

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
JANUARY 25, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield;  
Linda Lane; and Cindy Adams.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn, Planning Department.  
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:**

Ms. Geary reviewed the order of cases on the agenda. She informed members that an additional item has been requested by the applicant for reconsideration by the Commission and will be added to the agenda. In addition, the rezoning request will be moved up on the agenda.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Ms. Geary stated that the absences of Ms. Graeber, Mr. Smith, Mr. Pratt and Mr. Hoggard were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 7, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:**

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the December 7, 2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE REVISION:**

Counsel Jones said that proposed revisions to the rules of procedure were presented and discussed at the December, 2016 meeting. Members are in receipt of a draft reflecting the final revisions for adoption by the Commission.

Mr. Arneke commented that under Terms of Appointments it states that appointment for the unexpired portion of the term shall be considered as appointment for a full term. He requested that the language be amended to reflect that appointment for more than half of the unexpired portion of the term shall be considered as appointment for a full term.

Mr. Arneke moved to approve the new Rules of Procedure as amended, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Counsel Jones said that a corrected copy of the draft will be distributed to members at the next meeting.

**REQUEST FOR REZONING:**

**Recommendation for Rezoning Property Located at 507 North Church Street  
(APPROVED)**

Mike Kirkman, Zoning Administrator with the Planning Department, said that anytime there is a rezoning request that falls within one of the local historic districts, the ordinance requires the Historic Preservation Commission to be made aware of the request and have the opportunity to provide input that will then be used by the Zoning Commission for their consideration. He asked the Commission for their recommendation on this matter.

The request before the Commission is for property at 507 North Church Street. The applicant is requesting to go from an existing Conditional District Office designation to the Central Business district with conditions. The existing Conditional District Office designation currently allows for limited residential uses and office uses. The first condition to be added to the requested Central Business is that the existing historical structure shall be retained. The second condition is that all uses allowed in the Central Business district be permitted with the exception of a lengthy list of uses as noted on the application. If approved, the applicant is planning to use this property as a special events facility. This property has been on the market for several years.

Mr. Arneke pointed out that an eating and drinking establishment with drive-through facilities is an allowed use. It was noted that bars, nightclubs, and brewpubs are prohibited in the proposed conditions. Mr. Kirkman explained that since this is a conditional district zoning request, there is an opportunity for discussion to place additional conditions on the request through the hearing process. The use of an eating and drinking establishment with drive-through facilities could be a prohibited use in the Commission's recommendation.

Amanda Hodierna, 804 Green Valley Road, Attorney, was present on behalf of the applicants. She indicated that her clients, Cheryl Bradley and Kaitlyn Holland, have put this application together and intend to use the property as a boutique event venue. They applied for the rezoning because this use is currently not permitted in the Office designation. The conditions have been proposed in an attempt to keep the request appropriate with the historic district neighborhood and to insure that the historic nature of the property will be preserved. They will definitely add in the brew pub and bar use that was an oversight. They will amend their application going forward. She said that there is an additional layer of assurance in the zoning conditions that these houses won't be demolished. The property has been used commercially for 16 years and has not been residential for some time. The event venue will be a good adaptive reuse for the property. She felt that the request was congruent with the preservation goals of the historic district.

Chair Wharton said that the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation either in favor of or opposed to the rezoning request to the Zoning Commission.

Ms. Stringfield said she would like to be supportive; however, she does not have the full list of uses permitted in the Central Business district. She noted that any concerning items on the list of permitted uses could be discussed at the public hearing when the Zoning Commission meets to make a determination on this case.

Mr. Arneke felt that this was a great proposal considering the difficulty selling the property and the significance of the two large houses.

Chair Wharton commented that from a preservation point of view, the condition that it not be demolished is very good.

Mr. Arneke moved to support the proposed rezoning, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 811 North Elm Street**  
**Application Number 2032**  
**Applicant: Greg Flury, ABC Roofing**  
**Owner: Delancy Street Foundation, Timothy Counselman**  
**Date Application Received: 1-16-17**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Exterior alterations.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Roofs (pages 51-53)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Pak Historic District. The Fisher Park National Register of Historic Places entry for this property states: *W.L. Carter House: horizontality of Prairie style emphasized through; recessed horizontal mortar joints at brick veneer that covers bottom ¾'s of house; stuccoed second story with added raised horizontal bank; wide overhanging eaves at flat-roofed porch and low hip red tile roof; brick retaining wall with recessed horizontal mortar joints.*

**Fact:**

The project proposes to replace the original clay tile roof with a "Slateline" asphalt shingle in the color "Weathered Slate". This material mimics a slate roof.

**Fact:**

The clay tile roof is original to the historic property constructed in 1917. On a specialty roof of this age, the roof underlayment wears out over time and requires replacement. The clay tiles can often be removed, a new underlayment installed and the tiles can be reinstalled.

**Fact:**

The tin roof material on the dormers will be replaced with copper. The flat roof membrane will be replaced to match. The existing tin built-in gutters will be replaced with new aluminum built-in gutters. The existing gutter downspouts will be replaced to match in the color almond. The use of copper roofing materials on the gable dormers is consistent with historic roofing materials. The use of aluminum for the lining of the built-in gutters will not be visible.

**Guidelines under Roofs (page 53):**

2. *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission tiles" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original.*
5. *Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters.*

**Conditions:**

1. That the original clay tile roof be repaired rather than replaced.
2. That the built-in gutters and dormers are repaired to match with the exception of a change in material to allow for the aluminum lining and copper roofing.

**In Support:**

Mark Scott, 811 North Elm Street  
 Timothy Counselman, 811 North Elm Street

Greg Flurry, ABC Roofing, 624-A Guilford College Road  
David Hudson, 5727 Appomattox Road

**In Opposition:**

Liz Urkett, 403 West Bessemer Avenue

**Rebuttal in Support:**

Greg Flurry, ABC Roofing, 624-A Guilford College Road

**Discussion:**

Ms. Geary presented the staff report for this case and indicated that staff is in favor of application with conditions as follows: (1) That the roof be repaired rather than replaced; and (2) That built-in gutters and dormers are repaired to match with the exception of a change in material to allow for the aluminum lining and copper roofing. She explained that the owner is currently in process of replacing the historic clay tile roof. Staff feels that the mission style clay tile is a significant part of the historic character of the structure and therefore, it should be repaired. The property owner is Delancy Street Foundation and the applicant is Greg Flurry of ABC Roofing. She informed members that staff has offered to assist the property owner in applying for a local foundation grant that focuses on historic preservation. The grant would help offset the cost of obtaining a clay tile roof.

Mark Scott, 811 North Elm Street, is with Delancy Street Foundation. The roof has leaked for several years and this year they were able to put enough money aside to consider finally repairing the roof. They wanted to repair the roof within the budget they could afford and they wanted it to look aesthetically pleasing. He noted that neighbors have used similar roofing replacement material. The roofing company obtained a permit before they began work and half of the roof has already been taken off. He said they do not have the funding to put a clay tile roof on the building.

Timothy Counselman, 811 North Elm Street, is the project manager on behalf of the Delancy Street Foundation. They have not received quotes for clay tile roof replacement. They go on the roof quite often to unstop the gutters and the clay tiles have already cracked and are very brittle. It is not possible to repair the tiles. The tiles will have to be removed to find the spots where the roof is leaking down into the house. It was noted that 50% of the roof has already been replaced and the back of the property has already been done.

Gregory Flurry, ABC Roofing, 624 A Guilford College Road, said that the front and right side of the house have not been reroofed. The permit was issued to the applicant. Ms. Geary explained that in an effort to streamline the COA process, reroofing has been removed from the requirement of obtaining a COA. There was a lack of communication in this circumstance that occurs rarely. There have been conversations between Preservation staff and building inspections to prevent this from happening again.

Mr. Flurry said that replacing clay tile with matching clay tile would have added \$50,000 to \$75,000 to the overall cost of repair. Synthetic material that mimics clay tile would probably be a similar amount. It was noted that clay tile absorbs moisture and has a shorter life span the further north it is found.

The underlayment is completely compromised and is full of holes and tears. He expressed concern that the roof is exposed to the elements in its current state and damage is likely to occur there is a storm.

David Hudson, 5727 Appomattox Road, spoke from the audience. He is a licensed general contractor and stated his opinion that it could cost over \$100,000 to replace the clay tiles on this particular roof. Due to cracks in the tile and exposure to the elements, there is really no way to repair the clay tiles.

Liz Urkett, 403 West Bessemer Avenue, was speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. Based on the guidelines and COA requirements, the neighborhood association regretfully cannot support this application.

Speaking in rebuttal, Mr. Flurry said that the shingle that they are installing has a slate-like appearance and is in keeping with the period. Unfortunately, it is not the right clay tile. The amount of the contract using the slate-like material was between \$80,000 to \$90,000 in total. To use clay tile would increase the cost by \$25,000 to \$50,000.

Mr. Arneke pointed out the net assets of the Delancy Street Foundation and felt that funds were available for the repair using clay tiles. This group is Delancy Street Foundation—North Carolina and the work they do goes back into supporting their location.

Ms. Stringfield said that although it is a painful position to be in, she could not approve this request due to the guidelines.

Citing Guidelines 2 and 3 on page 53, Ms. Adams commented that there is discretionary room in the guidelines and felt the application should be granted without conditions.

Mr. Arneke disagreed and cited Guideline 2 that specifies the use of historical roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of the historic structure as this roof is. He said that Guideline 2 specifically mentions clay “missionary style” tiles. Ms. Adams pointed out that the materials listed in the Guidelines are suggestions and this is a foundation, not a private individual. Mr. Arneke referred to Delancy Foundation’s revenue statement in 2014 and stated his opinion that Delancy Street Foundation can afford the clay tiles. The property owner is Delancy Street Foundation-San Francisco, California and not Delancy Street Foundation-North Carolina.

Ms. Lane indicated that she was in agreement with comments made by Ms. Stringfield and Mr. Arneke. She added that the Commission is present to do historical review and not fiduciary analysis.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2032 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for *Roofs* (page 53) as follows: (2) *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay “mission tiles” or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original; and (5) Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane.

Following discussion, Mr. Arneke amended his motion. Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2032 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for *Roofs* (page 53) as follows: (2) *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay “mission tiles” or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original; and (5) Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The finding that the proposed project is not incongruous is contingent on the two conditions suggested by the staff that the original clay tile roof be repaired rather than replaced and that the built-in gutters and dormers are repaired to match with the exception of a change in material to allow

for the aluminum lining and copper roofing. Ms. Lane accepted the amendment and seconded the amended motion. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: Adams.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2032 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Gregory Flurry, ABC Roofing, Inc., for work at 811 North Elm Street with the following conditions: (1) That the historic roofing materials be preserved and maintained. Any clay tiles that are not in good enough condition to be reused can be replaced with new or matching clay tiles. (2) That the staff is allowed to work with the applicant to consider substitute materials and approve their use if they find a substitute material that matches the existing clay tiles. (3) That the applicant is allowed to use asphalt shingles on the rear elevation of the roof if they chose to do so. (4) That the built-in gutters and dormers are to be repaired to match with the exception of a change in material to allow for the aluminum lining and copper roofing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Adams, Lane. Nays: Stringfield.)

Ms. Adams requested that the record should reflect that the City, not Delancy Street Foundation, misstepped on this matter. Chair Wharton commented that it is the property owner's responsibility to do their due diligence. Zoning is a complicated matter but City employees and citizens both have responsibilities.

- (b) Location: 205 North Park Drive**  
**Application Number 2027**  
**Applicant: Sarala Acharya**  
**Owner: Yagya Acharya**  
**Date Application Received: 12-14-16**  
**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Landscaping - (after-the-fact).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Historic District. The house sits on an embankment with a center walk that extends to the public sidewalk with masonry steps.

**Fact:**

The landscaping creates a stepped terrace effect through the use of vertical wood boards (approximately 4 inches in height) that allows the establishment of plant materials. The vegetation will grow to cover the wood boards and assist in erosion control of the embankment until the plants are established. The project also includes the installation of a metal arbor gate and hand rails at the sidewalk steps.

**Guidelines (page 23):**

3. Maintain the property's natural topography, and avoid grading that adversely affects drainage and soil stability or could negatively impact existing trees.

**In Support:**

Sarala Acharya, 205 North Park Drive  
Liz Urkett, 3403 West Bessemer Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Geary explained that this property sits on an embankment and there is a sidewalk leading to the front door. Vertical boards were used to hold back the earth and eliminate runoff when these landscaping beds were created. The board placement created a terraced effect. Staff does not see this as a permanent change. Once the plant material has an opportunity to thrive and grow, the wooden boards will disappear or be unnoticeable. The project also includes the installation of a metal arbor gate and handrails at the sidewalk steps. Staff sees no issue with the gate and handrails; however, it was suggested that they be painted the traditional black color. It was noted that the bricks are considered edging material and do not require a COA according to the Guidelines.

Sarala Acharya, 205 North Park Drive, said that the wooden boards will decay in 3 to 4 years and are considered temporary. She will replace the wooden boards with bricks in the future.

Liz Urkett, 3403 West Bessemer Avenue, was representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. They are in support of the application because they feel it does not violate any of the guidelines.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2027 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines*. Based on information contained in the application, staff recommends in favor of this COA and in their opinion the work is not incongruous with *Guideline 3* (page 23) under *Trees and Landscaping*. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2027 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sarala Acharya for work at 205 North Park Drive based on the findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Counsel Jones noted for the record that Ms. Adams has left the meeting. This is considered an unexcused absence for the remainder of the meeting. In accordance with state law, Ms. Adams's vote in any subsequent motion will be counted in the affirmative.

- (d) Location: 111 East Hendrix Street**  
**Application Number 2030**  
**Applicant: Mary K. Nicholas**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 1-2-17**  
**(CONTINUED)**

**Description of Work:**

Exterior alterations.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)*, Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62-66) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park Historic District. The original design had 4 opened covered porches on both the first and second levels. Over time the areas were closed in to gain more interior space. The property owner would like to reopen the 2<sup>nd</sup> story porches while keeping the first floor porches closed in for security reasons.

**Fact:**

The project proposes to replace all windows so that they match in design and rework the appearance of the first floor closed in porches to be more compatible with the building.

**Guidelines under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 54):**

*2. Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.*

**Guidelines under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64):**

*1. Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.  
3. If a deteriorated porch must be removed or is completely missing, replace it either with a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design that is appropriate for the structure in terms of material, roof form, detailing, scale, size and ornamentation.*

**Conditions:**

1. That staff works with the property owner to identify an appropriate replacement window product for the first level closed in porch areas, the appropriate railing design and material for the 2<sup>nd</sup> story porch openings and any details pertaining to the finishes of those newly exposed exterior areas and that original window should be repaired. If necessary, only selective replacement of original windows should be done based on careful evaluation.

**In Support:**

Liz Urkett, 3403 West Bessemer Avenue.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

The property owner was not present to speak on this case. The project is proposing to reopen the front porches on only the second level while keeping the first floor porches closed in for security reasons. The owner wants to maintain the interior space that was obtained by closing in the porches on the first level. A railing will need to be installed. The owner is very open to design suggestions and materials and some of these details can be approved at staff level. Ms. Geary explained that the application itself proposes to replace all the windows in the building. Mr. Cowhig met with the property owner and representatives of Double Hung Windows at the property earlier in the day. As a result of the meeting, the property owner now understands how easily the windows can be repaired and reused and is looking in that direction. It is still undetermined how the owner will rework the first level porches. He wants to make the walls match and be more aesthetically pleasing. Staff is recommending approval of this COA application with conditions based on *Guidelines for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)*.



Liz Urkett was speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association gave their conditional approval of the request pending drawings.

Members expressed concern that many vagaries appear in the application and there is insufficient information for COA approval. A list of materials, site plans, and drawings are not contained in the application. Ms. Geary acknowledged that it would be difficult as a Commissioner to make a judgement on something from the packet without the information relayed in her presentation. Instead of continuing this application for more information, the option of turning these approvals over to staff was discussed.

Ms. Stringfield said that her first inclination was to continue this case or to deny it because there are so many unknowns.

Mr. Arneke was reluctant to approve this application because there is so much that is not clear. The Commission would be within the required 60 day period to continue this case.

Ms. Geary indicated that this will be a tax credit project. During discussion she felt that staff would be able to work with the property owner to make decisions that can be brought back to the Commission.

Mr. Arneke moved to continue this application and asked that staff works with the applicant to provide clarification on materials and design. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Adams, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: None.)

**(c) Location: 624 Park Avenue  
Application Number 2031  
Applicant: Mary K. Nicholas  
Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 1-2-17  
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace front door - (after-the-fact).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Aycock Historic District. The original front door was a multi-paned full glass door. The property owner has requested a new door for security reasons.

**Fact:**

The replacement door is of a design and material that is not compatible with the architecture and character of the building. The current replacement door does not alter the original door opening dimensions or trim.

**Fact:**

Alternative door styles are available and tempered glass utilized in a French door style are options that provide security while also complimenting the historic architecture of the building.

**Guidelines (page 57):**

2. Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.

**Conditions:**

1. That the property owner works with staff to identify an appropriate replacement door that matches the architectural character of the building.
2. The applicant may consider utilizing a salvaged historic door appropriate for a foursquare style building.
3. That the original door be retained if feasible so that it may be reinstalled at a future date.

**In Support:**

Mary Nicholas, 624 Park Avenue.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Geary said that this is an after-the-fact application and the front door of the house has been replaced with an inappropriate door style for the historic district. Staff is recommending in favor of this application with conditions. The owner chose this solid door for security reasons as there have been instances of break-ins in the neighborhood. The replacement door does not alter the door opening or the trim. There are numerous alternative door styles available and she noted the styles provided in *Historic District Design Guidelines*. In addition, she reviewed options to increase the privacy and security of the door per her conversation with Elizabeth Benton, City of Greensboro Code Compliance.

Mary Nicholas, property owner, indicated that she changed the door for security reasons and she cited crime reports in the area. The previous door had 15 glass panels and was appropriate for the period the house was built. There is a full light storm door that was installed after the solid replacement door. Ms. Nicholas believed that she still has the original door.

Staff suggested that the original door should be installed somewhere on the property if it is in existence.

Mr. Arneke said that this presents itself as another situation where the Commission could direct staff to work with the property owner to select an appropriate door that would be sufficiently secure to meet the concerns of the applicant but also be consistent with the style of the house.

Counsel Jones commented that since this is an after-the-fact application, a deadline should be placed on the condition so that further enforcement can be taken if necessary.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2031 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and *Guideline 2* (page 57) under *Doors and Windows* are acceptable as findings of fact contingent on the condition that the property owner work with the staff to identify an appropriate replacement door that matches the architectural character of the building. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2031 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mary Nicholas for work at 624 Park Avenue with the following conditions: (1) That the property owner works with the staff to identify an appropriate replacement door that matches the architectural character of the building; (2) That the applicant may consider utilizing a salvaged historic door appropriate for a foursquare style building; (3) That the original door be retained if feasible so that it may be reinstalled at a future date; and (4) That the work be completed within 90 days. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION:**

**Location: 612 Park Avenue**

**Application Number 2013**

**Applicant: David Hudson**

**(APPROVED FOR RECONSIDERATION AT THE FEBRUARY, 2017 MEETING)**

Ms. Geary said that this application for a retaining wall was before the Commission at the last meeting and was denied. This is an after-the-fact application. The applicant was unable to attend last month's meeting and has requested that this matter be reconsidered by the Commission. A request for reconsideration can come before the Commission when there is new information that was not provided in the previous review of the application. In speaking with the applicant, Ms. Geary believes that there are additional comments that could assist in this situation.

Counsel Jones explained that the Commission would hear from the applicant and if it is felt there is additional information to warrant reconsideration, they could vote tonight that the application be placed on the next agenda. Reasons or information for reconsideration would be considered tonight, not the merits of the application.

David Hudson, applicant, resides at 5727 Appomattox Road in Pleasant Garden, North Carolina. John and Judy Worsley are owners of this property. The reason for the wall is to help with erosion issues and the subsequent mud that runs off into the sidewalk. They looked for older, nice looking material to match the granite but noted that several neighbors on the street have used brick and other materials. The retaining wall is not permanent and it can be removed in less than an hour. They planted flowers to make the property look better. The retaining wall could not be moved further back because of the location of the City sewer cleanout drain.

Mr. Hudson explained that he works for the Worsleys and was supposed to be present at the last meeting. He got the dates mixed up and missed the meeting.

At the last meeting there was no one present to address the Commission's question of whether or not the retaining wall could be lowered to be more of an edging. The scale of the wall could be discussed if the matter is reconsidered at the next meeting. In addition, Mr. Hudson clarified that the wall is not actually sitting on the sidewalk. It was built right next the sidewalk to prevent the grass from growing up beside of it.

Mr. Arneke stated that it would be reasonable to rehear the case next month.

