

**MINUTES**  
**TOWN OF FORT MILL**  
**HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2020**  
**Council Chambers – 112 Confederate Street**  
**4:30 PM**

Present: Chairman Louis Roman, Assistant Chairman David Booth, Carmen Banks, Megan Brinton, Scott Couchenour, Samantha Nifong, Sarah Shaw, Planning Director Penelope Karagounis, Senior Planner Alex Moore

Guests: Jacob Saylor, Allen Brooks, Bayles Mack, Honour Trosper, Stan Lamb

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Louis Roman called the meeting to order at 4:34 PM.

**ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON**

Scott Cochenour made a motion to nominate Louis Roman as Chairman. Chairman Roman recused himself and Vice-Chairman David Booth then presided Vice-Chairman David Booth then seconded the motion to nominate Louis Roman as Chairman. By a vote of 5-0, the HRB elected Louis Roman as Chairman for the year 2020.

Chairman Roman returned to the meeting and noted that nominations would then be accepted for vice-chairperson. Scott Cochenour made a motion to nominate David Booth as Vice-Chairman for the year 2020. Carmen Banks seconded the motion. By a vote of 5-0, the HRB elected David Booth as Vice-Chairman for the year 2020.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Roman entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019, meeting as presented. Megan Brinton made a motion to approve the minutes. Carmen Banks seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved with by a vote of 5-0.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Chairman Roman opened the new business portion of the meeting by noting the contents of the agenda and the associated packet of information.

**NEW BUSINESS ITEM NO. 1**

**COA request for a ground sign and associated ingress/egress piers at 303 Tom Hall Street**

Senior Planner Moore then introduced the first new business item on the agenda by noting the COA request by Unity Presbyterian Church. This request would allow Unity Presbyterian Church to construct a ground sign and

associated directional piers at 303 Tom Hall Street. Specifically, the COA request and review by HRB is required because the property is on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Senior Planner Moore then noted that the applicant had come before HRB on November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 for an informational session on the proposed sign at this location. Thus, the HRB was familiar with the request. However, Moore noted that shortly thereafter, in December 2018, a fire occurred at Unity Presbyterian Church. This fire delayed the Church in making formal application for the sign and associated ingress/egress piers.

Moore then illustrated the particulars of the request using the materials as provided within the HRB meeting packet. Additionally, he went over the Town of Fort Mill zoning and historic design requirements for such a proposal as follows:

#### HEIGHT

- Maximum permitted height for a ground sign: Eight (8) feet
- Proposed height of the ground sign: Eight (8) feet

#### NUMBER OF GROUND SIGNS

- Maximum number of ground signs: One (1) for each street frontage.
- Number of proposed ground signs for the respective street frontage: One (1)

#### MAXIMUM AREA

- Maximum square footage for a non-illuminated, ground sign: Eighty (80) square feet
- Proposed square footage for this non-illuminated, ground sign: Eighty (80) square feet

#### MINIMUM SETBACK

- Minimum setback required for a ground sign: Fifteen (15) feet from any property line and/or three feet from any right-of-way.
- Proposed setback for this ground sign: Fifteen (15) feet from the street right-of-way.

#### ADVERTISING MESSAGE

- Letters, symbols, and graphics of a ground sign should not occupy more than 40% of the total sign area.
- The lettering of this proposed ground sign, which includes 11 square feet, occupies approximately 14% of the total sign area.

Moore went on to note that the property is located within the Tom Hall Street Corridor District (THCD). Signage is not addressed within the THCD provisions. However, there are building material requirements which include rock, stone, brick, and wood and other materials deemed appropriate. Ingress/egress directional signage has typically been allowed for businesses within the Town of Fort Mill. The proposed directional signs will replace existing ingress/egress signage on the Unity Presbyterian Church property. The piers as submitted within the application meet the materials requirements of the THCD as noted above.

Senior Planner Moore then provided the recommendation that the HRB grant **APPROVAL** for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed ground sign and associated directional piers at 303 Tom Hall Street.

Senior Planner Moore then opened the floor to questions from HRB members.

Megan Brinton asked if the sign would be illuminated.

Moore stated that the information as submitted by the church did not indicate illumination. However, he did note that they could provide up-lighting from the ground toward the sign.

