

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 31, 2018**

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

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

Vice Chair David Arneke opened the meeting in the absence of Chair Wharton. 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. He also stated that Ms. Lane has resigned from the Commission due to other obligations and time constraints.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 13, 2017 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield pointed out corrections in the December 13, 2017 minutes as follows:

Page 5, paragraph under Discussion/Speakers, line 13, states, "He would replace..." should read, "The property owner stated that he would replace..."

Ms. Hodierne moved approval of the December 13, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Townsend, Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Mr. Townsend stated that he appreciates the Commission for excusing his absence at the December meeting. His mother had surgery in October, thought to be routine, but it resulted in her passing. The Commission members voiced their condolences.

Chair Wharton arrived at 4:15 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 623 Summit Avenue**
Application Number 2130
Applicant: Jamie Spearman
Owner: Same
Date Application Received 1-09-18
(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replace roof

Stefan-Leih stated that she and Mike are thrilled that this property has a new owner and are very pleased with the work they have seen so far.

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 is congruous and in keeping with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51-53) for the following reasons:*

Fact:

The building currently has an asbestos shingle roof. This material becomes brittle and cracks with age.

Fact:

The applicant is proposing to use an asphalt shingle roof material, which is a common replacement material in the historic district. This material has been approved for roof replacement projects when the original material is determined as non-character defining.

Fact:

No changes will be made to the design and form of the roof.

Guidelines (page 53)

3. *Retain historic roofing materials such as asbestos shingles, metal shingles, and standing seam metal roofing. If replacement is necessary due to deterioration, substitute roofing materials such as composition shingles are appropriate. Since historic roofing materials were traditionally dark in color, light colored composition shingles are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.'*

Recommended Conditions:

The location of vents should be out of view from the street. The shingles must be dark in color and approved by staff. The valley gutter(s) feature must be replaced.

In Support:

Jamie Spearman, Owner
Mindy Zachery

In Opposition:

None

Discussion/Speakers:

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

Jamie Spearman, the property owner, stated that she currently lives at 112 Forester Street, SW, Washington, DC. She purchased this property as sight-unseen and had no idea the level of disrepair that this property was in. She has hired a contractor to do the work and upgrading of the house. It is a beautiful home and she wants to restore it back to its original beauty. Some of the outside wood was rotten and that has been replaced. The roof is completely gone because of its age. She likes to buy properties and restore them. Chair Wharton reminded her that there are state and federal tax credits that are available to her for this kind of project. She stated she would be looking further into that. She would like to use a red asphalt roofing material because the original roof was red in color. The Commission members felt that was a good choice to match the original color.

Mr. Smith suggested that the owner may want to go with an architectural shingle that has a pattern and it would be more dimensional. He pointed out that red fades very quickly and with a pattern, he feels it would fit in the neighborhood better and keep the character of the original roof.

Mindy Zachery, 604 Summit Avenue, stated that from a personal standpoint, she welcomed the new property owner to the neighborhood and thanked her for taking on this project. The Neighborhood Association met but there was not enough information for them to make a recommendation.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2130 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 Roofs (pages 51-53) 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, Hodierne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

The Commissioners also discussed approval of the proposed conditions, as brought forth by staff and the property owner, who wishes to use a red asphalt roof material to match the original color. It is recommended to use architectural shingles with a pattern. The valleys on the roof are to be open flashing to match the existing. The location of the vents are to be out of view from the street.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2130 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 623 Summit Avenue, with the conditions presented by staff as listed above. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodierne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

- (b) **Location: 735 Park Avenue**
Application Number 2134
Applicant: Steven Edmondson
Owner: Same
Date Application Received 1-16-18
(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Removal of large Willow Oak tree in front yard

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

This tree contributes to the tree canopy along Park Avenue, however, it requires continuous pruning to avoid interfering with the overhead utility lines.

Fact:

The property owner has had a continuous issue with water backing up and causing damage to the property's plumbing system. Several professional plumbers have reviewed the situation and state that the roots have damaged the underground sewer lines causing a continuous and expensive repair process.

Fact:

The 2013 Tree Inventory for the Dunleath (Aycock) district has this tree rated as in Good Health, a 6 out of 10 Hazard rating and describes 2 above-ground conflicts- 1. Utility lines and, 2. Sidewalk disruption.

Guidelines (page 23):

2. *When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.*
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.*

Conditions:

A new canopy tree at a minimum size of 2" dbh must be planted within 6 months. The species and location must be determined in consultation with the city arborist. If the tree does not survive a period of 2 years after planting, a substitute tree must be started.

Speakers In Support:

Steven Edmondson
Mindy Zachery

Speakers In Opposition:

None

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

Steven Edmondson, the property owner, stated that he loves the tree and it is not his first choice to cut it down. However, the issue is the cost of plumbing damages that are on-going within the house. It is hoped that removing the tree will alleviate this problem with his plumbing. Unfortunately, it is illegal in NC to break the pipes out on the inside in residential properties. Being a school teacher, he does not have funds to spend on the project, as he would like. So any help he can get from Duke Energy would be helpful. He will speak with the City arborist to determine an appropriate location for the new tree to be planted.

Mindy Zachery, 604 Summit Avenue, stated that the Neighborhood Association voted unanimously to support removal of the tree and replacement of a new tree.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Stringfield stated that as much as she loves trees, she knows that this tree should be removed to alleviate problems for the homeowner. On the sidewalk, it is difficult to get by this tree because of damages to the sidewalk. A lot of the limbs have been removed to accommodate the power lines. Chair Wharton stated this is a good opportunity to get a canopy tree located in the right place. Mr. Edmondson asked if it is his responsibility to repair or replace the damaged sidewalk. Chair Wharton stated that would be the City's responsibility. He suggested that the property owner may want to speak to the Neighborhood Association to make a request on his behalf.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Hoderne moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2134 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 *Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23)*, are acceptable as finding 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.)

A new canopy tree at a minimum size of 2" dbh must be planted within 6 months after the tree is removed. The species and location must be determined in consultation with the City arborist. If the tree does not survive a period of 2 years after planting, a substitute tree must be started.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Hodierna moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2134 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for tree removal at 735 Park Avenue with the conditions previously stated above. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Smith, Hodierna, Townsend. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton stated that he had no items to discuss.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Stefan-Leigh stated that Preservation Greensboro's 52nd Annual Meeting is coming up on February 7th from 5:30 until 8:30, at Colorworks Meeting Space at Revolution Mill, and each Commission is invited to attend. Anyone wishing to attend, please let her know by Friday. The speaker is Joe Dodson, who is an author and was instrumental in the O'Henry Magazine and is also a historian and preservationist. There is limited seating so there will not be a sponsorship table as there has been in previous years.

Chair Wharton stated that this is a great opportunity to meet with other preservationists and hear about things that are going on.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 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
FEBRUARY 28, 2018**

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

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 Ms. Hodierno, Mr. Hoggard and Mr. Smith were excused.

Chair Wharton adjourned the meeting until a quorum of members was present.

Mr. Arneke joined the meeting at 4:18 p.m.

Chair Wharton reconvened the meeting and stated that a quorum of members was now present and the meeting could proceed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 31, 2018 REGULAR MEETING:

It was noted that Ms. Stringfield submitted several corrections in the draft of minutes to Mr. Cowhig. The corrections have been incorporated into the minutes.

Mr. Townsend moved approval of the January 31, 2018 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Townsend and Pratt. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: Railroad corridor from Spring Garden Street to West Market Street**
Application Number 2137
Applicant: Dabney Sanders
Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 2-12-18
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of Phase IV of the Downtown Greenway through the College Hill Historic District.

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 congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Neighborhood Setting: Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 18)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

This phase of the Downtown Greenway will result in the removal of the railroad tracks along the east side of the historic district and re-using the railroad bed for the greenway. The greenway will enhance the pedestrian character and walkability of the historic district while cleaning up and improving an area that is somewhat unsightly and underutilized. The greenway will be an amenity that will add to the appeal of the College Hill neighborhood and encourage investment in the preservation of historic properties.

Guidelines (pages 18-20):

Streets, sidewalks, parks, and other public spaces are important parts of the neighborhood setting. The public right-of-way has evolved and changed over time, but much of the early twentieth century appearance and character remains in the Historic Districts. Most streets retain their original granite curbs and brick gutters, with a grass strip separating the street from the sidewalk. Neighborhood streets are usually two lanes wide and somewhat narrow compared with current standards. Mature shade trees along many streets provide a green canopy. On some streets, standard streetlights have been replaced by decorative lighting fixtures of a more human scale, adding to the pedestrian character of the districts. Future changes should maintain this character.

- 1. Maintain historic street patterns, widths, and construction materials.*
- 2. Maintain historic paving materials for roads and sidewalks, as well as granite curbing. When they are disturbed for underground utility construction or other work, repair pavement, brick gutters, and granite curbs with matching materials.*
- 3. Maintain granite curbs and brick gutters. Expose and restore these features when they have been covered.*
- 4. Maintain the planting strip between the street and sidewalk. It is not appropriate to surface the strip with pavement or other materials. Brick may be considered where a hard surface is needed.*
- 7. Introduce street lighting of a human scale that is consistent with the design and the illumination level of special street lighting in the Historic Districts.*

In Support:

Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street
Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

None.

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig explained that this phase of construction runs along the railroad tracks through College Hill. The College Hill Neighborhood Association considered the project and is very supportive; however, they would like to see a Sanibel light fixture at the intersection. The neighborhood purchased signature Sanibel light fixtures with their own MSD funds and installed them throughout the neighborhood. He stated that staff is very supportive of this application and feels that a good job has been done capturing the spirit of the railroad. Staff suggested that more traditional canopy-type trees be considered through the area if possible. Mr. Cowhig noted that there are railroad signals at the intersection and he asked if there was any way to capture a sense of the railroad crossing that was historically there. He felt that the greenway will be a very positive thing for the historic district and will add an amenity to the neighborhood that will encourage investment in the neighborhood.

Speaking in favor of this application was Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street, who is the project manager for the Downtown Greenway. She described the project and said that it offers an opportunity to celebrate the College Hill neighborhood. This portion of the greenway will have a bench designed by a North Carolina artist that will be reflective of the community's history. The vision and guidance that will be given to the artist once they are commissioned will come directly from the neighborhood. Signage will recognize the history of the neighborhood as well. Ms. Sanders described significant improvements at the area near the intersection of McGee Street and Cedar utilizing granite curbing when possible.

Responding to questions from Commissioners, Ms. Sanders addressed the railroad lights. She said that the lights will not remain and future negotiations with Norfolk Southern Railroad will determine how the right-of-way will be handled. The round-house effect, as shown in the illustration distributed to members, is an attempt to reflect the history of the railroad corridor in that community. It is uncertain at this point if the railroad tracks will be removed. Mr. Pratt felt it would be nice if the tracks could remain.

Ms. Sanders said that if this application is approved today, they will go back to the designers for the final plans. She hopes to have the final plans by the end of March, 2018 so that construction drawings can be completed and put out to bid. Negotiations will have to be settled with Norfolk Southern Railroad to determine how the right-of-way transfer will happen. She hoped these negotiations could be completed by the end of this year.

Ms. Sanders addressed the issue of Sanibel lights and said they are willing to work with the neighborhood to be sensitive to their wishes.

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street, was representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He thanked Ms. Sanders and Action Greensboro for their work on this project and their cooperation with the Neighborhood Association and residents to bring this project forward. He felt the project was in line with the goals and objectives of the City's historic district program. When the project is finished it will be a benefit to the whole community. At their last meeting, the Association reviewed the plans and everyone in attendance supported the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The neighborhood will continue to work with Action Greensboro on lighting standards in the vicinity of McGee Street, the actual curb radius at McGee and Cedar Streets, and the use of granite curbing as much as possible when the reconstruction work is done at that intersection. The Association enthusiastically supports this application.

Mr. Arneke agreed with the Neighborhood Association and felt the project will be a great addition to the neighborhood. It will improve an area that is unsightly into something attractive.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2137 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 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 under Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* on page 20, 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, Pratt, Townsend. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2137 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Dabney Sanders for work at the railroad corridor from Spring Garden Street to West Market Street, including the intersection of West McGee and South Cedar Streets. The motion was seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt, Townsend. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 609 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 2139
Applicant: Arlen Nicolls
Owner: Jane and Richard Green
Date Application Received: 2-15-18
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS AND SPECIAL EXCEPTION GRANTED)

Description of Work:

Changes to approved plans for new house and request for recommendation for Special Exception to the front yard setback requirement.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of approving the proposed changes to the approved Certificate of Appropriateness and a favorable recommendation for a Special Exception. In the staff's opinion the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction* (page 77-80) and the Special Exception meets the special provision regarding setbacks for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed changes to the approved plans are minor: shifting the house four feet to the right and eliminating the cover over the rear entrance. The changes should not affect the design of the house to any degree and it will still meet the intent of the guidelines for new construction.