Ms. Geary summarized that the property is in violation because the wall was built without a COA and the Commission denied the application last month because they did not feel the wall was built with an appropriate material and style. One way to correct the violation is to just remove the wall but it was relayed today that the reason for the wall is to prevent erosion. Staff can discuss other options with the applicant in the interim that would not require him to return before the Commission. It may be possible to remove the wall and create just one tier of stone that would help keep the dirt from

going out into the sidewalk. This solution could be approved at staff level. There could also be a discussion with staff in the interim about using other materials. It is possible that a resolution may be reached prior to next month that could be relayed by staff at the meeting.

Mr. Arneke moved to reconsider application 2013, property located at 621 Park Avenue, at the February, 2017 meeting, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton informed members that Mr. Pratt has an ongoing professional conflict that will prevent him from attending meetings for the next few months. He plans to return to the Commission in May, 2017 to fulfill the remainder of his term. Members were in agreement to retain Mr. Pratt on the Commission rather than to find a replacement. Ms. Geary noted that staff is still waiting for a replacement to be found to fill Ms. Adam's At-Large seat.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Members and staff discussed dealing with financial concerns of the applicant as applications are being considered. Ms. Geary cited a portion of the Guidelines that addresses this matter.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Geary stated that staff has fine-tuned the data base and they are in process of checking on outstanding after-the-fact applications. Staff will continue to report to the Commission on progress being made on this matter.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
FEBRUARY 22, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield; David Hoggard and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn - Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Ms. Geary stated that the absences of Ms. Graeber, Mr. Smith, Mr. Pratt and Ms. Adams were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 25, 2017 REGULAR MEETING:**

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the January 25, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 612 Park Avenue  
Application Number 2038  
Applicant: David Hudson  
Owner: John Worsley  
Date Application Received: 1-25-17  
(DENIED)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of retaining wall (after-the-fact).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the wall is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Fences, Walls and Site Features (24)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The wall is constructed of masonry units fabricated from concrete to mimic stone blocks. The units are interlocking and not mortared so they do not have mortar joints typical of most historic retaining walls in the neighborhood. The blocks themselves do not possess all of the characteristics of natural stone.

**Fact:**

The retaining wall is in a very prominent location—at the front of the property along the public sidewalk. Since it is so prominent the differences with the historic retaining walls are amplified.

**Guidelines #4 (page 26):**

*Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood. It is not appropriate to construct retaining walls of inappropriate materials such as landscape timbers, railroad ties, or concrete blocks where visible from the street.*

**In Support:**

David Hudson, 5727 Appomattox Road, Pleasant Garden, North Carolina  
John Worsley, 8145 Cypress Street

**In Opposition:**

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue  
James Rounds, 604 Park Avenue

**Discussion:**

Staff stated that this is a reconsideration of a denied application. The wall that was built does not have the characteristics of a historic wall. The wall is made of stacked concrete block which is more of a contemporary treatment. Staff is recommending against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness.

At the last meeting staff recommended the solution of installing a wall consisting of one row of block with a cap. David Hudson, applicant, said that they are concerned about safety resulting from erosion and the mud and dirt coming down onto the sidewalk. Taking the wall down to one row with a cap will not solve the problem of the dirt and mud. He replied in the affirmative when asked if they would entertain using a rusticated block for the wall. Mr. Cowhig recommended notching 4 to 6 inches behind the sidewalk to place natural stone at the base of the bank for one or two rows as a remedy for erosion. Mr. Hudson noted that the bank cannot be regraded to accommodate a lower slope due to the placement of a septic line that goes to the street. He indicated they did not realize they needed to secure a COA when they built the current wall.

John Worsley, property owner, said that he did not understand why the wall was not being allowed because it is much like all the other walls in the neighborhood. It was noted that Mr. Worsley owns several properties in the Aycock Historic neighborhood and previous applications for COA's have been submitted by him in the past. The guidelines were available for him to consult before the current wall was built. The reason for the hearing is that the *Historic District Design Guidelines* indicate that a COA was required for the wall and what was built is not congruous with the guidelines.

Mindy Zachary stated that the Neighborhood Association Board met and voted not to support this wall at any height. James Rounds described other walls in the neighborhood and stated his opposition to the wall.

Speaking in rebuttal, Mr. Hudson said it would be no problem to remove the wall if the Commission would like them to do so. They are just trying to make the houses look better and fix them up. He stated his opinion that there are walls in the neighborhood that do not appear to be in keeping with a historic district.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2038 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project remains incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for *Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 26), (4)*

*Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood. It is not appropriate to construct retaining walls of inappropriate materials such as landscape timbers, railroad ties, or concrete blocks where visible from the street;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2038 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Hudson for work at 612 Park Avenue with the condition that the wall will be removed within 60 days. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (b) **Location: 111 E. Hendrix Street**  
**Application Number 2030 (continued from January 25, 2017 meeting)**  
**Applicant: Christian Redmond**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 12-29-16**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Exterior alterations.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 62-66)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park Historic District. Originally, there were four recessed porches on the front of the building, one for each apartment. Over time, the porches were enclosed with windows and siding and in one case with a jalousie window. The applicant is proposing to tear out the existing enclosures and go back with three windows in the upper portion of the opening and brick in the bottom portion. The brick would be recessed slightly. This will give a consistent look to each apartment.

**Fact:**

The building has structural problems and maintenance has been neglected for years. It will be repaired and updated throughout. With the exception of the porches, there will not be any changes to the exterior.

**Guidelines under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64):**

1. *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.*
7. *Because of their character-defining role, it is not appropriate to enclose front porches. Side and rear porches may be enclosed to create sunrooms if the design of the enclosure is compatible with the architecture of the structure, and does not result in a loss of historic fabric or architectural details.*

Note: There is an illustration on page 66 that may apply in this case. It shows a side porch that has been enclosed for a "sun parlor" with windows above and wood panels below. The concern with using brick is that the porches will no longer be recognizable.

**Conditions:**

1. That the porches be enclosed in a manner similar to the illustration on page 66 of the guidelines.

2. Hardi panels and composite trim could be substituted for wood since it would be exposed to the weather.

**In Support:**

Christian Redmond, 1110 Schiffman Lane, McLean, Virginia  
Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

It was noted that this application is continued from the January, 2017 meeting. Mr. Cowhig said that the owner would like to make the porches have a consistent look. Staff enthusiastically supports this project. This property has been in disrepair for some time and has some structural problems that will be addressed during the work. The one catch is that there is a difference of opinion about how the porches should be handled. There is nothing in the guidelines that addresses this particular situation and therefore, a determination must be made on information that is available. Staff's concern is that if brick is used below the windows then some of the sense of the porch may be lost. Staff recommended using a wood panel below in the same manner some of the enclosed porches in the neighborhood have been handled. The owner is proposing two double-hung windows with a fixed window in the middle and that the requested brick be slightly recessed. A restoration contractor looked at the property and felt it was very important that the porches all have a consistent look versus its current awkward look. He felt the panel approach would be preferable. If brick is used, some type of pattern with the brick would be helpful to give the façade some definition. The contractor also felt there should be fairly wide trim boards around the windows to be characteristic with the neighborhood. Once the Commission has made its decision, staff can work out the fine details with the owner.

Christian Redman, property owner, said that any material other than brick will not preserve the integrity of the preexistence of a porch. He would be more amenable to the wood paneling proposed by staff if these were porches on the side of the building. He was trying to find a solution that would be aesthetically pleasing and he his preference to use brick under the windows although it will cost more. He is trying to figure out how to preserve the resemblance of a preexisting porch and recessing the brick would indicate that there was a porch. The question at hand is whether to use brick or wood paneling. He can be flexible about the spacing or framing between the windows.

Mr. Hoggard and Ms. Lane expressed concern about the proportions of the large space between the two double-hung windows.

Cheryl Pratt was present on behalf of the Neighborhood Association Board. The Board expressed gratitude to the applicant for his investment in the neighborhood and upgrade in the property. The Board can go either way between the brick with the setback and the wood paneling. Any of these options will represent an improvement in the property.

Staff clarified for Mr. Hoggard that the brick being proposed is the very same brick that is already there. Mr. Hoggard indicated that he still had some issues with the design of the windows. It was noted that the applicant will be repairing original windows. In addition, the brick should be cleaned in a way other than pressure washing.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2030 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies, Guideline (1); Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances (pages 64)* are acceptable as



finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2030 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Christian Redmond for work at 111 E. Hendrix Street with the following conditions: (1) That the brick cleaning method is approved at staff level; (2) That this COA is related to the front elevation of the property only; (3) That the other original windows on the property are to be repaired, not replaced; and (4) That the final decisions on the glass, the windows selected, and layout of that elevation as well will be approved at staff level. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 117 E. Hendrix Street**  
**Application Number 2036**  
**Applicant: James A. McMillan**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 2-8-17**  
**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construct accessory building and carport; construct wood shed roof over stoop at back of side porch; construct fence; remove 2 Bradford Pear trees.

Note: The applicant has reconsidered replacing the slate roof and has decided to repair it instead. The fence and tree removal can be approved at staff level.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Garages and Accessory Structures (pages 35-37); Additions (pages 75-76)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park Historic District.

**Fact:**

The accessory structure will have fiber cement shingle siding and a metal roof, materials that are compatible with the character of the historic district. The design of the accessory building is based on a historic garage nearby. The carport is a simple shed found commonly in the early neighborhoods.

**Guidelines (page 36):**

2. *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example.*
3. *Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished.*
4. *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*

**Fact:**

The shed roof addition over the stoop at the back of the side porch is a common roof form and it is in an inconspicuous location. It should not affect any defining features of the house. Materials are compatible with the house and the neighborhood.

**Guidelines (page 76):**

3. *Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.*

**In Support:**

James McMillan, 117 East Hendrix Street  
Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion:**

It was noted that this application originally asked for the replacement of the slate roof. The applicant has reconsidered this request and wants to repair the slate roof and keep it. The fence and the removal of the Bradford Pear tree can be approved at staff level. Mr. Cowhig described the proposed work and explained that the work is congruous with the guidelines. Staff is recommending approval of this application.

Mr. Cowhig stated that this building is located in a single-family zoning district but it is multifamily property. Therefore, a variance will be required in order to construct the accessory building.

Responding to a question from Mr. Arneke about the overall footprint of the proposed project, Ms. Geary explained that the project will be within the allowable percentage that can be covered by building footprint.

James McMillan, owner, said that the accessory building has been downsized to a 12'x14' studio as opposed to a full 18'x24' garage. He stated his intention to have a covered open porch instead of a screened-in porch.

Cheryl Pratt was representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board. She stated that the Board voted to approve the plans for the proposed work as submitted.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2036 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines for Garages and Accessory Structures, Guidelines 2, 3, and 4 (page 36)*; are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2036 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to James McMillan for work at 117 Hendrix Street with the understanding that the replacement of the slate roof is not approved and has been removed from the application and that the size of the shed has been reduced. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (d) Location: 1004 Magnolia Street**  
**Application Number 2037**  
**Applicant: Denise B. Bailey**  
**Owner: Thomas Wear**  
**Date Application Received: 2-10-17**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Repair damage caused by falling tree; rebuild and expand addition at rear of house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Additions (pages 75-76)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The rear of the house was severely damaged by a falling tree. The addition (or wing) at the back of the house is being rebuilt with a small expansion. It will have a gabled roof. The foundation will be brick. It will not affect character-defining features of the house.

**Guidelines (page 76):**

1. *In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.*
2. *Distinguish additions from the original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material.*
3. *Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.*
4. *Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.*

**Conditions:**

1. That the new windows be simulated divided light to match the design of other windows on the house. That the siding be lap siding either wood or fiber cement to match the design and dimensions of original siding (not the aluminum siding).
2. That the roof on the addition and the main roof be constructed to match the original design and materials—tongue-and-groove soffit, brackets, etc.

**In Support:**

Tom Bailey, 1004 Magnolia Street  
Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Major roof damage occurred when a tree fell on the house and an addition at the back was almost completely destroyed. They are rebuilding and expanding the wing approximately 5 feet. The addition at the rear will have a gabled roof. The house has aluminum siding and staff is suggesting that fiber cement lap siding be used on the addition that will match the original siding. The other option is to cover the rebuilt addition with aluminum siding. Staff supports this application with conditions.

When this house was reroofed, the original wood shingles were removed. The roof on the addition and the main roof need to be constructed to match the original design with historic tongue and groove soffit materials. Staff feels that the new window should be simulated divided light and they prefer to see the window reused.

Mr. Arneke commented on the satellite dish and said it did not appear to be in the appropriate place. If possible, the satellite dish should be located on the top rear portion of the house or in a more inconspicuous place.

Ms. Stringfield stated her support for this application. She informed staff that the upstairs windows on the north and south have unapproved metal slide windows. The downstairs south window appears to be a six-over-one aluminum window. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff believes these changes were made before the district was established. However, the roof was done fairly recently and it does need the brackets to go back in the proper soffit material.

Mr. Arneke noted a change in the foundation material on the addition and felt that brick looked more appropriate than what exists.

Tom Bailey, applicant, said that there will be a French door instead of a window at the rear elevation to provide light and therefore, there is no intention to reuse the window because it is smaller than the other windows.

Cheryl Pratt was representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board. The Board was supportive of the application provided the improvements met code and complied with the Guidelines.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2037 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and *Guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5* under *Guidelines for Additions* (page 76) are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2037 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Denise Bailey for work at 1004 Magnolia Street with the following conditions: (1) That the new windows be simulated divided light to match the design of other windows on the house; (2) That the siding be lap siding either wood or fiber cement to match the design and dimensions of original siding (not the aluminum siding); and (3) That the roof on the addition and the main roof be constructed to match the original design and materials—tongue-and-groove soffit, brackets, etc. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arneke asked staff to work with the property owner to determine if there is another location for the satellite dish.

- (e) **Location: 602 Fifth Avenue**  
**Application Number 2034**  
**Applicant: Lisa Haywood**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 2-2-17**  
**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replacement of 5 vinyl windows with salvaged wood windows.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion restoring the most prominent windows is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Guidelines for Windows and Doors* (pages 55-61) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Historic District. Most of the original two-over-two windows were replaced with vinyl windows by a previous owner. The current owner is proposing to replace the five most prominent windows with salvaged wood two-over-two double-hung windows. This will re-establish the historic character of the windows—a defining feature of the house—and increase the likelihood that the other windows will be restored in the future.

**Guidelines (page 57):**

*2. Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.*

*3. When repair is not feasible, as determined by City staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows, when designed to match the original in appearance, detail, material, profile, and overall size as closely as possible. Double-paned glass may be considered when they are true divided and can accurately resemble the original window design.*

*A. It is not appropriate to replace true divided light windows with vinyl windows or windows with snap-in muntins.*

**In Support:**

Lisa Haywood, 602 Fifth Avenue

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion:**

This is property where the windows were replaced without a COA and the current owner acquired the property unaware that there was a violation. In the interim, staff has met with Ms. Haywood and they have visited Architectural Salvage. They found five sashes that would fit the windows although technical advice is required to be certain of the fit. The proposal is to replace the five most prominent windows with sash wood windows that match the original windows. Staff feels the request is a reasonable solution and would reestablish the look of the historic windows on the house even though not every window would be replaced. There are still some original windows in the house.

Lisa Haywood, owner, feels that this solution will be a fair compromise to the neighborhood. She purchased five two-over-two windows at Architectural Salvage that she hopes can be made to fit the space.

Mindy Zachary was representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association Board. The Board supported this application at their last meeting.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2034 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and *Guidelines 2, 3, and 3A* (page 57) under *Doors and Windows* are acceptable as findings of fact contingent on the condition that the property owner work with the staff to identify an appropriate replacement window that matches the architectural character of the building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2034 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lisa Haywood for work at 602 Fifth Avenue with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton provided clarification on reading the guidelines into the record. The only reason to read them into the record is if it is felt the case might go to the Board of Adjustment. Reading the guidelines into the record provides clarity for the Board when they read the transcript. If the application is approved with conditions that the applicant may not like, then the guidelines should be read into the record as there is a greater chance the matter will be appealed to the Board of Adjustment.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Ms. Stringfield informed staff that there are major expenses of vinyl lattice attached to wooden piers at the James McMillan property at 117 Hendrix Street. Staff plans to investigate the matter.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig indicated that staff is looking for ways to improve enforcement and to prevent violations from slipping through the cracks. Ms. Geary has done extensive research on bringing things up to date in terms of enforcement. Although staff works closely with City enforcement officers, they are looking for ways to be more proactive. He discussed the idea of generating a letter from planning staff when a violation has been identified. They are working to determine the most appropriate approach to take in different situations. In addition, Ms. Geary distributed a data base kept by staff and specific examples were discussed that illustrate the fact the sometimes it is not clear what is and is not a violation.

Mr. Arneke pointed out a violation at 539 South Mendenhall Street. He noted that the owners did not remove the internal lights; in fact, they sometimes turn them on. Staff said they will check to see if the property owner is in compliance.

Mr. Cowhig clarified for Mr. Arneke that small satellite dishes that are located in the rear or side yard and not visible from the street do not require a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff is most concerned about satellite dishes that are very visible from the street. Mr. Cowhig noted that there is an FCC regulation that telecommunications cannot be restricted; however, they can be regulated in the historic district. He further explained that if there is only one place on a historic property where a signal can be received, the satellite dish must be approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
MARCH 29, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield; Wayne Smith; and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn - Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Ms. Adams, Mr. Pratt and Mr. Hoggard were excused. He noted that Ms. Graeber resigned from the Commission.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that one item on the tentative agenda, property at 923 North Eugene Street, has been removed from today's agenda due to a lack of complete information from the applicant.

Mr. Smith joined the meeting at 4:13 p.m.

Mr. Cowhig stated that members are in receipt of an email from Jerry Leimenstoll who was hired by Delancy Street to manage the terracotta roof repair project. There is a proposal from Robert Leonard Roofing to repair the clay tile roof by replacing the missing clay tiles with salvaged tiles from another source. This plan is being proposed in two formats, Plan A and Plan B. Plan A is to do the entire roof with clay tiles and Plan B is to do only the front portion and leave the rear portion of the roof with asphalt shingles as it currently is now. Mr. Leimenstoll asked in his email if these two plans were acceptable for submittal to Delancy Street's national office for their approval.

It is Mr. Cowhig's understanding that this is the way the COA was approved with conditions that either the entire roof be done in clay tiles or that the front be done with clay tiles with the asphalt shingles remaining at the back of the house. Chair Wharton said that the Commission approved the option of asphalt on the rear as long as it was not visible from the street. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that the rear of the building is not visible from Elm Street but it is visible from the side street. Members were in agreement that of the two options allowed under the conditions, the option to replace the entire roof with clay shingles was their preference.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 22, 2017 REGULAR MEETING:**

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the February 22, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 207 West Bessemer Avenue**  
**Application Number: 2041**

**Applicant: Linda Trimble**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 2-28-17**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of addition to house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the addition is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 75-76)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The proposed addition will be at the back of the house. It will be distinguishable due to a change in the roofline and wall plane. It will not affect any character-defining features of the house. Compatible materials will be used including matching brick, windows and roof shingles. The addition will not be so large that it compromises the integrity of the house.

**Guidelines (page 76):**

1. *In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.*
2. *Distinguish additions from the original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material.*
3. *Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.*
4. *Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.*

**Conditions:**

1. That the new windows and doors be wood simulated divided light windows and doors (muntins permanently attached to interior and exterior of the glass) that match the design of other windows on the house, and that the selected product be submitted for staff approval.
2. That the exterior walls be brick that matches the brick of the house.
3. That the color of the roof shingles matches the shingles of the house.
4. That the trim be wood, fiber cement or composite material that matches trim of the house.

**In Support:**

Jim Desjardin, 207 West Bessemer Avenue  
 Michael Chapman, 818 North Eugene Street  
 Bill Blaylock, 209 West Bessemer Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig spoke with Tracy Pratt, architect, who is not present at today's meeting. He reviewed the application and felt this project meets the guidelines. However, he did raise some concerns about how the roofs will intersect. Minor changes to address this issue could be approved at staff level without delaying the applicant in their process. There are no significant trees involved in this project that would require removal.

Speaking in support of the application was Jim Desjardin, 207 West Bessemer Avenue, who said that they are doing everything to stay within the historical guidelines and add value to the community by doing the addition with like materials. Also in support was Michael Chapman who is Vice-President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. At their recent meeting, the Board voted to recommend



approval of this project. Bill Blaylock lives next door to the subject property. He fully supported the proposed addition and noted that his support was evidenced by the way the property owners take care of their house and yard.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2041 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and *Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 under Additions (page 76)* are applicable and are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2041 with conditions and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Linda Trimble and Timothy Hammer for work at 207 West Bessemer Avenue with the following conditions: (1) That the new windows and doors be wood simulated divided light windows and doors (muntins permanently attached to interior and exterior of the glass) that match the design of other windows on the house, and that the selected product be submitted for staff approval; (2) That the exterior walls be brick that matches the brick of the house; (3) That the color of the roof shingles matches the shingles of the house; and (4) That the trim be wood, fiber cement or composite material that matches trim of the house. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 811 Cypress Street (former Charles B. Aycock Middle School)**  
**Application Number 2044**  
**Applicant: Gerald Greeson**  
**Owner: Guilford County Schools**  
**Date Application Received: 2-28-17**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Cover name carved in limestone above main entrance to the building with limestone panel with new name engraved.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (pages 44-46)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The original name of the school was carved in limestone in a decorative architectural feature called a cartouche above the main entrance to the building. The name of the school has officially been changed. A panel of limestone with the new name engraved will be attached so that it covers the original name. The ground sign at the front of the school will also be changed to reflect the new name of the school

**Fact:**

Covering the carved panel will not destroy the original carved name. It will be intact under the new name. The new panel is made of limestone and matches the dimensions of the original feature. Therefore, it is an element that is compatible with the building's design.

