HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN REVIEW

Minutes of the Meeting

December 18, 2014

ATTENDANCE	A regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Design Review Committee was held on Thursday, December 18, 2014, in the conference room of the Sumter City-County Planning Department. Four board members: Mr. Scott Bell; Mr. Grady Locklear; Ms. Jean Whitaker; Ms. Lynda Parker; were present. Mr. William Buxton; Mr. Billy Taylor and Ms. Sonia Shaw were absent. Staff members present were Mr. George McGregor; Ms. Claudia Rainey and Ms. Wanda Scott. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Mr. Scott Bell, Chairman.
MINUTES	Mr. Grady Locklear made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2014 meeting as written. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lynda Parker and carried a unanimous vote.
NEW BUSINESS	**<u>HP-14-23, 17 & 19 Caldwell St. (City)</u>** Mr. Scott Bell recused himself from the discussion on this request. Ms. Claudia Rainey presented this request for Historic Preservation Design Review approval for the installation of a ADA accessible ramp at the rear of the building located at 17 & 19 Caldwell St. Ms. Rainey explained that this was a request for approval to add a handicapped ramp to the rear of the building. Since the ramp will be visible from Harvin St., design review approval is required. Ms. Rainey stated the Guidelines state that new construction in the commercial area should be of its period and historical reproductions should be avoided. She added the proposed construction is contemporary in design and is compatible with the building, as well as the district. Staff is recommending approval for this request. With no further discussion, Ms. Lynda Parker made a motion to approve this request for the installation of an ADA accessible

ramp at the rear of the building on property located at 17-19 Caldwell St. in accordance with the materials, photographs, and drawings submitted and referenced in the Staff Report based on compliance with the Design Review Guidelines and Section 1.m.2 of the City of Sumter – Zoning & Development Standards Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lynda Parker and carried a unanimous vote.

HP-14-24, 117-119 N. Main St. (City)

Ms. Claudia Rainey presented this request for Historic Preservation Design Review approval for front and side façade renovations/alterations to the building located at 117-119 N. Main St.. Ms. Rainey stated the applicant wished to redesign the front and side facades of the building located on the corner of Main St. and Law Range, adjacent to the Sumter County Court House which is the former Naomi & Warner Building. She stated the proposal is for a combination lounge, or nice bar, and also a movie theatre, with dinner theatre being the idea. She explained the scope of work as follows:

Scope of work for 119 N. Main

- Relocating the existing entrance to the left hand side of the front façade and reinstall the existing materials;
- Replacement of existing windows with same size white metal clad windows;
- Installing new door in existing frame to match sidelights;
- Rebuilding glass block detail at each side of new entrance
- Installing new canvas awning to be solid color (black) with linen colored trim.
- Painting the existing masonry;
- Installing new doors with wrought iron detail;
- Installing new mirror glass detail to match existing detail;
- Lighting, ticket window, proposed signage etc. as shown in plans.

Scope of work for 117 N. Main

- Replacing windows to match existing – glass will be Spandrel;
- Installation of new brick wall to match height and details of existing building to left;
- Installing new canvas awning with existing transom windows behind. Paint shall be removed and glass cleaned;
- Installing new store front windows that will match across the front façade of both buildings;
- Installation of new sill, storefront & tile to match existing. All colors of new façade shall match existing façade. New canvas awning shall be a solid color (black) with

	linen colored trim. • Wood trim at entrance shall match existing color. <u>Scope of Work: Side façade of 119 N. Main St.</u> • Installing new windows in existing blocked up window openings. • Installing new doors; • Painting side facade to match existing color. Ms. Rainey stated the building on the right was built after 1940 and has no entrance of its own. If the building is going to be used in any way, it needs to be incorporated into the adjacent building or be completely redone on the front in another way. There are some features on the building like the glass block and tile, which may or may not have been put there in the '30s, that has the Art Deco - Machine Age look that works with the proposed styling that is proposed for the lounge/theatre that has an Art Deco/Modern feel to it. She added it is good that the architectural elements that exist which are not completely deteriorated and can be used are being retained. She added that awnings are encouraged in the Downtown and replacing the existing awnings very deteriorated and replacing them with new ones in the proposed color scheme will look good and is compatible with the district. Ms. Rainey stated the lighting and other detail elements appear to be more colonial in style and recommends the use of Modern or Art Deco elements. She stated staff is recommending approval of this request. Mr. Kyle Garrett was present to speak on behalf of this request. He stated he was the proposed owner of the building. Mr. Bell stated he was confused about the theatre space. He stated Ms. Rainey indicated that it is a one story space, but looking at the plans, it appears to be a two story space. He asked if the volume intended to be low or high. Mr. Garrett stated the volume of the theatre will be 50 to 100 people. He added the only reason they are upping the walls and roof is for the theatre screen itself, it has to be at least 30 feet to fit the screen in. Ms. Lynda Parker asked if this was going to be a theatre company a franchise or would the applicant own it. Mr. Garrett stated he will be the owner. Mr. Locklear asked if there would be a movie daily or weekly and if the restaurant would be open. Mr. Garrett stated the restaurant would be open from lunch until