Guidelines (page 80):

1. *Site new buildings so that the setback, spacing and orientation to the street are consistent with the 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 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.*

Because the lot is so small the house must be sited close to the street. Many houses in the historic district are sited close to the street so it will be compatible with the neighborhood. The City's Development Ordinance provides a process for obtaining a Special Exception to setback requirements in the Historic Districts at Section 30-4-4.2 (B) 2: "All street setback (except as provided in subsection 1 above) interior setback, building coverage, and height requirements shall comply with applicable zoning regulations unless a special exception is approved by the Board of Adjustment. The special exception shall be granted only if it complies with the intent of the architectural and historic guidelines of the historic district and if first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

In Support:

Gary Silverstein, 7917 Windspray Drive, Summerfield, North Carolina
 Arlen Nicolls, 216 Mendenhall Street
 Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig said that last year the Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction at a house at 609 South Mendenhall. It was recently determined when the permit was being applied for that the house actually encroaches into the front yard setback which will require a Special Exception because it is in the historic district. The Special Exception must be approved by the Board of Adjustment but first it must be recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission. He

described the proposed changes and explained that staff did approve a minor change to the south elevation to allow a set of three windows in the front instead of two windows. The siting of the house and the Special Exemption recommendation must be approved by the Commission. Staff is in support of the application and feels it is reasonable because this is a very small lot. There are many houses in the historic district that have short setbacks from the street and therefore, this will not be out of character with the neighborhood.

Speaking in support was Gary Silverstein, 7917 Windspray Drive, Summerfield, North Carolina, who is the general contractor for this project. He described the orientation of the surrounding properties and pointed out that the home on the right will be a little closer to the road than the house they will be constructing while the home on the left will be a little further back.

Arlen Nicolls, 216 South Mendenhall Street, is the agent for Jane and Richard Green, who are the property owners building the home. She stated their intention to work within the spirit of the guidelines.

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, was speaking on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Association is supportive of the application. They are approving the request for a variance for the front porch and the exception to the front setback guideline. The Association endorses the concept as well as the reality of the plan as presented.

Mr. Arneke commented that it would be difficult to put a house on a lot this small and the intrusion into the setback is minor particularly in the context of other houses in the neighborhood.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2139 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 and *Guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6* under *New Construction* on page 80, 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, Pratt, Townsend. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2139 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Arlen Nicolls for work at 609 South Mendenhall Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt, Townsend. Nays: None.)

Special Exception Motion:

Mr. Arneke moved to recommend a Special Exception for a setback, seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Pratt, Townsend. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Chair Wharton stated that there will be an informational discussion about fees at a future meeting when all of the Commissioners are present.

Chair Wharton announced that at a recent public meeting the Dunleith Neighborhood received the final plan presentation for the Summit Avenue Streetscape and the project will be moving forward. The portion of Summit Avenue being affected by the project starts at the downtown end of Percy Street going up to Sullivan Street.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that several training opportunities are coming up soon. Staff will forward the dates when they become available. It is required that at least two Commissioners and one staff member attend training each year.

Mr. Cowhig stated that there are several new Landmark properties in Greensboro. City Council recently designated Proximity Printworks as a Guilford County Landmark. They also designated the Mock Judson Voehringer Company Hosiery Mill located off of Spring Garden Street. Both of these buildings will be residential uses with some commercial involved.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street, invited Commission members to the Novem Mason Symposium at UNC-Greensboro that will be held on March 13 and March 14, 2018. The symposium is sponsored by the Center for Community Engaged Design. The Greensboro Housing Coalition is partnering with the studio and the students there in a study about accessory dwelling units which is a growing trend in the country. Mr. Curry plans to send information about the event to staff who will email the details to Commissioners.

Mr. Pratt asked staff for an update on 634 North Elm Street and the issue with the stairs. Ms. Geary said that the stairs have not been corrected yet. She indicated that staff is working with the current property owner who is in discussion with the previous property owner. Several solutions have been offered to the current owner for fixing the issue.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 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
MARCH 28, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield; and Amanda Hodierne.

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

A quorum of members was not present for the meeting. Staff and Commissioners agreed that even though no decisions can be made without a quorum, there could be a discussion about the COA (Certificate of Appropriateness) in a public forum with the applicants. Possible courses of action for the applicants could be discussed until a Special Meeting can be held with a quorum of members to vote on the application. Unofficial minutes from the discussion will be provided to members who could not be present at the meeting. These minutes would need to be adopted into the record at a subsequent meeting.

Chair Wharton called the meeting to order and explained the rules and procedures of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission. Speakers were sworn as to their testimony in the following matters.

Chair Wharton stated that the approval of absences, the adoption of February 28, 2018 minutes and the official public hearing on the COA application will occur when a quorum is present to vote.

Discussion:

Ms. Geary stated that staff met with the applicant and it was determined that the majority of the signs in this application could be approved at staff level with modifications. The applicant has made the necessary modifications for the signs that can be approved at staff level. Only two signs remain that need to be discussed by the Commission.

Mr. Cowhig further explained that staff met with representatives from Allen Industries to review their plan for signage. Several modifications were suggested that might help the applicant come closer to meeting the guidelines. Some of the signs were a little higher than what can be approved by staff. Staff can approve signs that are no higher than 5 feet that otherwise meet the guidelines in terms of materials, placement, etc. It was determined that the vast majority of signs could be approved at staff level and in fact, revisions were made that brought most of the signs under 6 feet. Most signs are now 5 feet high, made of aluminum, and painted in the school's colors. These signs clearly meet the guidelines and can be approved at staff level. However, there is one digital electronic messaging sign that will be located on West Market Street that staff did not feel they had the authority to approve. There is also a 6-foot sign located in the parking lot that is a map made of aluminum to match all the other signs. Mr. Cowhig felt comfortable approving the map sign at staff level as well as lettering that will go on four buildings for identification. These letters will be aluminum and will go on the soffit above the entrance of the building.

Staff pointed out the provision in the guidelines that addresses the special needs of institutional and commercial properties in the historical district because the guidelines are primarily focused on residential properties. Colleges and businesses have special needs that have to be met in order for them to be successful and staff felt that the message signs fell into that category.

Ms. Geary reviewed the signs that were reduced to 5 feet and noted that most of the signs that are 60 inches were reduced from 72" making them approvable at staff level. She noted that the majority of signs are located internally on the campus grounds. The electronic message sign that would need the Commission's approval is 72 inches in height. It is only slightly higher than the other signs and it is in a very unobtrusive location. It needs to be a little bigger just to be legible.

Chair Wharton had no objection to having the map sign approved at staff level. Mr. Arneke agreed and commented that the sign is consistent with all the other signs and is only slightly taller. Ms. Stringfield felt that based on its location and minor height difference, it would be acceptable to approve the map sign at the staff level.

Speakers:

Anne Hurd, 534 Woodvale Drive, is Vice President of Institutional Advancement at Greensboro College. She expressed the college's desire to be appropriate and respectful in the historic neighborhood. They are located on West Market Street which is a major thoroughfare and in order to let people know what is going on at the campus, it has been necessary to put banners up on the front lawn. They would prefer not to do this and have designed a digital message sign that will have flowers planted around it. The sign will be tastefully done and will not be blinking or have bright colors. The sign will face the street and will not face any neighbors in the district. Ms. Hurd stated that she did not realize they needed to apply for a COA for signage or they would have started the process sooner.

Responding to questions, Ms. Hurd said that the message sign would be a one-sided digital display.

Tom Saitta, Director of Marketing at Greensboro College, assured the Commission that appropriate messages and colors will be displayed on the messaging sign.

Paige Russell, Senior Project Manager for Allen Industries, is working with Greensboro College to provide signs for their campus. She explained that electronic message centers are controllable either manually or they can be programmed to be scheduled. The brightness of the lighting can be controlled if there are concerns in the neighborhood. She has been working closely with the college to make sure both campus and historic criteria are being met while keeping everything tasteful as well.

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, was representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Neighborhood Association does not support the application because they feel it is clearly incongruous with the guidelines. The sign is an internally lit reminder of a 21st century intrusion into the district and is an alarmingly different piece of work to stand in front of a contributing structure. The Neighborhood Association acknowledged the applicant's effort to make the sign as tasteful as possible; however, even with conditions they will not be in support of the application.

Chair Wharton reviewed the procedural options open to the Commission. Staff could approve the signage plan with the exception of the electronic message sign to allow the applicant to move forward. According to the statutes, a ruling must be made on the remaining electronic message sign within 60 days of the time the COA request was received, which was March 14, 2018. The COA could be heard at the regular April 25, 2018 meeting or a Special Meeting could be called before that date.

Mr. Saitta commented that Greensboro College's graduation is May 12, 2018 and if the application is approved at the next regular meeting, it may not be possible to fabricate and install the sign before graduation.

Ms. Hodiernne felt that a Special Meeting should be called. If it was not possible to get a quorum for the meeting at least staff would know in advance. Graduation is a big event for the college and they have obviously been planning toward that. She would like to give Greensboro College the opportunity to be in the position of having the sign in place or having a back-up plan in time for graduation. The meeting would be just for this COA and would not be a big time commitment.

Mr. Arneke agreed with comments made by Ms. Hodierne. He suggested polling Commission members to ascertain if there could be a quorum.

Ms. Geary indicated she will contact Commission members and work on arranging a Special Meeting.

Ms. Stringfield asked Ms. Russell if she could electronically, through the computer, show a sign that has modest lighting. Ms. Russell said that she plans to ask the producer of the insert to provide an animation to play for the Commission. In addition, she will find a sign that is appropriately lit somewhere in the vicinity and take a video of it under different lighting conditions.

For the benefit of the Neighborhood Association, Ms. Hurd commented that they do not want people to approach Greensboro College and only see a digital marquee. They want the beauty of the campus and buildings to be seen. They are purposefully making sure the message sign is not the first thing people see or remember about the college. Additionally, she said that the message sign will be part of Greensboro College's safety and security program. Notification of a lockdown would be posted on the message sign as part of their security plan.

Chair Wharton will work with staff to find a convenient time to call a Special Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 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 25, 2018**

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

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary stated that the absences of Mr. Hoggard and Mr. Pratt are excused.

CHANGES/UPDATES TO AGENDA ITEMS:

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that in regard to 614 S. Mendenhall Street, the property owner had put up a porch railing without a COA and it was put on the exterior wrapping the columns. She and Mike Cowhig met with the property owner on Monday and the porch railing was removed yesterday.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Everyone intending to speak on an item before the Commission was affirmed for their testimony.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the March 28, 2018 meeting minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Townsend. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Townsend, Smith and Hodierna. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 500 Percy Street**
Application Number 2145
Applicant: Matthew C. Thomas
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 3-28-18 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Rebuild porch damaged by vehicle.

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 not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 62-64)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The front porch on the property was demolished after it was damaged by a vehicle that ran into it. Similar damage has occurred in previous years and elements of the porch have been replaced and repaired. The project proposed to rebuild the front porch in the same footprint as the original and with the same detailing and materials to match as closely as possible to what was there. Wood materials and asphalt composition shingles will be used. The property owner has worked very well with staff.

Guidelines Porches, Entrances and Balconies (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 elements 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.*
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 materials, roof form, detailing, scale, size and ornamentation.*

In Support:

Mindy Zachery, 604 Summit Avenue, Dunleath Neighborhood

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the porch details on this house and the house next door are identical, so there is a good model to go by.

Speaking in support of this application was Mindy Zachery, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Dunleath Neighborhood Association Board, stated that they met Monday night and unanimously support this application. She pointed out that the Downtown Greenway is going to change the pattern to a hard right instead of the off-ramp from Murrow Boulevard.