**Guidelines under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 47):**

1. *Preserve original form, materials, and details of exterior walls. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material or detail with new material to match the historic material in composition, size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail. The appropriateness of substitute materials is reviewed based on the size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail as compared to the original material and, when available, past performance of the material in documented cases.*
2. *Preserve historic architectural features of exterior walls such as cornices, brackets, bays, turrets, fascia, and decorative moldings. It is not appropriate to remove these features rather than repair or replace with matching features.*

**In Support:**

Gerald Greeson, Guilford County Schools

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that this application is for the former Charles B. Aycock Middle School. The detail in question is above the main entrance and is a genuine limestone feature. The name of the school has been officially changed and the school system is proposing a panel of limestone with a new name engraved into it to be attached so that it covers the original name. In addition, the ground sign in front of the school would also be changed to the new name of the school. The new school name is the Melvin C. Swann, Jr. Middle School. The original signage would be left intact under the new panel. The new panel will remain limestone and will match the dimensions of the original features and therefore, staff feels it is an element that is compatible with the building's design.

Speaking in support of the application was Gerald Greeson with Guilford County Schools. He described the method that will be used to attach the sign. The font size will change but the lettering will still be legible from the street. The original sign will remain intact and the new limestone sign will be placed right on top of it.

Mr. Smith suggested that an edge be created around the new sign to integrate it into the space. Otherwise, the new layer of limestone will probably sit out beyond the current border.

Mr. Greeson confirmed that the new sign with the border will be made identical to the original and will be laid on top of the original sign. It was noted that there is a lot more text to be inserted into the space of the new sign than with the original sign. Ms. Lane commented it would be nice if the O's in the new sign could be overlapped as they are in the original sign.

Mr. Arneke felt that a different font should be chosen that was more in keeping with the style of architecture of the building. He felt the existing sign has a lot of character whereas the new signage looks more modern.

Chair Wharton commented that if the sign sits out a little bit then it is possible to detect it is a replacement. The original sign underneath will serve as an architectural clue that is left behind to record the history of the school.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2044 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines for Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (pages 44-46)* as follows: (1) *Preserve original form, materials, and details of exterior walls. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material or detail with new material to match the historic material in composition, size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail. The appropriateness of substitute materials is reviewed based*

*on the size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail as compared to the original material and, when available, past performance of the material in documented cases; and (2) Preserve historic architectural features of exterior walls such as cornices, brackets, bays, turrets, fascia, and decorative moldings. It is not appropriate to remove these features rather than repair or replace with matching features;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2044 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Guilford County Schools for work at 811 Cypress Street, formerly Charles B. Aycock Middle School, with the following conditions: (1) Review for font design to resemble closer to the existing as a design element; (2) Cleaning is acceptable in historic measures or methods; (3) Review a beveled detail and a possible design of that bevel at the staff level for final approval with scaled drawings; and (4) all of the above conditions may be approved at staff level. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton announced that the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association had a meeting earlier in the week and voted by an overwhelming majority to change its name to Dunleith after the name of the first built structure in the neighborhood. Details will be worked out as to the exact spelling of Dunleith and the neighborhood board is going to decide exactly how the neighborhood association will be renamed and how the change will be processed.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Mr. Smith, Smith Architecture, said that he did the addition and renovation to the historic Frasier-Wilson House in downtown High Point. The owner is proposing to build an event venue in the rear yard which is now a large parking area. He described features of the addition that were approved at the recent Guilford County Historic Preservation meeting.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig said that staff has been working on making some changes in how enforcement of historic district violations are handled. Ms. Geary said that staff is now sending out a friendly letter to the property owner when a report is received that work is going on. Staff feels that the letter gives owners the opportunity to work upfront with staff to comply. The violations are turned over to enforcement staff if the owner fails to respond to the friendly letter in a timely fashion. She described cases that are currently being monitored by staff.

There was a discussion about the process to make a change in the Guidelines, especially regarding replacement materials and when they are acceptable. Mr. Cowhig indicated that staff could have a draft of revised Guidelines ready for the Commission's review in six months.

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the owner who purchased the former Temple Emanuel Education Building property in Fisher Park plans to build six townhouses in three different buildings on the site. The property is located at the northwest corner of Greene Street, Florence Street, and Fisher Park Circle. The process is at the sketch review stage and a site plan has been finished. He noted that there are several issues and feedback from the Commission is needed. He asked Chair Wharton to consider appointing several members to serve on an ad-hoc Design Review Committee to meet with the applicant, their engineer and representatives from the neighborhood association. Mr. Smith and Ms. Stringfield volunteered to serve on the committee and provide feedback for the project.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
APRIL 26, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Hoggard; Ann Stringfield; Cindy Adams; and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn - Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Arneke, Mr. Pratt, and Mr. Smith were excused.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 27, 2017 REGULAR MEETING:**

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the March 27, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**3. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 699 Chestnut Street**  
**Application Number 2048**  
**Applicant: Patrick L. Gerini**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 4-3-17**  
**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replacement of windows with new wood windows.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the wall is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Non-Contributing (page 10)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a non-contributing structure in the Historic District built around 1970. It does not possess any particular architectural merit above that of a fairly ordinary apartment building from the period. The original windows are in poor condition although repairable. They are double-hung, friction-fit, true divided light 6-over-6 windows. The replacement windows are wood, double-hung windows, without grids.

**Fact:**

Although the replacement windows do not have muntins, they match the existing windows in most other details. While replacement is contrary to the guidelines for Windows and Doors, in this case the result does not have a negative effect on the overall quality of the property and does no harm to the

character of the historic district. Therefore replacement should fall within the bounds of “considerable flexibility is warranted” as provided for in the guidelines for non-contributing structures.

**Guidelines (page 10):**

*Non-Contributing buildings are those buildings within the districts categorized as not contributing to the history and architecture of the district.*

*The original architecture and style of the building should be evaluated for merit, and when architectural quality is noted, changes should strive to respect the character and features of the original structure. When making changes to the buildings themselves, guidelines in this document pertaining to “Exterior Changes” should be followed. However, considerable flexibility is warranted when making changes to non-contributing buildings. Decisions that make practical and aesthetic sense that may be contrary to specific guidelines are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the guidelines.*

**In Support:**

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

This is an after-the-fact application. Staff was made aware that work was going on without a Certificate of Appropriateness. They spoke to the contractor doing the work and an application was submitted for window replacement. There is a new owner of the property who is not familiar with the Historic District regulations. Staff learned that when windows are being replaced in an apartment building, a building permit is also required. Had the owner applied for a building permit, the process would have triggered the need for a Certificate of Appropriateness. This is a non-contributing building and all the windows are to be replaced.

Speaking in support of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Dunleith Neighborhood Association. She indicated that the Board felt the replacement windows were appropriate because this is a non-contributing structure. There was no one else present to speak on this application.

Ms. Stringfield felt comfortable with the replacement windows and noted that this apartment building is a 1970 non-contributing structure that has no particular architectural merit.

Mr. Hoggard commented that he liked the clean look of the 1-over-1 window configuration more than the current 8-over-8 window.

Ms. Lane agreed with comments that were made and was in support of the application.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2048 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and guidelines on page 10 as read into the record are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2048 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Patrick L. Gerini for work at 699 Chestnut Street with no conditions. The motion was seconded Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

- (b) **Location: 424 Fisher Park Circle**  
**Application Number 2053**  
**Applicant: Debbi Aberman, Manager**  
**Owner: Zen Holdings, LLC**  
**Date Application Received: 4-11-17**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Demolition of existing structure in preparation for development of six townhomes.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the demolition and new development is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls: Demolition (page 73)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This building is categorized as a non-contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. It was dedicated in 1979 and named the Rypins Building for Rabbi Frederick Rypins as a meeting and educational center for Temple Emanuel.

**Guidelines:**

*The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored.*

**Conditions:**

- (1) That the site be leveled and re-seeded and properly maintained.
- (2) That no trees or site features such as the historic retaining walls be disturbed during demolition.

**In Support:**

Debbie Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Drive  
 Neil Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Drive  
 Frank Chaney, 1309 Latham Drive  
 Michael Chapman, 818 North Eugene Street  
 Reese Schwartz, 422 Fisher Park Circle

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that this application is for the demolition of the existing Rypins Building and for the construction of six townhomes on the site. A subcommittee was appointed by Chair Wharton at the last meeting and they met with the applicants and their architect. Mr. Cowhig described the property, the surrounding area, and reviewed the illustrative site plan and elevation drawings of the proposed project. It was noted that the Commission will be considering the approval of the demolition of the Rypins Building. They will only be providing feedback in an advisory capacity to aid the applicant in their development of plans that might be approvable when the COA is applied for.

There was a thorough discussion when the subcommittee met with the owner and their architect. The committee was very supportive of the project. There was a lot of discussion about the guideline relating to spacing and orientation to the street to be consistent with the Historic District. On the site

plan buildings are oriented toward Florence Street and not Fisher Park Circle. It was noted that a COA will be required if it is determined any trees need to be removed when the site plan has been finalized.

Debbie and Neil Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Street, and Frank Cheney, 309 Latham Road, were present to speak on this project. They were present to get conceptual approval for the project because a zoning application will need to be filed. The site plan is for illustrative purposes and will be changing. They will be working with the City Arborist to make sure any replacement trees are appropriate. Mr. Cheney addressed the orientation of the buildings. To justify the large amount of money that has been invested in the project, it will be necessary to get six units on the property as opposed to five or four units. Therefore, due to the number of units and the slope of the property, the best configuration has the proposed units oriented toward Florence Street. There will be additional enclosed parking underneath the building at the basement level. He described the conceptual site plan and said the units will have the height and scale of a single-family house from the street.

Responding to questions, Mr. Cheney said there will be a recessed covered porch. There will be walkways from the sidewalk up to the front doors. They have also considered the idea of courtyards in front. Mr. Hoggard commented that he liked the orientation and massing of the buildings. Ms. Adams felt the concept was consistent with the adjacent townhomes at Baker Place. The proposed plan is a huge improvement over what is there now.

Also speaking in support of the request was Michael Chapman, 818 North Eugene Street, from the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association voted to approve the demolition. In a separate vote, they indicated support of the conceptual plan for the townhomes.

Reese Schwartz, 422 Fisher Park Circle, said that the Baker Place Condominium Association also supports this project. He asked that as many trees as possible be saved.

There was no one present to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Hoggard indicated his support for this project.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2053 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments that the current building is a non-contributing structure built in 1979 and the Guidelines on page 10 and page 67 suggest the building is a non-contributing structure built after the Fisher Park Neighborhood's period of significance and guidelines for residential structures that preserve the neighborhood spirit and character as mentioned in the Guidelines are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2053 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Zen Holdings, LLC, Debbie Aberman, for work at 424 Fisher Park Circle with the following conditions: (1) that the site be properly maintained during the demolition process; (2) that any trees or site features, such as the historic retaining wall, not be disturbed during demolition; and (3) that the site be reseeded and properly maintained. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

The Commission's consensus is that they support the project in concept.



- (c) **Location: 517 Park Avenue**  
**Application Number 2046**  
**Applicant: Josh M. Zales**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 3-29-17**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work:**

Remove crown molding to install gutters.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51-54)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The applicant is proposing to remove the crown molding in order to install gutters. Crown molding is a roof feature found commonly on historic houses.

**Fact:**

Ogee (or K-Style) gutters are attached to the fascia or gutter board and require removal of the crown molding. Half round gutters are attached by a strap to the roof deck and may not require removal of the crown molding.

**Fact:**

The roof shingles do not over-hang far enough to shed water properly. The water is running back toward the roof causing damage.

**Guidelines (page 53):**

*4. Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*

**In Support:**

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig said that this matter began as a simple application to install gutters and remove dead trees. However, in order to install the gutters the crown molding would have to be removed and the crown molding is an architectural feature on this old house that should be preserved. The roof shingles were apparently installed incorrectly because they do not extend past the crown molding enough and water is getting underneath the roof. Staff suggested half round gutters which are installed in a different way than standard gutters in that they are not bolted into the fascia board and the crown molding does not have to be removed. The problem with that solution is that the roof shingles do not extend far enough over. The guidelines are clear about retaining architectural features and he asked the Commission if they were amenable to go along with an exception in this case.

Speaking in support of this application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue. The Dunleith Neighborhood Association supports whatever the gutter company recommends as the best solution given the short shingles. The Association felt it was important to save the structure.

Members discussed possible solutions. Ms. Adams pointed out that the gutters and downspouts are not original features. Mr. Hoggard said there is too much crown molding and suggested a 1.5 inch

crown to cover the gap. He had no opinion about the half round gutters. If a half round gutter is not used, regular gutters have a crown front. Instead of the molding, it would have to have a design element such as an Ogee or K-style gutter that would mimic the crown that is there now.

Mr. Hoggard and Ms. Lane felt the K-style would be prettier alternatives. Ms. Adams and Ms. Stringfield were in agreement.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2046 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and *Guidelines on page 53* are applicable and are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hoggard, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2046 with conditions and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Josh Zales for work at 517 Park Avenue with the following condition: (1) that an Ogee or K-style gutter is used. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hoggard, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 600 Park Avenue**  
**Application Number 2055**  
**Applicant: Hope McLean**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 4-12-17**  
**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Install iron railing around front porch.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64-66)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The homeowner's insurance company is requiring that a guard rail be installed on the front porch.

**Fact:**

The porch was altered at some point. The wood floor was replaced with a cement floor and the columns were replaced with aluminum supports. Whether there was a railing originally is unknown.

**Fact:**

An iron railing will be more in keeping with the masonry porch floor and require less maintenance than a wood railing. Painted a dark color it will be less noticeable.

**Guidelines (page 10):**

2. *Preserve and maintain historic materials and features or historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replaced deteriorated porch elements*

*with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*

**In Support:**

Hope McLean, 600 Park Avenue  
Ron Johnson, 600 Park Avenue

**In Opposition:**

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

**Discussion:**

This application is to install a guard rail around the front porch as required by the insurance company. The front porch had been altered drastically at some point in time and the floor has been replaced with a concrete floor. The porch columns were replaced with metal supports. The railing must be 36 inches high if the floor is more than 30 inches above grade and the pickets have to be spaced so that a 4 inch sphere cannot pass through. This is a wraparound porch but there is a section that is not covered although the floor is continuous. The only option to a metal railing would be a wood railing which wouldn't look right with metal posts unless wooden columns are put back. Staff feels the iron railing being proposed is the choice that makes sense. The railing will be painted a dark color and won't really be noticeable.

Speaking in support was Hope McLean, 600 Park Avenue, who is the owner. She said she is complying with the insurance company by installing railing which is necessary due to the height of the porch. She would rather not use wood railing.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, was speaking in opposition to the request. She was present on behalf of the Dunleith Neighborhood Association. The Association felt that the wrought iron railing is not appropriate. They are sympathetic with the homeowner's situation with the insurance company and hoped there was another solution such as a wood alternative. This is an opportunity to upgrade the property and put features back on the porch that were previously there.

Speaking in rebuttal was Ron Johnson, 600 Park Avenue, who said that the porch is grandfathered in and he was not in favor of a 36 inch wooden railing noting that the flooring would have to be torn out too which would be a prohibitive cost.

Chair Wharton felt the iron railing would have a better look than an imposing wood railing. He was inclined to support staff's recommendation. He felt the application was not incongruous with the guidelines.

Ms. Adams was sympathetic to the homeowners in that they are required by the insurance company to add something they probably wouldn't have opted to add.

Mr. Hoggard stated his opinion that a 36 inch wood railing would overpower the house. Given the alternative, the iron railing is a good solution depending on the design.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2055 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and guidelines on page 64 as follows: *(2) Preserve and maintain historic materials and features or historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal*

*supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2055 without conditions and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Hope McLean for work at 600 Park Avenue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**4. PUBLIC HEARING ON CONTRACT FOR COLLEGE HILL STUDY AND EVALUATION OF STREET, INTERSECTION, PEDESTRIAN, AND SIGNAGE IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS: (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that this item is an advertised public hearing for a contract in College Hill. Jeff Sovich, Planning Department, is present to present the contract. The Commission was given authority by the City Council to hold a public hearing on Municipal Service District (MSD) contracts. This is a result of the legislation that was passed last year with respect to Municipal Service Districts in North Carolina.

Jeff Sovich, Planner with the City of Greensboro, said that he has been working with the College Hill Neighborhood Association on their neighborhood plan and implementing that plan. At the request of the College Hill Neighborhood Association, City staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a study and evaluation of streets, intersection, pedestrian, and signage improvement concepts within the College Hill neighborhood, specifically the College Hill Municipal Service District. The evaluation panel received and reviewed two proposals in response to the RFP. They recommended awarding the contract to Team Better Block. A public hearing is required to be held for all contracts that use MSD revenue. Notice of this hearing was advertised in the Carolina Peacemaker for two consecutive weeks and a letter about the hearing was mailed to addresses within the boundaries of the district. City staff received two phone calls requesting more information about the purpose and nature of the project.

This project is a key step in implementing several goals and policies in the College Hill Neighborhood Plan and the 3-Year Capital Improvement Program for the College Hill Municipal Service District. The project will make small focused temporary adjustments to the geometry of streets and intersections in College Hill. The aim is to enhance the quality of place and livability that these improvements will bring to the neighborhood.

Mr. Sovich explained that parts of College Hill's street network currently serve primarily as conduits for cars rather than as outdoor room where neighbors can stroll and interact with each other. This project will test, evaluate and refine temporary adjustments on selected streets to identify which types of permanent improvements might be most effective over the long term in reaching a balance between transportation function and the neighborhood goal of the function of streets.

Mr. Sovich indicated that the range of temporary treatments that will be used are commonly grouped under the banner of Tactical Urbanism. He explained the concept of Tactical Urbanism and provided examples of common treatments that included high visibility crosswalks, street furniture, way finding signs, bike lanes, lane roundabouts, parklets, curb extensions, intersection murals, pop-up shops and cafes, street side dining and transit stops.

The neighborhood requested to use a private firm on this project instead of staff for two reasons. The type of work the neighborhood is seeking is outside the range of tasks that City staff are normally trained and equipped to perform. Additionally, the neighborhood wants to bring a fresh perspective and innovative approach to addressing their concerns and issues within the unique constraints found in College Hill. Based on the results of the treatments tested, the contractor will develop

recommendations for permanent improvements that will form the basis of future construction projects in College Hill.

The evaluation panel evaluated the two proposals based on the following criteria: (1) the capacity to carry out a specific task in a timely manner; (2) examples of similar work products and services; (3) ability to provide creative solutions; (4) task performance; (5) estimated cost; (6) education and training of personnel; and (7) participation of Minority or Women Only Business Enterprises. Client references from past projects were also contacted by staff. The proposal from Team Better Block was chosen because the panel felt that they displayed a stronger understanding of the unique challenges and needs of College Hill and they presented a more realistic allocation of personnel hours to accomplish the range of work tasks. The firm's total proposed cost of the project including travel expenses and over 500 hours of personnel time is \$54,625 to be funded from the College Hill Municipal Service District account.

The scope of services for the project includes the following tasks: (1) review of current conditions; (2) concept development; (3) concept testing; (4) measurement of evaluation; (5) recommended permanent improvements; (6) branding and signage scheme; (7) a community meeting; (8) and a Communication and Summary Report at the conclusion of the project. Mr. Sovich explained that there will be extensive collaborative public involvement efforts to the project that will be led by the College Hill Neighborhood Association and City staff.

The purpose of today's hearing is to provide an opportunity for interested parties to learn more about the project and to comment on the recommendation to award this project to the firm, Team Better Block. The City Council will be asked to consider authorizing the City Manager to sign the contract for this project with Team Better Block.

Chair Wharton opened up the public hearing for comments.

James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, is president of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He thanked Mr. Sovich for his work and commitment to the neighborhood. The Association is looking forward to improving the livability of the neighborhood. He said the neighborhood is more like a racetrack in certain areas and the overall feel and safety of the area is a concern. He felt that Team Better Block displayed a better sense of neighborhood. There is an opportunity to reduce the cost by having the neighborhood residents do some of the implementations themselves. He looks forward to the collaboration between the neighborhood, Team Better Block, the Planning Department and the Greensboro Department of Transportation.

Lisa Kessler, 213 South Mendenhall Street, thanked Mr. Sovich for his work on this project. She encouraged everyone to support this project.

