



MINUTES

MEETING OF HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2025 - 3:00 PM

Greenville City Hall, Council Chambers, 206 S. Main Street
Citizens may access the meeting at the following web address:
<https://www.greenvillesc.gov/1694/Online-Meetings>

1. Call to Order

Chair Aaron Barr called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM.

2. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Chair

Chair Aaron Barr invited the other members to introduce themselves, provided normal beginning procedures for the meeting, explained the agenda, and outlined the rules for procedure.

3. Roll Call

Alyson Smith moved on to roll call of board members in attendance.

Members Present:

Aaron Barr, Mitch Lehde, Anthony Tiberia, and Aaron Arnett

Members Absent: Lura Godfrey

Staff Present:

Eva Bateman, Assistant City Attorney; Alyson Smith, Senior Development Planner; Edward Kinney, Principal Landscape Architect; Barrett Armstrong, Senior Urban Designer; Jamie Pratt, Development Planner; Deanna Ensley, Planning Assistant.

4. Approval of the Minutes

Mitch Lehde moved to approve the minutes. Anthony Tiberia seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

5. Call for Public Notice Affidavit from Applicants

Staff reported receiving all applicants' affidavits.

6. Acceptance of Agenda

Mitch Lehde moved to approve the agenda. Anthony Tiberia seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

None

8. Old Business

None

9. New Business (public comment)

a. CA 25-607

Application by Osborne Brown for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** at **110 Whitsett Street**

Staff report presented by Jamie Pratt. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Applicants Present Project:

Osborne Brown, 103 Monigan Ave.

Mr. Brown stated they were looking to add a separate residence on the property behind what is residentially owned, but is occupied by a business and is looking to bring residential habitation back into the neighborhood. He stated the owners would work out of the main structure and live in the additional structure as they are looking to move into the downtown. He stated the application of siding was the biggest issue and they had suggested the proposed material versus cedar shakes, which is outside the budget for the project. He stated the hardy application was suggested to get as close to a match of the existing structure.

Questions to Applicant:

Board members asked about the finishing of the dormers and how the proposed look was a bit bulkier. of eve on dormer; rafter tails versus boxed off dormer;

Mr. Brown stated they had tried to match the eaves as much as possible but would look into the detailing a bit further.

Mr. Barr asked if the windows facing Whitsett were the primary way to get light into the second story residence which was confirmed.

Board members debated if changing the dormers might block the light into the residence, but Mr. Brown stated he didn't feel it would stop too much light and was still amenable to reviewing alternatives.

Mr. Mann asked if the brackets on either side of the garage door were referenced anywhere else on the existing house.

Mr. Brown stated they were not on the existing structure, but they could be seen elsewhere in the neighborhood a few houses down and that he could provide reference photos for them if requested.

Mr. Tiberia asked about the intent of the construction and railing of the stairs.

Mr. Brown stated it would be a typical stair/deck style and would be painted the same as the rest of the trim throughout the property and would be contingent upon permitting. He stated that element was still up for debate and that he could take the Board's feedback to the homeowner for changes. He stated largely they didn't want the main entrance of the residence to be through the garage and wanted a more garden style entrance into the garage space, so they placed that under the stairs.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Lehde stated he would like more information on how the corner boards would be finished at the base of the structure considering hardy board has to be off-set from grade a few inches and how that would look. He also stated that relative to the comment on the dormer, there was a very large header that was contributing to the bulkiness seen and

stated it could be addressed with rafter tails, which may also give more of a nod back to the existing structure as well.

Mr. Tiberia stated he agreed, but stated he felt the stairs needed addressed differently as they'd put great lengths to have this garage match the overall scale/detailing and the stair just isn't quite there with the rest of it.

Mr. Lehde pointed out that just needing to adjust stairs and rafter tails could be reviewed at the staff level and they could approve the application with those a condition for those review points.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to approve CA 25-607 with the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed stair and railing material shall be developed to a greater level and reviewed by staff prior to final approval of the CA.**
- 2. The proposed dormer design shall be reviewed by staff and adjusted as necessary to address Board comments.**
- 3. An Affidavit of Substantial Compliance must be signed and notarized by the property owner prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Conformity.**
- 4. This CA is considered a specific site development plan. As such, the CA issued for this project shall be subject to Greenville Development Code Section 19-6.2.6-9 Lapse of approval/vested rights and the Vested Rights Act, Article 11, of Chapter 29, Title 6, of the Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976 (S.C. Code §§ 6-29-1510 et seq.). The CA shall be valid for a period of two years from the date of approval by the Board. The Vested Right shall be granted up to five annual extensions upon a written request for an extension that must be received from the applicant at least sixty (60) days before expiration, unless any change or amendment to the land development ordinance or regulations of the City of Greenville's Code of Ordinances were to be amended that would no longer allow execution of the site-specific development plan. At any time during the two-year period or any subsequent Vested Rights extensions, the applicant may be granted a building permit from the City Building Official. Should the CA expire at any time prior to the application for a building permit, such permit shall not be issued until a current CA is provided. Proposed Accessory Structure View from Whitsett.**

Evan Mann seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

b. LLDE 25-910

Application by Shane Conlin for **Local Landmark Designation** at **6 Watson Street**

Staff report presented by Alyson Smith. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Barr asked to clarify if the property had recently been reviewed by the board and if it was on the national register of historic places or in a historic district.

Ms. Smith confirmed the property had been before the board for demolition about a year ago, but it had been denied and staff suggested a path forward for renovation. She also clarified that the property was only on the City's architectural inventory, but not on the national register or in a historic district.

Applicants Present Project:

Shane Conlin, 155 River Place

Mr. Conlin, stated he was one of the owners and didn't have much to add other than he was excited to work on the historic home and though it needs a lot of work he was looking forward to bringing up to its full potential.

Questions to Applicant:

Mr. Barr asked if Mr. Conlin had any commentary on the original owner and asked how long Mr. Conlin had owned the home.

Mr. Conlin stated he'd owned the home a year and 2 months and commented that the home was built in 1930 by the Child's family.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Board members agreed that approving the application would assist the City in protecting the home and is a tool the City can use to assist in preserving the heritage and character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Barr stated concerns regarding meeting the criteria for local landmark designation, and stated though it is a valuable tool to protect properties, the home is not particularly significant in the way of its location or style, but that since a demolition was previously denied, it would be the only way to keep the house standing and moving forward. He also clarified that they would have to be clear that they were looking at the application as a stand-alone application, though admitted he had issues with what comes next.

Mr. Kinney agree the application should be viewed on its own merits and stated if the application was denied, they would not move forward with the next application. He pointed out that if the application was denied, there would still be a path for rehabilitating the home, but they would not be able to access the tax credits for assistance in the rehab and it would go through the Design Review Board for approval instead of Historic Review Board.

Mr. Lehde agreed it was important to consider the precedence they were creating in their approvals for homes like this.

Mr. Barr pointed out that the threshold for what is considered historic now is only 50 years old, so they might see a bunch of mid 70s houses that might qualify for the same designation.

Mr. Tiberia stated he wanted to make a counter to those comments by pointing out that there are historic districts that have a number of buildings contributing to the historic nature of the neighborhood but themselves are not historic and that it isn't always about preserving the individual home, but preserving the quality of the neighborhoods and a contribution to overall quality or scale of those neighborhoods.

***MOTION:**

Anthony Tiberia moved to approve LLDE 25-910. Mitch Lehde seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-1.

c. **RHP 25-778**

Application by Shane Conlin for a **Preliminary RHP at 6 Watson Street**

Staff report presented by Jamie Pratt. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Applicants Present Project:

Shane Conlin, 155 River Place

Mr. Conlin stated he and the builder were present to answer any questions. He stated the changes they were looking to make will really enhance the appearance of the property and would be a sizable investment that may encourage additional changes to other properties in the neighborhood, pointing out that there had not been any demolitions to the homes in the neighborhood.

Questions to Applicant:

Mr. Barr asked about the siding and if they had checked to see if the original wood siding is still present under the current siding.

Wayne Reece, 103 Thornwood Drive

Mr. Reece introduced himself as the architect and stated that there was some existing ship lap, but that he was not sure of the full condition of any of the original wood left.

Mr. Barr pointed out it was common with houses of this age to put aluminum on top of the original wood which helped to preserve the original materials and that an approval of a LLDE puts more onus on the property owner to preserve the original materials.

Mr. Reece stated if it was on the house to start with he'd prefer to keep it, but that he wouldn't know the extent of what was salvageable until everything is peeled back and said he was happy to check and then bring back updated plans if needed.

Mr. Mann pointed out the number of conditions suggested by staff and stated that it seemed like the project needed to be reviewed again as the extent of the proposed changes by staff would fundamentally change the whole project.

Mr. Conlin asked if that could be something approvable at the staff level.

Mr. Barr stated that would be best to discuss during the later part of the meeting during the board discussion regarding a path forward.

Public Comment:

Joe Farmer, 207 Alpine Way

Mr. Farmer stated he was against the project as the tax assessment, though set by the City, is carried out by the County and the project would have negative implications for those who live outside the City limits. He pointed out that Greenville County schools and County Council has not been in favor of these adjustments and that County Council has directed to no longer approve the assessments through their offices, so approving the application would give the applicant a false sense of hope that they would actually get the adjusted rate.

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Barr stated with the extent of changes proposed, it would be good to see updated plans and stated he was inclined to ask for this one to come back to the board after changes are made.

Mr. Lehde stated he agreed and pointed out that the project has gone pretty far in creating a new aesthetic after just having discussion on preservation. He specifically mentioned looking into the roof and siding and stated that what is proposed deviates so far from the rational for giving the local landmark that it needs a visit.

Mr. Tiberia mentioned they hadn't talked about the overall massing of the structure either and would like to see the difference between the new and existing massing in more detail before approving.

Mr. Barr also stated the finer details need reviewed, particularly where the applicant proposed painting the whole house black, which he stated would be out of character for the neighborhood. He stated the changes would be extensive enough to maybe warrant a re-application after all changes are made.

Mr. Kinney pointed out it is not uncommon for staff comments to be so onerous that the applicant is asked to come back later, but the applicant would have to ask for a deferral. If he didn't ask for a deferral and the application was denied, they would then have to wait for a full year to reapply.

Mr. Barr asked the applicant if he was okay with deferring.

Mr. Conlin said that would be fine but questioned how to proceed with getting the information requested, as they wouldn't know the full extent of what was salvageable until they started to do some work on the structure.

Mr. Barr stated the investigation work would be considered repair and it would be allowed so he could look into it further.

Mr. Conlin asked if after that point the application could be done as a staff level review.

Mr. Kinney stated he would still have to return to the full board, but that it would allow him to get more time to do more digging and ask additional questions from staff.

Mr. Barr pointed out the thought process was that the application would be much cleaner and have an easier time passing in coming back before the board.

Mr. Conlin asked if making the recommended changes would change the decision on the tax break.

Mr. Barr and Mr. Kinney clarified that the decision for local landmark had already been made, so that would not be impacted, but that the rehabilitation application would still need to meet historic district requirements in order to move forward. They stated that the changes suggested were to get the application to be closer to passing. It was just that there were so many conditions for approval, it would be easier to address the comments first, and then come back for final confirmation of a decision.

Mr. Conlin requested to defer his application.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to accept deferral of RHP 25-778. Anthony Tiberia seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

d. **CA 25-806**

Application by Chris Boswell for an **Appeal** to Administrative Decision on Siding Material at **123 West Earle Street**

Anthony Tiberia left the meeting at 3:59 p.m.

Staff summary presented by Alyson Smith.

Questions to Staff:

None

Appellant Presents Project:

Chris Boswell, 123 W Earle

Mr. Boswell stated the reason for their application was that a house down the street caught fire and the fire department had a hard time putting it out. He stated it was so hot, the brick and foundation of the house next door had to be replaced and the house rebuilt.

He stated the overlay district rules were originally written in 1977, adopted in 2000, and since the national rules they were based on has had several amendments. He stated between 2017-2023, the national guidelines said synthetic cement board is acceptable. He stated for him it is a safety issue and as the house was built in 1908, they don't know how much wood needs replacing and stated that when they've done work to the home, they find lathe and mud, horse hair, and newspaper used as insulation in the walls. He stated his application was based on safety.

Questions to Appellant:

Mr. Mann asked to clarify if the application was all about fire prevention and if they were proposing to remove and completely replace all wood siding.

Mr. Boswell confirmed it was about fire safety and stated their proposal was not to replace architectural details, just the clapboard. He said the pictures shown to the Board made it look much better than it really was and that it was just fuel for a fire.

Mr. Mann asked if the rest of the home is up to code for other trades.

Mr. Boswell stated, yes as far as he knows and that he's been there for 18 years.

Mr. Barr asked about the garage in the back of the lot and the materials for the garage.

Mr. Boswell, stated they were waiting on a garage door and that the plan was for it to be hardy board.

Public Comment:

Tim Monahan 201 E. Park

Mr. Monahan stated he was in favor of the application as he is in a similar situation, with a home over 100 years old that won't hold paint. He stated the materials can be replaced with a product that looks just as good and claimed that instead of saying the material has to be the exact same, it should be more about the appearance of the material.

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Lehde stated he lives in the east park historic district and has had a tremendous amount of damage to his older home and has had to go through the same process of replacing materials. He said he consults on developments where historically based architecture is needed and that they want to be careful that they aren't just replicating, that there is a lot of character in old neighborhoods, and this application would allow such a slippery slope of precedent as there have been several application for similar requests. He stated this project could end up as a tipping point to allow all those other applications to be approved and that these are not new structures trying to look old, its actually a home on the registry. He stated the focus should be on preservation and for a home that is on the registry, in an overlay district, preservation should be the focus.

Mr. Boswell stated at the national level safety is the priority and its his concern and pointed out if something happens and the application was denied, and someone is hurt, if you're not following the guidelines it will put the city in trouble.

Mr. Barr stated the latest brief that came out about it, it was heavily caveated that only in the worst cases beyond repair is it suitable for replacement of different materials. He pointed out the existing condition is such that it can still be repaired in kind.

Mr. Mann stated they would have to do more than just stripping out siding to replace, it would impact the remaining details as well.

Mr. Lehde asked how can you claim its historical anymore when the material is all new.

Mr. Barr pointed out that dozens of others around the city would also try to take the same course if approved.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to deny the appeal for CA 25-806. Evan Mann seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-0.

10. Advice and Comment (no public comment)

None

11. Other Business (no public comment)

Edward Kinney gave an update on the Downtown Design Guidelines regarding upcoming meetings.

12. Informal Review (no public comment)

a. **CA 25-506**

Application by Aaron Swiger for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for a Rear Addition at **103 Walnut Street**

Mr. Swiger presented his project and details that had been adjusted based on previous meetings and staff feedback. Board members discussed the details and different architectural elements of the project and provided feedback for Mr. Swiger to consider in his official application. Mr. Swiger stated his intention was to bring the project to the board for approval at the end of the year and the board clarified his options for next steps were to either continue with additional 2-member reviews if Mr. Swiger did not feel confident in bringing the project to the board yet, or to bring a full application before the board for formal review.

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:34 PM.

ADD NAME

ADD NAME

MEETING NOTICE POSTED AND MEDIA NOTIFIED ON ____.