In Opposition:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2145 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, (page 64)* are applicable and are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Smith, Hodiernne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2145 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Matthew Thomas, for work at 500 Percy Street with the following conditions: The front porch re-build would have the same footprint as the original; the detailing and materials must match the photographic documentation submitted of the previous porch; asphalt composition shingles are to be used on the front porch; the porch columns will be tapered to match the original; the masonry of the front porch will be reconstructed with wood tongue-and-groove material installed perpendicular to the elevation of the house; the new porch roof will have exposed rafter tails, bracket details on the eaves and at the peak; the column capital base and details will be replicated from the photographic documentation evidence; the v-groove soffit material that is available that is typically used on this style of house and will be replicated; in general, the re-build will be consistent with the photographic documentation of the previous porch; the drawing submitted with the application is a conceptual plan and not an architectural blueprint and does not represent all the required details. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Smith, Arneke, Hodiernne, Townsend. Nays: None.)

(b) **Location: 1014 N. Eugene Street**
Application No. 2147
Applicant: Robert Kantlehner
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4/11/18

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Enclose front side, back porches, construct small addition and 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 proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 75-76), Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 62-64) and Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-36)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The project proposes to construct a small bump out, approximately 36 square feet in size, to the right side elevation. The exterior material will be brick veneer painted to match the existing brick house. The original rood will not be altered. The bump out will have a copper roof It will have one window similar in size to the smaller window on the existing elevations.

Guidelines for Additions (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) Located, 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.

Fact:

The property has two small porches that are proposed to be enclosed. The first porch is at the front corner of the house. The second is at the back of the house. Neither are at the main entrance. The project proposes to enclose both of the porches in a similar manner utilizing windows and panel detailing. One key feature is that the panel detail is designed to mimic the window fenestration pattern while allowing for wall space on the interior. The windows will be aluminum clad wood simulated divided light windows which have been approved for porch enclosures in the past.

Guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64)

- 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.

Fact:

The project proposes to construct a new 2 car garage. It will be located at the back of the house. The materials are consistent with our Materials for New Construction document and include fiber cement siding and a brick foundation. The garage doors are of a "carriage house" design and will be steel.

Fact:

The plan for the garage calls for a cupola which is a detail often used in historic accessory buildings.

Guidelines for Accessory Structures and Garages (page 35-36)

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 lots, 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.

Conditions:

That the new doors on the porch enclosures be wood with Simulated Divided lights.

In Support:

Robert Kantlehner, property owner
 Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive
 Michael Chapman, 818 Eugene Street

Speaking in support of the application, Robert Kantlehner, the property owner, stated that the doors will probably be wooden doors and in regard to the windows, they will be simulated divided light. They would like to have the metal clad on the wood.

Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive, stated that in regard to the paneling it will either be wood or smooth hardy-board paneling for durability.

Michael Chapman, 818 Eugene Street, President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, stated that the Board recommends approval of the application without any reservations.

In Opposition:

None.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith stated that this was a good job on the sketches and he has no concerns. Ms. Stringfield asked if the placement of the garage would need a Special Exception from the Board of Adjustment. accessory structure to go in a traditional siting pattern.

Finding of Facts:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2147 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, and 4 (page 76) and Guidelines on page 64, number 7, and Pages 35-36, numbers 2,3, and 4, and page 50, Guideline number 6, are applicable and are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hodiern. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Smith, Hodiern, Townsend. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2147 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Kantlehner, for work at 1014 N. Eugene Street with the following conditions: Smooth Hardy-plank panel, ceiling tissues fiber board is acceptable; aluminum-clad simulated divided light windows are acceptable; wood doors; and the garage materials should be compatible in character and scale of the house. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hodiern. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Smith, Arneke, Hodiern, Townsend. Nays: None.)

c) 614 S. Mendenhall Street**Description of Work:**

Construct front porch railing (after-the-fact)

(REMOVED DUE TO COMPLIANCE)**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:**

Chair Wharton reported that he has been informed that Anne Bowers, who was a long-time member and Chair of this Commission, passed away unexpectedly this past weekend. She was also a board member and President of Preservation Greensboro Incorporated and a volunteer and designer for the Julian Price house, and also President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association in 2015. Stefan-Leih Geary added that Anne Bowers was so dedicated to preservation and her term expired and she remained for a year, partly because she was willing. She is a great loss to the Greensboro Preservation community and the community at-large. There will be memorial opportunities in the very near future.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

None.

SPEAKERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:18 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**

August 29, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Ann Stringfield; David Arneke, Amanda Hodierne, Wayne Smith and Tracy Pratt

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

None

CHANGES/UPDATES TO AGENDA ITEMS:

Mike Cowhig stated that there were no changes to the agenda.

Chair Wharton explained the purpose of the Commission and the procedures to be followed during the meeting.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Everyone intending to speak on an item before the Commission was affirmed for their testimony.

Chair Wharton asked if any of the Commission members had a conflict of interest or other situations related to items on the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (APPROVED AS CORRECTED)

Ms. Stringfield stated that she had some changes to the July 2, minutes and has discussed those changes with the Court Reporter. She pointed out that on page 5, Arlene Nichols is spelled incorrectly the correct spelling is Nicholls. Also, page 6 should say Vinyl Clad instead of Iron Clad and page 8, FOF is not incongruous. She moved approval of the minutes with the proposed changes, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Location: 909 N. Elm Street

Application No. 2187

Applicant: Aaron Moore,

Property Owner: Lehrer Properties

Date Application Received: 7/24/18

(CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER MEETNIG)

Description of Work

Construction of parking area and handicap access ramp

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 ramp and parking area will be not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways, and Parking Areas (pages 28-30)*, and *Safety and Code Requirements (pages 69-70)* for the following reasons:

Fact

The proposed ramp is located at the left side of the house connecting the front porch with the parking area at the back of the house. This is the least conspicuous location that meets code requirements.

Guidelines (page 80)

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 and construct new fire exits, stairs, and landings to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure.*
4. *Introduce reversible features to assist persons with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished, and historic materials or features are not damaged.*

Fact

There is an existing large paved parking area behind the house and another area of pavement on the right side of the house. The two parking areas are currently separated by landscaping. The project proposes to expand the smaller parking area and make a smaller landscape area. Such a large amount of pavement may have a negative impact on the historic character of the property and the neighborhood. It is not divided into smaller components with planting areas.

Guidelines

- *Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing. The Commission may consider alternate locations when properly screened and landscaped.*
- *Grading for new parking areas should not dramatically change the topography of the site or increase water runoff onto adjoining properties.*
- *Divide large expanses of pavement into smaller components with planting areas. Incorporate existing large trees and shrubs into the landscaping for new parking areas when possible.*
- *Select appropriate materials, such as concrete, brick, asphalt or crushed stone for surfacing parking areas.*

In Support:

Aaron Moore, the applicant, stated that one of the issues on the side is that it would go almost to the other house. They never thought of the idea of doing up that side that would make it less visible. Fire Inspector had something to say about it going into the front entrance, instead of going into one of the suites. Mr. Smith asked if it was suites. Mr. Moore said yes, they are suites. Chair Wharton said it is not possible on the right side and the left side would bring it into one of the suites. Mr. Moore said this would be separate office space. Mr. Smith asked about it being a commercial or residential? Mr. Moore said it was for both. Mr. Smith asked how big is this house? Mr. Moore said that there would be 5 suites. Mr. Smith asked if all would be office space? He also asked if it was a single use office. Ms. Hodierné asked if it would be one user? Mr. Moore said that it could be multiple users or one user. Mr. Smith asked if there was no change in use, why do they need the ramp? Mr. Moore said that there is no change of use. Ms. Hodierné asked about the permits and inspections? Mr. Moore said that they

would have to ask Mike that. Chair Wharton said that we are not even sure we need a ramp here. He wants to approve this contingent upon them coming back with a plan for the ramp. Ms. Stringfield asked about how many parking spaces will be added? Mr. Moore said there would be 2 additional spaces. Mr. Arneke asked if the two spaces will be added to the back end or the front end? Mr. Moore said it would be on the back end. Chair Wharton talked about the landscaping between the parking lots, he asked if that would be something they would do? Mr. Moore said if they did this ramp they will block it as well. Mr. Pratt said there needed to be landscaping in the front of the parking spaces to shield it from the street. Mike Cowhig said there are houses directly behind, so some landscaping behind the parking would be desirable. Mr. Pratt asked about the paving on the side that goes up to the side porch? Ms. Stringfield asked if the wood was in the basement as Mike Cowhig had said. Mr. Moore said he has not seen it, but there is a bunch of wood, lots of columns down there. They already have used some of it on the inside. Mr. Pratt asked if there was a landscaping plan yet? Mr. Moore said he could email it to Mike if that is what they wanted. Mr. Smith asked Chair Wharton if they have enough information to make decisions with yet. Mr. Pratt said he did not think so, they need a landscaping plan, more details on the ramp, investigate if the ramp is even needed. Ms. Stringfield asked if those could be conditions? Chair Wharton said they don't need their approval to do the other repairs. The concerns are the ramp and the landscaping plan. Commissioners stated that they would like to continue this until they get a landscaping plan and something solid on the ramp plan. Mr. Moore said he could get that to Mike tomorrow. Counsel Jones, said that they would be consenting to a continuance to the September 26th meeting. They will be over the 60 days then and it would be considered approved unless the applicant consents. Mr. Smith asked if it could be done on a staff level or would they need to come back here? Chair Wharton said that was up to the Commission. The Commission members want them to come back with the ramp and landscaping plans.

In Opposition:

None

Discussion:

Chair Wharton asked if the Commissioners had questions. Mr. Smith wanted to know if there was a description of what they are asking for. Mike Cowhig said he went over it and the applicant submitted plans that had detailed notes of what they were asking for. He said that it was such a large file, they didn't have it. That description was for the renovations of the house. The two issues that the applicant is wanting the commission to give approval for is the landscaping, parking and handicap ramp. Ms. Hodiernie asked Counsel Jones about an exemption for parking. Counsel Jones, said she didn't know about exemption but they could get a Special Exception. Chair Wharton said there is an exemption and a special exception provisions. Mr. Smith asked Mr. Moore to explain about where they want the handicap ramp. Mike Cowhig said the handicap access must connect with the primary entrance. Mr. Pratt asked if there was enough clearance to do it on the side of the house? Mike Cowhig said that there may have been a grade issue. Mr. Pratt said we have no idea what the handicap ramp is going to look like. Mike Cowhig said they weren't doing any changes to the outside exterior.

Findings of Fact:

None - this was continued

Mr. Smith moved to continue this item to the September meeting so that they can get more information from the property owners, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodiernie. Nays: None.)

Recommended Conditions:

That the parking areas continue to be separated by a landscaped bed. That a landscape plan is submitted for staff approval.

A detail showing the plan for the ramp.

Location: Summit Avenue (Murrow Boulevard to Dewey Street)

Application No. 2193

Applicant: City of Greensboro Transportation Department

Property Owner: City of Greensboro Public Right of Way Date Application

Received: 8/8/18

(APPROVED WITH CONDITONS)

Description of Work

Construction of streetscape improvements

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 streetscape improvements will be incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines for Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (pages 18-20) for the following reasons:

Fact

This is a comprehensive streetscape project that will convert the existing five-lane roadway into a two-lane facility and medians with bicycle lanes and brick-pattern crosswalks to create a safer and more attractive environment for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Fact

Planned improvements include upgrading water and storm drainage systems, adding a landscaped median at Summit, upgrading curb ramps to ADA standards and adding new decorative street lights.

Fact

Existing granite curbing will be retained and new curbing in the median will have a block/Vertical face rather than curved face. Decorative brick stamped concrete will be used at cross walks and medians instead of solid concrete. Where the median on Summit crosses through intersections at Charter Place and Dewey Street, decorative cross walks will maintain the original street pattern for pedestrians.

Fact

Modifications will be made to the existing medians on Yanceyville Street at the intersection of Summit to accommodate turning lanes. The existing trees will remain.

Fact

The street widths will not be altered, and historic materials will be maintained to the extent possible. Decorative street lights will be added to Summit Avenue and will be of a human scale. Landscaping in the medians will enhance the historic character of the street.

Fact

A total of 4 Bus Shelters will be installed along Summit Avenue within the Historic District boundaries between Murrow Blvd and Sullivan Street. The bus shelters will be black in color with perforated panels and not have ad boards to be less conspicuous visually.

Guidelines (page 3-4)

Greensboro's approach is based on the premise that the Historic District neighborhoods can and should be growing, vital, and vibrant places to live, work, and congregate. This philosophy is crucial to the future of Greensboro's Historic Districts and is outlined in this section. This philosophy is the underlying principle that must be relied on in the interpretation and application of the guidelines.

The guidelines allow for change when it is accomplished in a sensitive manner that maintains the special character of the Historic District, while meeting the practical needs of the residents and property owners...

A consistent approach to "Neighborhood Setting" provides for the appropriate measures to preserve neighborhood features such as large mature trees and tree lined streets, Retaining walls, fencing, and infrastructure features such as granite curbing and decorative street lighting. In striving to preserve the streetscape, tree canopy, granite curbing and other features of a neighborhood, the objective of preserving the historic character of the district and the spirit of the neighborhood is achieved.

Guidelines (page 20)

- *Maintain historic street patterns, widths, and construction material.*
- *Maintain historic paving materials for roads and sidewalks, as well as granite curbing. When they are disturbed for underground utility construction or other work, repair pavement, brick gutters, and granite curbs with matching materials.*
- *Maintain granite curbs and brick gutters. Expose and restore these features when they have been covered.*
- *Avoid grading which would change the topography of the public right-of-way.*
- *Place cables and wires underground and locate poles at the rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters that are disturbed as part of the installation, should be maintained.*
- *Introduce street lighting of a human scale that is consistent with the design and the illumination level of special street lighting in the Historic Districts.*
- *Locate items such as street furniture, benches, trash cans, and publication racks, so that they do not obstruct sidewalks or the streetscape.*

In Support:

Michelle Pisdazlar is with HDR Consultants out of Charlotte, NC. She is the project manager. This is the Summit Avenue project. She gave an overview of the project and the other projects going on. They are here to talk about phase 2 of the project. There is also a downtown greenway. Part of the streetscape project is some water line upgrading. The City has a resurfacing project where they are going to add bike lanes.

Brad Taylor, lead design engineer with HDR Consultants. They had 3 public meetings about this project and they used a map that was shown to Commission. Summit Avenue is the proposed configuration. It will convert four travel lanes into two travel lanes with medians, bicycle lane in each direction, and brick-patterned crosswalks. After intersections like Yanceyville the median will narrow down into right turning lanes, like Yanceyville intersection. City will do a resurfacing project. He showed a picture of what the future Summit Avenue would look like. It will be more of a decorative crosswalk. The crosswalk will be a lot more durable. He showed a picture of the Yanceyville intersection with the median as it is today and then another picture of what it would look like

after the project. It will be a left and right turning lane at the Yanceyville intersection. The oak trees will remain. Along Yanceyville and Summit Avenue will be a 6-inch curb and the outside curb are your standard 2 x 6 curb. Bus shelters will be black in color but instead of glass panels they went with mesh. He showed a drawing of the proposed two choice of street lights that are 12 to 15 feet high. Mr. Smith asked about how this thing starts and how does it end? Mr. Taylor showed Mr. Smith a picture of Yanceyville Street and Summit Avenue of what the project will look like before, in transition and after. Chair Wharton said that it was still up in the air where the Greenway is going to go, and other downtown streetscape projects. The Greenway will stretch across the bridge. Ms. Pisdazlar said as you go into downtown it will go down to a two-lane road. At the other end at Sullivan Avenue if you come West bound you will drop to one lane. If you are coming East bound it would just be a two-lane road. Mr. Smith asked about all the city engineers and everyone has looked at the traffic ramifications? Ms. Pisdazlar answered that they had. They had a public meeting and invited the neighborhood and presented two options. They talked about the operations of traffic and they was hyped about it.

Eric Tart, City of Greensboro stated that the percentage was 83% to 17% that wanted the two lanes with bike lanes versus the four lanes. Mr. Arneke asked about narrowing down the four lanes to two lanes. Can two lanes handle the traffic? Ms. Pisdazlar said yes, they still have acceptable operations until 2030. Mr. Pratt asked about what the deal was with the brick. Mr. Taylor said it was only four feet wide and then you must add curbs. Stefan-Leih said it normally would be just concrete, but on this one we are going over and above by putting in the decorative stamp material. They can pull in municipal service district dollars for that to be landscaped. Chair Wharton stated that in terms of maintaining that area there is a safety issue. Mr. Smith is talking about something that doesn't have to be maintained like ground cover. Ms. Pisdazlar said that the landscape architect for the planning department recommended not doing a ground cover, because then you will have maintenance where you are replanting plants. Mr. Smith stated this was a Historic District and we are talking about plastic posts. Chair Wharton said they said it was going to be thermo-plastic in the crosswalk and stamped concrete. Chair Wharton asked if they have seen the new downtown walks? Mr. Smith says that this does not fall into the guidelines. Mr. Arneke asked why not use granite on the 6-inch concrete curbs? Ms. Pisdazlar says they are matching what is on Yanceyville Street. She talked about the public meetings and how it did not seem to be that big of a concern to the neighborhood. Chair Wharton informed everyone that the Yanceyville median has been there since the 1980's. Chair Wharton also explained about the New Gateway Features, since he is on the neighborhood board. Ms. Hodiernie asked how far it was funded? Stefan-Leih said it was funded through 2008. Mr. Arneke asked about maintenance free plants? Chair Wharton said that Mr. Arneke was thinking about the asphalt street prints and he didn't want street print because it won't last. This has the pigment all the way through so as it wears down the color will last as long as the asphalt lasts.

Carrie Reeves, GDOT and she is also in charge of maintenance. Typically, in crosswalk sections you see the white crosswalk lines. There is some maintenance to those crosswalks. The thermo-plastic material is bonded to the asphalt that will typically last until the resurface again. The white lines will probably have to have some preventive stuff done to it, before they resurface again. Ms. Stringfield asked about how the new technology works? Ms. Reeves said that there is a crosswalk at Eugene Street just past Gate City Blvd that is called Street Print XD and that is a vendor that provides that and that is been in for like 8 to 10 years and still looks great. Ms. Hodiernie asked about what happens when they have to patch the road? Ms. Pisdazlar responded that as they are doing these projects they are trying to get those infrastructures done, so they don't have the cuttings in the street print. Mr. Arneke asked about the time frame for doing this? Mr. Tart said that hopefully construction would be started in the spring of 2019. The whole project will take 18 to 24 months.

Lars Farabee, 711 Percy Street. He is the Vice President for the Dunleath Neighborhood Association board. At the last meeting on Monday night the group moved that they found the Summit Avenue Streetscape appropriate except for the bus shelters. The bus shelters do not fit into the historic guidelines. They also want to see a full

lane plan and landscaping plan. Ms. Stringfield asked how they felt about the thermo plastic. Mr. Farabee said they wasn't really concerned about that. The landscaping plan and the lighting design was more important.

In Opposition:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue said that this has been the 4th design in over 16 years they have seen for this same project. They started in 2002. What they presented to us at the end was a beautiful book 150+ pages long of great design concepts, especially along Summit Ave. On Page 154 there is a page called the 11 characteristics of good urban neighborhoods. Number 8 says that a good neighborhood has small blocks with a network of thru streets. It includes major, minor, commercial and residential streets, but is not feeder roads and dead-end cul-de-sacs. That was finalized in January 2003. They had the actions we wanted to take in the neighborhood prioritize and created a strategic plan for the Aycock neighborhood. It was adopted by City Council in November of 2003. The number one priority was to redesign Summit Avenue. They talked about a center median and traffic studies. Under the traffic study section calls from reducing the traffic lanes from four to two lanes, with the outside lanes being converted to on street parking along Summit Avenue but for the first plan this was not recommended. The second plan says that a reduction in travel lanes would seriously impede traffic. That was in 2003. In 2006 housing and community development created the Summit Avenue Corridor Plan. They talked about three other designs including narrowing Summit Avenue, Rerouting traffic from Summit Avenue to an alternative facility, and to allow on street parking on Summit Avenue. All of these were considered and had a negative impact and considered unfeasible. The important thing is that all three studies show that Summit Avenue should remain a four-lane road. None of these studies ever showed anything about putting bike lanes in. She stated she voted for the bike lanes, but she don't think anybody really understood how that would impact the final design. There was 80% of the people who responded to the survey that voted it in, but none of us thought about the Greenway going in and there is not a lot of people who ride a bike up Summit Avenue. When people are traveling up Summit Avenue by car there are 3 convenience stores, grocery store, auto supply store, other retail facilities and 8 fast food restaurants, so I am not sure why there would be a need for a bike lane on Summit Avenue? She wants to know what is best for the neighborhood. They should maintain historic street patterns.

Rebuttal:

Ms. Pisdazlar stated that they did have a four-lane option. They showed two alternatives at the public meeting, one of them was a two lane without bike lanes and one lane in one direction and a bike lane. This is also why we provided the pedestrians crosses. That came from the community at the public meetings. A lot of this has been talked about and looked at. Chair Wharton said that he is a property owner on Summit Avenue and he is concerned about the traffic. He states that traffic conditions have changed on Summit so, what traffic studies have been done? Ms. Pisdazlar said that it is a big move to complete a street, especially in areas so close to downtown. Mr. Smith asked if there was a 2016 traffic study? Ms. Pisdazlar said yes, they done actual traffic analysis. The operation in 2030 along Summit Avenue was the same level as service of operation. They did find on Yanceyville go up in a change of operations. They were considered acceptable. Mr. Smith asked if that traffic study was available to the public? Ms. Hodiernie asked about the change in the letter? Summit went from a C to D. There is levels of A, B, C, D, E, and F. E and F is not acceptable, but C and D is acceptable of operations. Mr. Pratt asked if they could put up no left turns sign so as to not increase hazards. Summit is a major road. Mr. Smith said it seems like a two-lane road with no impact is hard to believe. The commission asked if it would increase traffic in the neighborhood streets? Ms. Pisdazlar said that they do not believe it will. Ms. Hodiernie asked what necessitates a down grade from a C to a D? Chair Wharton said that they recently narrowed Fisher Avenue and he drives that way every day. He states that it is a little bit slower, wants to know if it is going to be like that. He says it is working well there, but traffic is a little bit slower there. Ms. Hodiernie asked what the historical streetscape of Summit Avenue was. Stefan-Leih said they are not dealing with historic Summit Avenue. Historic Summit Avenue was a very narrow two-lane road and was dirt. It was widening in the 50's and it was about getting traffic

out from downtown. Summit Avenue was built in 1898 and had what was called Macadame. Ms. Pisdzlar said that this is about reconnecting the two sides of the historic district and not an attempt to restore Summit Ave.

Discussion:

Wayne Smith stated that he could not support this application because it is in the historic district and it has to meet what the guidelines say. He says they can put real brick pavers and put concrete in the medians. Their job here is to get to see if it meets the guidelines. He also stated that if maintenance is an issue they shouldn't even be looking at this application. This needs more consistency.

Tracy Pratt stated that with the traffic on Summit Avenue and going down from two lanes to one lane is going to have a big impact on the way traffic will go through that neighborhood. It is going to increase the traffic in that neighborhood. Summit is a major thoroughfare. The impact on traffic is a big issue.

David Arneke stated that he is concerned about the traffic as well. He finds it hard not to trust the traffic engineers say. He also doesn't think that taking Summit down to one lane is going to work. He states that no one would think about riding their bicycle down Summit Ave, right now, but if you put the bicycle lanes in there he thinks more people would ride their bikes and it would be positive.

Ann Stringfield stated that she is very conflicted about it. She has seen a lot of plans over the last 16 years. She is not too keen of the thermo-plastic material. She is very concerned about blocking off Dewey and Charter Streets, because this is supposed to be more neighborhood friendly section of Summit Avenue.

Amanda Hodierne asked where is this in the other approval processes? In response to questions Stefan-Lei they said if not approved this project would not be done. Changes in Historic District must have a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Hodierne told Mr. Smith that he made a good point, they are not traffic engineers and they are not here to look at that. She would look to the neighborhood and the people that live there to help with the decision. They are the people on the ground that will keep it a viable district.

Chair Wharton stated that he has a different view on this. The traffic problem is out of our authority and they should trust the professionals opinion about that. He thinks that the idea that it will slow traffic is a good thing, because the guidelines has the word pedestrian 8 times in the guidelines. That is one of the difficulties of Summit Avenue is hard for pedestrians to cross. So, he thinks that slowing traffic would fit into the guidelines of pedestrian character of the neighborhood. The only thing he sees where it pushes up against the guideline is the first guideline that says maintain historic street patters, widths and construction materials. He thinks that they are somewhat impairing the traditional street pattern, but the only place they are doing it is putting a median across and no longer let autos going straight across Dewey Street. There is no cross walk there right now and having the crosswalks there will maintain the street like it originally was. The guidelines don't say they can't introduce new construction materials. If you remember the median was done on Spring Garden Street through College Hill, which the median does similar things that the Summit median does. The medians there have really improved the pedestrian character of that neighborhood. There is residential development on Yanceyville Street that is being developed and he thinks that there will be more bike traffic if the bike lanes were there. This project has the compacity to spark a lot more historic preservation. The overall impact on character and preservation of the neighborhood will be very positive. Ms. Stringfield asked if they could reapply if they took another month? Ms. Reeves said that the plan is the plan and continuing doesn't do anything but stops the construction. Mr. Smith asked what she meant by the plan is the plan? Ms. Reeves explained that there is no piece of information will be brought back in a month. Mr. Arneke asked about the traffic volumes and the impacts of going down to one lane? Ms. Reeves said they did a full review of what could work out here. This project has been around for 15-20 years. She says that traffic engineers only think about cars, they don't think about all the modes of travel all the way down to pedestrian. They can reduce traffic and be able to do some other things. They are trying to find a balance for everybody's wants and needs. Mr. Smith asked if brick is approved material? Ms. Reeves said that brick pavers are not approved material. Mr. Smith asked about the left turning lane on Yanceyville Street, how many cars does that hold? Stefan-lei said that it will hold about 10 cars. Chair Wharton said that there is citizen

involvement there and over the decades of this they have had almost unanimous positive results from the neighborhood. Summit Avenue is in desperate need of improvement.

Neighborhood Members:

Lewis Dancy, Cypress Street and he has been on the neighborhood board for just a little over a year now. There is strong support for this project. 83% of the people that attended the public meeting was in favor of the bike lanes. He is strongly in favor of this project. He sees the historic street pattern as meeting the guidelines, because they would be changing the traffic pattern not the street pattern.

Mr. Arneke said that they must balance the good and the bad. He finds the neighborhood support persuasive. He is inclined to support it.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Arneke stated that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 2193, Summit Avenue, 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 and Guidelines under application of guidelines on page 3 -4 and the public right of way on page 18 and 20 are applicable and acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt and Hodierne. Nays: Smith.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 2193 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions for work on Summit Avenue with the following conditions: that the final design details of the bus shelters be determined in consultations with Staff and the neighborhood association. That the new and existing trees in the medians are replaced if they do not survive for a period of 1 year after the project's completion. Replacement trees should be minimum of 2" diameter breast height. Distinguish the median decorative from the crosswalk materials seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Conditions:

That the final design details of the bus shelters be determined in consultation with Staff and the neighborhood association.

That new and existing trees in the medians are replaced if they do not survive for a period of 1 year after the project's completion. Replacement trees should be a minimum of 2" dbh (diameter breast height).

Distinguish the median decorative from the crosswalk materials.

At this time, a short break was taken from 6:35 until 6:46 p.m.

Location: 321 S. Tate Street

Application No. 2194

Applicant: Nathaniel Hayes

Property Owner: Katrina Guilford-Hayes

Date Application Received: 7/30/18

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Construction of pergola

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 pergola will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines for Patios and Decks* (pages 41-42) for the following reasons:

Fact

A pergola is an architectural feature designed for growing vines to create shade and privacy for outdoor leisure. Pergolas were a common feature on houses in the historic districts. This pergola will be constructed over a patio just outside of the kitchen that will be an outdoor dining spot. It will be located behind a privacy fence in a relatively inconspicuous location. It will be constructed of wood with decorative rafters similar to historic pergolas. A patio and pergola are more historically appropriate method of creating outdoor leisure space than a treated lumber deck.

Fact

The location for the pergola encroaches on the side setback and will require a Special Exception from the Board of Adjustment.

Guidelines (page 41)

While terraces and patios may be more compatible with the character of a historic structure, decks are acceptable when they are of a compatible design and hidden from street view.

In Support:

Nat Hayes, owner said that he has tried to work very closely with Mr. Cowhig, because it is a tight space. It does encroach into the 5" set back. Technically the stone patio is not there yet, that is to be built. It was previously approved, and the pergola will go above that. This is the perfect little space to have a patio. If it was a separate structure, not attached to the house, he could be right on the line and encroach the 5" setback. He does have a 5" setback from the house. They have all been trying to figure out what is the most acceptable, approvable and easiest way to get what he wants and get approval. The previous owner of the house was a city employee and they put the garage up. The back of the house has been extended some and a laundry room was added on. The materials will be all wood, it is still up in the air as to if it will be painted white or be a stained pergola. In response to questions from the Commission Mr. Hayes said the fence is not his neighbors fence. Chair Wharton offered some advice about putting a pergola on a pre-existing pad the building inspector made him put holes in his pad and put footers in. Mr. Hayes said the patio doesn't exist, but he plans on putting the 2 posts on the right-hand side of the fence. He says he has not talked to his neighbors about this. Ms. Stringfield asked how far was he wanting to encroach the set back. Mr. Hayes said it would be about 3' 1/2'.

In Opposition:

None

Discussion:

Ms. Hodieme asked if it was just a pergola over an existing patio or is it a deck structure? Mr. Cowhig said that it was over an existing patio. Mr. Smith asked about where did the notion of getting a Special Exception come from? Mr. Cowhig said that it came from planning. He said that a pergola for building code is not considered a structure, because it doesn't have a roof. A pergola is considered a structure for purposes of a zoning ordinance and must meet set back requirements. Mr. Smith said he was actually back about 3' 2' from the post. Mr. Pratt asked what kind of material will be used? Mr. Cowhig said it will be wood, presumably pressure treated. Mr. Arneke asked if it's not desirable to have a pressure treated deck, would it be desirable to use pressure treated wood? Mr. Cowhig said that decks were not traditional. Mr. Arneke asked if the pergola would be attached to the house?

Mr. Cowhig said that is correct and traditionally you see pergolas attached to the house. Ms. Stringfield asked about the existing fence being more forward than it is supposed to be? Mr. Cowhig said that it has been there for a long time and could be grandfathered in.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Smith stated that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 2194, 321 S. Tate Street, 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 and Guidelines on page 41 are applicable and acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 2194 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions for work at 321 South Tate Street with the following conditions: That the pergola be wood, painted, or stained seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Recommended for Special Exception

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved to recommend the special exception, seconded by Mr. Smith. The commission voted 6-0 in favor of the Special Exception. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

312 Isabel Street

Location: 312 Isabel Street

Application No. 2187

Applicant: Brad Crump

Property Owner: same

Date Application Received: 8/7/18

(APPROVED NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Construction of addition to house.

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, Additions (pages 75-76) and Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 64-66)* for the following reasons:

Facts

The proposed addition will be located at the back of the house. It will incorporate a one-story at the back and will change the footprint of the house very little. Materials, including siding, and brick will match the existing. The applicant is proposing to use Hardy Artisan siding because it matches the profile and shadow lines of beveled wood siding with mitered corners. Windows will be wood, simulated divided light that match the muntin pattern of existing windows. A treated lumber deck will not be visible from the street. It will, however, encroach into the side yard setback and a Special Exception will be needed.

The addition will not affect any character-defining features of the house. The existing kitchen wing already is set back

from the wall plane of the house.

Guidelines (page 76)

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

Facts

The front porch floor will be repaired, and the flooring replaced with new composite tongue-and-groove flooring. The porch wraps around the house and is partially uncovered and exposed to the elements. The floor has been replaced before and has structural issues. Cellular PVC tongue-and-groove flooring has the same physical characteristics as wood tongue-and-groove flooring.

Guidelines:

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:

Brad Crump, owner, said that he has spoken to the neighbors and they are just as excited as they are. Someone made an enclosed porch at some point in time. Part of it is a laundry room and the other half into a powder room. If you open the rear door about 6 inches of opening is obscured by the dryer. They want to turn it into a mud room and enlarge it by going 2 feet into the kitchen and coming out 4 feet creating a cover walk way and stairs going down into the garage. Mr. Pratt asked about cutting it back, so they are on the setback. Mr. Crump said they did, but that is going to be the kitchen area.

Michael Chapman, Fisher Park neighborhood association is in approval of this application

In Opposition:

None

Discussion:

Chair Wharton asked if the material has been used on any other house in the historic district? Mr. Cowhig responded that it had been used on the house on Mendenhall Street and it has held up well. Their plan is to replace the entire porch floor.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield stated that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 2187, 312 Isabel Street, 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 and Guidelines for additions on page 76 numbers 1-6 are applicable and acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 2187 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions for work on 312 Isabel Street seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Ms. Stringfield moved to recommend a Special Exception for this project, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

1005 N. Eugene Street**Location: 1005 N. Eugene Street****Application No. 2192****Applicant: Ann Stringfield****Property Owner: Ann Stringfield, Bob Darby****Date Application Received: 8/14/18****(APPROVED NO CONDITIONS)****Description of Work**

Construction of addition to house.

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, Additions (pages 75-76) for the following reasons:

Fact

The proposed addition will be located at the back of the house. The addition will be a small expansion of an enclosed mudroom in order to build a handicap accessible first floor bathroom. Because it is such a small expansion it would be difficult to distinguish it from the original structure. It will not affect any character defining features. Existing windows and door will be reused, and exterior materials will match the house. A small crepe myrtle tree will be removed.

Guidelines (page 76)

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

- *Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.*
- *Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

In Support:

Ann Stringfield, owner, she wants to expand her current mud room. She purchased the home in 1993 she got a Certificate of Appropriateness to turn that into an interior laundry room. They added all wood windows. They have had some problems, because of the original downspout and affected some fascia boards. Rather than continue to make repairs to the exterior, they want to do some interior with eventually putting a first-floor full bathroom. They plan to reuse the door, and the 3 existing windows and will add one more window. They will use the tongue-and-groove exterior boards for the expanded space. They are asking to remove a Crepe Myrtle.

Cheryl Pratt, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, stated they unanimously voted to approve it.

In Opposition:

None

Discussion:

None

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield was recused from voting on this matter by unanimous vote.

Mr. Smith stated that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 2192, 1005 N. Eugene Street, 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 and Guidelines on page 76 are applicable and acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Hodierne. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Pratt and Hodierne. Nays: None. Abstained: Stringfield.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 2191 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness with no conditions for work at 1005 N. Eugene Street, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None. Abstained: Stringfield.)

705 Chestnut Street

Location: 705 Chestnut Street

Application No. 2190

Applicant: Harry G. Gordon

Property Owner: same

Date Application Received: 8/13/18

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Replace windows and paint brick walls of apartment building

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 replacement windows are 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 1965. It does not have any particular architectural merit. The original windows are in poor condition and some are missing. The proposed replacement windows are vinyl with 6-over-6 muntin arrangement.

Fact

While replacement with vinyl windows is contrary to the guidelines for Windows and Doors, in this case, the result should not have a negative effect on the overall character of the property or the historic district.

Fact

The building is constructed of red common brick which was often painted white. In this case it was left unpainted. Cleaning the brick with products specifically formulated for this purpose is also a possibility.

Guidelines.

- *Non-Conforming 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:

Harry Gordon, Sr., attorney for Greensboro Realty and Investments. They got this through a sheriff sale. They would like to upgrade this property. He said that this is one of the worst properties in this neighborhood. They want to take it to a new level, to the extent they can. They love this area, the street, the garden down the street. These are all single units, there is 8 units that have been condemned since 2013, and some as late as 2016. They had to trash out everything and the roof needed to be replaced. The sewer pipes had to be replaced, the copper had been stolen. It's been very costly to get where they are. Once we get a decision on what kind of windows they can have, they will be able to order the windows. Their biggest problem is the inside problems. They are a 1-bedroom unit, about 550 square feet. They are putting new appliances in. They want to attract good people for the neighborhood. They are here on the issue of windows and deal with painting the exterior. They want to do a double-pane window, which is more efficient for heating and air. They have not decided on a trim color yet. They are making good progress at this point. They don't want to go with the grids. He wants to know if vinyl windows are okay?

Harry Gordon, Jr., project manager said that the property needs a lot of work. They don't want it to look like a motel. They want this one to be set apart from the others and look more attractive and appealing. They are open to any ideas.

In Opposition:

None

Discussion:

Mr. Smith asked staff if they were apartments and if there were windows on the other side as well and if they were the same size. Mr. Cowhig in response said they was apartments, there are windows on the other side and they was the same size. Mr. Smith told Mr. Gordon, Sr., that if they decided to paint the brick he would encourage him to look at the house beside him. He thinks that this is a noncontributing structure and a nice strong vinyl window would work. Chair Wharton said he agrees with the grid between glass. Mr. Smith said he could leave it brick and paint the trim white and he asked about the stoops being put back. Mr. Gordon, Jr., answered about the stoops and the commission opinion about that. Chair Wharton said they can replace the stoops without having to come back if they match what is there. He also said he doesn't have a problem with them painting the brick, either white or cream. Mr. Cowhig said that a masonry stoop would probably be more in keeping that a wood stoop.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Pratt stated that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 2190, 705 Chestnut Street, 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 and Guidelines for buildings are applicable and acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hoderne. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Pratt moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 2190 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions for work on 705 Chestnut Street Avenue with the following conditions: Solid vinyl windows be used without muntins, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, Smith and Hoderne. Nays: None.)

Recommended Conditions

That solid vinyl windows without muntin's be used.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mike Cowhig stated that there was a special guest, Heather Slane, architectural historian, has completed an update of the downtown Greensboro National Register Historic District with the words possible expansion of the district. She has also surveyed 100 additional resources in the downtown area that could possibly be renovated using historic tax credit. The state has been reviewing the records for all the buildings in the database. She has a meeting next week with the survey coordinator and the register coordinator about the study recommendations. There is nothing that it is different. They had a general survey in 1975 that was all over Greensboro. In 1979 and 1980 of downtown that led to the historic downtown area being listed in 1982. They updated the historic district in 2004. The area they looked at is the Central Business District. They verified and recertified all the buildings in the historic downtown area. One of the major impacts on downtown was the construction of some shopping centers. The historic district had good records and photos which made it easier to track the changes in the historic district. Two buildings have been demolished since 2004. The Blue Bell Building on the corner of Elm and Gate City Blvd is on the study list, but it is also being renovated. So, it may not be included depending on the renovations.

SPEAKERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd-pr

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

October 4, 2018

SPECIAL CALL MEETING

The Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission held a Special Call Meeting on Thursday, October 4, 2018 at 4 pm in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 W. Washington Street.

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Ann Stringfield; David Arneke, Amanda Hoderne, Max Carter and Tracy Pratt

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Planning Department, and Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Wayne Smith

CHANGES/UPDATES TO AGENDA ITEMS:

Mike Cowhig stated that there were no changes to the agenda.

Chair Wharton explained the purpose of the Commission and the procedures to be followed during the meeting.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Everyone intending to speak on an item before the Commission was affirmed for their testimony.

Chair Wharton asked if any of the Commission members had a conflict of interest or other situations related to items on the agenda and no one had any conflicts.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (APPROVED AS CORRECTED)

Ms. Stringfield stated that she had some changes to the August 29, 2018 minutes as follows:

Page 2, second section there is a partial sentence, "areas" should have been added to the end of the sentence, page 3, lower top paragraph should be like not "lie", page 7, second paragraph "Dunleath", page 7, should have been "he" instead of "she", page 10, first description of work should be "not incongruous", page 11, under the first finding of fact should be 6-0 in favor of the motion, page thirteen under the finding of fact should have been 6-0 not, "Smith - Nay", and page 14 the last paragraph should have been "no conditions" and the vote was 5-0-1.

Mr. Arneke moved to approve the minutes with these recommendations, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The commission voted 6-0 (Ayes: Arneke, Pratt, Stringfield, Wharton, Hoderne and Carter Nays: None)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:**Location: 909 N. Elm Street****Application No. 2187****Applicant: Aaron Moore,****Property Owner: Lehrer Properties****Date Application Received: 7/24/18****(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)****Description of Work**

Construction of parking area and handicap access ramp

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 ramp and parking area will be not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* for Walkways, Driveways, and Parking Areas (pages 28-30), and Safety and Code Requirements (pages 69-70) for the following reasons:

Fact

The proposed ramp is located at the left side of the house connecting the front porch with the parking area at the back of the house. This is the least conspicuous location that meets code requirements.

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 and construct new fire exits, stairs, and landings to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure.*
- 4. Introduce reversible features to assist persons with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished and historic materials or features are not damaged.*

Fact

There is an existing large paved parking area behind the house and another area of pavement on the right side of the house. The applicant is proposing to expand the parking area on the side of the house which will result in larger percentage of pavement than is there currently.

Guidelines (page 30)

- 7. Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing. The Commission may consider alternate locations when properly screened and landscaped.*
- 8. Grading for new parking areas should not dramatically change the topography of the site or increase water runoff onto adjoining properties.*
- 9. Divide large expanses of pavement into smaller components with planting areas. Incorporate existing large trees and shrubs into the landscaping for new parking areas when possible.*
- 10. Select appropriate materials, such as concrete, brick, asphalt, or crushed stone for surfacing parking areas.*

Recommended Conditions

That the new paved parking area be broken up with a planting area.

Speaking in Favor

Aaron Moore, the applicant, was sworn in and stated that they were grandfathered in. They are trying to make it more functional. There will only be four spaces on the side. Ms. Hoderne asked about the site plan they have showing six spaces and Mr. Moore said that that was an old drawing and now there will be four spaces. They are adding an additional 1200 square feet to the upstairs. This will be a three-story building with rentable office space. Mr. Pratt said he was disappointed with a wood ramp. He liked the brick ramp better and he would like to see the landscaping go all the way across the front edge of the parking lot, so that it completely blocks the street. Mr. Moore said the cost is the reason they went with wood instead of brick for the ramp. Mr. Pratt said there is also some cross-slope requirements. Mr. Pratt said that he thinks it will be an eyesore. Mr. Moore asked what if they made a retaining wall out of brick in the front, so it looks like brick the entire way. Mr. Pratt said that he thinks that would be okay. He would like to see the brick wall out front. Mike Cowhig said that this is not a change in use, so he is not clear on whether that rail is required or not. Mr. Pratt said that the railing on the porch is going to be a code issue and if improvements are being made they may require other code items to be addressed.

Speaking in Opposition

Cheryl Pratt, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, was sworn in and stated that they didn't have enough information to make a decision. The information kept changing so they are still not sure.

Board Discussion

Mr. Pratt stated that he would need a lot of conditions for him to vote on it. Mike Cowhig said that there would be a wall and the ramp would be built behind it. Mr. Pratt said that the flooring material for the front porch is going to be concrete? Mike Cowhig said that the flagstone was removed when the house was deteriorating and was not removed by the applicant. Mr. Carter said that the landscaping and the brick wall was a good compromise. Mr. Arneke said that he agrees with Mr. Pratt about the wood ramp. Chair Wharton said that the masonry will be a better appearance, but as long as it remains a commercial property then the ADA requirements will have to be followed. Mr. Pratt wants the height of the retaining wall to be 25 feet, not sloped and matches the brick. Ms. Hoderne said that she would like to shrubbery in front of the wall.

Finding of Facts

Mr. Pratt stated that based upon the facts for application number 2187 for work at 909 N. Elm Street the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, design guidelines and staff comments. The following guidelines under page 28 - 30 and page 69 – 70 are acceptable as finding fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the Findings of Fact. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoderne, Pratt and Carter Nays: None)

Motion:

Mr. Pratt moved approval of the request with the following conditions: Landscaping across the front of the side parking, a brick retaining wall built in front of the proposed ramp with the top of the wall meeting the elevation of the front porch and brick to match as closely as possible, staff approval of the railing and retaining wall and the metal railing to resemble wrought iron metal, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of approval of the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hoderne, Stringfield and Pratt. Nays: None.)

Location: 307 S. Tate Street

Application No. 2200

Applicant: Paul W. Fisher

Property Owner: same

Date Application Received: 8/30/18 (APPROVED – NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Replace 5 vinyl windows with wood windows

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* for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61) for the following reasons:

Fact

The original historic windows were replaced with vinyl windows by a previous owner. The project proposes to use new wood double hung windows that match the muntin pattern of the existing windows on the house. They will be simulated divided light.

Fact

Wood double hung simulated divided light windows with a spacer bar are a window type that has been used for new construction, additions and in some cases when original windows cannot be repaired.

Guidelines (page 57)

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.*
- B. Window products will be reviewed on an individual basis using the following criteria:*
 - 1. Kind and texture of materials.*
 - 2. Architectural and historical compatibility.*
 - 3. Comparison to original windows profile.*
 - 4. Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building.*
 - 5. Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards.*
 - 6. Material performance and durability.*

Speaking in Favor

None

Speaking in Opposition

None

Board Discussion

None

Findings of Fact

Mr. Arneke stated that based upon the facts for application number 2200 for work at 307 S. Tate Street the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, design guidelines and staff comments. The following guidelines under windows on page 57 are acceptable as finding fact, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the Findings of Fact. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierne, Pratt and Carter Nays: None)

Motion

Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2200 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Paul Fisher for work at 307 S. Tate Street, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of approval of the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hodierne, Stringfield and Pratt. Nays: None.)

Location: 820 Spring Garden St.

Application No. 2203

Applicant: Evagelia Eustathiou

Property Owner: same

Date Application Received: 8/27/18

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Removal of chimney (after-the-fact).

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff’s opinion, the proposed work will be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* for Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 48-50) for the following reasons:

Fact

The chimney is an original chimney on the property. No efforts were made to repair the chimney prior to it being taken down without a COA.

Fact

There are no plans to reconstruct the chimney.

Guidelines (page 50)

6. It is not appropriate to shorten or remove original chimneys when they become deteriorated. Chimneys and furnace stacks that are not essential to the character of the structure, or that were added later, may be removed if it will not diminish the original design of the roof, or destroy historic details.

7. Construct new or replacement chimneys and foundations of historically appropriate materials such as brick or stone. It is not appropriate to use substitute materials that simulate brick or stone.

Speaking in Favor

Evagelia Eustathiou, the applicant, was sworn in and stated this was not a functioning chimney. She said there was four old gas heaters and they removed those gas heaters and the bricks started falling down. Mr. Cowhig asked about the chimney continuing down to the floor of the house? Ms. Eustathiou said that she can only guess, but she doesn’t know. Chair Wharton asked if the chimney has been removed all the way from top to bottom? Ms. Eustathiou said that yes, the bottom had mostly been removed and those gas heaters were inserted. Mr. Pratt asked

if she just bought the property and if it was already removed when she bought? Ms. Eustathiou said yes, and it was like that when she bought it. Ms. Hodierne asked if this was part of a larger renovation plan? Ms. Eustathiou said the plan has not been finalized, so she started there with the chimney. Ms. Stringfield asked what year she purchased the home? Ms. Eustathiou said she bought it in Spring of 2018.

Speaking in Opposition

None

Board Discussion

Mr. Pratt asked Mike Cowhig if the chimney was removed just below the roof. Mike Cowhig said that portion of the chimney had already been removed. Mr. Pratt asked what is the extent of the wood trim to be replaced. Mike Cowhig said they are replacing a few rotted trim boards and they are matching everything, so they need a COA. Ms. Stringfield asked if they knew if that extension to the building was added before College Hill was a Historic District and Mike Cowhig said that it was added before.

Chair Wharton said he got an email from James Keith the President of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. Counsel Jones said that since he was not here to swear to it, it would be unaffirmed. Chair Wharton asked if anyone wanted to consider the email? Ms. Hodierne said that what she was wondering is would there have been a way to save the top of the chimney if it was in the state of disrepair that Ms. Eustathiou was describing, and she don't understand if she is trying to fix up the property? Mr. Arneke said that in after-the-fact applications they must consider as if the chimney was still there. The solution is to fix it. Ms. Stringfield said there was a past owner on Tate Street that had some damage done to the chimney due to a large limb falling and the owner asked permission to not rebuild the chimney and put a roof over it and the answer was no. Mr. Carter said that if he understands correctly there is no chimney there all the way down. He said that maybe Faux Chimney would be a possibility. Chair Wharton said that is the kind of thing they like to avoid. There is a general prohibition against replacing historic materials with faux historic materials as if it would be there. Chair Wharton finds it hard to say to rebuild the chimney from top to bottom for a nonfunctioning chimney. Mr. Arneke said what they do know is the chimney was there and they have to consider as if it is there. Mr. Pratt asked if they could postpone this until staff could give them more information to verify some things? Chair Wharton said that she told them it was all gone. Mr. Pratt asked Ms. Eustathiou how much of the chimney was there? Ms. Eustathiou said that the chimney was gone on the first and second floor, so there was no chimney. Chair Wharton said that a good portion of the chimney had already been removed in the interior on the first floor and second floor. Mr. Arneke asked if there was a chimney above the roof when she purchased it? Ms. Eustathiou said that it was reduced. There was maybe two feet of the chimney stack. Chair Wharton said that in some sense it will be hard to say that this is not incongruous. Mr. Arneke said that they are considering a deteriorating chimney. Ms. Hodierne said that if that had been the case then the gas heaters need to go and then it will all fall down. Is that a typical undertaking, post that up and rebuild from the inside. Mr. Pratt said that he thinks it might have been possible. Ms. Hodierne asked if the gas heaters are a fire code issue? Mr. Arneke said that is not relevant. Chair Wharton said the defining feature had already been somewhat compromised. Ms. Stringfield asked about the precedent setting? Counsel Jones said that they look at each property and application on that specific property. If there are two identical situations, then you would treat them both the same. Mr. Carter asked about building a short stack through the roof line. Mr. Pratt answered saying they could not build a brick chimney on the top of the roof, it would have to come down to the foundation. Chair Wharton said that in his mind it is likely it is not in its original condition, and because of the extenuating circumstances that would make this application different from the other ones, when the rest of the chimney is intact. This application would be not incongruous. Mr. Arneke said that staff needs to go over there and verify this, and he cannot support this. Ms. Stringfield said that she understands continuing it, because the roof has been repaired. Mr. Pratt said that if the chimney has been completely removed all the way down to the foundation and was nonfunctional when it was taken down then the historical significance has already been compromised. Ms. Hodierne asked if they can get a In Lieu of? Counsel Jones said that they have the ability to approve the COA, modify conditions on it or deny it. Mr. Arneke asked how many

stop orders have been on this property? Mr. Cowhig said there was a violation, but no stop work orders. Mr. Arneke asked where you are going to get the facts, because the facts that were presented by the staff was the chimney was a defining feature of the house and the guidelines don't support an approval. Chair Wharton said they could use anything in the public hearing for finding of facts. Mr. Carter asked about the current heating system? Counsel Jones answered by saying that if they deny the COA then the chimney needs to be put back. Mr. Carter said he wasn't aware of how far the restoration has gone or whether there is no heating system there now and that could be the compromise to put a chimney in there to service a new heating system if that is part of the restoration plan. Ms. Hoderne said she would be willing to make a motion. Mr. Arneke said that if they want to encourage responsible preservation of historic structures, do not encourage after the fact COA applications.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Hoderne moved that the Findings of Fact for application number 2203 for work at 820 Spring Garden Street finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, design guidelines and that the chimney was not a defining characteristic of the house because it had been shortened and not the feature that it had been when originally constructed. The guidelines allow the Commission the digression to balance the cost of the project against the degree of impact the change would have. Given that the chimney does not seem to be a defining feature, the Commission can find that the cost of the project does outweigh the gain, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Carter, Stringfield, Pratt and Hoderne. Nays: Arneke.)

Motion

Ms. Hoderne moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2203 and grants the Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 820 Spring Garden Road with the following conditions: Consult with staff for any future work to be presented beforehand for COA, seconded by Pratt. The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the approval. (Ayes: Wharton, Carter, Hoderne, Pratt. Nays: Stringfield and Arneke.)

Location: 516 Fifth Avenue

Application No. 2198

Applicant: David Fabrizio

Property Owner: Mary Fabrizio

Date Application Received: 9/10/18

(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Replace two windows with single window.

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* for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61) for the following reasons:

Fact

The second story window configuration had been reworked to accommodate interior changes that include the existing two small windows and the applicant would like to restore the façade to a more original appearance.

Fact

The project proposes to remove the two windows and install a double hung window to match the window opening as found in the original framing. The window will be wood and will dimensionally match other original windows on the house, including exterior casings, sill, drip cap, etc.

Guidelines (page 57)

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building’s significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, site, materials, and details to existing units...It is not appropriate to introduce new window and/or door openings into the principal elevations of a contributing historic structure.

Speakers in Favor:

David Fabrizio, the applicant, stated that when they bought the house the previous owner had already gutted that room and was in the process of converting that back into one bathroom and they plan on to continue to do that. All the framing is still there. They want to remove the two windows that was added during the history of the house. Mr. Pratt asked if the new window would be the same size. Mr. Fabrizio said yes it would be the same size.

Mindy Zachary, stated that they had a Dunleath Neighborhood Association meeting a week ago Monday and they are in support of this application.

Speakers in Opposition:

None

Board Discussion:

None

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield stated the Findings of Fact for application number 2198 for work at 516 Fifth Avenue finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, design guidelines and staff comments. The guidelines for windows and doors on page 57 number 1 are acceptable for findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Carter, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, and Hoderne. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2198 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Fabrizio for work at 516 Fifth Avenue, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Carter, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, and Hoderne. Nays: None.)

Location: 925 Carr Street

Application No. 2202

Applicant: Jamie Campbell

Property Owner: Eric Snavely

Date Application Received: 9/11/18

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Remove 2 windows, other exterior changes for interior renovation.

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 not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61) for the following reasons:

Fact

The applicants are completely renovating this contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District. They are proposing to make changes to the window and door pattern in order to rework the floor plan for kitchen and bathroom renovations.

Fact

The windows that will be removed will be replaced with matching wood siding that is woven in to give the wall a seamless appearance.

Guidelines (page 57)

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, site, materials, and details to existing units...It is not appropriate to introduce new window and/or door openings into the principal elevations of a contributing historic structure.
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:

That window and door openings are trimmed out to match the original window and door openings on the structure.

That new windows and doors are wood simulated divided-light.

Speaking in Favor:

Eric Snavelly, stated that they are actually not putting new ones in place. They are using the windows that are there just moving them to a new location on the house. The window that is shorter that will currently be going where the sink is going. The windows will match the style of the house. Mr. Cowhig said that they are placing a dormer on the front.

Speaking in Opposition:

None

Board Discussion:

Mr. Pratt asked if the windows being removed is the one that is the new walk-in closet and the one that will be in the kitchen. Mike Cowhig said that is correct. Mr. Arneke asked if the existing window is the same size or if it will be bigger than that? Mike Cowhig said that it is a little shorter. Mr. Pratt said that it doesn't look like it is that much shorter than the current window.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield stated the Findings of Fact for application number 2202 for work at 925 Carr Street finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, design guidelines and staff comments. The guidelines for windows and doors on page 57 number 1 and 2 are acceptable for findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Carter, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2202 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jamie Campbell for work at 925 Carr Street with the following conditions: That the window and door openings are trimmed out to match the original window and door openings on the structure, that the French doors are wood simulated divided light, and that the clarification is provided on what changes are taking place on the right side elevation near the new bathroom and in the new kitchen where a row of three windows currently exists, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Carter, Stringfield, Arneke, Pratt, and Hodierne. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM CHAIR:

Chair Wharton stated that he is the Liaison for PlanIT – GSO initiative. He has been to couple of meetings supporting preservation. The kick off meeting is tomorrow at 5:30 at City Center Park. Mr. Pratt asked about the work being done at 634 N. Elm, wanted to know if that was being done in accordance with the COA, because they have installed lattice work underneath the stairs and he thought that was supposed to be siding. Mike Cowhig said that they had a long talk with the person who was designing it and they all felt like the lattice would look good in that instance. They thought the lattice would look better than horizontal siding. Mr. Pratt said that he hasn't seen it since it has been painted.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mike Cowhig stated that there will be a training session on October 26th, 2018

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS

Ms. Stringfield welcomed the newest member, Max Carter.

SPEAKERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd/pr

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

October 31, 2018

The Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission held a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, October 31, 2018 at 4 pm in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 W. Washington Street.

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Ann Stringfield; David Arneke, Amanda Hodierne, Max Carter and Wayne Smith.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan Leih Geary, Planning Department, and Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Tracy Pratt

CHANGES/UPDATES TO AGENDA ITEMS:

Mike Cowhig stated that there were no changes to the agenda.

Chair Wharton explained the purpose of the Commission and the procedures to be followed during the meeting.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Everyone intending to speak on an item before the Commission was affirmed for their testimony.

Chair Wharton asked if any of the Commission members had a conflict of interest or other situations related to items on the agenda and no one had any conflicts.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 4, 2018 (APPROVED AS SUBMITTED)

Mr. Arneke moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Smith, Stringfield, Hodierne and Carter Nays: None)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Location: 820 Spring Garden Street

Application No. 2210

Applicant: Evagelia Eustathiou

Property Owner: Same

Date Application Received: 10/12/18 (DENIED)

Description of Work

Addition of a new door opening and side door (after the fact)

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the proposed work will be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* for Windows and Doors (pages 55-61) and Non-Contributing Structures (pages 67-68 for the following reasons:

Fact

The property is in the College Hill Historic District and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a non-contributing building due to alterations. It is listed as a Queen Anne architectural style in an L-Plan constructed between 1890-1899.

Fact

An opening and new door was added at some point after April 2017. The door is on a secondary elevation but still visible from the street. The door is incompatible in style and material for the architecture of the property.

Guidelines under Windows and Doors (page 57)

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of an architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units. For commercial and/or institutional buildings in need of a utility entrance on secondary elevations, select a location that meets the functions of the building, but is least visible from the street and causes the least amount of alteration to the building. It is not appropriate to introduce new window and/or door openings into the principal elevations of a contributing historic structure.

Guidelines under Changes to Non-Contributing Structures (page 68)

1. Every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure that they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering of wood trim with vinyl on a brick building is not recommended.
2. For additions and alterations, choose materials and treatments that maintain the character of the building's architectural style.

Recommended Conditions

None.

Speaking in Favor

Evagelia Eustathiou stated that her door is attractive. Her question is what is wrong with this door? She thinks it is aluminum, but not sure what it is. She did not ask what the material is. The building has been altered to the front, side and behind. She doesn't understand the objection. The front door was replaced some time ago. Mr. Smith asked why she installed a door there? She said that it goes to an apartment. Mr. Smith asked if that was the

only door going into that apartment? She said no, there was another set of steps that goes to that apartment. Mr. Smith then asked her if she knew where the property line was? She stated that she doesn't recall. Mr. Smith asked if she got a building permit for that door from the city? She said no, she did not. Mr. Smith said that she must follow the rules and he is concerned that she made an opening so close to the property line.

Chair Wharton reminded that the only thing they have power over is the appropriateness of it.

Mr. Smith asked Ms. Eustathiou why she was here now? She said because there was a Certificate of Appropriateness and the door was there and it was after-the-fact. Mr. Smith asked her if she was here last time about the chimney on the same building? She answered, yes. Stefan-Leih Geary said that this property has been under Minimum Housing Inspection. Chair Wharton asked what options do they have, they could make that approval contingent on the building Code?

Counsel Jones said she doesn't know the status on this property, but her understanding is any new opening needs a building permit, however Certificate of Appropriateness is part of the process too. Chair Wharton said that their determination would be if the door was permitted, what type of door could be there. He wants to focus on the type of door and if it is permitted.

Mike Cowhig said they did not realize that it was a new opening until the day that Stefan-Leih was looking at Google Maps and realized that there was no previous opening there. They thought it was just replacing a door. Had a building permit been applied for, they would have sent her to their office to get a COA.

Chair Wharton said that their options are this: they could rule on the appropriateness of it and pass it on to the Building Code Department or they can continue it until after the Building Code Department determines whether there can be a door there. Mike Cowhig said they have been working with other departments, she purchased these properties not too long ago and there are four properties together. It is a combination of residential and commercial and there have been issues with all the buildings. They have been working with Code Enforcement, Building Inspections and Historic Districts. They are trying to coordinate this the best they can.

Chair Wharton asked what the normal order is in terms of issuing a building permit in the Historic District? Mike Cowhig said they will not issue a permit on exterior work without the Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Commission. So, they ask them first whether they think it is appropriate and then they look at the other conditions that are made. Stefan-Leih Geary said that the applicant has due process rights and if this is the door that she wants they must honor that request. Mr. Carter asked if the concern is the style of the door, would the applicant be willing to replace that with a more historically appropriate door? Ms. Eustathiou said she would be willing to do that. She thinks that to enter and exit, this will be the right size. Chair Wharton asked if it is a smaller door on the back and two doors to the same apartment unit? Ms. Eustathiou said that is correct.

Speaking in Opposition

Joe Wheby, 405-A Fulton Street, stated that he has lived in the College Hills neighborhood for 14 years. He opposes this for two reasons: inappropriate materials and a total disregard for the process. If the process had been followed they would not be here today, and this project would be moving forward. He encourages them to deny the COA.

Board Discussion

Mr. Arneke asked Stefan-Leih Geary if they were against the door and the opening or just the door? She said that it is the material and the design of the door itself, not the opening. Mr. Smith asked what the use of the building is? Stefan-Leih Geary said that it is commercial and residential. Ms. Hoderne asked if this would have been a Staff level approval if it had come in prior to the work being done? Stefan-Leih said that it is difficult as it is slightly a

gray area. If the property owner had come in ahead of time and worked with them they may have been able to approve that at a Staff level. The Board can choose to approve this with a condition that the applicant work with Staff to select a new door. The door that is in place does not meet the guidelines. Ms. Stringfield said that this is a synthetic Victorian style door and has nothing to do with this house. Chair Wharton said it was the design of the door and the material of the door. Stefan-Leih Geary said that it appears to be a type fiberglass door, there have been some synthetic doors that have been approved before, but the detailing is different.

In Favor of Rebuttal:

Evagelia Eustathiou stated that the work was done in a proper manner. In the short period of time that she has had the property, there has been significant improvement. She is willing to make the adjustments that need to be made. She did not bring any pictures, but all of this has been cleaned and partially landscaped. Do they want to leave this property in that condition or do they want to be a little bit closer to the adjacent building? Mr. Smith asked her why she couldn't make the other door taller? She answered by saying she couldn't make it taller because of the ceiling in that room. That section of the building was built earlier and it doesn't have the standard eight-foot ceilings. So, they cut the door, because the ceilings were not raised up. Mr. Smith asked her if she put the short door in? She said that the door was already there. Mr. Smith asked her if she was aware that now she needs to come to the Staff and try to get a COA or make another appearance here before you do any work? She answered that she did not keep track of the work that was done and she did not know that she needed to appear here twice. Mr. Smith asked her if she understood that she had to make these applications, but she continues to not do it? She said that she would not put it that way, but if that is how they choose to present it in that manner. He asked her again if she was aware that she needed a COA if they make any exterior changes. Her answer was yes. Mr. Smith asked if she realized it before the chimney or after the chimney. Chair Wharton said that they have established that it is an after the fact application and she knows that it is, and she is aware of it before. Mr. Smith, Chair Wharton and Mrs. Stringfield thinks it is an inappropriate door.

Opposed Rebuttal:

None

Finding of Facts

Mr. Arneke stated that based on the facts presented in application number 2210, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and design guidelines, staff comments and Guidelines under Windows and Doors on page 57, and Guidelines under Changes to Non-Contributing Structures on page 68 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Hodierne. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the Findings of Fact. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierne, Smith and Carter. Nays: None)

Mr. Arneke said they should consider the new opening, not just the door. Chair Wharton said that there is another entrance to this unit. The back door even though short is still functional. Mr. Arneke said they need to decide whether the opening of the door is acceptable under the guideline. He doesn't think it damages the historical character since it is not on the front. Chair Wharton said that if they deny the application, the applicant will have the opportunity to apply again or simply close the opening. Mr. Arneke asked if there were any time frame limitations on submitting the same COA again? Stefan-Leih Geary said they can't resubmit the same application, it would have to be different, like a different door style. Chair Wharton said the motion can be to deny, continue or to approve with conditions or conditional on approval of Building Code. Ms. Hodierne said she is struggling with it meeting the threshold of being appropriate to introduce it on this façade. It talks about the least amount of alteration of the building, it used to be a single-family home when it was built and now it has been converted to four units, how do you make the conversion and preserve the integrity the most? She thinks that not having a superfluous door is how they do that. She doesn't think two doors are required or it wouldn't have been an apartment for as long

as it was with only one door. Once they start punching a bunch of holes in and then there are four, six, eight occupants accessing the building from all different façades it does start to change the character of the structure.

Chair Wharton said it is very important that they hang their decision on something in the guidelines. Stefan -Leih Geary said that there is a parking area at the back of the property. Mr. Arneke said that for process purposes they should deny the application and let the property owner start the application over from the beginning. Chair Wharton said that he is not sure they would have granted it before the work had been done anyway. Mr. Smith said that they are supposed to treat this application like the work never happened, but they are treating it like it has happened. They have not gotten a good explanation of why this work was done and was the apartment opened to the public? There is also now a problem of the primary entrance and in public housing you have to have an accessible route to that apartment. This problem could be much bigger than the glass oval in the door. There is more to this than the style of the door.

Motion:

Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission denies Application No. 2210 for a Certificate of Appropriateness to Evagelia Eustathiou for work at the property located at 820 Spring Garden Street, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of denial of the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hodierne, Stringfield and Smith. Nays: None.)

Location: 822 Spring Garden St. /551 S. Mendenhall Street

Application No. 2212

Applicant: Evagelia Eustathiou

Property Owner: same

Date Application Received: 10/24/18

(DENIED)

Description of Work

Addition/extension of roof (after-the-fact)

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the proposed work will be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines for Roofs (pages 51-54) and Non-Contributing Structures (pages 67-68)* for the following reasons:

Fact

The property is in the College Hill Historic District and is listed on the National Register nomination as a non-contributing structure due to alterations. It is listed as being of the Queen Anne architectural style constructed between 1890-1899.

Fact

The property has had a series of additions added to the side of the property along the S. Mendenhall Street frontage. The portion closest to the house appears to have been original to the house and had a hipped roof design. The middle portion had a flat roof. Both roof forms have been removed.

Fact

The new roof on the middle portion is a shed roof that has extended the front wall elevation several feet and does not match the original flat roof. On the portion closest to the house a hipped roof was removed and replaced with what appears to be a parapet wall or an extended wall with a shed roof pitch.

Guidelines under Roofs (page 53)

1. Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks.

Guidelines under Changes to Non-Contributing Structures (page 68)

3. Every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure that they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering of wood trim with vinyl on a brick building is not recommended.
3. For additions and alterations, choose materials and treatments that maintain the character of the building's architectural style.

Speaking in Favor

Evagelia Eustathiou stated that inside the coffee shop there was an opening that was stuffed with plastic. The roof has been leaking for at least the last five years. They patched it and it temporarily stopped leaking. It started leaking again. The hurricanes were coming so she made a quick decision and made an appointment with an engineer. Whether it complies or not she doesn't know.

Speaking in Opposition

Joe Wheby, 405-A Fulton Street, stated that he opposes the COA, because significant structural modification on street frontage has been done without COA or approval process. Then the total disregard for the process that diminishes historic preservation standards of the neighborhood. Mr. Smith asked if he knew why this came here, was somebody reporting a complaint? -Mr. Wheby said that several people called and reported that work was going on. Counsel Jones stated that this property is subject to Code Compliance Enforcement through Minimum Housing Standards Commission. She thinks there is an issue with the fire code, which is why this was brought to the City's attention.

In Favor of Rebuttal:

Evagelia Eustathiou stated that she is not sure what Counsel Jones meant by the Fire Code issue. Counsel Jones said that the Fire Department informed the Building Inspector that there was an unsafe condition and then the Inspector examined the roof as well. Ms. Eustathiou said that she was not sure if there was a problem or not and not sure what happened. She does know that there was something with the Fire Code and this was prior to her buying the property. There was an appointment made to allow them into the building. That appointment was cancelled due to the first hurricane. There is no fire wall between this building and the back, but she is not quite sure where. This issue was there before she bought the property. The fire wall was there prior to her buying. Then she was presented with the issues by the Fire Department, some have been corrected already.

Chair Wharton said that the Commissions job is to oversee any exterior changes and that includes any changes to buildings that are not historic. They have specific guidelines that tell them how to handle even buildings that are not historic. Those guidelines were quoted by staff during the staff presentation. Each building is its own building, what is applicable to one may not be applicable to this building. They take each building on its own architectural style and then make their judgements on that basis.

Opposed Rebuttal:

None

Board Discussion

Mr. Smith asked if they obtained a building permit? Stefan-Leih Geary said, not to her knowledge. He then asked about a stop work order, which she says has been issued.

Chair Wharton stated that he agreed with the staff's recommendation in that these alterations are not within keeping of the architectural structure of this building. They are not in keeping with the traditional roof forms. The other Commissioners agreed.

Findings of Fact

Ms. Stringfield stated that based upon the facts for application number 2212 for work at 551 S. Mendenhall Street the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, Design Guidelines and staff comments because the Guidelines under Roofs on page 53 number 1 through 4 and Guidelines under Changes to Non-Contributing Structures on page 68 number 1, 3 and 4 are acceptable as finding facts, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the Findings of Fact. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierne, Smith and Carter Nays: None)

Motion

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission denies Application number 2221 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Evagelia Eustathiou for work at 551 S. Mendenhall Street, seconded by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted 6-0 to deny the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hodierne, Stringfield and Smith. Nays: None.)

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ITEMS FROM CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Smith stated that he feels like he is not contributing here like he needs to. Mike Cowhig stated that they look to him for his advice. Chair Wharton said that he is sorry he feels like it is not working. Mr. Smith thinks that they can only see it one way. He thinks that people get to walk over and over the regulations. People need to be held responsible for what they do. They don't need to sit here all night listening to irresponsibilities. He has talked to Mike Kirkman before about moving this stuff along and doing something a little more professional. Chair Wharton explained that they are different from the Building Inspections Department. Mr. Smith said he was talking about the Planning Department, Board of Adjustments. Chair Wharton said Board of Adjustments is similar and they don't allow time limits, in general. Chair Wharton said he tries to make this portion of the application as respectful as possible. Mr. Smith said that there is nothing wrong with asking people to adhere to the fact they are here to justify their design, not political, cost, socioeconomics, or demographics. Ms. Hodierne stated that most people don't understand the quasi-judicial standard that they are being held to. She thinks that they eventually will say something that we will be able to consider. She has been to some meetings where the chair will set out the relevant Standards Test. Chair Wharton said he would be happy to include that. Mr. Smith said how do you raise the standard if you don't require it? Chair Wharton said that Mr. Smith has a lot of useful input and he hopes he doesn't resign. Mr. Smith said he is frustrated today. He deals with Building Inspections and Codes. People will call the office and ask somebody a question on Code-related issues and will get an answer, but they don't know the whole picture or didn't get the whole answer. He thinks that if there are Code issues or Zoning issues we should make those people aware of it and go get a little advice instead of wasting an hour over a door that may or may not even be able to be there. Stefan-Leih Geary stated that they look to get Historic Preservation advice first, which is why they recommended denial of these applications. Counsel Jones stated that which works before the fact, -doesn't work for after-the-fact. Chair Wharton said that Mr. Smith's point is that it is a waste of our time to make a ruling on something that isn't even going to be allowed by Code. Counsel Jones stated they are supposed to consider it as it was before it is

important to know whether it will fail for other reasons. Chair Wharton said that he understands that the reason why they don't do it in this order, because someone will not get to build something just because they got a building permit. He asked if there was a solution? Stefan-Leih said that in this case it was identified that she did work without a COA, and she submitted that application. There is also a time line by which they must approve a Certificate of Appropriateness application and the reason they recommended denial is because there was no reason to be spending money on drawings and engineering work on this design when they knew it didn't meet the Historic Preservation Guidelines. Counsel Jones said that they have a tight 60-day deadline. State laws said you must do it within 180 days. She would suggest increasing that. It would be an ordinance amendment. 60 days sounds very short when you can have up to 180 days from the time the application is complete to the decision. The penalty to the Board is if they can't act in 60 days it will be approved. Chair Wharton said we could ask for a change in the ordinance from 60 days to 180 days and they can make sure the applicant stays on track. Counsel Jones said that they can call a recess at any time, especially if someone is hijacking the meeting. Stefan-Leih said that they try to make it a smooth process, but that is never the case. Ms. Hodiernie said that is a great reason for more time, so they have the time to accommodate things. Counsel Jones said this time they could have deferred because they were submitted right before the hearing and in December they are having an early meeting. State Law says you must decide within 180 days or it is deemed approved. Chair Wharton asked if we can ask for a change in the ordinance? Counsel Jones said this is easy, this is just what do you think is reasonable between 60 and 180 days. She doesn't recommend jumping all the way to 180. Chair Wharton said 90 to 120 days would be reasonable. Counsel Jones said that if the applicant agrees they could go past 180 days. Ms. Stringfield said that each of the historic neighborhoods need to work harder at making sure that people are aware of the process and guidelines. Chair Wharton asked the board if 120 days was a good number? They agreed, they will-request that as an ordinance amendment in the near future.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

Stefan Leih Geary thanked Ann and David for attending Commissioners COG Training on Friday. The City Manager has asked that all Board members and Commissioners get an I.D. from the Security Office on the UG Level during normal business hours. This will get you into the Greene Street entrance.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd/pr