David Sevier, 311 South Mendenhall Street, thanked Mr. Sovich, James Keith, and the entire College Hill Neighborhood Association for the large amount of work they have done on this project. This project has been needed for a long time and he noted that Mendenhall Street has become a racetrack which creates a safety hazard for residents.

Matt Russ, Tate Street Coffee, is a business owner on Tate Street. He expressed support for the project and thanked James Keith for his hard work. He thanked the Association for including the businesses on Tate Street in this process and commented on the important walkability factor in neighborhoods.

David Cannon, 924 Carr Street, is with the College Hill Neighborhood Association Board of Directors. He thanked Mr. Sovich and Dan Curry for their work on this project. He commented on the large benefit from this project not only for the neighborhood but for the entire community. He encouraged everyone to support this venture.

Mr. Hoggard moved to recommend approval of the contract to City Council, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**(RECOMMENDED)**

Chair Wharton called for a brief recess at 6:06 p.m. The meeting resumed at 6:15 p.m.

**5. REVIEW AND COMMENT ON REZONING APPLICATION, 507 NORTH CHURCH STREET, FROM CONDITIONAL DISTRICT-OFFICE TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT WITH LIMITED USES. (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Cowhig said that the Commission reviewed another zoning application for this property at the January 25, 2017 meeting and recommended in favor of rezoning the property to Conditional District-Central Business. That rezoning was approved by the Zoning Commission but was appealed to City Council. Since that time the applicant has withdrawn the application and filed a new request to rezone to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that allows a special events facility and a number of other uses.

Mr. Cowhig reminded the Commission it is not appropriate for them to consider land use issues like parking and noise. These are issues for the Zoning Commission to evaluate. The Historic Preservation Commission should determine if this use would further the Historic District and promote the preservation of the historic building.

Amanda Hodierne, Attorney, was present on behalf of the applicants and current owners. She said that the goal of this request has not changed. After the Zoning Commission meeting and the appeal that was filed by the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, they reevaluated the request and determined that there was a way to move forward and find a solution that everyone was comfortable with. The neighborhood was not necessarily against the concept; however, they wanted to make sure everything was done the right way. At the time of the appeal, the Association did not have a good comfort level with the request.

Ms. Hodierne explained that they are now requesting a PUD designation. This designation gives staff a way to mix uses around and plan for varying setbacks and building heights that fit into the ordinance. The PUD designation is the most flexible option for the applicants while still providing comfort to the Association by clarifying exactly what can be done on the property.

Members are in receipt of a list of conditions attached to the application along with a list of allowed uses. Ms. Hodierne commented on several conditions that she felt would be of interest to the Commission. Condition 5 states that the existing historic structure, as of March 31, 2017, shall not be demolished or expanded in any way that creates any additional enclosed, heated spaces. In addition, Condition 6 states that no parking areas shall be permitted between the existing structures and North Church Street and Condition 8 indicates that the property shall not be subdivided. In addition, Condition 9 covers special operational restrictions to help with impacts of parking.

Ms. Stringfield commented on Condition 4 regarding exterior signage and asked if the conditioned requirement for signage to be limited to a maximum of six (6) feet in height met the Historic District Guidelines. Ms. Hodierne said that Condition 4 was wordsmithed extensively between her office, the neighborhood representation and Mike Kirkman, Planning Department. She felt that the six foot height must be more restrictive. The project would still have to meet the historic neighborhood requirements.

Ms. Stringfield asked if ways to prevent expansion of the existing parking lot had been discussed. Ms. Hodierne said there is not a plan to expand the parking lot but it will have to be polished up and some work will need to be done. The concern was paving over areas that are currently green and they have indicated they will not do so.

Michael Chapman, 818 North Eugene Street, was representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. They had two major concerns with the project. The first issue was parking and this request answers that concern. The other issue was what could happen to this property in the future should the proposed venture not work out. The Association is pleased with the restriction in this application on what can be there in the future. The Board passed a resolution in favor of recommending this rezoning based on the PUD request that was described.

Ms. Adams moved to recommend this rezoning request, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:**

Chair Wharton stated that the discussion of alternative materials for the Historic District Guidelines update is postponed to the next meeting.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the Neighborhood Association of College Hill recently sold a lot they owned on Mendenhall Street. The couple who bought the lot would like to build a house there. He asked Chair Wharton to consider appointing a subcommittee to work with the owners and the Association to discuss their plans for the house.

It was recommended that Mr. Arneke and Mr. Smith be appointed to the subcommittee as a resident of College Hill and as an architect, respectively.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
MAY 31, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; Tracy Pratt; David Arneke, Ann Stringfield; Cindy Adams; and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn - Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair Wharton asked if there were any adjustments or changes to the items on the agenda.

Mike Cowhig stated that Item F, 321 S. Tate Street has been withdrawn from the agenda, and Item D, 807 Simpson Street, has also been withdrawn from the agenda.

Chair Wharton explained the policies and procedures of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission.

All speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

Chair Wharton asked if any of the Commissioners had any discussions concerning the Items on the Agenda that would have an impact of making their decisions related to the applications and Commissioners responded they had discussions, but do not feel that there would be any impact on their decision-making..

**1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Hoggard, Mr. Smith and Ms. Adams were excused.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE April 26, 2017 REGULAR MEETING:**

Ms. Lane pointed out some corrections to the April minutes as follows: Page 3 and 4, name on the list should be Maurice Schwartz instead of Reese. On page 9, last paragraph, the name should be David, Hemm, instead of Gannon.

Ms. Lane moved approval of the April, 2017 meeting minutes as corrected, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Pratt, Stringfield, Adams, Lane, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Chair Wharton explained the procedures followed by the Commission for each case heard.



**3. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) Location: 803 Magnolia Street  
Application Number 2057  
Applicant: Roger Seel  
Owner: same  
Date Application Received: 4-20-17  
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

**Description of Work:**

Demolition of shed/garage and construction of new garage.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the demolition of the shed and construction of a new garage is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Demolition (page 73) and Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-37)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The shed is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. However, it is in poor structural condition and would be difficult and expensive to rehabilitate.

**Fact:**

The design of the new garage is taken from the historic garage. Board-and-batten siding and other materials used in the construction of the historic garage will be used. It will be in the same location but constructed to meet present day setback requirements.

**Guidelines pg. 73**

*The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored.*

**Guidelines 36**

*2. Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example.*

*3. Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished.*

*4. New garages and Accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*

**In Support:**

Roger Seel, 803 Magnolia Street  
Cheryl Pratt, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion and Summary:**

Speaking in support of the application was Roger Seel, the applicant and homeowner, 803 Magnolia Street, stated that there is a 4' setback because the roof will extend 1' beyond the wall. They will be in compliance with the current ordinance.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Board voted unanimously to support this application.

There was no one else present to speak on this application.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2057 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the guidelines for demolition on Page 73 and the guidelines for garages 2 through 4 on page 36 under the guidelines for new construction 1 through 3 on page 80, are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Pratt, Stringfield, Adams, Lane, Arneke. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2057 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Roger Seel for work at 803 Magnolia Street. The motion was seconded Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Pratt, Stringfield, Adams, Lane, Arneke. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 1006 Yanceyville Street**  
**Application Number 2069**  
**Applicant: Shawn Patch**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 5-8-17**  
**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Repair front porch and replace porch railings.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62-66) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This house is outside of the National Register Historic District. When it was built it was on Percy Street. It lost its association with the historic district when Yanceyville Street was built. It has been converted to office use.

**Fact:**

The front porch was damaged during a storm and generally not in good condition. The new owners plan to repair the front porch foundation, the damage at the eaves, and replace the deteriorated flooring, ceiling and railings. Because this is a business use, the new railing are required by Code to be 42" high.

**Fact:**

The rooftop railing is not original but the porch railing appears to be original to the house. The original porch railing is not beyond repair. However, it does not meet Code for a business use. The extra height will not be as conspicuous in this case because this house is situated on a major thoroughfare.

**Guidelines (page 64)**

2. Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.

**In Support:**

Shawn Patch, 1006 Yanceyville Street  
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion and Summary:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that the house is outside of the Summit Avenue National Register Historic District and this has some significance. At one point in its history, it was addressed on Percy Street, but Yanceyville Street was cut through the neighborhood and left this property removed from the main body of the Historic District, so it lost some of the physical association with the district. It has been used as an office for a very long time and fallen into disrepair. The new owners want to repair it and use it for office use again.

Shawn Patch, 107 Cypress Street, the owner, stated that his company purchased the building and they are planning to move their office to this location. They need to replace the railings but they have insurance liabilities and safety concern about people using the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balcony and they want to make sure the railing meet Code and are safe. They will be more than happy to donate the 1<sup>st</sup> floor materials to Architectural Salvage. In regard to questions about the steps, the concrete steps have sunken backward to the house and need to be re-set as part of the foundation repair. Metal railing are the suggested material for the railing. There is also a handicap ramp on the side that will be repair and replaced. They plan to remove the vinyl siding and bring it back to the original wood. Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, stated the Dunleith Neighborhood Association unanimously supports the application.

There was no one present to speak in opposition to the request.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2069 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments in guidelines on page 64, number 2, are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Pratt, Stringfield, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2069 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Shawn Patch, for work at 1006 Yanceyville Street with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**(c) Location: 811 Cypress Street (Aycok Middle School)****Application Number 2070****Applicant: Stuart Johnson, Assistant Principal****Owner: Guilford County Schools****Date Application Received: 5-19-17****(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITION)****Description of Work:**

Construct outdoor classroom.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51-54)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The outdoor classroom is needed for the school to fulfill its educational mission. The "Classroom" will consist of a podium and wood benches in a semi-circular arrangement. It should be an attractive addition to the campus and have little impact on the character of the historic school building or the historic district.

**Guidelines (page 9)**

When interpreting the Historic District Design Guidelines for their applicability to commercial and institutional properties there are two factors that must be considered when reviewing an application. 1) The functional needs of the commercial or institutional property owner must be considered. The property owner should be allowed to use the property in the manner needed, as long as it maintains the character of the Historic District. 2) The architecture of the building should be valued and preserved in its own right, and any changes should respect the original contributing building on the property. Modifications that are consistent with the architectural style of the building are appropriate when required to meet a functional need. Often a balance between function and architectural appropriateness must be struck in order to meet the objectives of both the property owner and the intent of the guidelines.

**In Support:**

Stuart Johnson, Assistant Principal  
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion and Summary:**

Mr. Cowhig said that this application is for an Eagle Scout project to construct an outdoor classroom on the campus that will consist of a podium and benches in a semi-circular fashion. A drawing was presented for review. It is felt that this addition will be an attractive addition to the campus and have little impact on the character of the historic school or the historic district. There are no guidelines for projects like this so the Commission is referred to guideline language to the guidelines and there is a section that was added to deal with institutional property within a historic district because of the

special needs that they have. "When interpreting the historic district guide design guidelines for their applicability to commercial and institutional properties, there are factors that must be considered when reviewing an application: 1) the function needs of commercial or institutional property owners must be considered. The property owner should be allowed to use the property in the manner needed as long as it maintains the character of the historic district. 2) The architecture of the building should be valued and preserved in its own right and any changes should reflect the original contributing building on the property." Staff feels that this outdoor classroom project is needed for the school to fulfill its educational mission and it meets the guidelines for institutional properties. Guilford County Schools has reviewed the project plan and supports it.

Speaking in support of this application was Stuart Johnson, Assistant Principal of Aycock Middle School. He stated that GCs is in support of the project and the rest of the Administrative team is also in support of the project. It will enhance the educational experience of the students. He acknowledge Andrew Cogman, one of the Scouts who will be working on the project.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue. The Dunleith Neighborhood Association supports this project, unanimously. This is a lovely spot that is currently underutilizes and they think it will be a perfect place for an outdoor classroom. It was suggested that Greensboro Beautiful may be able to help on the project in terms of recyclable materials for the benches so they may last longer. Perhaps the City Arborist may want to get involved to make sure the tree roots are not damaged or disturbed.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2070 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and *Guidelines on page 9* are applicable and are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Pratt, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2070 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Stuart Johnson for work at 811 Cypress Street without conditions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

- (c) Location: 609 S. Mendenhall Street**
- Application Number 2068**
- Applicant: Arlen Nicholls**
- Owner: College Hill Neighborhood Association**
- Date Application Received: 5-15-17**
- (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of new house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (pages 77-80)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The proposed house has many of the design characteristics of craftsman style houses in the neighborhood; front porch, wide roof overhangs, lap siding with shingles in the gable ends, a shingled dormer, wide window and door casings, etc. The height, setback, spacing, orientation, roof form, massing and fenestration are similar to other houses on the street.

**Guidelines (page 80)**

1. Site new buildings so that the setback, spacing and orientation to the street are consistent with historic buildings within the district.
2. New construction should have a similar height and width of existing buildings within a block or street.
3. Relate the roof form, pitch, and overhang of new construction buildings to historic roofs within the district within the district.
4. Design the spacing, pattern, proportion, size, and detailing of windows, doors, and vents to be compatible with existing historic examples within the district.
5. Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic buildings in the districts including brick, wood, stucco, and stone. Materials such as steel, cast stone, fiber cement, and concrete are appropriate for new construction if they are used in a manner compatible with construction techniques and finishes used for historic buildings in the district. It is not appropriate to substitute vinyl or aluminum siding in place of traditional materials typical of the district.
6. Incorporate existing large trees and historic landscape features, such as retaining walls and gardens, into the proposed site plan. During construction protect trees and site features to be retained by temporary fencing, and do not disturb or contaminate the soil or store construction materials within the root zone of trees to be saved.

**Guidelines (page 4)**

The commission may balance the cost of a project against the degree of impact the change (that would be engendered by such project if completed) will have on the district, as long as the project meets the intent of the guidelines.

**Conditions:**

The applicants will work with City staff regarding any trees that need to be removed for construction; and the applicants work with staff to find the most appropriate windows, doors and soffits and staff to approve the final decisions on appropriate materials.

**In Support:**

Arlen Nicholls, realtor  
Gary Silverstein, builder  
Dan Curry, 305 S. Mendenhall Street  
Melody Bassett, 850 Spring Garden Street  
Jessie Arnette, 3004 Stratford Drive

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion and Summary:**

Mike Cowhig stated that the applicant wishes to build a new house on the property. Arlen Nicholls is the real estate agent for the people wishing to build the new house. Slides of the property were shown for review. Elevations drawings and site plan were also reviewed. There is a warehouse building located behind the property. The house immediately south of the property is a Queen Anne cottage style house and directly across the street is a Craftsman bungalow with very common gable front look and front porch. Next to that is a two-story Craftsman and in the neighborhood is an interesting mixture of houses from the 1900s. The lots in this area are very small. Staff feels that the design principles are met for height, setback, spacing, the orientation, the roof form, the massing and fenestration is all very similar to other structures in the neighborhood and captures the spirit and sense of place for College Hill. Staff also feels that some of the finer details and materials are things that help strengthen the relationship of a new building to the surrounding historic buildings. Staff recommends materials that are compatible with the historic district. There are composite windows that are more expensive but can be painted so composite materials for porch flooring and ceilings and those kinds of things would be a better choice in terms of being as compatible with the neighborhood as possible. The siding and trim boards will be made of fiber cement.

Arlen Nicholls, real estate agent for the proposed owners, 216 S. Mendenhall Street, stated that she is a resident of College Hill and a member of the Board, today she is present in the capacity as a realtor representing Jane and Richard Green. They wish to construct a home that will complement the historic district and add value to the neighborhood. They are retirement age and on a fixed income and the proposed project is within their budget. Their goal is to work in a good faith effort to build as nice a home that is close in keeping to what the guidelines call for. There are some restrictions in regard to costs and budget. They are asking for a slab built foundation and they have been very careful to modify the elevation so it would not be readily noticeable.

Gary Silverstein, the builder, Silverstein Construction, 7917 Windspray Drive, Summerfield, NC, stated that he is the contractor for this project and in response to question, stated that there will be a brick foundation with a slab on-grade so from the exterior, it would appear to be a brick foundation very much like the other homes in the neighborhood. There is a change in grade on the property, so the foundation will show more brick work on the left side to follow the grade. The elevations have not been shot yet but the grade does run lower toward the street. The fiber cement material will be used.

Dan Curry, 305 S. Mendenhall Street, stated that the Neighborhood Association unanimously supports the request. This lot was acquired many years ago through a donation and they are looking forward to having a productive solution that puts this lot back on the tax rolls and becomes a benefit, visually, to the neighborhood. They appreciate the team that put this project plan together and feel that this plan addresses the elements regarding the vinyl windows. Alternative window materials are being used in other historic districts. They would ask that if there is an opportunity to make an additional statement in the guidelines concerning fiber cement siding being an acceptable alternative material and have a statement similar to that for vinyl windows, exclusively on new construction.

Melody Bassett, 850 Spring Garden Street, stated that she is neither in support or against the application. She has questions about the parking arrangements for this property. She also would like to know how long the construction of the house will take. The last ten years in the neighborhood have been a nightmare and she hopes this will be a very speedy construction project. She is also worried about the elevation of the windows in relation to the house next door, will the windows be looking into each other on both sides? This is a very small lot and the houses will be close together.

Arlen Nicholls returned to the podium and stated that in response to Ms. Bassett's questions, there is a public alleyway that would allow access and would be to the north of the house and connects to the adjacent property, so this is used by the current homeowners for parking. They have also looked at obtaining the stickers so the homeowners can park on the street. It is her understanding that there is no paintable PVC that would be involved in this project. With regard to the windows elevations, she does not feel that is going to be an issue for this particular home.

Jessie Arnette, 3024 Stratford Drive, stated that he is with White Oak Residential Design and in regard to the windows of the proposed house, it would not be a condition that is any different than what is found in any of the other neighborhoods that have narrow lots. The grade change will also help that situation because on the south side of the house, the neighbor's house actually has a retaining wall that is probably 3 feet tall along the property line.

Gary Silverstein returned to the podium and stated that this project should only take about six months to complete. The windows will have a wide casing profile which would be typical for an older Craftsman style home. In regard to the trees that will have to be removed there are some stumps and overgrowth on the lot and there will have to be some site prep. At this time, he is unsure of how many trees will be removed.

Arlen Nicholls returned to the podium and stated that they understand the importance of the trees within the neighborhood. They will try and protect and retain as many of the trees as possible.

Mr. Pratt stated that he has concerns about the use of vinyl for the soffits and does not feel that if it is not installed properly it can look very bad. He would prefer not to see any vinyl. Ms. Stringfield stated that this is a lovely project but she is also concerned about the use of vinyl. Mr. Wharton stated that he has the same concerns about the use of vinyl. Mr. Arneke thanked the applicants for their responses to the concerns raised by the sub-committee. He is persuaded by the Presbyterian house and the use of the PVC windows that were installed on that house. He asked if it would be appropriate to have a condition to have staff work with the applicants to see if they can identify the PVC soffit material to make sure it is compatible or if there are alternatives that are affordable and practical.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2068 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and guidelines on pages 80 for New Construction, 1 through 5, are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Lane, Arneke. Nays: Pratt and Stringfield.)

In response to questions, Mr. Silverstein stated that the porch floor will be concrete as there are many examples of this use in the neighborhood.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2068 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Arlen Nicholls for work at 609 S. Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: The applicants will work with City staff regarding any trees that need to be removed for construction; and the applicants work with staff to find the most appropriate windows, doors and soffits and staff to approve the final decisions on appropriate materials. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Pratt, Adams, Lane, Arneke. Nays: Stringfield.)

**4. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION: REQUEST TO CHANGE NAME OF CHARLES B. AYCOCK HISTORIC DISTRICT TO DUNLEITH HISTORIC DISTRICT.  
(RECOMMENDED)**

Stephen-Leigh Geary stated that Aycock Middle School has petitioned to change the name and part of the long, on-going conversation has been the association with Charles B. Aycock. The name change of the middle school, which is also the name-sake for the neighborhood, that became the point at which neighborhood did extensive research to help determine what an appropriate new name



for this historic district would be and why it would be associated with the actual history of the neighborhood. The school and the land are located on property that was originally part of the Dunleith Estate and staff feels that is an appropriate choice. If the name change is adopted by City Council it will require text amendments that were presented to the Commission members for review. The Commission would make a recommendation to the Planning Board and they would review both the change and name to the district and also the text amendment to the Development Ordinance and make their recommendations to be forwarded to City Council for their July 18, 2017 meeting. City Council has final authority over adopting a Resolution for the name change and the text amendment. It will also be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office for documentation.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter and no one came forward.

Mr. Arneke moved to recommend approval of the name change to City Council, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted unanimously 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Adams. Nays: Pratt.) **(RECOMMENDED)**

**5. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION: REZONING APPLICATION, 424 FISHER PARK CIRCLE, FROM R-5 (Residential Single Family) TO CD-RM-8 (Conditional District Residential Multi-Family) (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Cowhig said that at the last meeting the Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the building located at 4242 Fisher Park Circle in the Fisher Park Historic District in order for the owners to construct six (6) townhouse units on the property. This will require a rezoning of the property and the process to be followed is presentation to the HPC for review and recommendation. Presentation was made at the last meeting and there are many apartments within the neighborhood. Multifamily units would be consistent with the goals of the Historic District.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Debbie Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Drive, stated that she is the Manager of Zion Holdings, LLC and they are developing the property. She is available to answer questions, if there are any. She explained their plans for the property and the buildings they plan to have constructed. They have notified several of the neighbors about their plans and they have not received any negative comments.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board, and stated that they support the request.

