



HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN REVIEW

Minutes of the Meeting

September 27, 2012

<p>ATTENDANCE</p>	<p>A regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Design Review Committee was held on September 27, 2012, in the conference room of the Sumter City-County Planning Department. Five board members – Mr. Scott Bell, Ms. Lynda Parker, Mr. Billy Taylor, Ms. Mary Kolb, Ms. Jean Whitaker– and the secretary were present. Mr. Grady Locklear was absent. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Mr. Scott Bell – Chair.</p>
<p>MINUTES</p>	<p>Ms. Lynda Parker made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 24, 2012 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mary Kolb and carried a unanimous vote.</p>
<p>NEW BUSINESS</p>	<p><u>HP-11-02 (Rev. 1), 109 N. Main St.</u></p> <p>Ms. McCullum stated this request is a revision to the materials originally approved by the committee on January 27, 2011 for HP-11-02, 109 N. Main St. Back in January 2011, this board approved façade renovations to this building. It was the applicant’s original intent to preserve as much of the original façade as possible – back to the brick and cast stone. During demolition process, it was discovered that structure was not as strong and originally thought and the structural engineer recommended changes that needed to be made to make the building structurally sound. The changes being asked for are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The windows originally approved for the bottom floor were four white aluminum-clad windows with nine gridded paned panels. The applicant is asking to change this to four one-over-one vinyl clad windows that give a transom appearance at the top to give it a more of a retail storefront. 2. The front doors originally approved were two single-

materials, photographs, and construction details submitted and referenced in the Staff Report based on compliance with Design Review Guidelines #6, 13, 30 and 31. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mary Kolb and carried a unanimous vote.

HP-12-22, 125 W. Bartlette Street (City)

Ms. Donna McCullum stated this was a request for design review approval for the installation of masonry and steel fencing on the Sumter, Bartlette, and Washington St. frontages of the Shiloh-Randolph Manor Senior Independent Living Community located at 125 W. Bartlette St. In addition, an outdoor recreation area with a walking trail and gazebo, are proposed to be constructed in the open lawn adjacent to the proposed fencing. At each corner on the Bartlette St. frontage, there is to be signage applied to the fence walls.

Mr. Bell asked if the fence was brick or painted concrete block.

Ms. McCullum stated it was concrete block to match the principle structure.

Mr. Bell asked if painted concrete blocks were in conformance with downtown fencing.

Ms. McCullum said the Guidelines state that (a) *Brick is the preferred building material for downtown Sumter;* (b) *Masonry materials should be compatible in size, profile, and detailing with historic materials.* She went on to state that the proposed masonry columns for the fencing have been selected to match the existing masonry on the primary structure.

Mr. Dean Pack, the applicant, stated there are existing masonry walls at the corners with existing signage. The goal is to interconnect the fencing with the existing signage and to enhance the whole appearance of the property. He stated there were two goals in deciding to do this project: (1) to provide some sort of security for the residents; and (2) to enhance the look of the property. Because of the building and signage being masonry, that was the reason for choosing masonry for the columns – to be consistent with the materials on site. The metal fencing will be consistent with other fences that have been done in the

paned glass doors. The new proposal is to install $\frac{3}{4}$ lite with the transom at the bottom.

3. It was originally planned to restore all the cast stone ornamental features. The new proposal is to use a foam board with light gray stucco. What the applicant is trying to do is use materials that will closely resemble the materials previously approved while reducing some of the weight of the overall façade.
4. Finally, the applicant wishes to install a 2" x 6" wood stud wall with brick veneer since the original brick cannot be used.

Ms. McCullum stated staff feels that overall this request is in keeping with the guidelines and recommends approval.

Mr. J. Stutz, the applicant, was present and stated he wanted to clarify that the doors would be $\frac{3}{4}$ lite but have a solid panel at the bottom.

Mr. Bell asked if it was an aluminum storefront type system.

Mr. Stutz stated it was. The only difference between the new proposal and the original plan is a smaller lite will be used. Mr. Stutz stated that on the brick situation, they had hoped to preserve most of the brick. The building had been renovated twice during the '50s and 70s and damage was done during those renovations. Then when the cladding was taken off, the remaining exposed brick façade was in very, very bad shape. The structural engineer informed them that it was an unsafe situation that needed to go. What they are proposing is a 2" x 6" wood stud wall with brick veneer that will give the same appearance as the previous façade. He stated the other thing they would like to do is use stucco instead of the cast stone – weight-wise, economy and speed of construction.

Mr. Bell asked if the stucco detailing would have the same profile as the cast stone.

Mr. Stutz stated that it would.

With no further discussion, Mr. Billy Taylor made a motion that the Sumter Historic Preservation Design Review Committee approve this request in accordance with the

	<p>downtown area. The walking trail was meant for the residents to get exercise and was done for two reasons: (1) to get a measured length; and (2) to not disturb any existing landscaping or trees.</p> <p>Mr. Bell asked if there was an existing gazebo on site.</p> <p>Mr. Pack stated that there was an existing gazebo on site. They (the property owners) wanted to expand that area and add another gazebo with a connector so they could have a barbeque type area. The gazebo will match the existing one.</p> <p>Upon no further discussion, Ms. Mary Kolb made a motion that the Sumter Historic Preservation Design Review Committee approve HP-12-22, in accordance with the materials, photographs, and construction details submitted and referenced in the Staff Report based on compliance with Design Review Guidelines #4, 38, and 43. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lynda Parker and carried a unanimous vote.</p>
<p>OTHER BUSINESS</p>	<p>Ms. Donna McCullum gave a brief update on the following in-house approvals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ HP-12-19, 32 E. Liberty St. – signage ➤ HP-12-20, 3 E. Liberty St. – signage ➤ HP-12-21, 130-A S. Main St. – signage
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>With no further business, Ms. Lynda Parker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at approximately 3:55 p.m. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ms. Jean Whitaker.</p>
	<p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p><i>Wanda F. Scott</i></p> <p>Wanda F. Scott, Board Secretary</p>

Historic Preservation Design Review

Meeting Date: Sept. 27, 2012

NAME (Please Print)	Which request are you here for?
Rev Wm. Randolph	Shiloh-Randolph
Mrs. Doris Randolph	Shiloh-Randolph
DEAN PACE	" "
JAY STUTZ	DEAS LAW FIRM