



MINUTES

MEETING OF HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2025 - 2:00 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

Vice Chair Lura Godfrey called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

2. Roll Call

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

Members Present:

Vice Chair Lura Godfrey, Mitch Lehde, Anthony Tiberia, and Evan Mann

Members Absent: Chair Aaron Barr

Staff Present:

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

3. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Chair

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

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. Evan Mann seconded. The motion passed 4-0.

7. Conflict of Interest Statement

None

8. Old Business

None

9. New Business (public comment)

a. CA 25-506

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

Staff report presented by Alyson Smith. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Applicants Present Project:

Aaron Swiger, 103 Walnut Street,

Mr. Swiger introduced himself as the homeowner and architect of the project and stated the current application was based on several informal reviews with various board members. He preceded to address each of the Architectural Review sections as it related to his project and its compliance with each section's standards.

Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Godfrey had clarifying questions about replacing the windows, materials for the addition, and paint colors. She mentioned the addition has a much darker color than the original structure and recommended having a color more similar to the original structure, but did comment on difficulty of ensuring the additions in historic districts are distinct enough that they don't appear to be attempting to look original while still being cohesive to the main structure.

Mr. Swiger clarified that only the addition will have new windows, that the materials of the addition would be pre-painted and the smooth-faced variety of hardy board, but that the original home would also be painted. He clarified that the color choice was in reaction to requirements to maintain the distinctness of the addition and that though it was not originally mentioned in earlier meetings on the project, it had been more recently mentioned as a consideration to change the paint color to give distinctness to the addition.

Ms. Godfrey asked staff if the condition regarding the mass of the building was meant due to the addition appearing as a second house from the street or if it was due to the carport section of the addition which staff answered it was due to both.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Tiberia commended that the work on the original house was really well done and completely within guidelines. He stated there were still issues with addition on back. He stated it was a huge improvement from initial review, but that he was struggling with the floating mass over the covered patio. He asked the other Board members if they would be amenable to closing in the bottom patio sections to help address everyone's concerns.

Mr. Mann commented that that might be doing a dis-service to what he is looking for use-wise.

Mr. Lehde stated his agreement with Ms. Godfrey on the material and tone of color matching more to the original structure as there were already other elements that made the addition distinct from the original structure. He stated he could be sympathetic to the

floating element given site constraints and that it was not largely visible, but stated materiality still needed some work.

Ms. Godfrey stated she agreed that being that the floating element was facing the backyard, it may not be that large of a problem, but regardless she hesitated to ask them to build out the rest of the structure and change how they intended to use the space.

Mr. Lehde asked about the lattice work on the original house and if it was planned to be removed or replaced. He commented on needing to ensure whether or not that was considered a historical element when the home was added to the historical registry.

Mr. Swiger stated the plan had been to remove it and stated he'd be shocked if it was original of the home as the lattice looks its made out of crude 2x4s with only a single layer of paint. He said he was amenable to leaving it in place if it aids his case.

Ms. Godfrey stated clarifying the situation on that could be added as a condition.

Mr. Mann pointed out in a previous informal review of the addition, screening was suggested as an option to assist in the issue of the floating mass.

***MOTION:**

Anthony Tiberia moved to approve CA 25-506 with staff conditions and two additional conditions: one to review the color of the addition with a 2-member review, and the second to review the historic nature of the lattice work and if found to be of a historic nature, require the applicant to keep it in the design of the structure. Mitch Lehde seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

b. **RHP 25-775**

Application by Stewart and Andrea Hudspeth for a Preliminary RHP at 714 North Main Street

Staff report presented by Jamie Pratt. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Ms. Godfrey asked if staff had any commentary on the proposed colors.

Ms. Pratt stated the only mention of colors was that they needed to be muted and coordinated with the original structure, but that staff was open to Board comments.

Mr. Lehde pointed out the new design has the shutters removed and that staff needed to verify if the shutters were approved as part of the initial historic review.