Ms. Stringfield moved that the HPC recommend this rezoning request for 424 Fisher Park Circle as submitted by staff, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Pratt, Stringfield, Lane, Arneke. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:**

Chair Wharton stated that he had no items for discussion at this time.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Stefan-Leih informed members that there will be a Commission Training Session in Sanford, scheduled for August 16. Information will be sent to Commissioner members by e-mail and anyone interested in attending can respond.

Mike Cowhig stated that there has been a lot of discussion about alternative materials that are appropriate for an historic district during construction, renovation and rehabilitation. Staff is going to be in Raleigh on June 16<sup>th</sup> to hear more about this so this information will be discussed at a later date.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
JUNE 28, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield; Wayne Smith; and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department.  
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Pratt and Mr. Hoggard were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 31, 2017 REGULAR MEETING:**

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the May 31, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 224 South Mendenhall Street**  
**Application Number 2074**  
**Applicant: Mary Garvey**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 6-7-17**  
**(DENIED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work:**

Plywood panels attached to foundation to cover windows.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District. At some point plywood panels were attached to the foundation to cover basement windows.

**Guidelines (page 57):**

2. *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.*

**In Support:**

None.

**In Opposition:**

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig said that this application is the result of a notice of violation that was issued. It was reported that basement windows in this house had been covered with plywood panels. This is an after-the-fact application submitted by the property owner. The owner was instructed in the notice to either remove the panels or submit a COA application. The panels were placed over the windows to avoid the maintenance of repairing the basement windows. Guidelines are very clear about repairing original windows on a structure rather than replacing or in this instance, covering the windows. The appropriate approach would be to repair the basement windows. Staff is not in support of this application.

Ms. Stringfield said that replacement windows for that size and shape of window are typically available at Architectural Salvage for a modest price. Mr. Cowhig plans to relay this information to the owner.

There was no one present to speak on this application.

Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street. She was representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association who opposes this after-the-fact application. They requested that the windows be property replaced and maintained.

Mr. Smith suggested that the owner address the ground and drainage in front of the window to keep water from coming into the basement. If the windows have deteriorated to such a point that they admit water into the basement then obviously, they need to be repaired or replaced.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2074 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments relative to contributing structures and *Guidelines 1, 2, and 3 for Windows and Doors (page 57)* are acceptable as finding of fact. Ms. Stringfield read *Guideline 2* into the record as follows: *(2) Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.* The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2074 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mary Garvey for work at 224 South Mendenhall Street with the condition that she removes the plywood panels within 60 days. Mr. Arneke made a friendly amendment that the enforcement of the decision be staid for 60 days for the removal of the plywood. Ms. Stringfield agreed to the friendly amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

(b) **Location: 207 South Tate Street**  
**Application Number 2073**  
**Applicant: Virginia and George Haskett**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 6-12-17**  
**(DENIED)**

**Description of Work:**

Remove storm damaged chimney.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District. A tree fell on the house during a storm and severely damaged one of the brick chimneys. The applicants would like to remove the chimney and replace the roof rather than rebuilding the chimney. Twin chimneys are commonly found on hip roof, late Victorian cottages like this one so it would be considered character-defining.

**Guidelines (page 57):**

*1. Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps. Decorative grilles and vents, water tables, lattice panels, access doors, and steps are character-defining features of foundations that should be preserved as well.*

**In Support:**

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the homeowners experienced a tree falling on the house during a recent storm. The tree demolished one of the chimneys on the house. The applicants would like to remove the chimney and replace the roof rather than rebuilding the chimney. The twin chimneys are typical for a house of this architectural style. The guidelines are clear about preserving the shape, size, materials and details of character defining chimneys and other features. Although staff understands the situation the owners are in, they are not in support of this application because it does not meet the Historic Guidelines.

Speaking in support of the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street. She explained that the north chimney still remains but the south chimney was destroyed in the storm. She said that there are double and single chimneys represented throughout the neighborhood but the majority of houses on Tate Street and the neighborhood have single chimneys. She felt it would not interrupt the view on Tate Street to have this be a single-chimney house. The brick from the chimney that fell into the yard is not old brick and therefore, the chimney must have been replaced sometime in the past. The south chimney served the heating system, not the fireplace. The south chimney rises within a closet wall and goes directly to the basement where it was connected to a coal burning heating system. The chimney is not only non-functioning, it is obsolete. The north chimney is a wood burning fireplace. If the chimney were to be rebuilt, it would be ornamental and would not serve a function. The estimates she received for rebuilding the chimney were \$3,800 and \$5,000. She is

unsure if insurance would cover the work because the chimney serves no function and would only be ornamental.

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street, spoke on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She reported that the Association moved to approve the application.

Ms. Geary suggested that insurance coverage be ascertained to determine if cost would be a burden on the property owner.

Mr. Smith stated his opinion that the chimney is non-contributing since it has already been rebuilt.

Chair Wharton commented that this is an opportunity to restore the south chimney to its original condition. He felt that twin chimneys are clearly a character defining feature of a house. He would like to see the chimney replaced to its original condition.

Mr. Smith said that the structure is more prominent with two chimneys; however, the fact that the second chimney is not there now does not really bother him visually. Either way, when the chimney is replaced it will still be a new chimney.

Chair Wharton was opposed to this request and reiterated that the guidelines are very clear on this matter.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2073 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the following guidelines for *Masonry and Stone (page 50)*: (1) *Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps. Decorative grilles and vents, water tables, lattice panels, access doors, and steps are character-defining features of foundations that should be preserved as well;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: Smith.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2073 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Virginia and George Haskett for work at 207 South Tate Street with the exception of the work on the gutters and shingles which are approved by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: Smith.)

- (c) Location: 321 South Tate Street**  
**Application Number 2078**  
**Applicant: Nathaniel P. Hayes**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 6-20-17**  
**(DENIED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work:**

Vinyl gate attached to garage.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District. The homeowner attached a vinyl gate to the garage which is at the back of the property and not visible from Tate Street.

It is visible from Edgar Street, historically an unpaved alley used for coal delivery and other services. Today it is considered a public street used by the City to collect garbage and by Tate Street residents to access parking areas.

**Fact:**

Wood, cast iron and woven wire are traditional materials for fences.

**Guidelines (page 26):**

*5. Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location, and size with original fences and walls in the Historic District.*

*A. Low picket fences of an open design, constructed of wood or metal and finished in white or another color/stain compatible with the building, and low walls and hedges are appropriate for front and rear yard use. Front yard fences and walls should usually not exceed 42" in height.*

*B. Install utilitarian fences of woven wire or chain link in rear yards only. Where they are visible from the street, screen with climbing vines, ivy or shrubbery. (If chain-link fencing is needed, coated chain-link is preferable to raw aluminum.)*

*C. Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72" in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard. (Note: fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line that abuts a street, by City ordinance, as well.*

**In Support:**

Nat Hayes, 321 South Tate Street.

**In Opposition:**

Virginia Haskett. 207 South Tate Street.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that this application is the result of a notice of violation. The homeowner installed a gate made of vinyl at the very back of his property attached to the garage. The house faces on Tate Street and that is staff's point of reference for purposes of interpreting the Guidelines. Edgar Street is a public street that started as an alley. Staff cannot support this application because of the vinyl material. The vinyl fence is attached to a vinyl post.

Speaking in support of the application was Nat Hayes, 321 Tate Street. He was not aware that a vinyl fence was unacceptable when he installed it. The fence is at the rear of the property and is not visible to anyone except someone in the alleyway. The reason for the fence is to provide a better view and a little security for the homeowners. The space containing the vinyl fence is approximately four feet and is located between the garage side and the wooden fence that is the same height as the vinyl fence. Mr. Hayes likes the vinyl fence because it is painted white and provides a better view than looking into their storage shed and it provides some security. The fence is vinyl because it was economical, attractive and low maintenance. It is lighter and easier to work with than other fences yet it is sturdy enough.

Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street. She was representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. While the Association understands the need for screening in

this area, the materials are not consistent with the Historic Guidelines. They would prefer that the vinyl fence be consistent with the existing fencing material running along the rest of the property.

Ms. Stringfield expressed opposition to the application. Although she is sympathetic to the owner's point of view, the material is not in compliance with the Historic Guidelines and the guidelines should be enforced.

Mr. Arneke agreed with comments made by Ms. Stringfield. In addition, he felt that the fence looked odd closing at that angle against the end of the fence. The vinyl fence appears inconsistent and out of character with the wooden fence and it would be better if the fence closed parallel to Edgar Street rather than coming in at an angle.

Ms. Lane commented that even if the owner changed the material of the fence, the location of the fence is a little unusual for creating a barrier between a property line and the owner's space.

Members noted that the height of the fence will need to be addressed moving forward.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2078 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for *Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 26)* as follows: (5) *Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location, and size with original fences and walls in the Historic District. (A) Low picket fences of an open design, constructed of wood or metal and finished in white or another color/stain compatible with the building, and low walls and hedges are appropriate for front and rear yard use. Front yard fences and walls should usually not exceed 42" in height. (B) Install utilitarian fences of woven wire or chain link in rear yards only. Where they are visible from the street, screen with climbing vines, ivy or shrubbery. (If chain-link fencing is needed, coated chain-link is preferable to raw aluminum.) (C) Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72" in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard. (Note: fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line that abuts a street, by City ordinance; are acceptable as finding of fact.* The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2078 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Nat Hayes for work at 321 South Tate Street with the condition that any penalties will not be imposed for 60 days to allow the applicant time to fix the violation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton updated the Commission and reported that the City of Greensboro Planning Board unanimously approved a request to change the name of the local historic district from the Charles B. Aycock Historic District to the Dunleath Historic District. The item is on the City Council agenda for the August 15, 2017 meeting.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that training for Commissioners will be held on August 16, 2017 in Sanford, North Carolina. Interested members should contact staff for details.



**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
AUGUST 30, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield; Tracy Pratt; and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department.  
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Smith and Mr. Hoggard were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 28, and JULY 26, 2017 REGULAR MEETING(s):**

Ms. Stringfield pointed out a correction in the June 28, 2017 minutes, on page 3, under "Discussion" should read, "to remove the chimney and repair the roof", instead of "replace the roof". Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the June 28, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

Ms. Lane stated that she has had various discussions with the owner on this request and she would like to recuse herself from this matter. Therefore, Ms. Lane seated herself away from the Commissioner's table and did not participate in the proceedings.

- (a) **Location: 634 N. Elm Street**  
**Application Number 2092**  
**Applicant: Michael Fuko-Rizzo**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 7-27-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of second story entrance and exterior stairs (after-the-fact)

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code requirements (page 69) for the following reasons:*

**Fact:**

An entrance was added to the second story of the house by replacing a window in the sleeping porch with a door and constructing exterior stairs. The stairs are on the side of the house near the back but can be seen from the street. The stairs encroach into the required side yard setback. Therefore, a Special Exception would be needed. The Board of Adjustment can grant Special Exceptions in the

historic districts if they are recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission. The Board can base its decision on meeting the historic district guidelines rather than hardship. If the stairs were relocated to the back of the house they would more closely meet the intent of the guidelines and the encroachment could be avoided. A different railing design could also help the stairs more closely meet the guidelines.

**Guidelines (page 70):**

1. *Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.*
2. *Construct fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so that they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.*
3. *Design them so that they are compatible with the scale, materials, details and finish of a historic structure.*

**In Support:**

Michael Fuko, Owner  
Fran Simbert, Neighbor  
Cheryl Pratt, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig said that this application is an after-the-fact application for work done in the Fisher Park Historic District. At one point this property was on the Demolition By Neglect list and it was purchased a year or so ago. The new owner has done a remarkable job restoring the house. Please pay special attention to the columns as the original columns were almost completely rotted out. The columns and capitals have been restored as if they were pieces of fine furniture. Staff was very worried that the incredible rooftop balustrade would be lost because the deterioration was so bad. The house has been restored doing everything correctly. All the windows have been completely refurbished and restored. The exterior has been put back to the way it was originally. They even restored the wonderful wall and wrought iron fence in the back yard. Staff cannot say enough about how impressed they are with the work they have done on this property. There is the issue of a set of exterior stairs that was constructed without a COA and staff understands that things happen during the course of a project of this scale. The Commission's job is to review it against the guidelines and make a recommendation as if it had never been built. Staff would have recommended that the stairs be located where there is no encroachment involved. The guidelines imply that exterior stairs should be located as inconspicuously as possible, preferably at the rear of the house. If the Commission chooses to approve the stairs in their existing location, a Special Exception would be needed from the Board of Adjustment on the basis that the project meets the historic district guidelines rather than what is the normal criteria such as a hardship in situations like this. Staff also would recommend a railing on the stairs that is designed to be more in keeping with historic railings, using a top rail and usually a bottom rail that is more similar to porch railings in the district. A window was removed from the sleeping porch and replaced with a French door,

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Fran Simbert, 100-B South Park Drive, stated that her house is right behind the location of the stairs. The stairs are about 2 feet from the property line and while she commends the other renovations to the house, she was shocked to look out her back door and see these stairs. They would be in favor of this project, as long as there is appropriate wrapping, painting, so that it would fit in and blend in with the neighborhood. Also, she would like to see landscaping around the stairs.

Michael Fuko, owner, 812-A Pisgah Church Road, stated that she met with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Board on Monday night and he offered his apologies as he has done everything he knew to do the project in keeping with the neighborhood. It never crossed his mind to ask about the stairs at the side and rear of this house. The FPNA discussed the setback issue of 5 feet and that requires a letter of recommendation to the Board of Adjustment for a request for a Special Exception. There are several groups of trees so it is hidden to a degree, but he would happy to add more vegetation to help hide the stairs. Some of the recommendations of the FPNA were to add plantings to start hiding the stairway from the street. The wood has to season so it can be stained a dark red-brown so it blends in more with the brick. Chindo vibernum were recommended as a possible planting that would eventually hide the staircase. Magnolias are a possible planting to be considered, as well as arbor vide, which can be trimmed or untrimmed, as well as some type of holly trees. He presented other instances of staircases within the neighborhood. He also presented photographs of stairways that have been encased to help hide it from the street.

Mr. Pratt stated that he felt that the railing should match the one that was used on the front of the house.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, stated that they support the stairs remaining in the location with the recommendation that it be trimmed out and landscaped to help hide it from the street.

Ms. Stringfield agreed that if the railing could be designed and encased like the one seen at Meredith's property and painted a darker color. She does have concerns that if the stairway is encased and plantings are added close to it, that it will appear cluttered and the owners would not be able to get to it for future upkeep or painting. She feels a different picket structure should be recommended for the stairway.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2092 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under Safety and Field Requirements, on page 70, numbers 1, 2, and 3 are acceptable as Findings of Fact, and as an additional fact, the applicant has volunteered to change the design of the railings and the stairway to meet the design requirements of guideline #3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt. Nays: None. Abstained: Lane)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2092 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 634 N. Elm Street with the following conditions: 1) The design of the stairway be revised so that the rails match the railing at the front of the house; 2) that the stairway be painted or stained a darker color to make it match the house; 3) to encase the stairway and to develop a landscape plan in consultation with neighbors and the Historic District staff for the area in the back yard, encompassing the stairway. 4) The railing and the pickets should reflect the design of the railings at the front of the house. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt. Nays: None. Abstained: Lane)

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that a letter to recommend to the Board of Adjustment to grant a Special Exception for the setback to encroach into the required side yard setback. Chair Wharton made a friendly amendment to the motion, because of the location of the stairs, as approved, it is in an inconspicuous side location according to Guideline #1 on page 70, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt. Nays: None. Abstained: Lane)

Ms. Lane returned to the table to participate in the remaining items on the agenda.

- (b) **Location: 424 Fisher Park Circle**  
**Application Number 2093**  
**Applicant: Zen Holdings, LLC**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 7-16-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of six (6) multi-family townhomes in three (3) buildings

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work would not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (pages 77-80)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The site of the proposed project is a corner lot at the intersection of Florence Street and Fisher Park Circle. Currently on the site there is a vacant institutional building that was approved for demolition at the April HPC meeting. Originally, the site had a historic single-family residence on the property that was oriented to Fisher Park Circle. The proposed project has three buildings that are oriented to Florence Street. Each proposed building has an entrance with individual front walks that lead directly from the public right-of-way on the Florence Street side of the property. The Fisher Park Circle side will have a side wall elevation that will have windows and a recessed covered patio with French doors. There is one area of solid exterior wall on the side elevation that should be re-examined to potentially add a window(s).

The project will require the removal of several mature canopy trees and the installation of a new landscape plan. Any trees that are not removed should be protected during construction. The site plan will retain the existing stone wall and brick walls. Each entrance has a front walkway and steps that will use a Belgard wall system that is similar to the original stone wall.

The design reflects architectural characteristics that are found in the Fisher Park district including a hopped roof design, metal clad casement windows that are Simulated Divided Light with an arch and multi-light "French" doors. The front elevation entryway has a design that draws on characteristics of a historic front portico but has been modernized to have a recessed design. Limestone details over windows, doors and other decorative features are found in the district.

Additional project details include paved patios and aluminum fencing in a black finish. The project also proposed to allow an optional screened porch on individual units.

Some of the construction materials are not typical of historic construction in the district. The project proposed to use modern stucco and 1-foot by 2-foot limestone tile cladding. While Stucco exterior walls are found in the district the type of stucco used should carefully be selected to best match historic stucco in the district. Exterior masonry wall materials on residential buildings in the district are typically brick or natural finished and naturally shaped stone such as rock with a grapevine mortar. The proposed Limestone cladding is a material that is not relevant to the period of significance for the historic district.

**Guidelines (page 80):**

1. *Site new buildings so that the setback, spacing and orientation to the street are consistent with historic buildings within the district.*
2. *New construction should have a similar height and width of existing buildings within a block or street.*
3. *Relate the roof form, pitch, and overhang of new construction buildings to historic roofs within the district.*

4. *Design the spacing, pattern, proportion, size, and detailing of windows, doors, and vents to be compatible with existing historic examples within the district.*
5. *Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic buildings in the district including brick, wood, stucco, and stone. Materials such as steel, cast stone, fiber cement, and concrete are appropriate for new construction if they are used in a manner compatible with construction techniques and finishes used for historic buildings in the district. It is not appropriate to substitute vinyl or aluminum siding in place of traditional materials typical of the district.*
6. *Incorporate existing large trees and historic landscape features, such as retaining walls and gardens, into the proposed site plan. During construction protect trees and site features to be retained by temporary fencing and do not disturb or contaminate the soil or store construction materials within the root zone of trees to be saved.*

**Staff Information:**

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that this is a significant property in the historic district and a large project for this property located at the corner of Fisher Park Circle and there is an institutional abatement building on the site. The property owners are proposing a multifamily development with 6 units comprised of 3 buildings. They have worked closely with staff and a sub-committee that met early-on with this project trying to make sure that this project at this particular location works for both the property owner and the Fisher Park Historic District. Revised elevations were shown for the Commission members' review. The institutional building was approved for demolition at the April HPC meeting. Originally, the site did have a historic single family building on it which was oriented toward Fisher Park Circle. This project shifts that orientation and the fronts of the townhomes will face Florence Street. On the side elevation, there are double French doors, that is actually a recessed porch that will have a covered metal roof. To the left of the side elevation there is a fairly large expanse of blank wall. The Guidelines typically recommend to avoid large expanses of wall space and have some windows in that area. The project will also require the removal of several mature canopy trees as shown on the site plan. Staff needs to learn how the new walkways will impact the historic wall. Staff suggests as a condition that it come back for staff level approval. There is also an original set of stairs that will be staying on the property. The applicants are proposing to use a Belgard wall system to help fill in the gaps for the stairs and the material is a good match to the original. Overall, staff feels that the design does have architectural characteristics that fit well into the district as it has a hipped roof and arched windows. The multi-light French doors on the front of the buildings should match the design and muntin pattern and material of the French doors that are used on the main façade of the house, particularly since this site elevation will be visible from Fisher Park Circle and the park. The design of the front of the building is found throughout the district on the Georgia Revival and other Revival uses within the district. Staff feels this is an appropriate design feature based on its reference to some practical design throughout the neighborhood. Additional project details include the paved patios, aluminum fencing that will be around the property, so it would not be privacy fencing. In regard to the covered porches, the applicants would like to allow individual property owners the option of turning those into screened porches. That can be approved at staff level. One of the concerns is compatibility with similar materials, as some of the construction materials are not typical of historic construction materials found in the district. It proposes to use stucco on the second story of the buildings. The bottom level proposes to use a limestone cladding material and exterior masonry walls are common in Fisher Park but the common materials are usually brick and when it is stone, it is stone that is natural finished. The limestone details that are proposed over the windows, doors and other decorative features are commonly found throughout the district, so masonry with limestone is very common, but the limestone cladding is not seen in the district as a full wall material.

