

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

January 30th, 2019

The Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission held a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, January 30th, 2019 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, Wayne Smith, and Linda Lane.

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 and no one had any conflicts.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 31st, 2018 (APPROVED AS SUBMITTED)

Mr. Arneke moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 7-0 (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Smith, Stringfield, Hodierne, Lane and Carter Nays: None)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Location: 611 Joyner Street

Application No. 2220

Applicant: Datus Rwechungura

Property Owner: Same

Date Application Received: 12/17/18 (Approved)

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 one-story addition is relatively small, it will be located at the back of the house, and it will not affect the character-defining features of the house. Materials, including wood siding and brick will be compatible with the character of the house. Windows will be wood simulated divided light that match the muntin pattern of existing windows.

Guidelines under 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. *Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.*
4. *Limit the size and scale of additions, so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.*
5. *Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.*
6. *Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

A Special Exception is required to build the addition since the house does not meet the side yard setback requirement. Staff recommends in favor of this request since the project meets the guidelines for additions and house is sited in a manner that is consistent with historic siting patterns in the district.

Mike Cowhig stated that they think this clearly meets the guidelines. The issue is this house is a non-conforming structure meaning that it is within the side yard setback. This house is 4 feet from the property line. These houses were built before the zoning regulations were put in place. If they could have moved the addition over, they could have avoided the Special Exception they will need to do the project. It is a small house and they need every bit of space they can get. They want to go ahead and keep the wall of the addition in line with the wall of the house and that requires a Special Exception to the side yard setback. The Commission is being asked to recommend the Special Exception for the setback requirements and then they can go to the Board of Adjustment, which that application has already been submitted. Ms. Lane asked if the Special Exception was the only thing they was asked to decide upon? Mike Cowhig stated that the way a Special Exception works is when the Commission reviews a COA application, if they feel that the Special Exception helps the project meet the intent of the Historic Guidelines, that is the basis for the recommendation. Otherwise the Board of Adjustments would have to see if there were any hardships involved, but in the historic districts if the Commission approves the COA they can base their decisions on that, that it meets the guidelines. Chair Wharton asked if they were to vote on the COA and then make a motion whether they want to recommend the Special Exception? Mike Cowhig stated that was correct.

Speaking in Favor

John Schmidt, 5412 Fieldbrook Drive, contractor for the applicant, stated that he has been dealing with the client and tried to make something that fit the house and the neighborhood. There is a fence between the neighbors and the client and the distance is 3 ½ feet. So, to build they would have to take the new addition and offset it to 5 foot or stay in line with the house and build their addition. The house is very nicely restored both inside and outside. He stated that he would approve.

Speaking in Opposition

None

There being no one else to speak the public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

Mr. Smith stated that, they were talking about a 1 ½ feet into a 5 feet setback for 10 feet. For a 10x16 addition that is the only choice they have, so he is in favor of granting the COA and Special Exception.

Finding of Facts

Ms. Stringfield stated that based on the facts presented in application number 2220, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and design guidelines, staff comments and Guidelines under additions on page 76 numbers 1 through 6 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the Findings of Fact. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierne, Smith, Lane and Carter Nays: None)

Motion:

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2220 for a Certificate of Appropriateness to Datus Rwechungura for work at the property located at 611 Joyner Street, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hodierne, Stringfield, Lane and Smith. Nays: None.)

Mr. Smith asked if the condenser would be sitting on that side yard? He wants to know if that will work and if it will be on their side of the line? John Smith stated that the unit is on their property and not over the line. So, it is already there and has nothing to do with this project. Ms. Lane asked what would the finished outside exterior look like? John Smith stated that it will all be the same.

Mr. Smith moved recommendation of a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment for the encroachment of this addition to the side yard and that the existing compressor is already there, seconded by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the recommendation. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Carter, Lane, Smith and Hodierne. Nays: None)

Location: 207 West Bessemer Avenue

Application No. 2221

Applicant: Mark Lytle

Property Owner: same

Date Application Received: 1/11/19

(Approved)

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 one-story addition is relatively small, it will be located at the back of the house, and it will not affect the character-defining features of the house. Materials, including wood siding and brick will be compatible with the character of the house. Windows will be wood simulated divided light that match the muntin pattern of existing windows.

Guidelines under Additions (page 76)

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

Speaking in Favor

Mark Lytle, applicant, 207 West Bessemer Avenue, stated that he is new to Fisher Park. He has been working on this project since November and he thinks that it meets the requirements. Mr. Smith stated that it looked very good.

Jim Holsch???, 812 ???Hollow Street, President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association and the board approves this project.

Speaking in Opposition

None

There being no other speakers the Public Hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

None

Findings of Fact

Ms. Stringfield stated that based on the facts presented in application number 2221, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual

and design guidelines, staff comments and Guidelines under additions on page 75-76 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the Findings of Fact. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierne, Smith, Lane and Carter Nays: None)

Motion

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 2221 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Datus Rwechungura for work at the property located at 207 West Bessemer Avenue seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hodierne, Stringfield, Lane and Smith. Nays: None)

919 North Church Street Petition for consideration of Historic Significance

Mike Cowhig stated that years ago when the City's LDO was being revised they were able to add some things that made it easier to restore historic properties. They added a provision that allowed some additional times under the Minimum Housing Authority and a provision that grants some relief from parking requirements when someone is restoring a historic property. They wrote it, so it applied to historic structures. That are properties that are listed on the National Register, properties that are contributing in a National Register or Local Historic District and the properties that are on the City's inventory of historic resources. They also included a provision that gives the HPC the authority to determine whether a property has historical significance. The building is an interesting building that has been there forever. They have checked old city directories and this property and the property beside it was commercial. It was a café, a candy shop, and a grocery store. This is an early 20th century commercial strip. This building has been covered in vinyl siding, but it has the form and the look of an early 20th century commercial building. Around WWII it was a welder's shop. It is at least 50 years old and has the form of a historical building and Staff thinks that it is of equal significance to the historical buildings on their Historic Resources Inventory list. There is a clay tile cap and the walls are constructed of Terra-cotta bricks. They would love to see what is under the siding and get a closer look of the building. They think this is a building that ought to be on their inventory list. Chair Wharton stated that are instructed to issue a written determination as to whether this building has historical significance. The family that operated the welding building they went on to establish a very successful welding shop, so there is another story to this property.

In Support Of:

Cheryl and Tracy Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, stated that this building came on the market and they are looking at purchasing it to locate another business there. The intent would be to revamp the building. The front wall that faces North Church Street is all a brick wall along the front. The other walls are clay tile including the smaller addition on the other side. They would clad the building with wood or metal siding on the clay tile part. The brick on the front would remain exposed. A lot of times when buildings like this was built with the clay tile for external walls they were covered with something else. There are a lot of places where the clay tile has been damaged. Typically, the clay tile would not be exposed if it was an exterior wall. It does have a sloped roof with asphalt shingles. The renovation of the building probably would call for the roofing to be replaced. They noticed that the windows on the front are the old steel sash and they would keep those. They feel like it is a significant building for the neighborhood. This is between Bessemer and Wendover Avenue. It anchors the edge of Fisher Park. Mr. Smith asked which way the lots are going? Mr. Pratt stated that there are four parcels. Three parcels are owned by the same individual and the other parcel is on the back side. There is another parcel is also, for sale. Ms. Pratt stated that their concern is someone could buy all six parcels and build something like a medical office building or something. Ms. Pratt did go and speak with Charlie Rierson, who is a cousin to the Rierson owners of the welding shop. They started their business in the 30's because they were starving. They went somewhere up north and learned the trade and came back and started the business. They said that before the welding business that it was a grocery store. Mike Cowhig

