

**MINUTES**  
**Architectural Review Board**  
**February 1, 2016**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kevin Jayroe, Clare Reigart, Jerry Miller, Dwayne Vernon, & Linda Abate'

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Sally Gillespie & Glenn Roberts

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rick Martin, Janet Grant, Cindy Thompson, & Debra Grant

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:** January 4, 2016; **Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted; seconded by Mr. Dwayne Vernon; the motion carried unanimously.**
- III. **Public Input: None**
- IV. **New Business:** *(The agenda was amended to hear the 4<sup>th</sup> item first)*
  1. **Prince George Winyah Episcopal Church** is requesting the approval for demolition and alterations, at 315 Screven Street. **Rick Martin/City Staff** told the Board that the request is to demo two (2) structures and relocate one (1). Mr. Michael Walker/Architect is present to represent the church. **Mr. Miller/Chairman** asked how many structures would be affected. **Rick** said to his knowledge two (2) residential and one was a lawyer's office. The **Rev. Paul C. Fuener/Senior Pastor** told the Board that the church is trying to develop a church campus, and have been trying to acquire property on that block since 2006; in 2007 the Cuttino House was purchased (315 Screven), which is being requested to be relocated. The Freeman House (307 Screven) was purchased shortly thereafter, in 2015 the Nation Law Firm was purchased (317 Screven). Mr. Walker was hired to see how we can best use the property to develop it for the best use and enhance the look of Screven Street. **Michael Walker/Tych & Walker Architect** told the Board that the plan is to make the function of the church better. This will be a unified campus, with the growth being on Screven Street. The house at 307 Screven Street is proposed to be relocated off the property or demolished, 315 Screven Street to be relocated to 317 Screven where the Nation Law building is currently located. *(Mr. Walker had preliminary plans for the future look of the church campus)* This plan would create an edge around the property and allow an internal use of the property. The State Archives did not have a problem with the project as long as the height/orientation is maintained as well as the rhythm of the streetscape. This will allow the church to grow in the future and have better supervision of the youth. **Mr. Miller/Chairman** asked what Mr. Walker was asking for approval for today. **Mr. Walker** said today they are asking for the 307 and 317 to be demolished or relocated and 315 to be relocated to 317 Screven. **Ms. Abate'** said the request is similar to the request of the Catholic Church across the street that came before the Board previously and their application was approved. **Mr. Kevin Jayroe** asked if the Board put a time limit on the previous application for the Catholic Church. **Mr. Walker** said there was a timeline for them to advertise the building to be moved and if not successful then demolition. **Mr. Miller** asked about the timeline of this project. **Mr. Walker** said that the money is in the bank, however they will need to know how to proceed with fundraising. There immediate scheduling would be to relocate the rectory, and they have extensive renovations on the existing church in the future, but the first step would be to relocate the 315 house. There is a secondary structure

behind the 307 house and it too will be removed/demolished. **Ms. Reigart** asked if there is a basement under the 315 house and will it be relocated also. **Mr. Walker** said yes there is a basement, however it will not be moved. Mr. Brad Sauls/Archives and History said as long as the house remain the same height that would be the main concern. The fencing will be maintained and continued around the entire property. **Ms. Reigart** asked why they would not put a basement back on the house after it's moved. **Mr. Walker** said typically basements are not installed today because of the flooding in this area. **Ms. Reigart** said the entire house would be a part of the historical factor of the house including the basement. **Mr. Walker** said Archives and History did not feel that way. The basement is a stand up basement and is about 2 ft. below grade. **Mr. Vernon** asked if the house is on the National Registry. **Mr. Walker** said that Brad Sauls/Archives and History did not identify it as such since it is privately owned, and asked that pictures be sent after the project is done. **Mr. Vernon** asked what would have to be done to keep the 315 Screven Street (Cuttino House) in place. **Mr. Walker** said he did not know and if they slid it back it would impede on the area for the future playground and the functionality of the campus. When the 315 house is moved all the exterior materials and elements will be matched to what is currently there. There are some minor repairs that may be needed. **Mr. Vernon** asked if there are any documentation from Archives and History to support what was stated. **Mr. Walker** said he has emails and could get copies to the Board. **Mr. Vernon** said the work to be done would be restoration and renovation rather than preservation, i.e. the issue of the basement. **Mr. Walker** agreed. **Mr. Miller** asked about the material of the foundation. **Mr. Walker** said it's hard to tell what is under the stucco but all exterior materials will match. **Ms. Reigart** had concerns about moving the house, and asked if the new structure could not be moved back and the house stay where it is currently. **Mr. Walker** said doing that would affect the internal use of the property, and said because this is private property this Board would have jurisdiction. **Mr. Vernon** asked for all photographs of 315 Screven be documented before the project begins.