Moore then invited Mr. Jacob Saylor, Unity Presbyterian Church administrative officer, to address the HRB on the signage proposal.

Mr. Saylor began by noting that Unity was very excited to be able to have a new sign which would be able to be read by passing motorists. The current signage simply did not lend itself to being discernable by those driving by. The new design was generated by feedback from the HRB and Planning Staff in November 2018. That previous informational session allowed Unity to come up with an appropriate design for the signage.

David Booth asked about the landscaping materials which would be used in conjunction with the proposed signage.

Senior Planner Moore noted that there were some landscaping materials indicated within the elevation submittals which consisted of a crepe myrtle and small, flowering vegetation. Moore stated that while this was good, landscaping materials are not specifically required by the Town of Fort Mill Zoning Ordinance with new ground signage. Moore stated that it was his understanding that the church did intend to do some type of landscaping around the sign, however.

David Booth noted that there was discussion about landscaping materials adjacent to the signage at the previous meeting in November 2018. Booth stated that he was attempting to discern if the HRB intended to require such landscaping as part of its review and approval.

Senior Planner Moore then asked Mr. Saylor if the church intended to incorporate landscaping materials within the signage project.

Mr. Saylor stated that the 2018 informational submittal did include canopy-type trees, but that the current proposal included an understory tree as shown in the current schematic. He noted that the church wanted to be able to complete the project expeditiously, and thus they had revised the proposed landscaping materials.

David Booth asked for clarification on whether the current application was independent of the previous application in November 2018.

Senior Planner Moore noted that the previous submittal was just for informational purposes and not an official application.

Chairman Roman inquired if the church would need to come back to the HRB for review and approval for future up-lighting of the signage.

Moore stated that they would not need to come back to the HRB, but that the light generated by such must be yellow or white in color.

Mr. Saylor indicated that there were no plans at this time to install up-lighting.

Scott Cochenour asked if the applicant had been required to pay a fee for the current application.

Senior Planner Moore stated that the applicant paid the standard \$250.00, non-residential HRB application fee.

Mr. Cochenour asked if such fees could be waived in the future for applications from non-profits.

Senior Planner Moore said that this could perhaps be investigated.

Planning Director Penelope Karagounis noted that she could investigate this possibility as the Town prepares the FY 2020-2021 budget.

Chariman Roman then stated that if there were no additional comments, he would entertain a motion on the certificate of appropriateness application.

Megan Brinton made a motion to approve the application as presented.

Samantha Nifong seconded the motion.

The HRB then voted 7-0 to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the signage request as submitted. HRB member Sarah Shaw arrived at the meeting after the voting for Chairman and Vice-Chairman, but prior to the vote for this COA.

### **NEW BUSINESS ITEM NO. 2**

#### **COA request for exterior building improvements at 219 Main Street**

Senior Planner Moore then introduced the second item on the agenda which was an application from Honour D. Trosper, represented by ALB Architecture, for a certificate of appropriateness (COA) to make exterior improvements at 219 Main Street.

Moore noted that the property is located within the downtown historic district and is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The property is known as the former Ardrey Drug Store and is currently used as an antique business.

Moore stated that the architect has proposed to return the building to its original architectural form which would include front façade alterations to include refurbished brick and likely paint removal. The full aluminum storefront and metal siding will be removed and replaced with brick masonry framed glass and wood display windows. A wood, recessed door will be added for sidewalk entry via steps. A faux door will be installed along the right façade. The aluminum awning will be replaced with fixed casement-display windows.

The rear elevation alterations will include removing the infill sections and replacing them with wood windows. Handicap accessibility will be added via a lift. A deck will be added across the loading dock. This section will be covered with a metal porch. HVAC equipment will be installed on the porch roof. Water, sewer, and electrical will be added along with a crawlspace behind the lift.

Senior Planner Moore then provided the following information for the review of zoning and historic district guidelines as applicable to 219 Main Street.

When considering an application for a COA for alteration, repair, or restoration, the HRB shall use the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as guidelines in making its decisions. These guidelines are to serve as the basis for determining the approval, approval with modification, or denial of a COA. These guidelines are listed below. The staff findings follow each guideline and are in **bold and underlined**.

- 1) Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its original intended purpose. **This is an adaptive reuse project. As such, significant historic characteristics of the exterior will be retained and refurbished while accommodating a new function. The proposed use for the building is a hair and aesthetician salon.**
- 2) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible. **The original qualities and character of this building are not being destroyed but rather enhanced. Non-contributing architectural features are proposed to be removed from both the front and rear elevations.**
- 3) All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged. **The proposed work to be done consists mostly of enhancements to the original architectural features of the building rather than alterations. The principal, contemporary exterior alteration includes the proposed ADA lift to be installed at the rear of the building so that proper accessibility will be granted.**
- 4) Changes which have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected. **This building is an example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century vernacular storefront. Subsequent changes to the front and rear building elevations are not reflective of that era and have not obtained significance in their own right.**
- 5) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity. **It is anticipated that distinctive features of this building will be treated with sensitivity. Materials submitted by the applicant indicate a desire to maintain significant, original features found on both the front and rear elevations.**
- 6) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visible qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by history, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings. **The applicant has indicated that there are significant, deteriorated architectural features on either elevation.**
- 7) The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building material shall not be undertaken.

**Sandblasting will not be used for this project. It is anticipated that surface cleaning will be done in a manner that is conducive to preservation.**

- 8) Every reasonable effort should be made to protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to the property. **There are no known archaeological resources that will be affected by this project.**
- 9) Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural materials, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment. **Contemporary design is not being used. This is an adaptive reuse project. The work will include refurbishment and enhancement of original architectural features.**
- 10) Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. **Neither additions or alterations are being proposed to the exterior of the building to the extent that the form and integrity of the structure might be impaired.**

#### ZONING DISTRICT GUIDELINES REVIEW

- The subject property being reviewed by the HRB is zoned LC, Local Commercial District.
- The proposed use is a hair and aesthetician salon. This is a permitted use within the LC District.

Senior Planner Moore then stated that Planning Staff recommended approval for the COA for the exterior improvements at 219 Main Street.

Moore then noted that the project architect, Allen Brooks of ALB Architecture, was in attendance to answer any questions on the project.

Mr. Brooks introduced himself and then gave an overview of the project.

There was some concern by David Booth regarding elements of the front façade, including the front step and handrails. Particularly, Mr. Booth wanted to ensure that these specific elements as depicted within the elevation drawings could indeed be constructed within the parameters of the building code.

Megan Brinton suggested that if elements of the new façade as approved by the HRB needed to change per building department review, then those changes be required to come back to HRB.

The HRB members concurred with the idea that if the façade design changed substantially, then it would need to come back before them for review.

Megan Brinton and Sarah Shaw expressed concern about the steel, structural element shared by 219 Main Street and 221 Main Street as to whether it would affect the design of the subject building.

Mr. Brooks noted that this should not be an issue.

Megan Brinton asked how they would remove the existing paint.

Mr. Brooks stated that they would of course not do sand blasting, but that they intended to do some type of chemical removal.

Discussion then moved the rear façade of the building.

David Booth asked if the air conditioning units would need to be screened.

Mr. Brooks indicated that they would do some type of metal screening at this location.

Scott Cochenour asked for clarification on the depth of the proposed, rear porch.

Mr. Brooks stated that the depth would be eight feet.

Chairman Roman noted that the back side of many of the structures along Main Street have needed some attention for some time. Thus, he was happy to see what was proposed here.

Mr. Brooks agreed and stated that he believed the plan for 219 Main Street would work out well.

David Booth then asked if the porch awning would align with the porch access on the adjacent building.

Scott Cochenour stated he thought it would be setback somewhat from the adjacent building's porch access.

Senior Planner Moore asked the HRB members if they wanted to further discuss the screening of the upper HVAC units on the rear of the building, or if they were satisfied with what was currently proposed.

David Booth suggested that the screening be the same color as the new metal roof.

Chairman Roman agreed and noted if the color was contrasting, then undue attention would be drawn to the HVAC units.

Sarah Shaw asked if the projecting sign shown on the color rendering of the front façade needed to be addressed at this meeting.

Senior Planner Moore stated that the applicants would need to come back to HRB when they had a definite design for this sign. Moore did note that the Town could consider it an extension of the current application so that they would not have to be charged another application fee.

Chairman Roman asked if there was an existing sign on the front façade.

Mr. Brooks stated that there was no sign currently in place.

Chairman Roman then agreed that the sign should be handled as a separate manner in the future.

Megan Brinton asked if the front elevation would also include a wall sign.

Mr. Brooks noted that there were no specific plans for wall signage, but that he did envision that there would be window signage.

David Booth asked if the HRB would need to review any of the proposed complementary colors.

Chairman Roman stated that this could be included in the motion.

Ms. Trosper suggested that the color white be implemented within such areas of the façade.

Chairman Roman then stated that he would entertain a motion on the request for the COA as presented.

David Booth made a motion to approve the front elevation as provided in the illustration, except that if the original brick cannot be refurbished, any revised plan to paint the brick shall be reviewed by the HRB. The front railing shall be black iron and the window and transom trim on the front elevation shall be white.

Mr. Booth continued with his motion to state that the rear elevation is approved as provided in the illustration, except that if the original brick cannot be refurbished, any revised plan to paint the brick shall be reviewed by the HRB. The window trim on the rear of the building shall be white. There shall be an addition of screening on the top of the aluminum porch roof which to screen the HVAC units. The color of the screen shall be the same as the aluminum porch roof. The railing on the rear porch shall be painted black aluminum or painted black wood.

Additionally, as previously noted within this meeting, any signage proposal for this building will need to return to HRB for review, provided that no additional application fee will be charged.

Scott Cochenour seconded this motion.

The HRB then voted 7-0 to approve this motion.

### **NEW BUSINESS ITEM NO. 3**

#### **Request for preliminary Bailey Bill certification at 219 Main Street**

Senior Planner Moore then introduced the request for preliminary Bailey Bill certification for 219 Main Street. Moore stated that in this instance, the HRB would need to review the proposed project and determine whether it is consistent with the standards for rehabilitation. Ultimately, *final* Bailey Bill certification authorizes a special tax assessment for rehabilitated historic properties which meet the eligibility criteria as established by Section 5-21-140 of the SC Code of Laws.

Moore noted that for income-producing on non-owner-occupied properties, an investment amount equaling 20% of the fair market value (FMV) was required to qualify for this special tax assessment. In the case of 219 Main Street, the FMV was determined by a real estate appraisal prepared by Fred H. Beck and Associates, LLC which indicated this figure to be \$420,000. Cost estimates provided by the applicant indicated expenditures to be \$422,900, thus greatly exceeding the minimum investment requirement of 20% or \$84,000.

Moore stated that if the HRB did grant preliminary approval the rehabilitation work could begin subsequent to plan review, approval, and issuance of permits by the Town of Fort Mill Building Department. Then the project must be completed within two years of the date of preliminary certification. Upon completion of the project, the applicants must return to HRB for final certification. The annual tax assessment will be based on the pre-rehab appraisal value of \$420,000. This tax abatement will continue for twenty years thereafter.

Senior Planner Moore then presented existing pictures of the interior of 219 Main Street along with drawings illustrating the proposed rehabilitation. Moore stated that it was anticipated that the first floor would be occupied by a hair salon and the second floor would be occupied by an aesthetician. Both uses are permitted at this location.

Chairman Roman asked if the information presented met the minimum Bailey Bill requirements.

Moore stated that based on the information submitted by the applicant, the project does indeed meet the minimum requirements for preliminary Bailey Bill certification.

Megan Brinton asked the applicant when the second-floor rehabilitation was going to take place.

Ms. Trosper stated that the rehab of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor would be done concurrently with the renovation of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Roman entertained a motion.

Scott Cochenour made a motion to approve the Bailey Bill preliminary certification of 219 Main Street.

David Booth seconded the motion.

The HRB then voted 7-0 to approve the motion for Bailey Bill preliminary certification of 219 Main Street.

On another matter, Scott Cochenour stated that he would appreciate it if Planning Staff would pass along to Town Council that parking on Main Street continued to be a problem.

There being no other business, Chairman Roman adjourned the meeting at 6:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alex J. Moore, AICP  
Senior Planner  
July 28, 2020