stated that proximity mill were 100 yards away from this. A lot of mill housing was in that area. Ms. Pratt stated that between downtown and the mills, Church Street was a main street. Chair Wharton stated that their determination is supposed to be architectural and historical significance. He asked what the architectural features of this building would be that will give it equal historical significance? Mr. Pratt stated that the basic construction of the front wall is 8 to 12 inches thick solid brick wall. It has the significant features on the front. Clay tile was a popular building material in the late 1800's. It became widespread around the turn of the century when they were trying to find ways to fire proof buildings. The clay tile was used to incase steel construction. The metal sash windows are very typical to buildings around the turn of the century. Mr. Smith stated that this building is a survivor. Mr. Smith asked if the section in the LDO just says that this board writes this down for the other Boards? Counsel Jones stated that if it is not already in a National Historic District or part of the City's inventory, then this Board has to make this decision that is of equal historical significance. Mr. Smith asked what making this decision would do for them? Mr. Pratt stated that it is the parking issue. Mr. Smith asked if they had off-street parking? Mr. Pratt stated that they do have off-street parking on Cherry Street. Mr. Smith asked if they knew how much parking they needed? Mr. Pratt stated that it depends on how this goes. It could be 10-50. Counsel Jones stated that it depends on the use of the property. Ms. Hodiernie asked if they got this today would they have to close? Mr. Pratt stated no that they would not. Chair Wharton asked if these parcels were continuous with the Fisher Park Historic District? Mr. Pratt stated that these parcels do not touch other parcels that are in the district. Ms. Hodiernie asked if the owner had to sign this request? Counsel Jones stated that anyone could submit this petition. Stefan Leih Geary stated that it is just saying that throughout Greensboro these are properties that an architectural historian has said that has historic merit. Mr. Smith stated that they were potentially eliminating it? Stefan Leih Geary stated that they are not eliminating it but giving the opportunity to have some flexibility. Chair Wharton stated that they have no authority to determine the use.

In Opposition:

None

There being no other speakers the public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion:

Chair Wharton asked if they want to recommend that this structure is at least 50 years old and is of equal architectural or historic significance of others included in the city's inventory. Chair Wharton, Mr. Smith and Ms. Lane all stated yes. Ms. Hodiernie asked if there were any tax implications? Mike Cowhig stated that there was not.

Motion:

Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves the petition for historic significance for 919 North Church Street, seconded Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Carter, Hodiernie, Stringfield, Lane and Smith. Nays: None)

Items from Commission Chairman:

Ms. Hodiernie asked if Special Use Permits in historic district come to this Board? Counsel Jones stated that they are supposed to. Chair Wharton asked if that would apply to short term rentals? Mike Cowhig stated that the City doesn't have anything in the ordinance regarding short term rentals at this point. Ms. Hodiernie asked what is the follow-up on past issues on COA? Mike Cowhig stated that they try to keep tabs on the projects, but usually they hear about it if conditions are not being met. They have talked about coming up with a better way and with a better

system for that. Ms. Lane stated that they approved tree removal on North Park Drive and there were conditions that wasn't met. Mike Cowhig stated that he knew of one tree removal close to Church Street on North Park Drive. He stated that they did plant two new trees. Ms. Lanes issue was that a lot of times that they talk about Conditions and it wasn't met. Ms. Lane wanted to know if there was a protocol to go back? Stefan Leih-Geary stated that if there are not conditions they can't go back. Mike Cowhig stated that they could follow up on that. Ms. Lane asked if they had a size minimum? Stefan Leih Geary stated that two inches is what is recommended by the City's ordinance. Ms. Hodierne asked about the electronic message sign for Greensboro College and their conditions have not been met? Mike Cowhig stated that they have talked to them on several occasions and they are waiting. Mr. Arneke stated that they should keep an eye on that because they could have done that before the fall. Chair Wharton asked if they backed off with the colors? Mr. Arneke stated that staff has received complaints about them not abiding by the conditions that they agreed to and those have been fixed. Ms. Stringfield asked if at some point the Commission could talk about new materials? Mike Cowhig stated that it is based on the merits of the case as to what kind of new material can be used. Ms. Stringfield stated that they have heard at Commissioners training sessions that in certain City's newer materials have been approved to use. Chair Wharton stated that in the Guidelines there is a list of approved materials and wanted to know if she was wondering whether they might make a move in that direction for knowing what new materials can be used. Chair Wharton asked her if these were North Carolina towns that had historic district programs where they have expanded their approved material list? Ms. Stringfield stated that at the last Commissioners training she made notes that certain Commissions, such as Raleigh, had decided to approve certain materials. Mr. Smith stated that was the issue that he was having that sometimes replacement materials are okay and other times they are not. It is okay if the circumstances are right. Stefan Leih Geary stated that they must make a compelling argument for why the synthetic material is more appropriate. Mr. Smith stated that a list of potentially approved products would be useful. Stefan Leih-Geary stated that this commission does not allow for hardy board siding to replace wood siding on a historical structure. So, they should talk about what materials that they are allowing in new construction that could be used in the historical district.

Items from the Planning Department:

Terri Jones, City Attorney, stated that they had discussions because the local ordinance states that if they don't decide on a COA in 60 days then it is deemed approved. With the HPC meeting being the last Wednesday of the month and doesn't always line up correctly. State law mandates that a COA has to be approved within 180 days. They are doubling their time, but not as much as the State law allows. this will go to City Council on February 19th, 2019. If they approve, then they will need to do a change in the rules. The rules will have to be presented at one meeting and then voted on at the next meeting. Mr. Smith stated that was his concern that they did not have enough time to make a reasonable recommendation. Counsel Jones stated that this Commission has the shortest amount of time between the application deadline and the public hearing, which doesn't give Staff enough time to fully evaluate the application? Most boards have at least a month and this Commission is two weeks. Chair Wharton stated that they wanted 120 days? Mr. Smith asked if the 90 days would do it? Counsel Jones stated that they just had a meeting October 31st, 2018 and this was the first meeting since then and that puts it really close to the 90 days. Ms. Hodierne asked if this would go to them in work session? Counsel Jones stated that this would have a public hearing and she would add the explanation about not having Quorums, etc... Chair Wharton asked if they were being asked to recommend this? Counsel Jones stated that it was just being presented to them and its contingent on City Council approving it. Chair Wharton stated that if City Council approves then they would vote on the rules change at the next meeting. Counsel Jones stated that at the October meeting there was an application for two properties owned by the same woman. One was for a door and one was for a roof replacement, both were after-the-fact COA's. She appealed both of those to the Board Of Adjustments on Monday night. She withdrew the roof appeal and stated she would put the roof back to the way it was. They had a full hearing on the door and the BOA has remanded it and they will hear that in February. They were not satisfied with the Findings of Fact. They will give them a written decision saying, here are the things

to reconsider and the burden is still on the applicant. Mr. Arneke was at the BOA and testified. They can still deny it again, or make conditions. She would then have the right to appeal it again. Chair Wharton stated that their authority to make decisions is based on the Guidelines and whatever finding of fact that they make, they cite very specifically, page, chapter and verse from the Guidelines. So, that the BOA will know the basis of their decision. Counsel Jones stated that the application was to replace a side door as if it was existing and between the application and hearing, looked like it was a new entrance. There was conflicting testimony on that and it is the Commission's job is to say which one they found to be more compelling. Mr. Arneke stated that the BOA really had no clue what was going on. Counsel Jones stated that they don't like appeals, it's not what they typically do. Chair Wharton stated that it is important for them to have a focus discussion. A good lawyer can make them look really bad. Counsel Jones stated that the BOA doesn't have the kind of expertise that this Commission has. Stefan Leih Geary stated that the Chair of the BOA stated that they didn't want to assume authority, knowledge, or expertise that they don't have. Chair Wharton stated that Mr. Smith knows the life and safety issues but as a Board they do not. Counsel Jones stated that she checked to make sure that Minimum Housing was aware, because there are residential units and checked to see if they had an open case on these properties. They had no open case. Mr. Smith stated that they need to see a site plan showing how close that wall is to that property line and then determine if that door was there or not.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd/pr

**MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
February 27, 2019**

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, February 27, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair Dave Wharton (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Ann Stringfield (Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett, Wayne Smith, Amanda Hoderne (Fisher Park), Max Carter, Linda Lane (Fisher Park).

STAFF PRESENT

Mike Cowhig and Stefan Lieh Geary, Planning Department, Terry Jones, Deputy City Attorney

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

A request was made to move Item 5 to Item 2 in the agenda due to a request for a continuance to be heard after the approval of the minutes. No objection by members.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Intended speakers were affirmed as there was no bible.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

No commissioners have a conflict of interest and no commissioners discussed applications prior to the meeting.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

No absences.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (January 25, 2019)

Ms. Stringfield advised on page four there was a spelling error for Jim Halsch regarding his last name of 812 Olive Street. The first page of the agenda, Item A, 3a had errors. A motion by Arneke was made, second by Smith. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hoderne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Chair Wharton explained the policies and procedures of the Board to the audience.