Applicants Present Project:

Kristina Watson, 19 Parkwood Drive

Ms. Watson stated she was the designer of the renovation and confirmed the shutters are vinyl and were added later to the structure. She also mentioned some of the existing windows are vinyl and they plan to replace them to match the rest of the home.

Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Godfrey if the original non-vinyl windows were being replaced, which Ms. Watson answered they would just be painted and that the intent was to only replace the 2 vinyl windows.

Ms. Watson stated the color on the addition is the same as planned for the sash/trim on the windows to tie everything together.

Mr. Mann asked if the brick bonding changed between 1st and second floor, and if it also existed above second floor, which Ms. Watson stated it did not.

Mr. Lehde asked to clarify if they were modifying the gable detail on side entry, which Ms. Watson stated they would not be, there was just a rendering issue.

Public Comment:

Joe Farmer, 207 Alpine Way

Mr. Farmer advised against honoring any applications for any tax assessments as he stated they would not be honored with the County and that any applications for assessments need to go through County. He stated the County bills and assesses for taxes, not the City and he stated he recommended the Board not give people false hope.

Board/Commission Discussion:

Ms. Godfrey stated this project also struggled with looking like a floating mass and asking about the consideration for a bit more brick. She stated she was also struggling with the paint color and how this gets away from the traditional red brick and white trim. She also stated she understands the want for outdoor space, but stated it needs more work.

Mr. Mann stated concerns with the archway and opening on the addition and finding how it ties into the rest of the structure. He also stated he had difficulty getting past the fence which he feels shuts off the property from the rest of the street very close to the sidewalk and doesn't contribute to the character of the area.

Ms. Godfrey pointed out the fencing would still need to be reviewed by staff and Ms. Smith confirmed that the fencing as proposed would not currently meet the Development Code standards, but that would be reviewed at permitting.

Board members discussed the paint colors and how it impacts the overall appearance of the structure.

Mr. Tiberia mentioned the interplay between the wood and brick and how it responded to the street and color palette. Overall he stated he felt it was a sympathetic addition and that he felt it could be successful with some work to the fencing and colors.

Andrea Hudspeth, owner

Ms. Hudspeth clarified the intention of the fencing was to be 6ft tall, which matches the existing fence height, but set back from the property line by 3 feet which would be allowed by zoning code and would be landscaped as well as there is a commercial lot next door with a lot of traffic. She also clarified the reason they didn't have more brick other than on the bottom skirt of the addition was due to concerns with matching brick to the original structure. She also pointed out the archway and how it mimicked the arch over one of the entrances currently.

Mr. Mann asked if the existing fencing was on a masonry plinth, which Ms. Hudspeth answered it was not, that it was right up against the sidewalk and the proposal would be pulling it up entirely and moving it back 3 feet from the property line.

Mr. Tiberia asked if the plan for the driveway gate was to be wood or iron which Ms. Hudspeth answered that they could go either way.

Mr. Lehde stated he felt it was successful as is, but looking at whether it was successful from a historical standpoint was different. He stated if they kept turning back history, there probably would have been more masonry.

Mr. Tiberia stated he appreciated the simplicity of the addition and questioned if adding layers of other materials to make it more historic, would muddy the addition.

Mr. Mann commented that as this being a sort of gateway into East Earle versus West Earle and as a starting point to an historic district, keeping it simple makes sense. He did state for a walkable portion of town, the proposed fencing still was a concern, but stated emulating the current fence and how its scalloped may help to soften the look.

Ms. Godfrey and Mr. Mann discussed including a condition for a 2-member review for the fencing.

Mr. Mann and Mr. Tiberia discussed the soldier course on the original structure and its relation to the addition.

***MOTION:**

Evan Mann moved to approve RHP 25-775 with staff conditions and two additional conditions to review the final colors and fencing through a 2-member review.

Anthony Tiberia seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-1.

c. **LLDE 25-934**

Application by Ryan Johnston for Local Landmark Designation at 31 Burdette Street

Edward Kinney quoted state ordinance as it related to the Boards ability to make decisions on special tax assessments and the authority granted to municipalities to make such decisions.

