



City of Greenville
Design Review Board – Neighborhood Design Panel
Minutes of the **July 2nd, 2020** Regular Meeting
Webex Virtual Meeting
Meeting Notice Posted on Wednesday, June 17th, 2020
Minutes prepared by Matt Lonnerstater

Members Present: Monica Floyd, Fred Guthier, Jermaine Johnson, Matt Tindall and Allison Tucker
Members Absent: None
Staff Present: Jay Graham, Planning and Development Manager, Logan Wells, Assistant City Attorney; Courtney Powell, Senior Development Planner; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Brennan Williams, Community Development Division; Kris Kurjiaka, Development Planner; Benjamin Abdo, Development Planner; Jordan Harris, Development Intern.

Call to Order:

Chairman Fred Guthier called the virtual meeting to order at 3:00 PM. He welcomed those in attendance and explained the procedures for the meeting. The minutes of the June 4th, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously. The agenda for the July 2nd, 2020 meeting was approved unanimously. All affidavits were received. Allison Tucker cited a conflict of interest for case CA 20-266. Lonnerstater called out to the public to gather names for public comment.

Old Business:

A. None

New Business:

A. CA 20-266

Application by Josiah Pott for an **UNREASONABLE HARDSHIP EXEMPTION** for roof replacement at **110 Butler Ave.** (TM# 001500-02-00600).

Allison Tucker recused herself from the meeting, citing a conflict of interest with this case.

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for an unreasonable hardship exemption to replace an existing metal roof with a faux terra-cotta design with a new architectural shingle roof. Lonnerstater explained that, upon submittal of the application, both staff and the applicant believed the roof to be real terra-cotta clay tile. However, since, application submittal, the applicant discovered that the roof was composed of corrugated sheet metal bent and painted in a way to imitate terra-cotta tile. Lonnerstater outlined the Land Management Ordinance standards for finding an unreasonable hardship, and explained staff's recommendation of approval with the condition that the replacement roof consist of high-quality architectural shingles with specifications to be approved by the Planning and Development Department. Lonnerstater presented pictures of the subject property, dating back to 1947, which were submitted by neighbors after the publishing of the staff report; the pictures appear to depict a corrugated metal roof on the subject house.

Josiah Pott, applicant, 823 South Church St., Apt. 1209, Greenville, concurred with staff comments and recommendation. Mr. Pott added that the previous owners of the house had indicated to him that there were not serious issues with the roof prior to purchasing. Mr. Pott indicated that a metal roof would cost less to install than real terra-cotta, but would still cost upwards of \$24,000. Mr. Pott indicated that he does not currently have financing for the roof replacement.

Matt Tindall asked Mr. Pott if he had received a quote for replacing the roof with a new metal roof. Mr. Pott stated that the terra-cotta would be approximately \$28,000 and a metal roof would be approximately \$24,000. Mr. Pott clarified that, prior to purchasing, it was his understanding that the roof was in good shape.

Fred Guthier asked Mr. Pott if he had engaged with the neighborhood regarding this application. Mr. Pott replied that he had spoken with Mr. Bob Lloyd, president of the Hampton-Pinckney Neighborhood Association.

Planner Lonnerstater stated that letters received from the public regarding this application had been forwarded onto all the Board members.

Aaron Barr, 109 Butler Ave., spoke in opposition of the application. Mr. Barr presented historic photographs of the subject property, dating back to 1947.

Travis Seward, 308 Hampton Ave., spoke in opposition of the application.

Josiah Pott clarified that he had asked Mr. Bob Lloyd for his opinion on the application and indicated that he was supportive of the change.

Matt Tindall asked if this was the first time this project had come before the board. Planner Lonnerstater clarified that there had been several staff-level reviews of this property, but that this application was the first to go in front of the DRB. Matt Tindall explained that this roof issue had been previously reviewed informally by staff and two members of the DRB, and that there are companies that can produce a similar metal roof today.

Fred Guthier stated that, although he was previously unfamiliar with this type of roof, it would be a mistake for the Board to permit its removal.

Monica Floyd stated that the existing roof is distinctive and should be replaced in kind.

Jermaine Johnson concurred with the previous Board comments.

Monica Floyd asked if the applicant would be required to return to the full DRB for approval of the metal roof. Planner Lonnerstater clarified that staff does have the capacity to approve 'replacement-in-kind' administratively.

Matt Tindall made a motion to deny application CA 20-266 based on the finding that it is possible to replicate the roof in-kind such that it meets the color, texture and material of the existing roof, and that replacing in-kind would satisfy the Design Guidelines. Further, the Board requests that the new roof material be reviewed and approved by staff and two Board members prior to approval. The motion was seconded by Jermaine Johnson and approved 5-0.

Allison Tucker rejoined the meeting.

B. CA 19-674

Application by Kimley Horn on behalf of Verizon Wireless for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for new wireless infrastructure.

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new small-cell wireless facility poles within city rights-of-way. The applicant is seeking design approval for two types of poles, a wood pole and a metal pole. Per the City's Small-Cell Wireless Facilities Design Catalogue, applicants may submit details for inclusion in the catalogue. Lonnerstater clarified that the applicant has not, to-date, formally submitted a list of node locations; rather, the applicant is seeking approval for design only. Lonnerstater outlined staff's support of a wood pole with a concealed shroud at the top and support of a slim metal pole design with a pole-top omni antenna. Staff is not supportive of the decorative lamp attachments. Lonnerstater outlined staff's recommended conditions of approval:

1. The wood pole design shall feature a concealed antenna shroud of the same diameter as the wood pole for pole-top omni technology antennae and a similarly suitable shroud proposal for future technology currently unspecified. Applicant shall submit to staff a revised wood pole design depicting the applicable shroud solution at the top of the pole rather than exposed antennas/radios; and
2. The wood pole design shall only be permitted for use in rights-of-way where there are existing wood utility pole along the same block face; and
3. Equipment cabinets should be about the width of the pole (so that from the opposite side they are only partially visible); and
4. Metal poles shall be of a slim design and feature the omni-top antenna design; and
5. The decorative lamps are not approved for the metal poles; and
6. Colorations should match the pole for the wood pole, and the stealth facilities should be colored the same as street lights along the same corridor; and
7. No elements are permitted that are not shown on the design (e.g., lighting, noise-generating equipment); and
8. This is a design approval only. All specific locations must be authorized by an individual node site license issued upon a showing of compliance with the LMO, the right-of-way management ordinance, and the terms of the Verizon Franchise Agreement dated November 25, 2019.

David Franklin, 6410 Yellow Birch St., Cumming, GA – applicant - presented updated graphics that incorporate 5G technology. Mr. Franklin clarified that the wood poles would likely only be permitted where there are existing wood poles.

No one from the public spoke in favor or against the application.

Matt Tindall made a motion to approve application CA 19-674 for the shrouded wood pole and metal pole option number 3 (omni-top antenna and slim design), with the following conditions:

- 1. The wood pole design shall feature a concealed antenna shroud of the same diameter as the wood pole for pole-top omni technology antennae and a similarly suitable shroud proposal for future technology currently unspecified. Applicant shall submit to staff a revised wood pole design depicting the applicable shroud solution at the top of the pole rather than exposed antennas/radios; and**
- 2. The wood pole design shall only be permitted for use in rights-of-way where there are existing wood utility pole along the same block face; and**
- 3. Equipment cabinets should be about the width of the pole (so that from the opposite side they are only partially visible); and**

4. Metal poles shall be of a slim design and feature the omni-top antenna design; and
5. The decorative lamps are not approved for the metal poles; and
6. Colorations should match the pole for the wood pole, and the stealth facilities should be colored the same as street lights along the same corridor; and
7. No elements are permitted that are not shown on the design (e.g., lighting, noise-generating equipment); and
8. This is a design approval only. All specific locations must be authorized by an individual node site license issued upon a showing of compliance with the LMO, the right-of-way management ordinance, and the terms of the Verizon Franchise Agreement dated November 25, 2019.

Motion seconded by Monica Floyd and approved 5-0.

Other Business (Not a Public Hearing):

- A. None

Advice and Comment (Not a Public Hearing)

- A. None

Informal Review (Not a Public Hearing):

- A. None

Adjourn:

Having no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.