

MINUTES
TOWN OF FORT MILL
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD
August 9th, 2022
112 Confederate Street
4:30 PM

Present: Chairman Louis Roman, Megan Brinton, Scott Couchenour, Elizabeth Leventis, Jessica Scarlett, Nikki Todaro, Planning Director Penelope Karagounis, Senior Planner Alex Moore

Absent: David Booth

Guests: Trisha James, CJ Hines, Amy Dellinger

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Louis Roman called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Louis Roman entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the June 14th, 2022, HRB meeting. Elizabeth Leventis made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Scott Couchenour seconded the motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were then approved by a vote of 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

Since the applicant for the first item on the agenda was not in attendance at the meeting, Planning Director Penelope Karagounis requested that Chairman Louis Roman reverse the items on the HRB agenda so that the case involving a request for a certificate of appropriateness for a proposed ground sign to be placed at 134 North White Street be heard first.

Senior Planner Moore then provided an outline of request which included a COA application for a proposed ground sign to be located at 134 North White Street. Moore stated the proposed sign would be an on-premises ground sign for Fort Mill Pharmacy which would occupy the existing building at 134 White Street. He noted that the application indicated that this property is located at 134 N. White Street and is located within the town's historic district. The application showed the proposed installation of one double-sided, non-illuminated monument sign mounted on a brick base fronting Clebourne Street.

Moore then stated that the town's historic district guidelines indicate that ground signs should maintain the visual qualities and ambience of a building, site, and surrounding context in the following manner:

- i. Ground signs should be placed in a location that is readable from the street and appropriate for the building and its surroundings.
- ii. Ground signs should be subordinate in size to the building and in scale with the building's architectural elements.
- iii. Ground signs should be designed to not be so elaborate that they replicate or upstage the architecture of a historic building or its surroundings.
- iv. Only external illumination shall be used.
- v. Do not use internally lit plastic or plastic looking boxes

Moore then presented the specific zoning requirements for a ground sign.

- i. The maximum height of a ground sign is 8'. The proposed ground sign is 6' in height.
- ii. The maximum number of ground signs per street frontage is one. They propose one sign on the Clebourne Street frontage.
- iii. The maximum square footage for a non-illuminated ground sign is 80 square feet. This sign is proposed to be 21.32 square feet.
- iv. The minimum setback requirement for a ground sign is 15' from a property line and/or 3' from the edge of the right-of-way.
- v. The advertising message for such a sign should not occupy more than 40% of the total sign area. The advertising message of this sign proposes an area of approximately 8.16 square feet which comprises 38% of the signage area.

Senior Planner Moore then stated that Fort Mill Planning Staff recommends that the HRB grant approval for a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed ground sign as submitted.

Megan Brinton then asked if the sign base was already in place.

Moore responded that the sign base had not been placed on the property yet but that there was a temporary sign located on the property.

Megan Brinton then asked if the brick on the sign would match the building.

Moore responded that the sign was designed so the brick on the sign would match that of the building.

Megan Brinton then asked if there were plans for up-lighting of the sign.

Moore responded that he knew of no intention at this time to provide signage up-lighting.

Scott Couchenour asked if SCDOT had completed their project at the intersection of North White Street and Clebourne Street.

Planning Director Karagounis stated that SCDOT had indeed completed this project.

Scott Couchenour then asked if the town requires an address to be placed on such signs as that being proposed.

Senior Planner Alex Moore responded that he was not aware of such a requirement but that he would check on this.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Roman entertained a motion.

Scott Couchenour made a motion that the request for a certificate of appropriateness for the ground sign be approved as submitted.

Jessica Scartlett seconded the motion.

Then, by a vote of 6-0, the HRB approved the ground sign as presented for 134 North White Street.

2. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

The second item on the agenda included a request from Shanon Little for a certificate of appropriateness for a wall sign, window signage, and a change of paint colors for the building located at 231 Main Street.

Senior Planner Moore presented the information pertaining to this request. The applicant is “**You, Me, & the Dog**” represented by the business owner, Shanon Little.

Moore presented the historic district guidelines which would pertain to the project proposal:

1. This property is located at 231 & 233 Main Street. It is located within the historic district and is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
2. The town’s historic district guidelines indicate that there should be clear objectives for signage with limited impacts on defining features of a given building.
3. Window signage should be designed to minimize the amount of window covered and be painted on the glass or hung inside a window.
4. Regarding the proposed color change on the doors, the historic district guidelines indicated that the preferred color palette in Fort Mill is that which promotes a traditional or historic feel.

Moore then presented the specific proposals as submitted:

1. **Wall Sign:** The wall sign as proposed does indicate a clear objective design and the impacts on the upon the building’s character defining features are limited. Further, the location of the proposed wall sign is appropriate, and it fits the architecture and scale of the building. Additionally, this proposed wall sign meets the town’s zoning requirements in that it does not exceed 15% of the façade area.
2. **Window Signage:** The proposed window signage is shown on page 24 and page 24 of the packet. Although the applicant plans to place peel-and-stick lettering on the exterior of the windows, staff recommends that these stickers be of outdoor-grade if placed on the exterior.
3. **Door Color:** The applicant proposes to change the color of the two doors that front Main Street. The color would be a darker shade of the current blue, indicated to be “coastal blue” per page 21 of the packet, with a matte finish. This color would be consistent with the historic district guidelines.

Moore concluded his presentation by stating that planning staff recommended that that the HRB grant approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the improvements as presented with the condition that the window signage material be of outdoor grade.

Planning Director Karagounis then interjected that people get caught up on the “cuteness” of fonts on signage. She indicated that this would make the wall sign font difficult to read from Main Street with the “me” in “You, Me and the Dog” looking like “the.”

Elizabeth Leventis then stated that she had the same immediate reaction regarding the signage. She also noted that the window signage was not consistent.

Senior Planner Moore then noted that the board could make it a condition that the branding of the business be consistent.

Elizabeth Leventis then stated that she would like to have a better drawing illustrating the proposed window signage.

Nikki Todaro then stated that the proposed copy as presented for the windows would cover a good deal of the window.

Moore then asked the HRB if they wished for this proposal to come back to them for further review or if they would like for staff to handle this administratively.

Chairman Roman then asked if there had been any discussion about the upper windows in this building as they are currently boarded up.

Planning Director Karagounis then noted that if opportunities arose then town council wanted boarded up windows in the downtown area to be opened. However, she also noted that this applicant does not own this building.

Chairman Roman then stated that the proposed “coastal blue” color on the doors was within the parameters of what the HRB was looking to see, but that perhaps there could be opportunity for also upgrading the existing awning on this building.

Chairman Roman then indicated that it would be necessary to determine whether they wished to approve the submittal with conditions and allow staff to handle it or if HRB deemed it necessary for the applicant to be present at a meeting to present changes as recommended.

The HRB indicated that they wished for the applicant to come back to them with changes as discussed.

Chairman Roman then entertained a motion for deferral on the agenda item.

Scott Couchenour made a motion that action on the item be deferred until the next called meeting.

Chairman Roman then asked for clarification from Alex Moore on the items which were to be addressed by the applicant at the next called meeting.

Moore then stated that the following items needed to be addressed by the applicant and reviewed by HRB:

1. The applicant needs to submit a true and accurate schematic of the proposed window signage.
2. All business branding must match with readable font used.
3. The paint used on the doors must be suitable for outdoor use.
4. A swatch sample indicating that the paint used on the doors will match the color of the awning.
5. The possibility of the currently boarded, upper story windows being restored (suggestion only).

Megan Brinton then seconded the motion.

Then, by a vote of 6-0, the HRB approved the item’s deferral to the next scheduled meeting with the conditions as noted.

There being no other business, Chairman Roman adjourned the meeting at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Alex J. Moore, AICP

Senior Planner

August 31st, 2022