	3:00 a.m. Monday through Saturday. Movies, at this point, will be played at this point Thursday, Friday and Saturday. Mr. Locklear asked if there were plans for an apartment or apartments upstairs. Mr. Garrett stated plans were to have one apartment on the left hand side upstairs along with a photography studio in the other section. Mr. Locklear asked what the seating capacity for the restaurant. Mr. Garrett stated seating capacity was 72. Mr. Bell asked the applicant if he proposed to serve alcohol in the lounge area and if there were any issues with distance to churches as there are two churches nearby and there are certain requirements for alcohol and churches. Mr. George McGregor stated the use will require Special Exception review but an application for Special Exception application has not been submitted. Once the application has been submitted, the review will take place in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals. There will be a separate use discussion and a public hearing in front of the Board of Appeals. Mr. Bell asked Mr. Howie Owens how he felt about the use and the conformity of the proposal. Mr. Owens stated in his opinion and what they are trying to do in Downtown development, the use and conformity goes right along with what the City is looking for – a nice mixed use, want businesses to stay open at night and this encourages night life. He stated that from his discussion with the applicants they have security measures in place so that it stays a pleasing atmosphere and doesn't degrade Downtown but lifts it up. He stated the City is in favor of the request. Ms. Parker asked if parking would be available. Mr. Owens stated parking was available. Mr. Locklear asked about the time frame for the project. Mr. Garrett stated the time frame was about six to seven months – if construction started now. Mr. Bell stated this is a landmark building downtown – a very important corner that is seen very clearly a long ways as you come down Main St. The side of this building on Law Range is a

	major backdrop to events that happen on the Court House lawn. He stated he felt that the side of this project needs a lot of attention that it is not getting right now. He stated he is not sure opening the windows/doors that have been blocked up a long time will be done in a way that is aesthetically pleasing. He added they are tearing down the one story building and creating a two story space. Mr. Garrett stated they were not tearing anything down – they were adding to the existing structure. Mr. Bell stated if they are going to create a two story space, the whole roof structure would have to be ripped off. Mr. Garrett stated the entire roof on both buildings would have to be ripped off and replaced anyway. Mr. Locklear asked if the roof on the current building and the one story building would be consistent. Mr. Garrett stated the roofs would match. Mr. Bell stated they are proposing to change the front of the building significantly. The portion of the ordinance the committee wrestles with is that when something is built or something is changed, it is supposed to represent the character of the time it is being built. He added that the building is a classic three bay building and the applicant is trying to make it a four bay building and doesn't think it is architecturally correct and feels it throws off the integrity of the original building. Mr. Bell stated this building is one of the few that has windows on three sides and with the two story volume, some of the windows that make that second story a very unique space are being taken away. He added he was confused about the awnings – one diagram shows awnings upstairs and downstairs and another diagram shows them on just the lower story. He added he doesn't feel the awnings are the appropriate size because they go up to the sill of the windows above – there is not a line of brick showing. Mr. Bell stated a box office is shown on the floor plan, but there is not one shown on the outside of the building. He added this building is not a box office and is not sure a box office aesthetic is appropriate for the historic integrity of this building. He also stated he had concerns about the back of the building that shows door opening three feet from an adjacent building. He also expressed some concern with the Law Range side façade that is long with neat clusters of windows. He feels as though this façade, with paint or trim, could be broken up to create a more Law Range proportion. He further stated this is a very important project on a very important corner, but there are a lot of refinements that need to be done

	and a lot of questions that need to be answered before the project can move forward. Mr. Art Brabham stated his office is the immediate adjacent neighbor to the rear of the building on the Law Range side. He added that he loves this building and would like nothing better than to see it rehabilitated in an appropriate manner. He stated he is not in favor of the proposed façade redesign because it doesn't apply enough attention to the Law Range side. He suggested painting that long stretch of wall several compatible colors that creates more of the Law Range feel. Mr. J. Cabot Seth stated his law firm is excited that someone is renovating the old Naomi Warner building. However, he has concerns with the proposal for the Law Range side. He stated he is opposed to awnings – there are no awnings on Law Range and adding them would not be consistent with other properties on Law Range. Mr. Garrett stated the awnings were added to blend the front and side of the building. He added he understood Mr. Seth's concern and had no problem with leaving the awnings off that side. Mr. Seth stated breaking up the "gray beast" would be extremely welcomed and may make it fun and interesting for the perspective owners. He added putting windows on that wall will be a huge help if they are the right kind of windows. He added his last concern was access to the rear properties. He stated all the offices on Law Range open to back area that is all private parking. He stated he would be very concerned with any drinking establishment opening up to that dark corner at night – not so much opening up the back but it being a public exit. Mr. Grady asked if there was a proposed public exit on the rear of the building. Mr. Garrett stated it is only intended to be an emergency egress from the building. Ms. Parker stated she loved the rainbow row idea. She asked about the supply entrance to the kitchen and where the delivery trucks would park when making deliveries. Ms. Garrett stated they would do everything in their power to speed up the deliveries to get the trucks in and out as quickly as possible or schedule deliveries at night. Ms. Parker asked if the windows on Law Range had to be exactly alike.

	Mr. Bell stated he didn't think the windows had match. That would be a benefit of breaking up the façade. Mr. McGregor stated they are advocating changing the existing windows that inherent to the building from 1936. Ms. Rainey suggested meeting with the architect and the applicant and come up with some solutions that will achieve this and that are not too restrictive in terms of costs. Ms. Parker stated she was excited about the project but it needed tweaking to make it better. With no further discussion, Mr. Grady Locklear made a motion to defer this request until the January 22, 2015 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jean Whitaker and carried a unanimous vote.
OTHER BUSINESS	Mr. Grady Locklear made a motion to approve the 2015 Calendar. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jean Whitaker and carried a unanimous vote. Ms. Rainey stated she was working on the in-house approval guidelines and will have something at the next meeting.
ADJOURNMENT	With no further business, Mr. Grady Locklear made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by acclamation.
	Respectfully submitted, *Wanda F. Scott* Wanda F. Scott, Board Secretary