Some conditions that are proposed are: 1) Floorplan shows a covered patio with a set of full glazed French doors on a side elevation. The doors should match the design and material on the main elevation since this side will face Fisher Park Circle. 2) That the details on how the stone steps and front walks are designed be submitted for staff approval. 3) That both of the 18" Oak trees that are next to the existing drive be retained and protected during construction, if possible. 4) That consideration be

given to retaining historic site features including the steps on Florence Street and the circular stone wall behind the building. 5) Site lighting be of a type that does not trespass onto surrounding properties such as full cutoff fixtures and reviewed at staff level.

**Speakers In Support:**

Neil Aberman  
Debbie Aberman  
Tucker Vinengay  
Cheryl Pratt  
Leslie Gunter

**Speakers In Opposition:**

Steve Rubin

Speaking in support of the application was Neil Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Drive, the applicant, stated that they searched all the neighborhoods in the walking proximity to downtown Greensboro and they want to continue the trend found in other cities, re-Urbanization, where people are drawn to living and working in downtown areas, walking to work, walking to restaurants, shopping at local markets. They found the property at the corner of Fisher Park and Florence and felt that this location would fill their needs. The type of brownstone or townhomes they have design with the help of many historic architects, they believe is the best use of this property. They wish to create a small cluster of homes for those that wish to age-in-place. Instead of designing the parcel with 8 units, as the law allowed, they reduced it to 6 units so that lush green space can be provided. There are 3 staggered buildings in order to be sensitive to scale and mass. The front elevation reads as 3 single family homes and this will allow their project to blend in with the surrounding neighborhood. He outlined the proposed project in detail, which had previously been discussed by staff. In regard to the blank wall, the landscape architect has proposed unique plantings that will fill the wall and make it less intrusive into the neighborhood. The limestone that is proposed for the project was inspired by some of the structures they have seen on visits to other countries that use this material for their buildings. There are also examples of the use of limestone within North Carolina, that are used on significant properties within the state. In regard to the proposed stucco material on the second floor, this particular stucco is not EFIS as they plan to use real stucco. The roofline will slope to enable water run-off for the buildings. The columns are 16" limestone and carved limestone. Limestone will also be used as molding around the windows and doors.

Debbie Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Drive, stated that the reason for the indented patio is to provide natural lighting within the townhome. They are taking out a very large parking area and driveway on the west side of the property. The driveway must be widened to allow access to emergency and fire vehicles, therefore, this would impact the existing trees. They hope to save as many trees as they can, but they must follow the direction of the emergency vehicle traffic.

Tucker Vinengay, 1707 Independence Drive, stated that he is the landscape architect for this project. The landscaping will be within the City Code as well as keeping some open sidelines into the site so that they do not completely block off and close in the street from the units. This would be more in keeping with the residential feel of the neighborhood. A 3-D presentation was made to allow the Commission members a more realistic view of the property. The wall has been landscaped so there would not be a massive expanse of wall. The patios are to be fenced in. The grade changes on the back side so the buildings sit properly on the site and are not super elevated to allow easier entry into the front door and driveway.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, spoke on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She reported that the Association moved to support the application.

Speaking in opposition was Steve Rubin, 224 S. Park Drive, stated that this is an ambitious and unique project for this property. He feels that this would be a benefit to the neighborhood, but he wished to

caution that certain materials may reflect certain things within the neighborhood, when put together it does not always work. He pointed to the property on N. Park Drive which is a perfect example because it looks extremely modern and is a similar mass in height of surrounding properties, but it looks completely out of place for the neighborhood. He encouraged the Commission and staff to work with the applicants to use the critical process to determine whether or not certain types of materials will really fit into the neighborhood.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Pratt stated that according to the drawings it does look as if the project is a little out of proportion and seems to be quite a bit more substantial than the surrounding houses along Florence Street. He is concerned about the flat wall space and feels that it is too big for the neighborhood. Ms. Lane felt that the drawings do fit the ratios for building to land but she does have some concerns about the proportions. Leslie Gunter, 5900 Church Street, stated that the engineer hired has taken all the ratios into consideration and the City pre-authorizes to make sure everything is in place for those measurements. The buildings would absorb more asphalt and provide more green space with the proposed building on the property. Mr. Arneke stated that he agrees a little with the comments made by Mr. Pratt but he feels that the overall plan is okay even though larger than they are used to seeing for proposal in the historic district. Provided that the landscaping, particularly along the Fisher Park Circle side, does what it is planned to do, should be acceptable. His question would be whether the limestone would look out of place for the neighborhood. Mr. Wharton stated that he feels that if the project meets what is in the Guidelines, even if the Commissioners feel it may not fit into the neighborhood or the taste of the neighbors, his position is that the property owners need to be given the full leeway of what the Guidelines say they can and cannot do. He feels that the Guidelines for New Construction give a lot of leeway and should be considered. He would support the application.

### **Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2093 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the following guidelines for New Construction (page 80), are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: Pratt.)

### **Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2093 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 424 Fisher Park Circle with the following conditions: 1) Floorplan shows a covered patio with a set of full glazed French doors on the side elevation. The doors should match the design and material of the French doors on the main elevation since this side will face Fisher Park Circle. 2) That details on how the stone steps and front walks are designed be submitted for staff approval. 3) That both of the 18" Oak trees that are next to the existing drive be retained and protected during construction, if possible. 4) Site lighting be of a type that does not trespass onto surrounding properties such as full cutoff fixtures and reviewed at staff level. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: Pratt.)

Ms. Stringfield asked that her comments about making the façade darker than what was shown in the initial plans be included. She feels that having these structures being so light in color would be detrimental to the surrounding area.

At this time a 10-minute recess was taken from 6:30 until 6:40 p.m.

**(c) Location: 607 N. Greene Street  
Application Number 2094**



**Applicant: Walt Teague, TFF Architects**  
**Owner: Holy Trinity Episcopal Church**  
**Date Application Received: 8-16-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Extend covered walkway to the sanctuary entrance.  
Construct covered terrace addition to the Parrish House.  
Replace windows and doors in the Parrish House.  
Relocate HVAC equipment to roof of Parrish House.  
Widen and make two-way Greene Street driveway and relocate stone wall.  
Construct stairs and walkway at covered terrace to provide handicap accessibility.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Commercial and/or Institutional (page 9), and Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 35)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The proposed addition of a covered walkway at the sanctuary entrance, the covered terrace at the Parrish House, the replacement windows and doors at the Parrish House, the relocation of the mechanical equipment to the roof, and the widening of the driveway will allow the church to provide needed services and programs for its congregation for years to come. All aspects of the project have been carefully designed to maintain the character of the church and the historic district. Materials including heavy timber framing, slate shingles and standing seam metal are compatible with existing materials. Mechanical equipment will be screened from view. The covered walkway will not alter or obscure any significant architectural features of the façade of the sanctuary.

**Staff Comments:**

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that the property owner is Holy Trinity Episcopal Church at 607 N. Greene Street. There are several planned modifications to the site as previously stated. The property is a contributing structure in the National Register of Historic Districts. Staff recommends in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness with no conditions. It is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines under Commercial or Institutional on page 9, and Utilities and Mechanical Equipment on page 38. The proposed addition of a covered walkway at the sanctuary entrance, a covered terrace at the Parrish house, replacement windows and doors at the Parrish house, relocation of the mechanical equipment to the roof and the widening of the driveway will allow the church to provide needed services and programs for its congregation for years to come. All aspects of the project have been carefully designed to maintain the character of the church and the historic district. Materials including heavy timber framing, slate shingles and stand seam metal are compatible with existing materials. Mechanical equipment will be screened from view from the street, the covered walkway will not alter or obscure any significant architectural features of the façade of the sanctuary. Any changes or renovations to the front façade can easily be removed without making any permanent damage or change to that historic front façade.

**Guidelines (page 9):**

- 1) *"When interpreting the historic district design guidelines for their applicability to commercial and institutional properties, there are two factors that must be considered when reviewing an application. The functional needs of commercial or institutional property owner must be considered. The property owner should be allowed to use the property in the manner needed as long as it maintains the character of the historic district., 2) The architecture of the building should be valued and preserved in its own right and any changes should respect the original contributing building on*

*the property. Modifications that are consistent with the architectural style of the building are appropriate when required to meet a functional need. Often a balance between function and architectural appropriateness must be struck in order to meet the objectives of both the property owner and the intent of the Guidelines.”*

*In regard to the Utilities and Mechanical Equipment, the Guidelines on page 40 read: 1) “Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building. 2) Locate utilities, satellite dishes and antennas as low to the ground as possible at the rear and side of the structure where it is not readily visible from the street. The smaller satellite dishes of 18” are now appropriate and create the least amount of visible impact on the district. 3) Install mechanical equipment such as electrical panels or gas meters at grade level when they are visible from the street and screen with shrubbery or other landscaping. 6) Air conditional units and other similar mechanical equipment should be placed in the rear and side yard with as little visibility from the street as possible. When equipment can be seen from the street it should be screened with shrubbery or fencing.*

**In Support:**

Brian Pierce  
Walt Teague, TFF Architects  
Cheryl Pratt

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Speaking in Support**

Brian Pierce, 1711 Swannanoa Drive, stated that he is a member of the Vestry, a body of Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, and he also an attorney. He asked that the application be modified from Holy Trinity Parrish to Holy Trinity Episcopal Church. This is a project that the church has been looking at for many years because there is deferred maintenance that needs to be done on these buildings. As they continue to grow the church is trying very hard to make their renovations with historic features and not changing the exterior to a substantial degree. The porches are an area for them to congregate. They wish to maintain the same look that is currently in place. They are extending one of the driveways to allow their pre-school operation to run more smoothly with parents getting in and out with the children.

Walt Teague, representing TFF Architects, 5655 Baldwin Road, Elon, NC, stated that he is the principal architect for TFF Architects for over 30 years, located at 300 N. Greene Street. He presented a handout for each Commission member to provide more information on this project. Holy Trinity has experienced phenomenal growth in the last 15 years and has almost doubled their congregation within that period of time. Over that same period of time they have acquired additional lots to provide more space for their use. About 10 years ago a Master Planning process began and it came to a halt during the recession in 2008. About 18 months ago it was revived and they have reprogrammed for their Master Plan and they developed another Master Plan. This project is the first phase of implementation. The diagram provided shows the current planned renovations and additions. There has been great sensitivity for the historic nature of the buildings in this district as a contributing structure. The Parrish House was built in the 50s and 60s and was renovated and had some façade improvements done in the early 90s. These are structures that were residential structures that the church has adapted for other uses and they plan to continue using those in the future. This project does not involve anything other than improve the driveway that comes off Fisher Avenue. The bulk of the planned work is for interior renovation of the Parrish House. The covered walkway connection between the sanctuary and the Parrish House needs to be improved. There is an exposed open-air covered terrace which will be an expansion and will have doors that open from the Haywood Duke room, fellowship hall, into the terrace area. When the building was renovated in the early 90s, they replaced windows on two facades but did not replace the windows on the south and west sides, so those windows will now be replaced. The mechanical equipment will be placed on the roof of the Parrish House and will be screened from view. There is also a driveway that is a single lane drive that

goes in for the drop-off at the day school. That will be widened to accommodate more traffic in this area. There is a stone wall along Greene street and one side will remain in place and the other side will be reconstructed to accommodate the wider driveway. All the parking is developed to meet a conditional use requirement of the rezoning that they received a few years ago and they are required to provide 45 additional off-street parking spaces.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association supports the application.

Stefan-Leih stated that in regard to the window replacement, the Commission members may wish to cite Guidelines on page 57, Guideline 4, "Where the replacement of steel casement windows if it is not feasible to repair original windows, as determined by City staff, select replacement products that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size and details to the original window component using the criteria stated."

Chair Wharton stated that the windows are really not historic windows as the building was built in the 40s or 50s. He asked Mr. Teague if they planned to expand the size of the replacement windows. Mr. Teague stated that, for the most part, they would be put back in the same opening. The new doors will be replacing some of those windows.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2094 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for windows and doors on page 57, Guidelines for Institutional use, page 9 and Guidelines for Utilities and Mechanical Equipment, numbers 1, 2, 3, and 6 on page 40 are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2094 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Holy Trinity Episcopal Church located at 607 N. Greene Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**(d) Location: 116 Cypress Street**  
**Application Number 2096**  
**Applicant: Kenneth Dean Driver**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 8-9-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Remove multiple trees and clean up over-grown yard.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application and review by the City Arborist, Judson Clinton, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness without conditions. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The project will clean up existing over-grown trees and vegetation. It will require the removal of several trees in an effort to allow others to flourish. Some of the trees proposed for removal will interfere with overhead utility lines as they continue to grow.

**Guidelines (page 23):**

1. Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.
5. Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.

**Staff Comments:**

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that this application is for tree removal and lot clean-up. This was previously rental property and the new owner wishes to clean up this property as it has been badly neglected over the years. She, Mike Cowhig and Judson Clinton, the City Arborist, visited the property last Monday and walked around the property and Mr. Clinton is recommending to approve the request because of the overgrowth. Many trees that are in really bad locations and are going to grow into power lines.

**In Support:**

Dean Driver, Property Owner

Mindy Zackery, Dunleath Neighborhood Association

Dean Driver, the new property owner, 4701 Land Road, stated that they just acquired this house which is divided into three apartment units and their goal is to renovate the house and continue it as a rental property. A lot of the trees are already dead and need to be taken down. Other trees are probably voluntary growth and are within 3 feet of the house, which is too close. They are not vital to the overall landscaping of the property. Some of the trees have also caused damage to the house and roof. It seems obvious to get rid of most of these trees. This would allow the other trees in the yard to flourish. He also plans to make renovation to the sidewalk and that will be approved at staff level.

Mindy Zackery, 604 Summitt Avenue, stated that the Dunleath Neighborhood Association supports this application. They would recommend that the applicant might secure the services of a landscape architect to propose what will be going in along Yanceyville Street as that is a major thoroughfare through the neighborhood.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Arneke stated that he would like to see some replacement trees put in, but there may not be enough room to put in new trees. Mr. Driver stated that the power lines take up a lot of the territory there and that is part of the problem.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2096 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for trees and landscaping, numbers 1, 2, 5 and 6 on page 23 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2094 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to 607 N. Greene Street with the following condition: 1) that the applicant try to save the Elm tree next to the neighboring garage and references guidelines for trees and landscaping, numbers 1, 2, 5 and 6 on page 23. The motion was

seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**(e) Location: 224 S. Park Drive**  
**Application Number 2095**  
**Applicant: Steven J. Rubin**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 8-22-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Demolish front porch steps and construct new brick steps and stepped cheek walls.  
Cover walkway and steps leading to public sidewalk with brick pavers.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—*Walkways, including steps and sidewalks on page 30*):

- 1) Retain historic driveways and walkways, including the steps and sidewalks in the original locations.
- 2) When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original.

**Fact:**

The masonry steps and walkway are not in good condition. The proposal to replace the front porch steps with brick steps and brick cheek walls will give the house a look that is more in keeping with the historic district. The front steps do not appear to be original.

**Staff Comments**

Mike Cowhig stated that this application is for demolition of the front porch steps and construction of new brick steps and stepped cheek walls; and to cover the walkway and steps leading to the public sidewalk with brick pavers. Staff would recommend approval of the COA with the condition that the applicant and staff work together on the cheek wall details. If handrails are used, metal handrails would be recommended and approved at staff level.

**In Support:**

Steven Rubin  
Cheryl Pratt

Steven Rubin, the applicant, stated that they suspect that the original porch stairs were probably wooden when the house was built. The existing steps were probably poured in the 50s or 60s. The large set of steps leading into the porch appear to be a couple inches of concrete over what appears to be a mix of sand and rock and they are starting to split and rock somewhat. The lower steps have broken up from freeze/thaw. They have been repaired once about 6 or 7 years ago and now they need to be repaired or replaced. They are still stable enough to put pavers over them rather than demolish them and completely rebuild. They feel that brick would be a more attractive solution than concrete. They would not go any higher than the porch level.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association supports the application.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2095 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and staff comments as submitted, and the guidelines for Walkways, including steps and sidewalks on page 30): 1) Retain historic driveways and walkways, including the steps and sidewalks in the original locations. 2) When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**Recommended Conditions:**

That the brick steps and cheek walls be constructed to match the design of the historic steps and cheek walls in the neighborhood and that a construction detail, sketch or photograph of the proposed design be provided prior to construction.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2094 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to 224 S. Park Drive with the following conditions: The cheek walls do not go beyond the level of the porch, a sketch plan to be reviewed by staff prior to construction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton updated the Commission and reported that the City Council has approved the name change of the Aycock Historic District to Dunleath Historic District. He thanked staff for all their help during that process.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Stringfield stated that Stefan Leih and she attended the training session in Sanford, NC last month. The summer intern also attended the training session. It was a very good session.

There two new Commissioners have been appointed, but only one has accepted, Amanda Hodierna, who will be at next month's meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield; Tracy Pratt;  
Carlos Townsend and Linda Lane.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department.  
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Smith, Ms. Hodierne and Mr. Hoggard were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 30, 2017 REGULAR MEETING(s):**

Ms. Stringfield pointed out a correction in the August 30, 2017 minutes, on page 3, under "Discussion" should read, "he" not "she"; aborditae is the correct spelling further in the paragraph. Under Finding of Fact – 4<sup>th</sup> line it says "under safety and field requirements", should read "safety and code requirements". Page 4, under Facts: "hopped roof design" should be "hipped roof design". Page 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, "open sidelines" should be "soot lines". Page 7, Commission Discussion: - "would absorb more asphalt" should read "would replace more asphalt". Page 8, Staff Recommendations: "the work is incongruous" and should be "not incongruous". Page 10, last paragraph, Staff Recommendations: again says "the work is incongruous" should be "not incongruous". Page 12, Staff Recommendations: same situation "the work is incongruous" and should be "not incongruous".

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the August 30, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

Chair Wharton welcomed the new Commission member, Carlos Townsend, who arrived for the remainder of the meeting.

- (a) **Location: 424 Fisher Park Circle**  
**Application Number 2102 (amendment to \$2093)**  
**Applicant: Zen Holdings, LLC**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 9-13-17**  
**(GRANTED)**

**Description of Work:**

Change to approved exterior wall material as part of the construction of 6 multi-family townhomes in 3 buildings.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 77-80)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

Painted composite material will be used for porch columns. Because they will be painted they will be indistinguishable from wood columns.

**Fact:**

Painted brick will be substituted for the limestone panels as one of the wall materials. Exterior walls will be painted common brick and stucco with limestone details. Examples of originally painted brick structures can be found throughout the Fisher Park Historic District.

**Guidelines (page 80):**

5. *Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic buildings in the districts including brick, wood, stucco and stone. Materials such as steel, cast stone, fiber cement, and concrete are appropriate for new construction if they are used in a manner compatible with construction techniques and finishes used for historic buildings in the district. It is not appropriate to substitute vinyl or aluminum siding in place of traditional materials typical of the district.*

**In Support:**

DebbiAberman, Owner  
Leslie Gunter  
Michael Chapman

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion/Speakers:**

Mr. Pratt stated that because of the nature of the material, it is inappropriate to paint the brick, so even with new construction, it would seem that new brick should not be painted, as well. Stefan-Leigh responded that the guidelines are specific to the painting of unpainted historic masonry and they don't necessarily touch on this issue specifically, but staff is looking at previous decisions by the Commission regarding new construction and one property, in particular, that was approved as brick and the Commission, in that situation, actually put a condition on it that it be painted because they felt that it was more compatible with the streetscape where that was being constructed. That is Don Smith's property on Fisher Park Circle.

Mike Cowhig said that the guidelines recommend against painting unpainted brick and brick that was never intended to be painted, but there are some houses in the district that were painted originally and they are constructed of a red common brick and these may be some of the later Colonial Revivals. He feels that this application is intended to be similar to that red common brick that is really intended to be painted and most often is painted. There are several examples in the district.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Debbi Aberman, 304 St. Lauren Drive, Manager of Zen Holdings, LLC., stated that she did not have anything to add but was available to answer questions. The way they understand the guidelines is that the new construction should be compatible with existing structures based on setback, scale, massing and materials and there is nothing showing those types of restrictions on materials to be used for the exterior.



Leslie Gunter, 5900 Church Street, stated that they may be going to a flat top window instead of the arched windows.

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street, stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association recommends approval of this project, as presented.

Stefan-Leigh stated that the philosophy would be that in new construction you want to allow for some flexibility in how the design is developed. She read from the guidelines under Masonry and Stone: #4 "Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry or stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry or stone feature and can accelerate deterioration. Previously painted surfaces may remain painted." That is the predominant guideline that staff refers to and it does specifically say "historic appearance".