**Public Input:**

**Ms. Tanya Sisk/316 Screven Street read into the records her objections for allowing this project (Exhibit A)**

**Ms. Susan Fleming/Resident of the district** told the Board that she had concerns about the protection of the trees, especially the live oaks. She was also concerned about the Freeman house, with the option of relocating or demolition; and if the owners wait out the timeline they could just say no one is interested and demolish it. It would be nice if the Church could relocate it themselves, renovate it and sell it at a low interest loan. Also parking is an issue and hopefully this will be addressed.

**Ms. Debbie Thomas/331 Screven Street** stated that the drainage on Screven and Duke Street is horrendous and until the City does something it is a nightmare and a major concern. If the building at 317 Screven is demolished and the rectory (315 Screven) is relocated the property has to be leveled and then where will the water go, this needs to be looked into and address. The trees are a concern also. The timeline is important so that there is not a vacant lot left. Ms. Thomas said she called Brad Sauls and the concern is if 315 Screven is moved and put on a new foundation will it still be contributing, that is something that needs to be addressed and taken into consideration. Ms. Thomas said we don't need to lose another historic structure. The people on Screven Street have put a lot of time, money, and love into their homes.

**Michael Walker's Response:**

1. There will be no increase in activities and so the parking will not increase
2. Losing the basement will not destroy the contributing factor/it is not original
3. Drainage has been addressed and the new project will help the situation, not only on the street but internally
4. The design will address the trees
5. The parking will remain on Broad Street

**Mr. Miller** said he has concerns about the long term parking issues, and asked Rick Martin if Zoning would require a parking plan. **Rick** said no because they are not adding more footprint at this time, when the master plan is submitted it would be addressed at that time, and if need be it would be taken to the Board of Zoning & Appeals before being brought back to this Board. **Mr. Miller** said it is unrealistic to think that after this master plan that the growth in parking will not sift over to Screven Street.

**Ms. Reigart** had concerns about the number of stories in the proposed new structure, **Mr. Walker** said it will be a 1 1/2 story structure. **Mr. Miller** stated that the Board is not at that point at this time, and the design would be discussed at a later date. **Mr. Miller** said he had concerns about the streetscape, the impact on a residential street, and the massiveness of the building, but he is not prepared to comment on the master plan. **Mr. Vernon** recommended that Mr. Walker come back with conceptual plans before moving forward with a master plan. **Mr. Walker** agreed. **Ms. Reigart** asked once again if they were not allowed to move 315 Screven is there any way that the project could move backward with it remaining in its current location. **Mr. Walker** said this plan is what the parish wants to go forth with. **Rick Martin** said his only concern would be traffic patterns but it could not be addressed until plans are submitted. **Mr. Miller** stated that he wanted to go on the record about his wife being a member of this church and so is Ms. Linda Abate', however they have no vested interest or sit on any boards, so there is no conflict.

**Board Discussion:**

**Ms. Abate'** referred to the application that came before them in August with the Catholic Church, and said she does not see much difference in the two applications and feels this application has more positives, especially for the playground being in the back. This is a way to entice younger families to come to the area, and although she is very sympathetic to the neighbors, it is a hardship for the Church if they were denied this opportunity and the Board has to look at the greater good for the Church and the City to continue to grow.

**Mr. Miller** said there is a difference because there is a trophy house on this street that will be dramatically impacted. The Board asked the Catholic Church to come back with more information, in which they did and ultimately the application was approved. In this case **Mr. Miller** said Screven Street is a unique treasure on this block and he was not sure that his discussions with Brad Sauls, if Mr. Sauls actually considered the streetscape, and that causes concern. The members of the community raised lots of good questions and their concerns will impact the fabric of the district and that street.

Ms. Reigart said she felt that the history of a house includes the area that it is in and the lot it is on, moving it really plays a hard part of that, and if this Board allows this they will begin to lose the historic fabric of the district.

Mr. Miller said he is not so concerned about the house being moved 15 ft. and retaining its historic characteristics. The close proximity of the Cuttino House and the Thomas house may have a positive impact. Mr. Miller said personally he feels this has the potential to enhance the street, however he said he needed more information from Archives and History and more information on how the street will look.

Mr. Jayroe said the plan is great, but the rhythm and scale of the street needs to be considered and other questions needed to be answered before a decision could be made.

Ms. Abate' said she was confused because she thought the application tonight was for demolition and the relocation of a house and nothing else.

Mr. Vernon said it seems like the Board has put themselves in a position to request certain information before an approval, however they need to deal with the application at hand, or table it if there are questions. The positive aspect is that if they allow the relocation of 315 Screven Street (The Cuttino House) it would secure the future of house and the church is very valuable to the community and encouraging them to stay and grow is very important.

Ms. Reigart asked again to see some type of plan that will allow the Cuttino House to stay where it is and build around it. If it can't be done, then it can't be done.

Mr. Vernon said there is merit in what Ms. Reigart says however allowing them to move the house 75 ft. does not disturb the fabric of the street and the foundation is not original to the house and doing a new foundation and losing the basement will not destroy the historic value.

**Motion:**

(Rick Martin/City Staff suggested that the Board make 3 separate motions, one for each structure requested).