Staff report presented by Alyson Smith. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Tiberia asked if the application passed, would the repairs have to follow the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation which was confirmed.

Applicants Present Project:

Ryan Johnston, 308 Chapman Rd

Mr. Johnston stated they were attempting to proactively create spaces and not just "follow the artist" in this project. He also mentioned trying to figure out ways to provide affordability for creatives and that they had engaged someone from the neighborhood to assist with the design.

Questions to Applicant:

None

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Board members voices support for the project.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to approve LLDE 25-934. Evan Mann seconded the motion.

Motion passed 4-0.

d. **RHP 25-869**

Application by Ryan Johnston for a Preliminary RHP at 31 Burdette Street

Staff report presented by Jamie Pratt. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Applicants Present Project:

Jared Moore, 3 Mason Street

Mr. Moore stated he also lived and worked in the Village nearby the site and that he loved the building and looked forward to being a part of restoring it. He stated they were not

going to be using the existing parking lot, but that a portion of it will remain paved for events while the rest was landscaped. He stated the front portion was the old sanctuary, which the floor had already been demolished and a new slab re-poured at grade to provide accessibility. He stated they were keeping the bell tower and re-constructing it to its current form, size, and height, but that the material would be different and wouldn't be open inside. He said they largely plan to bring it back to its original form.

Questions to Applicant:

Mr. Mann asked about the siding for the steeple.

Mr. Moore stated it would be lap siding and the original material was unknown as it was all covered.

Ryan Johnston

Mr. Johnston stated in some areas the vinyl fallen off and it appears to be asphalt roof shingle underneath.

Mr. Moore stated they were keeping all window openings the same.

Ms. Godfrey asked about staffs comments on repairing block and how they'd address any issues for repair of the brick.

Mr. Moore stated he was not sure about creating the same kind of brick but stated they would have 2 different types of masonry as there are some spots that will need filled in regardless, and pointed out that with the paint, it won't have the appearance of different masonry styles.

Mr. Tiberia asked about comments made regarding replacing versus fixing the windows and the thought behind their decision on that as well as the color scheme.

Mr. Moore stated it was because newer windows would help seal up the building and since some windows were in questionable condition and/or missing in some areas. He stated the black coloring was to add contrast and to match additional accents elsewhere in the design.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Lehde asked if, since the Board had just given the site a Local Landmark Designation, did the board have any proprietary aspect to enforce the buildings original detailing, relative to window color.

Ms. Godfrey stated she could understand the need for energy efficiency, but did agree that there was some consideration that if the windows were changed to black aluminum clad windows, they'd stay that forever.

Mr. Tiberia stated some internal conflict for prescribing colors, pointing out that colors could be easily changed. However, he stated that since they are trying to reintroduce the building to the public and there were only a few existing materials/components that make up the building, windows included, he leaned more towards rehabilitating them versus replacing them.

Ms. Godfrey agreed, stating there were conflicting concerns in requiring them to spend money on restoring the windows versus the issue of encouraging a space artists want to be in.

Mr. Kinney reminded the board they could stipulate in a condition of approval that further research be done on the viability of reconstruction of the windows and have that reviewed

by 2-members of the board to which Board members agreed it would be helpful to at least have additional documentation.

Mr. Lehde asked about the front door and the level of freedom allowed to applicants for replacing such items based on the landmark designation and department of interiors standards.

Mr. Kinney stated the primary driver for the door replacement is accessibility which supersedes those considerations.

Mr. Lehde asked about the criteria related to colorization of windows with having a local landmark designation.

Mr. Kinney stated the standards shy away from prescribing colors, giving the Board a broad range of authority on it.