Mr. Pratt stated that he feels that the point of using brick is to cut down on the maintenance and also using brick because of the look. Painting brick, seems to him, contradictory to the choice of using brick in the first place. He also pointed out that it is not appropriate to paint previously unpainted brick and it would seem that would carry through for new construction, as well.

Debbi Aberman stated that they are doing the whole building in brick and they are not doing any stucco. Stefan-Leigh stated that the application should actually read, "The applicant would like to change the exterior material from limestone panels and stucco, to painted brick and use painted composite columns." Ms. Aberman stated that they also plan to use brick trim. Stefan-Leigh stated that the "detail and trim pieces will now be brick." No limestone or stucco will be used on the building, per this application.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2106 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under New Construction #5, "incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic buildings in the districts including brick, wood, stucco and stone", are acceptable as Findings of Fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Townsend. Nays: Pratt.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2106 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 424 Fisher Park Circle. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Townsend. Nays: Pratt.)

- (b) Location: 805 Simpson Street**  
**Application Number 2104**  
**Applicant: Dabney and Walker Sanders**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 8-07-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of addition to house

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work would not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The project proposes a small second story addition at the rear of the building. The existing gable will be extended by adding a hipped roof addition. It will not be visible from the street.

**Fact:**

The materials will match the original materials on the building including wood siding, wood windows and wood details. The windows will be simulated divided light wood windows in a 16-over 1 lite pattern.

**Fact:**

The project will have no impact on surrounding trees or on the original footprint of the building.

**Guidelines (page 75):**

1. *In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.*
2. *Distinguish additions from the original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material.*
3. *Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.*
4. *Limit the size and scale of additions, so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.*
5. *Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.*
6. *Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

Mr. Pratt asked if any thought was given to re-using the existing triple window in that dormer. Stefan-Leigh stated that was discussed on-site and it is her understanding that because of the interior configuration, the windows would not fit properly.

**Speakers In Support:**

Dabney Sanders  
Michael Chapman

**Speakers In Opposition:**

None

Speaking in support of the application was Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street, the applicant, stated that in regard to questions about the window, they did ask about keeping the three windows, and Dan Huckabee who was doing the drawings, told them that they could not use those windows with what they are doing on the inside. She would be happy to go back and ask him again as that was her preference. Mr. Pratt stated that the wall between the bedroom and the bath and closet, looks like it is in the same location as the existing wall. They are interested in preserving as much of this original historic house as possible. They have Pam Frye who has done a lot of work in Fisher Park and Dan Huckabee has also done a lot of work in the neighborhood, as well. They do not plan to start this work until mid-December so there is some time to work with. If the Commission would use and either/or situation in their motion, she would appreciate any consideration.

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street, stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association recommends approval of granting the application.

**Commission Discussion**

Mr. Arneke stated that he agrees that the triple window is a distinctive feature and if there is a way to maintain it, that would be great. Mr. Pratt stated that the applicant should speak with Mr. Huckabee to see if they can keep that triple window, but if not, maybe it could be finalized by staff.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2104 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the following guidelines for Additions (page 76, 1-6), are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt, Townsend, Lane. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2104 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 805 Simpson Street with the following conditions: 1) The existing upper rear triple windows be retained and reconsidered for use in the same location, or if in the opinion of staff, it is not feasible to retain the original windows, they are approved as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Pratt, Townsend, Stringfield, Lane. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 209 W. Bessemer Avenue**  
**Application Number 2099**  
**Applicant: Norman B. Blaylock**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 8-30-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Remove magnolia tree and replace 3 non-original windows

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23), and Windows and Doors*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The magnolia tree appears to be in decline. It is one of the street trees along Bessemer Avenue

Guidelines (page23)

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
5. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*

**Fact:**

The applicant has found the original windows in the attic and plans to re-install them in place of the three non-original stained glass windows.

Guidelines (page 57)

2. *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided.*

**Recommended Condition:**

That two (2) magnolia trees be started in place of the two (2) that were removed.

**Questions by Commissioners:**

Mr. Pratt asked if there a minimum caliper designation for canopy trees. Stefan-Leigh stated that the guidelines stipulate that if a tree greater than 4" in diameter at breast height is removed, approval is required. Her experience in working with the various City arborist, if you get much larger than 4" or 6" it actually makes no difference in the growth of the tree. Mike Cowhig added that one of the arborist had suggested using a replacement tree of 2" as they tend to grow faster when transplanted at that size. Over the years, a property owner has not been required to replace trees that died. Mr. Pratt pointed out that since the tree is in the right-of-way, it may not be the property owner's responsibility. Counsel Jones stated that the property owner is responsible for maintaining the vegetation between the sidewalk and the curb, even though it is not their property.

**In Support:**

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association recommends approval of this application.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2099 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project at 209 W. Bessemer Avenue is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for *Trees and Landscaping* on page 21-23, and *Windows and Doors* on page 57 are acceptable as finding of fact. A condition was placed on the application that two new magnolia tree be planted in the same location within the next 6 months with the diameter at breast height to be determined by the City Arborist. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Townsend. Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2099 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the location at 209 W. Bessemer Avenue, with the condition that the City Arborist would determine the size of the caliper of the two magnolia trees in the pre-existing locations, within the next 6 months of this application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Townsend, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

- (d) Location: 923 N. Eugene Street**  
**Application Number 2101**  
**Applicant: Steve B. Pippin**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 9-11-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construct roof over deck at back of house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the work will not be incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions and Porches (page 75) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The project proposed to reconfigure the roof on the rear elevation so that it extends over the existing deck to create a screened in porch. The back of the structure is part of an addition that was approved in 2006.

**Fact:**

The project proposes to reconfigure the roof on the rear elevation and create a massing that in combination with the existing addition overwhelms the original historic structure as it will now be 50% larger than the original historic structure. When the addition to the property was approved in 2006, the massing and scale of the addition and how the roofline was designed was carefully considered.

**Fact:**

The rear gable end of the historic building was extended as part of the 2006 addition. The design of the gable end was constructed to include an appropriate overhang, knee brackets, siding material and other details which were carefully considered for compatibility with the original structure

**Fact:**

The project proposed to use wood materials and roof materials to match the existing. It will not be easily visible from the street.

**Guidelines (page 75):**

3. Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.
4. Limit the size and scale of addition, so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.
5. Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.

**Guidelines (page 62)**

- #7. Because of their character-defining role, it is not appropriate to enclose front porches. Side and Rear porches may be enclosed to create sunrooms if the design of the enclosure is compatible with the architecture of the structure, and does not result in a loss of historic fabric or architectural details.

**Condition:**

That the gable end details match the existing gable and or that a different roof form be considered for staff approval that would decrease the overall massing of the roof.

**Staff Comments:**

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that this property was at one time a small Craftsman bungalow and in 2006 a property owner came before the Commission to have an addition done to the property. They Commission deliberated and studied that project and what it would do to the original historic bungalow. Since then, the addition has been constructed and the new owner wishes to add another addition to the original 2006 addition. Staff feels that they usually look favorably on this type of situation because they are not adding on to an original component or loss of original features. They would like to construct a

screened-in porch, which staff feels in an appropriate addition in the historic districts and certainly something that could make their property more enjoyable. Some of the issues are the gable end that has the wide overhang and knee brackets and the shake siding materials, all of those are details that were specified in the 2006 application and approval. With the new proposal, that left side addition there will be a gable end that now encompasses the majority of that one-story left side addition and comes out and reaches over to the point of the deck, making that roof form quite massive. When you look at the plan from above, the addition, in totality, is actually more than 50% of what was the original historic structure. They are proposing that the gable end be partially enclosed over the left side one-story area and then it would be opened over the deck. So they are creating, in effect, a cathedral ceiling within their deck area. Disregarding the changes to the massing, was one area of concern, but one other piece to look at is the loft of that gable end detailing that was maintained through the previous addition.

**In Support:**

Steve Pippin  
Michael Chapman

Steve Pippin, the property owner, 923 N. Eugene Street, stated that, for clarification, this is a master bath suite that is on the north side of the porch and there is a jut-out that is a bathroom and tub area. The back porch is only usable in the early morning because of the extreme heat in that area of the property in the afternoon. Hearing the staff recommendations they can compromise and carry across the shingle siding. They are not relying on the 2006 requirements for that shingle feature so they are willing to compromise.

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street, stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association recommends approval of this application.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2101 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as submitted and the guidelines for *Additions* on page 76, numbers 3, 4, 5, and page 62, number 7, under *Porches, Entrances and Balconies* are acceptable as findings of fact. The applicant volunteered to continue the façade details including the shingles at the top of the gable to be continued across the portion now that shows screening and to include bracket details, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Townsend, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Mr. Pratt stated that he would prefer to see them clad with the horizontal lap siding, the shakes would also be acceptable, but the siding would probably look a little better to match the original details.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2101 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness at 923 N. Eugene Street with the following condition: 1) The gable and details match the existing gable end. 2) The panel detailing be clad with wood horizontal lap siding or wood shingle siding to match the original details on the structure. The motion was seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Townsend, Pratt. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton stated that he had no items to add to today's meeting.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Mr. Pratt stated that currently there are no application fees for submitting COAs, and there have been discussion in the past about an application fee or fines for after-the-fact COAs. He would like to revisit the possibility of an application fee for after-the-fact COAs.

Mike Cowhig stated that they have compiled that information and would be glad to put it together and email it to Commission members. Counsel Jones stated that a fee for after-the-fact applications could be justified as a punitive penalty fee.

Stefan-Leigh stated that the after-the-fact applications seem to take a lot of time and energy and it seems that staff deals with them more often lately, although on average, there are only about 5 or so per year. Mike Cowhig stated that if they see someone starting a project without a COA they will talk with them and make sure that a COA is applied for, if necessary. A lot of times though, it may be something that can be approved at staff level.

There will be more discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Arneke stated that in an update regarding 609 S. Mendenhall Street, the closing has been done and the Neighborhood Association has sold the lot to the Green's who are going to build a house there.

Ms. Stringfield stated that her notes from the August NC HPC in Sanford, would be sent to other members. One thing that was new to her at the time was that every February, the National Parks Service accepts Grant requests for up to \$150M dollars of grants and NC typically applies through the NC Historic Preservation Office. She will send pertinent information to other Commission members for their review.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Stefan-Leigh explained the process of an after-the-fact application for Mr. Townsend's benefit.

Stefan-Leigh stated that there was a new co-worker here earlier today who will be assisting with the Downtown Architectural Survey Update and has a background in English and is a very capable young lady and seems to be very excited and passionate about historic buildings.

In response to a question by Chair Wharton concerning the Railroad bridges in the historic district, Stefan-Leigh stated that she was contacted by a staff person in the Engineering Department and the City has already negotiated with the Railroad and on Market Street the RR underpass has been painted with the A&T colors. That was a pilot program that they were planning to select various RR bridges and use some of the other University and College colors in a spirit effort. Staff was given the opportunity to give their opinion for the color scheme to be used at the Summit Avenue bridge. She conveyed that they generally do not agree with the painting of masonry, brick or concrete in historic districts as it creates a maintenance issue. The metal details have already been painted and where there is graffiti, it cannot always be removed, so painting that matches the original lighter color of masonry looks like it would be appropriate. Mike Cowhig stated that the downtown RR bridges were designated as historical in 1975, so he feels they should be treated according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Their office has offered to consult on this matter. Also, the lighting has been switched out to the new LED fixtures, but because the Commission brought it up, they will check to make sure that they all are functioning properly.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd



**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
OCTOBER 25, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield;  
Carlos Townsend Amanda Hoderne and Wayne Smith.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department.  
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Pratt; and Ms. Lane were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 27, 2017 REGULAR MEETING(s):**

Ms. Stringfield pointed out corrections in the September 27, 2017 minutes as follows:

Page 1, "aborditae" should be "arborvitae" same page further down "soot lines" should be site lines"; page 2, 2nd line, should be, "In the staff's opinion that "changes". . ." should be added; page 4, last sentence should read "would use an either/or situation"; page 6, under Finding of Fact, 6<sup>th</sup> line, "two new magnolia tree"s" be planted in the previous locations. . ."; Under Motion on page 6, "the pre-existing locations, and within the next 6 months of this approval"; page 7, last "Fact", "The proposed project "is" to use. . .",

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the September 27, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Townsend, Hoderne. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

Chair Wharton welcomed the new Commission member, Amanda Hoderne.

- (a) **Location: 218 South Park Drive  
Application Number 2108  
Applicant: Jennifer Weathersby  
Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 9-21-17  
(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Rebuild front porch (terrace) and retaining wall with brick.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will be consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62-66) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The front porch (terrace) is not original. This 2-unit house was built with twin covered porches. The porches were removed at some point and replaced with a masonry terrace. The terrace was constructed of brick that was covered with stucco. The floor of the terrace is terra cotta tile. The front wall of the terrace has deteriorated in places. The retaining wall at the public sidewalk also has a stucco exterior. The wall is leaning and cracking in places. If the terrace and retaining wall are rebuilt in brick to match the design and details of the existing, then the work should maintain the historic character of the property and the historic district.

**Guidelines (page 64)**

1. *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.*
2. *Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture, and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

- 1) That the design and details of the new retaining wall and terrace match the original, including the cap, drainage openings and that a brick paver be used for the flooring of the terrace.
- 2) If dimensional changes are required to meet building code, the project is brought back to staff for approval.
- 3) The brick used should match the brick on the recently replaced existing chimney.
- 4) The pre-cast caps on the both the terrace and steps be salvaged and reused to the extent possible.
- 5) That the existing arched weeps are incorporated to match the existing original and that the pre-cast sills are reused.
- 6) The street retaining wall will be brick to match the chimney and terrace and the pre-cast caps will match the existing or be reused.
- 7) That the retaining wall will be built to code with rebar and proper drainage.

**In Support:**

William Weatherby, Owner  
Scott Beam

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion/Speakers:**

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

William Weatherby, the property owner, stated that the photos being shown were a good representation of the property today, as well as he produced an old photograph of what the house originally looked like. They purchased the house about 4 years ago and have been in the process of updating and restoring it through those years. They feel it was probably one of the first townhouses in

Greensboro as there are 2 front doors and it used to be split in the interior and now it is one physical structure. The interior walls have been opened up. On the photograph of the original house, it shows the brick chimney and they tried to duplicate that design when the chimney was rebuilt. They also rebuilt all three chimneys. It is their contention that the brick was covered up with stucco to cover up the failing brick structures. They are now trying to match that same look and feel on the base part of the structure where the stucco is now and leaving that existing cement cap on the retaining wall. They want to replace the whole façade of the front of the house so that it all matches like it was originally intended.

Wayne Smith stated that the problem is that the stucco being added has allowed moisture to get back there and deteriorate the bricks. He asked if the archway under the porch, what he would call a “weep” is going to be replaced? Mr. Weatherby responded that they would try and use the original vents, if possible.

Scott Beam, the contractor for this project, 3413 Old Mountain Road, Trinity, NC, stated that in regard to the front porch, the plan is to take it down completely because they are really not sure what is behind the existing structure. The front foundation is also the stucco and has the same brick which is crumbling, the same as the chimney was. They are asking to be able to do all of it while they are in there, because it doesn't make sense to tear off the front porch and not fix the foundation because it is all tied together.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2108 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64) are acceptable as Findings of Fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hoderne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

The Commissioners also discussed approval of the proposed conditions, as brought forth by staff.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2108 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 218 South Park Drive, with the conditions presented by staff as listed above. The motion was seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hoderne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 511 Charter Place  
Application Number 2110  
Applicant: Mia McDonough  
Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 10-11-17  
(GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Roof repairs and/or replacement due to tree damage to the roof

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

A large tree fell on this house during a storm causing severe damage. The back half of the roof must be completely rebuilt. The Building Code requires that new replacement rafters be 8" wide. The existing rafters are 4" wide. In order to avoid a noticeable transition point in the roof, the applicant is proposing to change from a hip to a gable form at the back of the house.

**Fact:**

While the proposal will result in a change to the rear portion of the original roof form, it will solve a technical problem in a manner that maintains the general appearance and character of the house and the neighborhood. The roof line of the front façade of the building will not change.

**Fact:**

Original details such as rafter tails will be incorporated into the areas that will have the new roof.

**Guidelines (page 53):**

1. *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and window's walks.*
2. *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*

**Speakers In Support:**

David Millsaps

**Speakers In Opposition:**

None

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

David Millsaps, 822 Rankin Place, stated that they are working on a 1938 Sears catalog Craftsman house. Part of their challenge is that the original rafters are larger than what they can provide to replace them with to make the roof planes match. This house was ready to be sold before the tree fell on it. The tree came across the kitchen and the refrigerator helped stop part of the fall and it cleaved all the way through the wall and pushed out the other wall, approximately an inch-and-a-half and damaged the foundation. That is what they know so far. There may be other damages as they get into the repairs and replacement. They feel they can get it to work out in the roof planes, if they change it from a hip to a gable roof. When there is a hip roof, those hips that run from the ridge to the corner, each one of those is about 24' long and what you have to do is support those. Those are 2' X 10' instead of what was originally built which were 2' X 4's so one piece is about making all the components fit, getting things back into plane. The other challenge is that everything will be the same dimension, and everything is in the same plane. The center wall has some termite damage and some other things and the engineers recommended that inside there to put the ceiling joists on, also have to be 2' X 8's instead of 2' X 4's and glue lams are being run in there to pick up the load and carry everything to meet the building code. Mr. Smith asked why they can't use trusses? Mr. Millsaps responded that the issue is with the walls being in plane.

**Commission Discussion**

Wayne Smith stated that the trusses are unilateral regardless of what the walls are doing. In a 2' X 4' construction, so it would essentially fit with the plane that is already in there. A hip-set doesn't require those rafter hips, as there are jack-sets of trusses and they just make a truss and a truss and a truss and when to get to about 60' to the end, there would be a shed truss and then you can put, as another alternative, it could be put back with trusses and still maintain the plane required. He pointed out that the load would be on the exterior wall and there would be no interior load. Mr. Weatherby pointed out that he crawled under the structure and it is all pier and post wall construction underneath it.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2110 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments as submitted and the following guidelines for *Roofs (page 53, 1 and 2)*, are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodierne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2110 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 511 Charter Place. The motion was seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodierne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton stated that he had some informal feedback about the motions made, that they are sometimes not clear enough. He thinks everyone worked on that today to make sure that they are clear and so that when the public reads the minutes, can have more of an understanding.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Mr. Arneke stated that Ms. Lane is not at today's meeting because she is preparing for a tour of Hillside and Fisher Park tomorrow which is sold out and, due to popular demand, will be repeated in two weeks. If anyone is interested in seeing the work in progress at Hillside, November 9<sup>th</sup> will be another opportunity to see it. Next Thursday there will be a tour of Cascade Saloon, as well. Stefan-Leih stated that both of those are fund-raising opportunities for Preservation Greensboro, Inc. and Hillside is located at 301 Fisher Park Circle and the house that was featured on the show "Hoarders" about 8 months or so ago.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Chair Wharton stated that at last month's meeting there was a request to have discussion about the possibility of fees being levied for after-the-fact COAs. Since Mr. Pratt was the one that really wanted to have this discussion, they could table this item until the November meeting.

In response to Ms. Hodierne's inquiry about what the question was, Stefan-Leih stated that she would give a brief overview of what is going on since there are two new members here today. A couple of years ago, the City of Greensboro has gone to a system where they are charging fees for permits, as an example, the building code permit and they had raised those rates. At that time there was a discussion about requiring fees for COAs and staff proposed a fee schedule. The feedback received from the neighborhoods was that doing work in historic districts already requires a higher level of investment and skill set and who is hired to do the work. The Neighborhood Associations were really not in favor of another added fee for doing work in the neighborhoods. In addition, two of the local historic districts also pay higher property taxes in the form of the Municipal Service District Program. So the feedback received was that there was an overwhelming desire to have an after-the-fact fee. Staff researched that and determined that there is already a penalty system in place through the Zoning Code, so there is an "all or nothing" matter. There is a fee system that charges for minor and major works and after-the-fact work, or continue to go with the current no fee, and then do the penalty system under the Zoning Enforcement Development Ordinance that is in place.

Counsel Jones clarified by saying that when the City receives a complaint that work has been done without an approved COA, the property owner will typically get a Notice of Violation. Part of evading that violation is to get a COA, so no civil penalty is issued if the property owner promptly, or within a reasonable amount of time, applies for a COA. Right now those civil penalties are being issued if they are going through this process. If they refuse to go through the process, then there are civil penalties.

Eventually, there would be a Court injunction to make them remove the change or restore the change or whatever is appropriate.

Mr. Smith what good is a fine if they have destroyed the house? He feels they should be made to put it back the way it was, as that would be the worst penalty they could find. Counsel Jones pointed out that there are two constraints; a penalty has limits under state law in what a penalty can be, and again, the penalty is unlikely to really reflect any damages to an historic property. That is probably not as much as they invested in the change or the work they may have done. So it is unlikely to be a deterrent. The other thing is, if there is a fee it has to be rationally related to the amount of work that the City staff has to go through in order to process that permit. It does have some rational relationship to that, and that has been discussed, "is there really a difference between processing a COA application that comes in before any work is done, and an after-the-fact." Then there are also COAs that are for new construction and changing a retaining wall and there are differences in scale and should they have the same permit fee because the staff level of involvement on completely new construction and getting an ad hoc committee to look at it, there is more resources that go into larger projects.