Mr. Miller proposed a motion to:

1. Allow the demolition of 317 Screven
2. Relocation of the Cuttino House 315 Screven, conditioned upon the applicant providing written support for the record from Archives and History and perhaps other preservationist:
  - (a) that the relocation will not adversely impact the historic designation of the Cuttino House nor the district, specifically Screven Street and its historic homes,
  - (b) that the information takes into account the impact on the other properties and the potential impact of the fabric of Screven Street.

Based on the finding and facts that it is in the benefit of the Cuttino House that it will be preserved and relocation will ensure the future use of the house, and the house at 317 Screven Street is not contributing and would not impact the historic district except for lessening the number of residential properties on the street.

**Mr. Vernon simplified the motion by making another motion that stated:**

- 1. I make a motion that we approve the demolition of 317 Screven Street (Nations building), citing Residential Guidelines Section 7; page 37 (Demolition), seconded by Ms. Abate'; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.**
- 2. I make a motion that we approve the relocation of 315 Screven Street (The Cuttino House) to 317 Screven Street, with the condition that (1) the house is reconstructed to match what is existing, (2) that it is photographically documented and submitted before the reconstruction (3) the applicant submit written documentation to support the impact on the historic district from Archives and History (Michael Walker's email from Brad Sauls), (4) That Mr. Walker submit something that states the impact of the relocation of the historic fabric of the street and contributing properties in close proximity), citing Residential Guidelines Section 21; page 59 (Moving Buildings), seconded by Ms. Abate'; the motion carried 4 to 1 by a roll call vote. (Ms. Clare Reigart cast the downward vote). Mr. Walker read a portion of the email from Archives and History into the record.**
- 3. The recommendation that 307 Screven Street to be tabled until more information is submitted on the balance of the design. (Mr. Miller suggested that the Church diligently try to relocate the structure within the district)**

**Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the moving of 307 Screven Street preferably within the district or if this is not possible to relocate within the district then perhaps outside the district, after all efforts are exhausted, the demolition will be reconsidered and approved upon the presentation of plans that address the issues raised by the public and this Board, seconded by Mr. Vernon; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.**

- 2. Duncan Methodist Church** is requesting the approval to remove/replace windows in their Family Life Center at 901 Highmarket Street (**Applicant was not present, the item was tabled**)
- 3. Mr. Andrew Dawson** is requesting the approval to construct a new two story single car garage at 121 Broad Street. **Rick Martin/City Staff** told the Board that Mr. Dawson has taken this project to the BZA and got their approval. **Mr. Dawson** said his proposal is 90% the same as the Truluck's design on St. James Street. There has been 2 changes; the windows were taken out of the first floor for privacy and security reasons and the roof pitch was lowered to meet the height requirement for zoning. The building materials will match the existing house, 1 by 6 German siding, the windows will be wooden vinyl clad (2 over 2), the roof will be 5-V red as the existing house, the handrails will be 36 inches and match the ones on the front porch of the house if possible. **Mr. Miller** suggested that Mr. Dawson may want to put a window on the right elevation of the first floor. The Board did not have a copy of the site plan, however Mr. Martin assured them that Staff will verify all setbacks when the permits are issued. **Mr. Vernon** suggested exposed rafter tails on the first floor since it is exposed in other areas, also the side door could be a 5 panel door.

Mr. Dawson said he is also asking to enclose the back porch to make additional room for the house. The existing windows will not be removed.

**Public Input: None**

**Motion: Mr. Vernon made a motion to approve the application as submitted, noting that the handrails will match the front of the house, there be exposed rafters on the lower floor and 5 panel door that was suggested be approved also, citing Residential Guidelines Section 22-B; page 63 (New Construction/Secondary Buildings) and Section 24-E; page 66 (Porches), seconded by Ms. Abate'; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.**

4. **Michael & Cheryl Yancey** are requesting the approval to construct a garden shed and install gutter at 411 Highmarket Street. **Rick Martin/City Staff** said the request is to add gutters on the left side and the rear and construct a storage building on the left rear yard. **Ms. Yancey** told the Board the garden shed will be painted the same color of the existing house and will have a shingle roof, the door will be one 48 inch door instead of the double door on the photo. The siding will be vertical and will have a trellis on the side. The existing gutters will be replaced and new ones added to the porch and on the side with down spouts.

**Public Input: None**

**Board Discussion: Mr. Vernon said that the vertical siding on the garden shed is not a concern since it will have a trellis on the side that faces the road. The gutters requested are Ogee style which is already on the house, and are a continuation of what is already there.**

**Motion: Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve as submitted, with the option of having vertical or horizontal siding and one single door, citing Residential Guidelines Section 22-B; page 63 (New Construction/Secondary Buildings) and Section 16; page 53 (Gutters), seconded by Ms. Reigart; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote.**

**Board Discussion: The Board asked that Staff notify the Duncan Methodist Church and let them know that they are allowed to come back as soon as possible.**

- V. **Adjournment:** With there being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

*Submitted By,*

*Debra Grant  
Board Secretary*