CONTINUANCE:

820 Spring Garden Street - Appeal of Denied COA Application, remanded back to Board of Historic Preservation Commission by the Board of Adjustment.

Counsel Jones advised this was denied in October 2018 by the Historic Preservation Commission, appealed to the Board of Adjustment which remanded back to the Historic

Preservation Commission to consider evidence regarding the existence of a previous door opening, to work with staff regarding the proper material and design and to consider fire safety issues. The Chief Building Inspector, Don Sheffield, is present to advise a permit has not yet been applied for the door and permanent plans will be necessary in order to determine the fire rating that the door has as it is a mixed-use building and not just a residential building. Board was advised staff prefers to get information first before recommending the material and style of the door. The applicant also wants a continuance in order to go through this process so there will be full information available for the Commission to make a decision on these three issues that the Board of Adjustment has remanded. Staff is recommending this be continued to the next meeting on March 27, 2019. Chair Wharton clarified that the Board of Adjustment specifically asked this Commission to consider the fire safety issues and if it was heard today more than likely would not have that information.

Don Sheffield, Chief Building Inspector for the City of Greensboro, 300 West Washington Street. Advised this is a commercial building. What is being discussed is the egress out of it which means there has to be a set of architectural plans as it concerns the egress out of the building and currently there are no plans for review. They can be submitted electronically but has not received them to date. Mr. Sheffield is not sure a permit can be issued without a COA first. Ms. Jones replied staff cannot recommend on the COA application until they know what the requirements would be for the fire door and the permit would be contingent on the COA approval. Lisa Eustathiou, 820 Spring Garden Street, the applicant, is requesting a 30-day continuance. She is attempting to obtain a permit for the door but has not been able to. She provided a letter to the Commissioners. She has contacted an architect and has an appointment for the coming week and will provide the information that is required. Chair Wharton advised Ms. Eustathiou city staff concurs with her request. A motion by Wayne Smith was made to grant the applicant a 28-day continuance or until the Board's next meeting, second by Hoderne.

Ms. Hoderne inquired if this was a commercial building as thought it was previously stated as an apartment building. Ms. Jones responded there is commercial space in the front end and at least two apartment units in the rear. It is a mixed-use building. Ms. Hoderne inquired if the unit was occupied currently. Ms. Eustathiou stated the building is vacant. Ms. Jones advised there is a stop work currently in place. Mr. Smith commented he feels life safety and code issues are beyond the purview of this Board. Ms. Jones stated if a certain fire rated door is available, the material may not be available for wood doors to meet the fire rating. The Board will have the opportunity to grant or deny the COA based on that but the Board of Adjustment in the appeal has specifically said to consider fire safety issues. Chair Wharton stated there is a possibility there could be a conflict between the Historic Preservation guidelines and the fire code and would have to work through it. No further discussion was held. Chair Wharton advised the motion has been moved and seconded to continue for 30 days. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hoderne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: (Approved with conditions)

a. 2227 - 620 Joyner Street

Mr. Cowhig advised the application is window replacement for this property located in the College Hill historic district. The building is considered a non-contributing building in the College Hill National Register Historic District due to alterations that have been made. It is not

recognizable as a historic building but in looking closely at some features which was indicated on the picture provided, the various features provide clues to lead one to believe it is an older house. There are special guidelines for non-contributing properties. The applicant is proposing to replace all the windows with new windows. Some have already been replaced. He indicated on the picture where windows have been replaced and would need to ask a question about when replaced and referred the Board to the guidelines for windows and doors. Guidelines are clear regarding retaining and preserving original windows wherever possible. Mr. Cowhig looked at the windows which are not in great condition but not beyond repair. Staff prefers to see the windows repaired rather than replaced. Referred the Commissioners to the guidelines on non-contributory buildings which say **“when making changes, the guidelines in this document pertaining to exterior change should be followed. However, considerable flexibility is warranted when making the changes to a non-contributing building, decisions that makes practical and esthetic sense that may be contrary to specific guidelines are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the guidelines.”** Referred back to the old windows are made of old Oak wood, a higher quality as the wood is denser, less prone to deterioration. Ms. Stringfield inquired if any were wood. Mr. Cowhig replied most of the windows are the front of the house appear to be wood, double hung. He assumed rope and pulley type windows. Ms. Stringfield inquired about the back elevation. Mr. Cowhig replied those have been replaced but not sure of the material. Mr. Arnett inquired if the front windows are the originals. Mr. Cowhig did not know due to the difficulty of not knowing what the house originally looked like.

Arthur Lynch, 620 Joyner Street. Stated has been working on redoing the house for five years. The front windows were all replaced in 1950 and this is the double-hung replacement window with a trim piece on the side. The remaining windows have storm windows which are not the original. His plan is to replace all the double hung windows with wood. The rear of the house currently is Sic windows, single window panes that drop down into the wall. Was not able to save the framed piece of glass. Mr. Arneke inquired when that was done. Mr. Lynch replied six months ago. Mr. Arneke asked if he applied for a COA which he did not. Mr. Lynch advised the house has aluminum siding. Chair Wharton asked for clarification on the two-pane wood window. Mr. Lynch stated two Ply gem panes of glass double hung wood windows. Provided a diagram how the windows will look. Mr. Smith inquired if the double and triple in photo that have been are operable. Mr. Lynch replied they are not operable, they are fixed. Was the only way to obtain a solid piece. Mr. Smith and Mr. Lynch had a discussion about how many windows are actually being replaced which was determined to be 12, which include the double paned windows. Question asked if the double hung ones are replaced as an entire window unit or a kind of window that fits inside the existing opening because if the sashes were taken out there are ways to retrofit. Mr. Lynch stated they are replacing the sashes but the exterior casing will remain and the wood is painted. It is not going to reduce the amount of glass or the size of the sash, no storm windows. There is a vinyl slide piece in the windows that no one will be able to see and indicated on the photograph current sash kit windows.

Support of Application:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. They reviewed the application at their meeting on Monday evening and the most important piece of discussion concerned the non-conforming nature of the property and support the application.

Opposition of Application:

No one spoke in opposition.

Fact Finding:

Mr. Arnett agreed with Mr. Cowhig on how different the house looks and doesn't feel in replacing the windows any historic character will be diminished. Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Cowhig regarding the degree of care the owner is taking with the renovation and taking good care to maintain the character of the house as it is currently. Inclined to let him do it. Ms. Hoderne stated she feels the new windows may cost more than repairing the windows and feels the new windows would not last as long. Has a mixed opinion.

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2227 and in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds the proposed project is not incongruous with the historic district program manual and design guidelines and that the guidelines under non-contributing structures on page 10 is acceptable as a finding of fact. Second by Smith. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hoderne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Mr. Arneke moved the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2227 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Lynch for work at 620 Joyner Street with the following conditions: the wood replacement window sash kits be used be painted white and sized to fit the same space as the current windows. Second Smith. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hoderne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

b. 2228 – 206 S. Tate Street (Approved with Conditions)

Mr. Cowhig advised the Board this a request to be allowed to remove a garage heavily damaged by a fallen tree, assessed by insurance company as a total loss and the garage is not safe to enter or to work on. It is a contributing structure in the National Register of Historic in College Hill. There are few of these garages left in the neighborhood and this one is especially interesting due to the maid quarters on the second floor. Showed a picture depicting the damage. He doesn't feel there is any other option due to the amount of damage except to be demolished. The owners plan to obtain a COA application for a new garage. There is an architectural salvage program in Greensboro but is not sure it would be safe to salvage materials even if the owner was agreeable to that. The guidelines say that the following questions apply as a last resort: **Could the building be moved to another location, does the site have known or potential archeological significance, is the structure a national, state, or local significance. If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted, record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and reporting any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures and archeological significance to the site and protecting any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.** The building has been recorded as part of the national register. A question was asked if they are required to build as such and would the replacement stay in the same footprint. Mr. Cowhig stated that would be determined. It could be rebuilt in the same footprint if it required a variance to zoning requirements and setbacks, the Commission could recommend

that to the Board of Adjustment. Everyone agreed it does appear to be a dangerous structure. Mr. Cowhig did not know if there were liability concerns but would have to be considered.