Mr. Smith stated that he feels that the most helpful thing is not to charge a fee to apply, but raise the bar, at least enforce the bar, if what is required in terms of making the application, as in more drawings; better photographs; more documentation; so there is something to work with and they don't have to rely just on photos. And then if work is done without a COA, be much harsher on the penalty, specifically in regard to after-the-fact work.

Chair Wharton pointed out that staff is where the requirements and public feelings about historic preservation meet and sometimes there is a lot of push and pull. He feels that, in general, there has been enough information and the danger is if people are applying and staff says they need a measured drawing for their project and people may resent that. Stefan-Leih stated that the issue is not normally with approved COAs not being done the way they were approved. That does happen occasionally, and that's where staff gets involved and they go out and meet with the applicant and figure out a solution to how the work is going to be done, the real issue is just not knowing they need a COA and they begin to build a fence or some other work, like covering their foundation windows with boards because the window had deteriorated and is falling in. The City staff drain or work load come in continually following with those approvals after they have come to the Commission and received approval for that, following up with, they have had 6 months to do this and haven't done it yet. And then they say they are on the waiting list for such-and-such contractor and he's not available until such-and-such date. Staff has to say, okay, they are waiting and being patient because they ultimate goal is compliance and they don't want to have money just given to the City that could be put toward making the project better. Fines do not seem to make those situations move along any faster. As an example, 624 Park Avenue where the front door was replaced has just been completed and it was a 3-year process. There is a lot of background to that situation but she and Mike finally met with the property owner at New Home and selected a door that was appropriate. She is not checking that one off until the door is actually installed. The owner stated that he was not in sticker-shock over the wood door with all the right panel configurations because he has already spent money on fines. He wants to get it taken care of. He had a property manager that had some issues going on. He point is that the fines did not make the project move any faster. She presented a schedule of fines she obtained from Amber Kidd from the State Historic Preservation Office. One of the questions on the 2014-15 NC Certified Local Government Report was: "Does the Commission or local government enforce penalties or fees for after-the-fact COAs?"

Ms. Stringfield stated that it is important for everyone to see this information. Stefan-Leih stated that she would email the information to each Commission member. She also explained that 43.75% of historic districts stated that they did not have penalties or fees and a little over 10% said they had penalties, but they don't use them, and 45.83% stated that have some sort of penalty or fee.

She also had some information that Mike did several years ago on fees, in general, and pointed out that now Charlotte does charge fees.

Michelle McCullough, Winston-Salem City-County Planning, stated that they have the same issues. They decided about 3 years ago to enforce the fees and they are not penalties. They had to prove how much more work is done by staff for after-the-fact applications because there is more work involved by staff.

Mr. Smith stated that he feels that they need better documentation and Mr. Wharton had stated he feels that they get enough information. Mr. Smith pointed out that he cannot think of any permit for work in Greensboro without providing a measured drawing, whether it be a septic field or addition to a house or addition to a building, a site plan. He is not suggesting seeing an architect and spend a couple thousand dollars, but when somebody is putting an addition on a house or doing landscaping plan, he does not feel it is too much to say there needs to be a scale site, how far are they from the property line, how close is that, is that a 20' fence or 150-yard fence. He feels this information is very important in making decision on whether they proposed work is appropriate, especially within an historic district. Chair Wharton pointed out that the Guidelines for different types of applications, have different requirements. There have been occasions where an application is discussed and then continued so the applicant can obtain and provide more information. Any Commission member can certainly ask that more information be provided before a vote is taken.

Chair Wharton pointed out that the Commission has to gauge the tolerance of the public and the elected officials for Historic Preservation and the regulatory burden that it puts on people.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
DECEMBER 13, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield;  
Amanda Hodierne, Tracy Pratt, Linda Lane,  
David Hoggard and Wayne Smith.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department.  
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

Mike Cowhig stated that Item (e) 917 N. Elm Street has been withdrawn from the agenda.

Chair Wharton explained the policies and procedures of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Speakers were sworn or affirmed as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Mr. Townsend was excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 25, 2017 REGULAR MEETING(S):**

Ms. Stringfield pointed out corrections in the October 25, 2017 minutes as follows:

Page 3, paragraph 1, last sentence "they want to replace the wall façade of the front of the house so it all matches like it was originally intended".

Page 4, paragraph David Millsaps, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence from the end. " Glue lambs should be . . . " should be "glue lams should be. . . "

Page 4, last sentence says, "pier and pert wall construction. . . ." delete the word "pert".

Page 5, 1<sup>st</sup> motion, "Mr. Arneke made the finding of fact, --- he should also make the motion instead of Ms. Stringfield.

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the October 25, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Lane, Hodierne. Nays: None.)

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 112 Fisher Park Circle**  
**Application Number: 2115**  
**Applicant: Sally B. Cone**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 10/26/17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**



**Description of Work:**

Demolition of carport and construction of new carport; remove tree: add railing and steps to front porch; replace front walkway with stepping stones and construct new walkway and steps; construct retaining walls; construct colonnade and fence at back of lot; alterations to back deck. Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the demolition of the existing carport and construction of a new carport is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Demolition* (page 73) and *Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-37), *Fences, Walls and Site Features* (pages 24-26), *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (pages 28-30) for the following reasons:

**Fact**

The existing carport is listed as a contributing structure but it may have replaced an early garage. Carports are rare in the historic districts. The design and materials of the proposed carport will match the existing carport so there will be no change in terms of the character of the property or historic district.

**Guidelines pg. 73**

*The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored.*

**Guidelines 36**

2. *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example.*
3. *Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished.*
4. *New garages and Accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*

**Facts**

The front porch was constructed without a railing. However, part of the porch is fairly high above the ground so a railing is needed for safety. The proposed railing is compatible with the house and district and meets the building code. The design is unusual enough to be recognized as a later addition rather than creating a false historical appearance. The new steps are in an inconspicuous location at the back side of the porch.

**Guidelines page 64**

4. *It is not appropriate to add elements or details to porches to create a false historical appearance.*

**Facts**

The front walkway is being pushed up by tree roots. To replace the concrete would require cutting roots and

and risking the loss of a significant tree. As an alternative, the concrete will be removed and replaced with stepping stones. A new concrete walkway will be constructed that leads to the front corner of the lot along with a brick garden wall. Low brick walls are found throughout the historic districts and curved walkways are also found.

**Guidelines page 26**

4. Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood.

**Guidelines page 30**

1. *Retain historic driveways and walkways, including steps and sidewalks, in their original locations.*
2. *When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways*

*and walkways in terms of width, location, materials and design.*

**Facts**

The colonnade and fence at the back of the lot will help screen the parking lot of the adjacent office building. The proposed fence must be tall enough to compensate for the severe change in grade between the

two properties. This situation was created when the adjacent property was graded to create a level building lot. The visual effect of the new fence will be the same as the existing fence (that is in poor condition) and give the homeowner the desired screening of the parking lot. Because the fence will be higher than the maximum allowable height for fences a Special Exception will be needed. Special Exceptions in the historic

districts are considered by the Board of Adjustments and must first be recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

**Guidelines page 26**

*5. Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location, and size with original fences and walls in the historic district... Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72”.*

**In Support:**

Sally Cone, Owner  
Jesse Arnette, 3024 Stratford Drive  
Michael Chapman

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion/Speakers:**

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Jesse Arnette, 3024 Stratford Drive, stated that he is the designer for this project and he answered questions by the Commission members. In regard to the fence, the reason for the double layer of fencing is that the existing fence is on the office property to the rear. The office property is not willing to put up a new fence, so it falls back to the applicant to resolve the issue of exposure to the rear of her property. The new proposed fence is no taller than what is already in place at the back yard but will provide the security and privacy feature for the applicant's property. In regard to the proposed lattice on the south side of the front porch, the purpose is for privacy. The pathway is probably going to be brick.

Sally Cone, 112 Fisher Park Circle, the applicant, stated that the previous owners had put lattice and it is removable and can easily be taken down. The trellis can also be easily removed if she chose to remove it. She has talked with David Craft who is owner of the commercial building behind her lot and he suggested building the double fence at the rear of her property because he is having a difficult time finding a solution. That fence has been hit several times by vehicles in the parking lot and the fence is actually leaning on her garage. He may even remove his fence completely which would mean that there is no screening at all for the applicant's property.

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street, President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, stated that they voted to recommend approval of this project at the rear of the house. The elements in the front of the house, they did not have enough information and voted to leave it up to the Commission to make a recommendation.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

Mr. Smith stated that the drawings included in the packets did not match the drawings shown at the meeting and there needs to be clarification of which drawings are to be submitted for consideration. Mike Cowhig stated that the packets got out earlier and the plans were still a work-in-progress at that point, so the plans shown today are the final plans. Mr. Hoggard stated that he has a problem with the walkway and he likes the design, but it seems strange to have two entrances off the sidewalk to the house. He does understand the trade-off. Mr. Wharton stated that this project retains the character of the neighborhood and they are within the guidelines.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2115 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under Demolition and Removal (page 73 and page 36 under Garages and Accessory Buildings numbers 2,3,4); Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64, number 4); Retaining Walls (page 26); Driveways and Walkways, (page 30, numbers 1,2) Walls page 26,number 5), are acceptable as Findings of Fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. Ms. Stringfield asked if the guideline for Trees and Landscaping, page 23, number 2 and 5, can be added for the tree removal at the rear of the garage in the back yard. This friendly amendment to the motion was accepted. The Commission also recommended in favor of a Special Exception in regard to the height of the fence and setback of the carport.

The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt, Lane, Hoggard, Smith, Hodiern. Nays: None.)

The Commissioners also discussed approval of the proposed conditions, as brought forth by staff. The following are the conditions the Commission determined should be added to the application.

**Recommended Conditions:**

1. Lattice screening on the front porch be designed to be removable.
2. Landscape retaining wall indicated on the site plan to be brick to match the existing foundation brick as closely as possible.
3. Plans reviewed on the screen at the meeting are the plans to be approved.
4. Time limit of 6 months on removal of tree in rear yard and replanting and location within a certain time-frame and specimen to be determined by staff.
5. Fencing around the HVAC is to be constructed of wood, brick or stone.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2115 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 112 Fisher Park Circle, with the conditions presented as listed above. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodiern, Pratt, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Location: 227 North Park Drive**  
**Application No. 2120**  
**Applicant: Sherry L. Rogowski**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 10-23-17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work**

Removal of large oak tree in back yard and maple and cherry trees in front yard.

Based on information contained in the application and review by City Arborist, Judson Clinton, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed tree removal is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping* (page 21-23)

for the following reasons:

**Fact**

The oak tree appears to be healthy. The maple tree could be retained by removing one of the leaders. The cherry tree appears to be healthy but it does not contribute to the canopy and character of the historic district like the other two trees.

**Guidelines (page 23)**

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*

**In Support:**

Tom Rogowski  
Sherry Rogowski  
Michael Chapman

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion/Speakers:**

Tom Rogowski, the property owner, stated that there were two other oak trees next to this oak tree and they over-lapped each other. The other two trees did have disease and they were taken down through the approval process. This particular tree is leaning toward the structure and the other side of the structure, to the left is a house and behind the structure is another house. The concern is that if the tree should fall, it would cause severe damages to these houses. All the weight of the tree is going toward these other houses. His arborist, John Riley, has also assessed that the trunk of the tree is having some issues and cause some damage in the future. In regard to the maple tree, the arborist has said it started dying during the summer and there was another maple tree on the other side of the driveway that went through the exact same issue and the tree ended up dying. That is why they would like to go ahead and take the tree down. They take very good care of their yard and have added a lot of vegetation and other trees and when they have had a tree taken down, they always replaced it. They do want to keep the canopy intact. Mike Cowhig added that they have started some oak trees in the back yard. He would replace the maple tree. In regard to the cherry tree, their concern is that as that tree has grown, it is imposing itself to the brick foundation of the front porch. They are concerned about further damages it may make to that foundation.

Sherry Rogowski, the owner, stated that she would like to put an oak tree on the opposite side of the driveway. Right now there is a small ornamental tree, a red bud, and she would move it to another location so make room for the replacement oak tree. They would like to give the newly planted oak tree in the back yard all the room it needs to grow.

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, stated that they Board voted to recommend approval of this application with the condition of replacement of the trees that are removed. They were particularly concerned about the leaning tree because that is a very significant property it is leaning over.

Commissioners noted that there have been significant damages recently because of weather related winds and they agree that if the trees are considered dangerous, they should be removed and replaced.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2120, for work at 227 North Park Drive, and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23)*, with the following conditions:

That the trees be replaced with at least two canopy trees of 2" to 4" trunk diameter at breast height, is acceptable to the City Historic District staff and the City arborist, within 6 months of removal of the trees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2120 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 227 North Park Drive, with the conditions presented as listed above. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hoderne, Pratt, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Location: 114 W. Bessemer Avenue**  
**Application No. 2121**  
**Applicant: Michael Riek**  
**Property Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 11/1/17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work**

Replace original garage doors with new doors

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion replacing the original doors with appropriate new doors will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Structures and Garages (pages 35-37)*, Staff looked at this from a practical standpoint and there are very few original garages left in the district. This is a way to ensure that the garage survives.

**Fact**

The garage is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The original doors are not very functional for the homeowner's purposes. Replacing them with appropriate new doors, sliding barn doors, will ensure that the garage is made functional and increase the likelihood that it will be preserved. The house is located on a corner lot and is very visible from the street. It is difficult to match the original doors exactly, but the ones chosen by the applicant are very close.

**Guidelines pg. 36**

*Retain the original materials and features of historic garages and outbuildings including windows, doors, siding, trim and latticework. If replacement of an element is necessary, match the original in design.*

**In Support:**

Michael Riek  
Michael Chapman

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion/Speakers:**

Michael Riek, the applicant, stated that this is a door that slides back and forth and they are not pocket doors. The piece of hardware that holds the door is very rusted and difficult to open. He thinks he can save the hardware, cut the bolts and clean them up to re-use. The windows in the door will not be as long as the original because they do not make them like that anymore.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2121 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under Accessory Structures and Garages (page 36) are acceptable as Findings of Fact. Ms. Hodiernie recommended that door style 920 Plain be used. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2121 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 114 W. Bessemer Avenue, with the condition presented as above, #920 Plain, glazed 3 or 4 pane windows, painted steel be used, that the existing hanging track be retained to the extent possible, and suggest that the existing doors be donated to Architectural Salvaged. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodiernie, Pratt, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Location: 805 Rankin Place**  
**Application No. 2122**  
**Applicant: Paul Phillips**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 11/6/17**  
**(GRANTED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work**

Removal of large oak tree in back yard.

Based on information contained in the application and review by City Arborist, Judson Clinton, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed tree removal is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23)* for the following reasons:

**Fact**

This tree could be 175-200 years old. While there is decay, it does not appear there is a high risk that it will fall. There are treatment alternatives short of total removal. The City Arborist does not feel that there is imminent risk of falling, as it could survive for many years, even with a cavity in the tree. The holding wood, if strong enough could withstand the weight of the tree and limbs. The owner is very

concerned about the possibility of future damages.

**Guidelines (page 23)**

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*

**In Support:**

Paul Phillips, the owner  
Virginia Haskett

**In Opposition:**

None

**Discussion/Speakers:**

Paul Phillips, the applicant, stated that the photo of the child standing inside the cavity indicates that there is severe damage to the tree. The tree is 17 feet around at the base and several of the limbs are hanging right over the house and back yard. Those limbs are of significant size. The arborist did say that the tree is not dead, but he also said it is not going to last, without a doubt. He did indicate that an ice storm could be devastating for the tree. He hates to take the tree down but feels that it is very dangerous to keep it up. This project is going to be very expensive and time consuming. The tree provides a lot of canopy, but about 30 – 40 feet back in the yard under the canopy of this tree, there is a magnolia tree that is also very large as well as several other very large trees on the property, which will really grow faster if this particular tree is removed. There is also a pen oak in the front yard that has grown substantially over the last 20 years. Mr. Phillips stated that he never got the impression from the arborist, Mr. Clinton, that he was opposed to taking this tree down. Mr. Cowhig added that Mr. Clinton sees these very large trees as connections to the history of the neighborhood and feels there is a way, rather than completely removing them, to remove dead wood and nurture the tree along for as long as possible, as a possible alternative to complete removal. He did recognize that this tree is nearing the end of its life. Chair Wharton stated that it is difficult for the members to make a decision when they cannot ask questions of people who are not in attendance.

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association, stated that at their last meeting, they voted to recommend approval of the removal of the tree requested by the applicant.

Commission members felt it would be very helpful if the City Arborist could attend the meetings when there are tree removal applications to provide more information.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2122 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under *Trees and Landscaping 1. "Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district."* (page 23) are acceptable as Findings of Fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stringfield.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2122 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 805 Rankin Place, with the condition that the tree be cut down to ground level or completely. The motion was seconded by Mr.

Smith. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodierno, Pratt, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Location: 1007 N. Elm Street**  
**Application Number 2127**  
**Applicant: Parker H. Washburn**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 10-11-17**  
**(DENIED)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace clay tile porch roof

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51 #2)*, for the following reasons:

**Fact**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District.

The clay tile roof is a defining feature of the structure.

**Guidelines (page 51)**

2. *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission tiles" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original.*

From the Fisher Park National Register Historic District Nomination Form:  
1007 North Elm St. *John Marion Galloway House, individually listed on National Register; designed by Harry Barton, stonemason Andrew Leopold Schlosser; large, random-coursed stone, gable-end structure with chocolate-colored mortar; two gabled rounded bays at either side of front façade with porch between; stucco & half-timbering in gables; battered stone piers at front and side sun porch; red tile roofs; former servants' quarters/garage has matching finish.*

**Speakers In Support:**

Robert Taylor

**Speakers In Opposition:**

Michael Chapman

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Robert Taylor, 7729 Temary Quarry Road, Kernersville, NC, stated that he is the general contractor for David Millsaps, the applicant. He came to get the permit and it was approved. Some minor repairs have already been done, trying to see what can be done to retain the beauty of the house. He pointed out that there is some significant sagging going on at the arches and it is a very low pitch. There have



been a lot of leaks through the years and it should not have had tile on it for all these years. He will have to find a way to support it from above and they do not want to get into the arches or the existing millwork, as they want it to remain the same. There are some rafters that are broken in the middle that need attention and replacement.

Michael Chapman, 818 N. Eugene Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, stated that they strongly recommend rejection of this application, as the tile is too important.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2127 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and the guidelines under *Roofs (page 53)* “1, 2, 4 and 5, are acceptable as Findings of Fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2127 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 1007 North Elm Street. Denial of the application is due to the following:

1. Maintain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features, such as chimneys, dormers, cornices, ballustrades, and ????
2. Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay “mission tiles” or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original.
3. Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative wrap details, crown moldings, soffit boards and cresting. If replacement is necessary the new details should match the original.
6. Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems.

**I cannot get the numbers to change on the above, it should be 1, 2, 4 and 5.**

From the Fisher Park National Register Historic District Nomination Form:  
 1007 North Elm St. *John Marion Galloway House, individually listed on National Register; designed by Harry Barton, stonemason Andrew Leopold Schlosser; large, random-coursed stone, gable-end structure with chocolate-colored mortar; two gabled rounded bays at either side of front façade with porch between; stucco & half-timbering in gables; battered stone piers at front and side sun porch; red tile roofs; former servants' quarters/garage has matching finish.*

It has been determined that the tile roof is a defining feature of the structure, so the proposed material in this application is totally incongruous with the original materials.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodiern, Pratt, Lane, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton stated that he would like to have the City Arborist attend meetings that are for tree removal or at least put something in writing for the Commission members to review and rely on. Applicants should be instructed that they are going to need documentation or direct testimony from their arborist, so that the Commission members do not have to struggle with a decision based on just the information given by the applicant.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mike Cowhig stated that in regard to the downtown survey, an architectural consultant historian, Heather Slane Wagoner, from Durham, has been hired to revisit the downtown Greensboro National Register of Historic Districts and review all the individual records and determine whether some buildings that did not qualify for tax credits previously may now qualify or determine whether or not the district could be expanded and look at the most significant buildings (approximately 100 buildings) outside of the historic district downtown, that may be worthy of National Register listing. The whole idea is to encourage the use of the tax credits to rehabilitate historic downtown buildings. At the same time, staff is doing a full inventory of all buildings in the downtown. An intern is helping with that project, recording data for each building. Staff feels this would be useful for developers who are interested in particular buildings. This data would include photos of building type, architectural data, and any other useful information available.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd

Application No. 1956  
Location: 1007 North Elm Street  
Applicant: Parker Washburn  
Property Owner: Same  
Date Received: 11/29/17

**Description of Work**

Replace clay tiles on porch roof with metal roofing.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs* (page 51-53) for the following reasons:

