve application CA 20-376 with the following condition: city staff may approve an alternate brick, if proposed. Motion seconded by Jermaine Johnson 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 3:53 p.m.