Mr. Tiberia stated on the doorway, it made sense for the ADA accessible entry to be the front door, considering the requirements for ADA compliance, the relatively small footprint of the building, the limited number of alternative entry points, and since the entry floor had already been demolished.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to approve RHP 25-869 with additional conditions to review the viability of restoring the windows versus replacing them and the selected colors via a 2-member review. Anthony Tiberia seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

e. **LLDE 25-935**

Application by Anthony F. Gallo III for Local Landmark Designation at 14 Deering Street

Staff report presented by Jamie Pratt. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

None

Applicants Present Project:

Anna and Anthony Gallo,

Mr. Gallo stated the building has been largely unused for several years and they were looking to create a new use, specifically workforce housing. He stated their intent to preserve the past and build toward the future with this project, which included minimal exterior modifications, though those modifications they are requesting have been extensively researched to weigh the interests of preservation, code requirements, and making it a place people want to live.

Questions to Applicant:

None

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Tiberia commented that though the mills in Greenville have been being renovated for the last few decades, the mill villages and institutions that supported those communities and workers have seemed to be largely forgotten.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to approve LLDE 25-935. Anthony Tiberia seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

f. **RHP 25-936**

Application by Anthony F. Gallo III for a Preliminary RHP at 14 Deering Street

Staff report presented by Jamie Pratt. Staff recommends approval.

Questions to Staff:

Mr. Tiberia asked if there would be any additional review required by the state which staff stated was not mandated.

Applicants Present Project:

Anna and Anthony Gallo, Poinsett Corners

Mr. Gallo stated their points had been extensively covered and that they welcome questions.

Questions to Applicant:

Ms. Godfrey asked about comments regarding using the original stained glass inside the structure.

Mr. Gallo stated they would like to use them as much as possible, possibly as an architectural element in the common area or in some of the lofted units. He stated there would be a benefit in taking them inside is to preserve them, similar with other elements such as pews, lighting, the organ, etc.

Mr. Mann asked about the smaller attached structure and its purpose.

The Gallos stated it used to be coal storage and that they would like to transition that to a bike storage/recreation area. He stated the intent was to have workforce housing in the development with the hope of encouraging as much alternate methods of travel as possible, minimizing vehicle reliance, though did mention they would have adequate screening for other elements on site they can't hide such as parking for those who can't walk/bike, mechanical equipment, etc.

Public Comment:

None

Board/Commission Discussion:

Mr. Lehde stated overall, he thought the intent of the project was fantastic. In relation to the color discussion, he stated he thought the modification of the color has proven successful in other recent past projects and since the use is going to be different, he felt it could be successful for this project as well.

Mr. Mann asked about other churches in Greenville that have taken the residential route, which staff explained had been done several times before.

Ms. Godfrey agreed, but pointed out they had just told the last applicant they didn't want to see a different colored window. She stated she understood wanting to modernize but struggled with barely being able to see the architectural details because of the colors. She pointed out that using a different also makes the mass look different, for example, it makes the columns much thinner in appearance.

Mr. Tiberia stated it says something of the quality of the project for it to be such a grand project and of such a scale, but that the Board is only left with talking about color of the trim. He stated he didn't have an opinion one way or another on the paint. He said on one hand, you could see the darker paint as an overall blending of trim, cornice, columns, and

windows making it a whole versus delineating the edges using stark white, but stated there was room for interpretation. He pointed out its paint, which is one of the most easily reversible modifications that could be made.

Mr. Mann asked if there was a detailed elevation of the side entrance.

Luke Perry

Mr. Perry explained it was a side entrance and they had planned to keep the existing concrete raised platform with an addition of a roof over that. He stated there was a cover on it at one point and the remnants of columns from that time were still attached to railing, so they were just restoring it to what it was. When asked, Mr. Perry stated the side entrance would act as the primary entrance from the parking lot for residents due to it being on the inside corner area and closeness for accessibility.

***MOTION:**

Mitch Lehde moved to approve RHP 25-936. Anthony Tiberia seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

10. Advice and Comment (no public comment)

None

11. Other Business (no public comment)

Staff gave an update on the Board's meeting calendar for 2026, the passing of the Board's bylaws, and updates to the Downtown Design Guidelines.

12. Informal Review (no public comment)

None

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:09 PM.