Chair Wharton requested the applicant to speak.

D. Wilson, 206 Tate Street, stated rain loosened an oak tree from neighbor's yard which fell across and damaged the garage. Knocked it off kilter, took his automobile, fence, and other items out and is requesting to rebuild. Mr. Smith asked if he would entertain building it back similar to what it was? Mr. Wilson replied he plans to do that. He would like to have an electric garage door opener as the previous doors were wood doors that rolled. Mr. Smith recommended to Mr. Wilson to repeat how it looked if he can and asked who was taking it down. Mr. Wilson stated his insurance company is handling the demolition part. He advised everything would be taken out of the building and stored in a temporary facility. Discussion followed on possible ways it may be brought down. Mr. Smith asked if he intended to salvage the materials? Mr. Wilson stated he didn't know at this time. Mr. Smith asked if not would he be willing to let the architectural salvage people come and get it for the city? Mr. Cowhig advised Mr. Wilson Architectural Salvage of Greensboro tries to keep demolition items from going to the landfill. Mr. Wilson stated he would have to talk to the construction company. Mr. Cowhig stated it is tricky with a demolition company due to liability issues. Ms. Stringfield inquired if he knew of the tax credits available to him for his repairs and felt it would be important for him to investigate. Advised there is a process but could have good benefits. Chair Wharton advised these are the historic tax credits and if it was a commercial use, it would be eligible for federal tax credits. Discussion between board members regarding tax credits. Chair Wharton stated they've passed the information off and the staff will advise the applicant on the process for applying for tax credit, if he wishes.

Chair Wharton asked if anyone was there to speak on behalf of support for the application.

Support of Application:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association and stated they support the application without reservation.

Opposition of Application:

No one spoke in opposition.

Fact Finding:

The board spoke of the extensive damage done and everyone was in support of the demolition. Ms. Stringfield moved the case on the facts presented in the application number 2228 in 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 with the staff comments and that the guidelines under guidelines for demolition on page 73 is acceptable as a finding of fact. Second Arneke. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hodierne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve the application under 2228 and grant the Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant Nancy Wilson for work at 206 Tate Street, notated with the following conditions that are on page 73 of the guidelines for demolition and it says "**record the structure thoroughly with photographs and**

other documentation so it can identify in the recording any special architectural features of the building, record the landscape pictures, structures and archeological significance of the site. Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during the demolition.". Discussion was held on the condition if the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days and because of these particular circumstances, the decision was to leave it out, seconded by Smith. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hodierna, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Mr. Cowhig advised there will be a picture of this structure at the state historic preservation office that can be used for reference for the new building. Chair Wharton suggested the applicant use for the next COA for the rebuilding.

c. 2231 – 917 N. Eugene Street (Approved with Conditions)

Mr. Cowhig provided images of 917 North Eugene Street in the Fisher Park Historic District. Proposal is to replace the low stone wall in front with a low brick wall that would be no higher than the existing wall and to construct a carport at the rear of the property where a previous garage had been. Indicated the slab on a photo where the garage had been previously. Showed the site plans for the carport and the wall and it appears to be a fairly simple structure and is not different to any degree with the other structures in the district. Staff stated they would like to recommend open rafters for roofs of garages in the historic district and would like to have that clarified. Stated the siding for the storage area in the back will match the house and the roofing on the house and feels it will be compatible with the properties in the historic district and are in favor of this application. Referred the Commission to the guidelines for an accessory structure and garages on page 36, **"design new garages and out building to be compatible with the main structure of the lot in material and design using existing historic buildings in the district as an example. Limit the size of the scale and accessory structures and new garage should be located in the rear yard"**. Staff feels this proposal clearly meets those guidelines. The proposed brick wall will be very low and meets the guidelines. They are introducing new walls that are compatible to the material design, scale, and location and size with the original fences and walls in the historic district. The brick wall across the street as an example to be shown which indicates it has a low-lock.

Discussion ensued regarding the storage space. Mr. Cowhig provided a picture indicating the carport and the storage area. Mr. Cowhig stated the applicant has submitted measured drawings. He has emailed the Commission with the updated drawings depicting the rear elevation and updated side elevation. Everything has been measured and a site plan has been provided showing the dimensions. A question was asked is it the door that needs to be approved specifically for the overall features? Mr. Cowhig replied yes. A question regarding setbacks was asked. Mr. Cowhig replied that is 3-feet and they are showing 5-feet. A question was asked if staff had talked to the applicant regarding a large tree shown in picture. Mr. Cowhig advised there will not be any footing dug and will not cut roots but is something to be addressed with the applicant.

Chair Wharton requested the applicant to speak.

Donald Basten (ph.), 917 N. Eugene Street. Has lived at this address since 1992, They are proposing to build the carport where the existing driveway is indicated on the photo, which will allow for two car parking, plus the carport and the storage. In front of the driveway there is a section of 8 to 10-feet where concrete is buckled which will also be replaced. Indicated on the

driveway an area to allow for a U-turn in order for them to pull straight out. Feels it would be a safety factor because of age and incidents involving broken mirrors.

Question was asked if it was a shared driveway. It is not, is theirs alone. Mr. Smith asked a question regarding pitch and if they were looking at anything on the existing house to determine the pitch as there are several pitches to choose from. Mr. Basten introduced Mike Patrum as the general contractor who will address the more technical questions.

Mike Patrum, 3804 Oak Cliff Road advised he drew the drawing. To match the house, the siding, the boxing custom made pieces will need to be made in order to make it match exactly and are prepared to do that. They will be boxed as the house is. Mr. Basten advised the house was built in 1922 and has the original siding.

Mr. Patrum advised it does not have corner boards, it has mitered corners. Mr. Smith asked if it is going to be reconstructed to match the general character of the existing house using authentic materials, some custom made to match the original house. Mr. Patrum stated that was correct and they are going to build it up on a sanded rock base to help preserve the root sections of the tree and will be 5-feet away from the tree. A question was asked of the depth and width. Mr. Patrum stated it is to be 22x24. Twenty-foot-deep carport and the last four feet is a storage room which will have two sets of double doors and match the house. Chair Wharton advised for accessory structures, it is not something the Commission can request. Discussion followed on how to match the accessory doors. Mr. Smith feels it is significant and the Commission can recommend. Ms. Hoderne asked if the carport was there since ownership of the house? Mr. Basten replied not to his knowledge. A question was asked regarding the columns. Mr. Patrum stated he was going to use cedar, painted white and will be decorated rings to match.

Ms. Hoderne inquired to hear more about the brick wall. Discussion was held on type of brick. Ms. Hoderne asked it was going to be on the corner and go up the driveway the same as the existing stone or something else. Mr. Basten advised it will be tapered slightly. Explained the topography regarding the trees which are about 100 years old. Indicated a dry stack wall which he feels is a hazard with children and animals walking on it consistently and feels the brick is more stable. Ms. Lane asked if the dry stack was there when the property was purchased. He did not think so and thought it was put in within the first five years of purchase.

Ms. Lane asked if the brick wall will be painted. Mr. Basten stated they will not be painted.

A question was asked if the existing house had a divided pattern of the sash for the windows. Mr. Basten advised they are the original windows with storm windows. Was curious of the pattern. A photograph was displayed of the windows and discussion was held on type of windows. Did not feel it was necessary to match the front windows as these windows are in the back. Mr. Patrum advised he will be able to match the grids.

Support of Application:

No one spoke in favor.

Opposition of Application:

Jim Halsch, 812 Olive Street, on the Board for Fisher Park. Advised the Board has looked at the photographs and plans. They did not have an opinion as there was not enough information and Donald was present at the meeting.

Chair Wharton stated in looking at the issue of paneling the doors, the guidelines state new construction should be compatible with the house and he feels the Commission can find a way if they wanted to require something more compatible. Feels the applicant is very amenable to comply. Mr. Smith asked if the applicant would entertain not having the kickers and requested if the applicant could address the columns further as he feels the door need to be more formal. Chair Wharton stated it is within the Board's authority to request that. Mr. Arnett asked for Staff to approve the design of the doors. Chair Wharton requested to have a finding of fact and then narrow down the conditions and make a motion after.

Fact Finding:

Ms. Hodierne moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 223 and the public hearing of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission find that this proposed project is not incongruous with the historic district program manual and the designing guidelines and staff comments numbers 2 through 4 on page 34 are acceptable as finding of facts. Second by Lane. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hodierne, Carter. Nays; 0.) The Board discussed different condition options to be in place before making the motion.

MS. Hodierne moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2231 and grants the Certificate of Appropriateness to Donald Sebastian for work at 917 North Eugene Street with the following conditions; building materials are architecturally compatible to the main structure with similar features such as decorative molding, mitered siding, door and window casings. Posts or columns supporting the front of the structure have the decorative feature such as a capital decoration or break and the doors to the storage area at the rear of the building have the compatible decorative feature specially of a raised panel design. Second by Smith. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hodierne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Discussion followed regarding painting of the brick and the applicant needing to come back for a COA but should not be an issue because the applicant has stated he will not paint the bricks.

915 Olive Street: Rezoning change from office to residential single-family 5 and special exception to rear yard setback requirement. (Recommended rezoning)

Mr. Cowhig stated this is a rezoning application for the property at 915 Olive Street in the Fisher Park Historic district. Part of the process of rezoning when they are in a historic district is they first have to go before the Historic Preservation Commission for a recommendation which would then go to the Zoning Commission. The Commission is only being asked for a recommendation, not a decision. Ms. Jones stated the Commission can take public comments if desired.

Mr. Cowhig provided a map indicating the location of the property where you can see the office zoning. This is the last lot in a block of houses that face Bessemer Avenue. The lot is oriented toward Bessemer, the house was built facing Olive Street. The owners would like to put the house on the market. The house has been restored completely and wants to ensure the house

remains a single-family home and is the reason for the request to rezone. Staff feels it is consistent with the goals in the historic district program because it will help ensure the preservation of the property.

Chair Wharton clarified the Commission has to make a request for single-family residential rezoning. The owner came forward to speak.

Steven Rizica, 517 Fifth Avenue, Dunleath. House was brought 30 years and his wife has used it as an office. When purchased in 1989, neither side of Bessemer was in the historic district. Since then the south side of Bessemer has been included in the historic district. The house has been completely renovated. His wife wants to ensure that it stays as residential when it is put on the market and have agreed with the neighborhood to not sell it unless it is treated as residential. The neighborhood association is supporting and have contributed to the cost of \$1100.00 for the application. Mr. Smith stated he did not have a problem with recommending it. Ms. Stringfield thanked the applicant for the work that has been accomplished with the home.

Mr. Smith made a motion for the Commission to recommend the zoning change to residential, R-5, second by Hodierne. Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Hodierne, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Ms. Hodierne was excused from meeting with no objections.

820 Spring Garden Street: Appeal of denied COA application remanded back to the Historic Preservation Commission by the Board of Adjustment. (Approved)

Ms. Jones, Counsel, advised the Commission state law mandates once an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is received, if not acted on it within a certain amount of time it is automatically approved. State law gives up to 180 days, the City's land development ordinance has 60 days. There have been issues with quorum or continuances and not meeting the 60 days. Explained why it is particular to this Board as they meet on the last Wednesday and very hard to meet the deadline. Ms. Jones has requested the increase in time and to remove the applicant has to consent. The recommendation was for 120 days, splitting the difference of what the state allows and what is current. City Council did approve the change to the Land Development Ordinance and there is a similar provision in the rules. These were presented at the last meeting and just needs voting to change the rules to indicate it is 120 days before it will be automatically approved.

Ms. Lane made a motion to remand the COA application back to the Board of Adjustment, second by Arnett. Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Carter. Nays; 0.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Chair Wharton advised Guilford County Schools has done a massive study of the physical facilities and made a number of recommendations and as far he is aware, no action has been taken.

One recommendation was the demolition and replacement of Swann Middle School, formerly Aycock Middle School, which is the National Register building in a national registered historic district in the Dunleath neighborhood. He has drafted a letter and would like the Board member's endorsement to send the letter in this or suggested changes to be sent to the

Guilford County Commissioners, the Guilford County School Board, and to the Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. Arneke suggested replacing the words “renovate and rehabilitate” with “for repurpose” as the report talks about replacing structures if the cost of the renovation would be 60% or greater. He feels the real issue is to keep the building there, not necessarily the school. He feels the report indicates there are more schools than needed and it appears they could take whatever plans they have for Swann and just do it at some other middle school nearby.

Chair Wharton stated the school has been an important part of the neighborhood’s life, as a neighborhood school for the children he would hate to see it stop existing as a school. He would like to state their primary desire would be that it remains a school but if not possible, to at least retain the building. There was further discussion on the positive uses of the building and status of the St. Leo’s Development. Chair Wharton feared that the Dunleath neighborhood could lose its national registered status because the significance is not just for the houses but also upon the school.

Mr. Arneke made a motion to have the letter endorsed and sent out, second by Lane and Stringfield. Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Ms. Stringfield referred to page 87 of the guidelines on a spreadsheet. Thanked staff who worked on it. Indicated what was on the sheet and the way it is displayed and inquired if staff could ensure this one page goes to any applicant to be clear on what the Board expects. Mr. Cowhig stated staff can do that. Ms. Geary advised it is from about 2001 but is something that could be pulled out and have highlighted on web sites. Ms. Geary stated there is also another useful document in the appendix that talks about new construction material list and is really helpful in discussing with anyone about projects and is a good document reference but often people refer to the PDF version. Ms. Geary stated when putting a notebook together for Mr. Arnett, she was contemplating doing updates for everyone’s notebook. She is going to prepare for a discussion at next month’s meeting to ensure everyone has the same information.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Mr. Cowhig advised the History Museum is going to have a year-long program regarding democracy. There will be a Smithsonian exhibition on the history of voting and democracy and there will be events associated with it. Encouraged everyone to check into it. Ms. Geary advised tonight there were eight Commissioners present. There is one vacancy and she is working with Sharon Hightower to get her district represented. Also wanted to make the Board aware Betsy Richardson, the city clerk, retired last month. She worked very hard with her to bring Commissioners onboard and was very appreciative of her assistance.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

A motion was made by Mr. Carter to adjourn the meeting, second by Arneke. Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Arnett, Lane, Smith, and Carter at 5:52 p.m.)

**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

March 27, 2019

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, March 27, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Wharton called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Chair Wharton inquired if there were reasonable efforts made to identify and notify surrounding property owners and other interested parties for all the COA applications. Staff responded yes.

Chair Wharton called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the. Chair Wharton requested everyone introduce themselves. Chair Dave Wharton, Dunleath Historic District, David Arneke, College Hill Historic District, Linda Lane, Fisher Park, Jesse Arnett, Ann Stringfield, Max Carter. Stefan Lieh Geary, Planning Department, Russ Clegg, Planning Department, Terry Jones, Deputy City Attorney, Christine Swanson, minute taker.

Chair Wharton explained the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission. He provided information regarding the appeal process for denials of Certificate of Appropriateness. Requested anyone who was going to speak at this hearing to go to the lectern and they will be affirmed.

Chair Wharton inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest regarding any items on the agenda. No one had any conflicts. Inquired if any Commissioners have discussed any applications prior to the meeting. No one has.

WITHDRAWALS/CONTINUANCES:

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any adjustments to today's agenda. Ms. Geary advised staff is removing the application number 2248, 10 Cypress Street from the agenda. There were modifications made that allowed it to be approved at the staff level.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any excused absences for the record. Ms. Geary advised Commissioner Smith is absent. Commissioner Smith was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (February 27, 2019)

Board members did not receive packets in time for this meeting. The agenda was available. Ms. Geary said something happened with the distribution of the packets this month and she will be checking on that. Chair Wharton stated since the packets have not been received, the approval of the minutes can be tabled until the next meeting if no one had a chance to read the minutes. Ms. Stringfield advised she has read them and had some corrections of the minutes, but they are not significant to the outcome of the meeting. Mr. Arneke added two, pages 6 and 8, speaker is Virginia Haskett. Chair Wharton thinks most of them have not read the minutes and he would entertain a motion to table the approval until the next meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Arneke to table the minutes until the next meeting, second by Ms. Lane. No discussion. Board approved 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays; 0.)

Chair Wharton inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest regarding any items on the agenda.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

a. 820 Spring Garden Street, an appeal of a denied COA application remanded back to the Commission by the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Geary refreshed the Board's memory regarding a decision made in reference to 820 Spring Garden Street and 551 Mendenhall, both properties owned by the same property owner. A decision was made, and both decisions were appealed to the Board of Adjustment. The appeal for 552 South Mendenhall was withdrawn as the property owner said they would return the roof line back to its original form. The owner has hired an architect for 820 Spring Garden Street and the architect has been in communication with staff. Both are present this evening to request a continuance on 820 Spring Garden Street and the Board will be briefly updated on the status of 551 South Mendenhall. Ms. Geary advised the Board will not be making a formal decision on either of these properties, other than to grant a continuance if the property owner does indeed ask for that and provide updates on the property at 820 Spring Garden Street. Chair Wharton inquired if there were any questions for staff. There were no questions.

Ms. Hodierna joined the meeting in progress.

Chair Wharton requested the applicants to speak.

SPEAKERS:

Ms. Evagelia Eustathiou, 820 Spring Garden Street and 551 South Mendenhall Street. Ms. Eustathiou stated she is working through the process, has changes she would like to make and is requesting additional time for the architect to perform a study of the work.

Chair Wharton inquired if the architect would like to speak on the proposed changes. Ms. Geary stated she has passed around a preliminary sketch provided by the architect regarding the re-working. This would be for putting it back the way it was or as close as possible. Building code does come into play and so it cannot be identical. She understands that there is discussion about perhaps going a different route with this roof to accommodate some of the other needs that they were originally trying to accommodate when the work was done without a Certificate of Appropriateness. She stated the applicant and her architect do understand if they do not go with something that is like the preliminary drawing, they will have to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for whatever new design work they choose to do. Ms. Geary stated from the staff perspective they expect this to come before the Commission likely at the April meeting.

Chair Wharton inquired for the architect's name and address.

Ms. Martha Mason, 607 West Broad Street, Burlington, NC. Ms. Mason advised 822 Spring Garden has a condemnation notice on it and there must be a fire separation between the two. Whatever is done, the fire separation must be accommodated. She has not been in the building. It appears at the low roof of this wall (indicated on diagram that was presented) could possibly be a fire separation wall. To her it reads as bathroom addition, but she has not been in the building.

The client wants to raise the ceiling. Ms. Mason indicated in looking at the photograph, it was higher and was really close to the door. They would keep the same profile and slope the roof. High at the front, low at the back and the gutter would pick up the water. To make it clean, they would take the parapet back on the sides and on the middle to make it cleaner. Ms. Mason advised Ms. Eustathiou indicated to the Board

it may be more useable perhaps by incorporating this space (indicated on diagram). Once they go in and see what is going on, they will have a better idea.

Chair Wharton inquired if these were conceptual ideas at this point. Ms. Mason replied it is. Chair Wharton inquired if she has had a chance to read the Historic District Design Guidelines. Ms. Mason stated she has. Chair Wharton inquired of the board if they had any questions. There were none. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anything else the architect or applicant would like to say.

Ms. Mason stated she looked on the Greensboro GIS map and using the measuring tool, it appeared the side elevation on the building is about six feet from the property line which has certain fire resistance rating requirements. A door with a window in it, as the guidelines show, would not work there as there would be too much glass. There are doors that instead of windows, there is a panel. The profile would like the same except it would not have glass in it. Currently she is attempting to locate a rated wood door that looks the same but without glass.

Chair Wharton asked if this was for the side entrance at 822. Ms. Mason stated it was. Chair Wharton advised Ms. Mason one of the things the Commission will have to decide is whether there was an original opening at the side entrance and if the Commission would approve a COA for an entrance there. It is not only what type of door to be reheard but if a door is permitted under the guidelines. Ms. Mason stated she understood.

Chair Wharton inquired is the request is for a continuance to next month's meeting. Ms. Geary advised it would be 30 days and would be continued to April 24, 2019. Chair Wharton requested a motion for a continuance to April 24, 2019. Chair Wharton advised it is approved unanimously. Motion was made by Mr. Arnett, second by Ms. Stringfield. Board approved 7-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter, Hodierna. Nays; 0.)

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

a. Application 2238, 715 Simpson Street, application for exterior alterations. Ms. Geary advised this is application number 2238. Applicant is Rosemary Kenerly and is the property owner. It was received by staff on March 13, 2019. The project is proposing to re-work an original side porch that historically would have been open. It has been enclosed with sliding glass doors over the years. To the left of the picture provided to the Board, toward the bottom, you can see the original side porch which has been enclosed. The applicants are looking to do work at the back -left corner. Ms. Geary pointed out elevations on the diagram. The interior plan was shown to the Board which is existing. Ms. Geary indicated on the right where there are currently two sliding glass doors, they are proposing those be removed and the lattice wall detail throughout the entire porch enclosure be replicated. A window drawing indicated a set of three windows on the left-hand side of the diagram. Two of those windows will be removed and replaced with the lattice wall material.

Ms. Geary stated there may be two different options proposed. The first option showed where it was completely walled in and the second option is with one window in place. A diagram was shown indicating what the applicants are proposing for the back wall. Ms. Geary read staff comments into the record: Based on information contained in the application, staff recommends in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, porches, entrances, and balconies on page 62 for the following reasons.

1. The applicant is proposing to enclose a portion of the existing sunroom. The original side porch was enclosed with sliding glass doors to create the sunroom.
2. The project proposes to replace two sets of sliding glass doors on the rear portion of the porch to provide interior space for a bathroom.

Ms. Geary stated one of the things reemphasized when the guidelines were rewritten was the Historic Districts are supposed to be living, breathing neighborhoods and want to be able to accommodate modern needs. She stated this is a growing family and having an additional bathroom is very key for them and is the basis for this request.

The rear wall be replaced with a wall and small window. The side door set will be partially replaced with a wall but allow a single fold window to remain or the other option where it is completely closed in. The walls will be constructed in a way that replicates the existing wood lattice design that is on the porch enclosure.

3. The area is not visible from the street because it is at the back of the house and will maintain the original appearance of a side porch.

Ms. Geary stated the footprint will remain the same. It is not an addition where the addition is consuming the footprint of the side porch. Citing guidelines on page 64, Preserve and Maintain Historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces, and entrances. Guideline number 6, screening a porch may be appropriate when it is installed and designed in a way that does not alter or detract from the details of the original porch and uses compatible materials to the original structure. For example, porches may be screened if the framing is recessed, the screening placed behind columns or balusters and the framing can be removed in the future without damaging historic elements of the porch.

Ms. Geary stated it is somewhat past that point with this side porch because modifications have already been allowed but is trying to illustrate that the guidelines do allow for modifications. Because of the 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.

Ms. Geary stated staff is recommending one condition. The small window at the back-wall staff feels reads more modern construction. Would like it to be investigated whether that window could be centered and a more appropriate window for some natural interior light. Consideration be given to a different approach that is more consistent with windows in bathrooms and natural light. Often double hung windows in bathtubs that is not necessarily ideal, they would not choose to do that because of issues that creates. If possible, staff would like to see something a little different to obtain the natural light.

Chair Wharton stated before questions of staff, he realized he did not explain to the applicants the procedures. Chair Wharton explained to the applicants the process and procedure of these requests.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any questions for staff regarding the application. Mr. Arnett requested to go back to the floor plans to view the window and how it relates to the layout. Mr. Arnett inquired of Ms. Geary is the staff objection the style of the window, or the placement, or both. Ms. Geary stated both and it is something the Commission could approve with a condition, that the applicants work with staff to determine the best approach.

Board Discussion:

Chair Wharton advised it is on the rear elevation and is the small high window shown on the illustration. Ms. Stringfield thought it was single sash, three over three, which would represent the top sash of all the other things across the back of the house, as opposed to what is there across the back of the house and making it more uniform. Ms. Lane asked what the ceiling height is. Ms. Geary was not sure. Chair Wharton advised when the applicant comes forward for their testimony on the record, the question of height can be addressed. Ms. Stringfield asked Ms. Geary if at some point she should cite the guidelines on windows and doors, page 57, 1 through 3, which are common because they are changing a double door on the left. Ms. Geary stated she was correct. Ms. Stringfield inquired if she could simply say in the motion as a condition per the guidelines when we get to that point. A diagram was shown with the current exterior. Ms. Geary stated that she believed staff was okay with approving the change on the mudroom

area at a staff level. They felt the new changes are more appropriate and are just looking at the side porch. It was discussed at the staff level because it is not visible from the street, it was her perspective that she asked it to come to the Commission because she felt that sometimes they can get on a slippery slope. When it was allowed as a porch to be enclosed with sliding glass doors. Not knowing how many years ago and now here today with a portion is getting completely closed in. Ms. Geary felt it needed to be before the Commission so the decision can be carefully considered, although staff is in support of the change.

Ms. Geary advised staff is approving that as a minor alteration to a rear elevation. Ms. Stringfield inquired is the decking material designed. Ms. Geary replied all of that can be approved by staff. Chair Wharton inquired if there were any more questions for staff. Ms. Hodiernie asked to go back to the interior floor plan and inquired on the far right where it says option number two, add window. When showed the two options, if they did do the window it would be totally up in the front part, where the closet is shown. Ms. Geary replied it was better to have the applicant address that issue. Those are the two choices, either have the left-hand side filled in or this which has the single glass there (indicating on diagram). The Commission will want to give the applicants some guidance as to which approach the Commission thinks is appropriate or if the Commission is in favor of the project and allow them to go with either choice.

Ms. Hodiernie inquired if they went with the option 2 and the single glass there is correlating to the closet on the inside or is that something she should wait and ask the applicants. Ms. Geary suggested to ask them as they might have a reasoning as to why that window there.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any more questions for staff. There were none. Chair Wharton asked for those speaking in support of the application to come up to the lectern and provide their name and address for the record. Requested for them to tell the Board about their project and the Board will probably have questions for them.

Rosemary and Jay Kenerly, 715 Simpson Street. Mr. Kenerly stated they have lived in this house since June of 2004. Mrs. Kenerly stated currently the house is situated where they have a half bath and a mud room right off the kitchen, the kitchen island. The plan is to open that had have windows so they will be able to see their four children outside playing in the backyard. They really need another full bath and would like it to be in the back of the sunroom area. The two options were to present options as far as a window. Right now, it is a sliding glass door set and must come out. A replacement window would need to go there and enhance the current look. The window would be in the same style. They prefer not to do this option as it is not their favorite look.

Indicated on the diagram a window they want to put in the back of the kitchen and would replicate the ones in the front of the house. On the side is a small window currently and a window in their basement which used to be where the doors are, saved from their renovation, and they plan to put in that location. They would like to have light coming from the back. Ms. Kenerly stated they drew a small one initially due to privacy concerns and because the shower is in the corner.

In response to a question by Ms. Hodiernie as to why they didn't enclose properly at night. Mr. Kenerly stated he thought it was originally set for walls purposes, not having the big window on the side would be easier to do a wall but if they must do a window, they will do a window there. They are also open to just putting another replica window over there instead of the big long glass door. He has thought of all three of those.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any other questions for the applicants. Ms. Stringfield referred to a diagram and stated the two windows right above and another one, she appreciated not having double pane glass and saves them some money. Ms. Stringfield felt the back window could be expanded some and still have privacy as those were never originals to begin with. Ms. Geary inquired option 1 was their preference. Ms. Kenerly responded that was correct.

Chair Wharton stated one of the Commissioners had asked before, what is the ceiling height. Ms. Kenerly responded she thought it was 8-feet and is lower than the main house. Chair Wharton inquired having that window in that shape and height is for privacy reasons as a full-size window would not be private. Ms. Stringfield stated three over three with one single sash as there are double sash above. A brief discussion was held regarding double sash windows versus single sash for privacy issues. Mr. Arnett referred to a diagram of the rear elevation indicating on the second floor a small window and asked if that was a window. Ms. Kenerly responded no, it is a laundry room and indicated the bathroom. Mr. Arnett inquired a window with the size of that other sash is what they are saying to place. Ms. Stringfield responded yes. Ms. Kenerly stated it would be a narrower window than what is depicted. Mr. Arnett stated it might be possible to shift a window to be centered and be in line with the door. Mr. Kenerly stated he thought it was there is because there was a shower. It's not a large space. They are not planning a bathtub, it will just be a stand-up shower.

Chair Wharton stated he has seen some old windows of that shape and knew of at least one fixed window as it is in his house. He does not think it was original to the house but does think it is old. For a rear elevation, is that type of window something that is common around the historic district. Ms. Geary responded she did investigate on historic bathroom facilities but did not have much luck as she thinks that most bathrooms were incorporated in whatever space they could find at that time. Ms. Geary stated that is not something that is make or break for staff but in the role of the Historic Commission in looking at the design, it is something staff considered as potentially an area that could be re-looked at. Privacy bathroom concerns and options to ensure privacy were discussed by the Commission. Window options were discussed, and one suggestion was a single sash. Chair Wharton stated a casement window that opens might be considered. Awning window was suggested.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were more questions for the Kenerlys. No further questions. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. There was none. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition. There was none.

Ms. Stringfield moved that based on the facts presented in application 2238 in 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 the staff comments in the following guidelines for porches, entrances, and balconies on page 64, number 1, 6, and 7 are acceptable as finding of fact. Second by Ms. Hodierna. No discussion was held. Board voted and approved 7-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter, Hodierna. Nays; 0.) Chair Wharton stated the finding was made unanimously,

Board Discussion:

Chair Wharton inquired if there would be discussion regarding the imposition of conditions. Discussion among the Commission regarding options to be in motion or leave to the applicant. Option 1 is a solid wall, option 2 has the single window. Ms. Stringfield inquired if that was something the Board would consider as a condition. Ms. Geary replied it could be specified in the motion which one the Commission would prefer or either choice, whichever the Commission prefers. Board discussion centered on the solid wall which was the applicant's preference. Ms. Stringfield inquired in terms of the back window if there was any consensus on an option the Board should specify. Ms. Geary stated it might just need to be clarified that the use of a true divided light or simulated divided light could be used there. Mr. Arnett stated he did not feel anything needed to more specific as it will more than likely be in the least visible location.

Ms. Stringfield moved the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application 2238 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant, Rosemary P. Kenerly for work at 715 Simpson Street with a condition of recommendation. The Commission prefers option 1 of their drawings and they use the word true divided light or a simulated divided light window in the bathroom area. Chair Wharton stated the first one was a recommendation and the second was a condition. Ms. Stringfield replied that was correct. Chair Wharton asked is there was a second to the motion.

Motion second by Ms. Hodiernie. Chair Wharton asked for any discussion. No discussion. The Board voted and approved 7-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter, Hodiernie. Nays; 0). Chair Wharton advised it is approved unanimously with conditions.

Special Exception: (Approved)

Chair Wharton stated the next item was a request for a special exception to a rear yard setback. Ms. Geary refreshed the Board's memory of when it was before the Commission and had been approved. It went before the Board of Adjustment as this is a rezoning from Office to R-5. It is approved, however the change in zoning has different setback requirements. The property now has about 4 or 5-feet to its rear property line. Under office zoning, you can have a zero to 5-foot setback. However, R-5 is 20-feet. Staff is requesting the Commission's recommendation to the Board of Adjustment for a reduction in the setback requirement. If in agreement, a motion will need to be made recommending in favor of it to the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Geary emphasized one of the reasons for doing this as the Board might think they're reverting it back to its original zone, but the rezoning makes it a non-forming property. By getting the special exception, it is alleviating any future issues that the property owner might incur, particularly if they are trying to sell the property and this comes up and stalls a sale.

Chair Wharton inquired if everyone remembered the case. It was at last month's meeting. Mr. Arneke asked this is the house that faces Olive rather than Bessemer. Ms. Geary advised he was correct and believed that Mr. Ruzicka had been here to speak on his behalf and he and his spouse have owned it for over 30 plus years and on their own accord had it rezoned back to single-family from office. Ms. Hodiernie inquired if there was a plat land or a survey. Ms. Geary stated they do not. Ms. Hodiernie inquired they have less than 5-feet. Ms. Geary advised it is around 5-feet, is what she was told from the zoning staff. Ms. Geary advised it did have 5-feet historically. Discussion ensued on the dynamics of the case due to how the lot is laid out. Ms. Hodiernie stated she was in support and has no problems with it. She thinks the Planning Director needs to decide on front and side setbacks and maybe it has been attempted. It might be preferable to not have a variance on the property for financing and it is certainly an issue of the way the house was oriented. Ms. Geary stated it is an issue of not wanting to also formally change what is the historic address for the property.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was a motion to recommend the special exception to the rear yard setback requirement. Ms. Lane so moved, second by Mr. Arnett. No further discussion. Board voted and approved 7-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter, Hodiernie. Nays; 0). Approved unanimously.

ITEMS FROM CHAIR:

Chair Wharton did not have any items to discuss. No items from the Commissioners.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Ms. Geary introduced Christine Swanson as new minute taker and the Planning Department has hired her on specifically to be the minute taker and will be taking the minutes for all the Planning Boards/Commissions.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any speakers from the audience. No came forward.

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Carter, second by Mr. Arneke. The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, FAICP, Director
Planning & Community Development

SS/cgs

**MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
April 24, 2019**

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, April 24, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Wharton called the meeting to order and requested everyone to introduce themselves. Chair Dave Wharton, David Arneke, Ann Stringfield, Linda Lane, Jesse Arnett, and Max Carter.

Staff present were Mike Cowhig, Russ Clegg, and Terri Jones, City Attorney.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed. Chair Wharton advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

Amanda Hodieme was absent and excused from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (March 27, 2019)

Ms. Stringfield made a motion to approve the March minutes as amended, second by Mr. Arneke. Board voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Chair Wharton inquired if copies of the COA applications and the meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. Mr. Cowhig responded they were.

3c. 2248, 701 Chestnut Street, removal of chimney (after the fact), exterior repairs. (Approved)

DESCRIPTION OF WORK:

Mr. Cowhig advised this was removal of a chimney during the re-roofing process. Mr. Cowhig read the guidelines on page 50 for chimneys. Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry or stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps. 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.

Chair Wharton asked if there were questions for staff. Mr. Arnett asked if this house was on a corner. It was responded it is not and is about midway down Chestnut Street. Ms. Stringfield referred to a photograph and asked if the chimney could be seen from the front of the house. It was responded you can see the top of it on the roof and it is higher than the roof line on the photograph provided. Discussion was held regarding a house on Tate Street with an extra chimney that was destroyed which was in the front of the house. Mr. Cowhig stated it was more prominent than this one. Chair Wharton asked if that chimney had a corbel detail. Mr. Cowhig responded it did. Ms. Stringfield stated this chimney is more simplistic.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone speaking in support of the application.

Lynne Anderson, 701 Chestnut Street, owner of Families Properties of North Carolina. Ms. Anderson stated they manage this house which is owned by her father. They were in the process of bringing the chimney up to the way it should look and are looking to have it repaired. Has several different prices for the roof and everyone asked do they want the chimneys taken down and they always said no. They had the gentlemen come and look at it and advise them if they were in bad shape. The front one is not. The back one obviously is, it's leaning. The shingles were lifted at that spot and they felt that was what was causing the problem inside the house. They talked to him

about fixing it, but he didn't want to climb up that far. They were planning to get it fixed, the roofers started the work and due to weather conditions a tarp was placed over it which had holes in it and all three apartments were damaged by the rain. They were working on the back side and he said you need to take down the chimney and so because it was causing damage in the interior, she made the decision to take it down. They were not initially trying to take it down. She did not realize it had to be approved. That is the timeline and they applied to have it removed after the fact. Ms. Anderson stated they paid for a roof before it was replaced and will be receiving a new bill for taking down the chimney, which she feels reflects they were not planning to take the chimney down.

Chair Wharton asked for questions of the applicant. There were no questions. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit. Ms. Abbott stated they had a board meeting and discussed this application. They were looking at the whole application at that time. It was approved unanimously because Ms. Anderson indicated that the fireplace and the chimney flue up to the point of where it was covered at the roof line was intact and if somebody wanted to go back at some point and rebuild the chimney, it will be all there. It was on the back of the house and barely visible but obviously leaning very badly and dangerous. It was decided given all the other improvements they were doing, the Board felt it was a good thing and that it was not an essential character feature of the house, it was approved.

Chair Wharton asked if there were any questions. No questions were asked. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else in support of the application.

Don Sheffield, 300 West Washington St. Chief Building Inspector stated he is neither in support nor against the application. Mr. Sheffield stated because the chimney has been removed and is put back, it will need to be put back to current code which means it probably will not be the same size as indicated in the photograph. A lot of the older houses have 4 or 6-inch flue pipe and if it is not adequate for the height of the chimney and the draw of the chimney, it will have to be bigger. They do not make small flue pipes any longer. So if it gets up to a bigger point, it will go all the way down to the fire box.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked for anyone who wished to speak in opposition. There was no one.

DISCUSSION:

The general opinion of the Board after much discussion was this is a character defining chimney and should be replaced. Mr. Arnett asked a question to the owner if what was in that room in the house is the fireplace. Ms. Anderson responded it is in the kitchen.

Lynne Anderson, 508 East Lake Drive. Ms. Anderson indicated a side door and room which was not originally a living room but is now. Indicated on a diagram it was not useable. The fireplace was sealed off with a cast iron original screen. It is a living room but not useable but wasn't originally, but close to the back porch.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit. Ms. Zachary stated she had an application before for her back chimney to be removed and was denied and stated how upset she was as it was not vented anything. After years of renovation, they found out that the person who lived there and used it as a traveler's lodge, was quoted in a newspaper article as saying while scaping wallpapers and before she got to the bottom, discovered a man's name and the date of 1859 written, which then dated the back half of her house to 1840s, 1830s,,and then moved and added on to the back of her front house around 1906. Her house does indicate where it was a one-story house originally showing the top of the chimney on the flue and then was enlarged to a two-story home in the 1880s and then got moved in 1906. It had a story to tell, that's not this. You can't see it from the street, it's not a character defining feature and it doesn't have a story to tell.

Ms. Stringfield added her chimney was a non-functioning furnace, but the chimney could not be removed. Chair Wharton stated it is important to be consistent. The Board has discretionary guidelines and they make the judgement. It is a gray area about what is character defining and what is not. The fact that a previous Board said in their opinion it was character defining, doesn't mean this Board is bound to that. It has been decided based on what is in guidelines, what constitutes character design and then decide based on that. Chair Wharton stated there is another person in the audience who wishes to speak.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia. Ms. Pratt stated their house had a rear chimney that was like this but was not attached to anything inside and were allowed to take it down. The neighbor behind her came before the Board with a rear chimney, not attached to a fireplace and was allowed to take his down.

Chair Wharton stated his point is it is a case by case basis to decide what character defining means and he stated he did not think this chimney has a character defining feature. Mr. Arnett stated he does not think it is character defining and it could be possible to rebuild it to its original. Chair Wharton asked Mr. Sheffield if it were built to code, would a consequence be that the chimney would have to be bigger than the original or be higher. Mr. Sheffield replied it must be 2-feet higher from the roof and 10-feet out. Depending on the pitch of the roof and where the chimney is, it could be 2-feet above the peak of the roof or 2-feet below the peak. If there is 10-feet of space between the top of the chimney and the roof, that is all you must have. The size is based on the fire box and the height of the chimney as far as the size of the footage. Consequences were discussed. Ms. Lane asked Mr. Sheffield if a liner flue would work in this situation. Mr. Sheffield responded it would be an alternative to the code and would have to prove why they can't build it back to current code. He stated a metal chimney could be attached to the rest of the chimney still there and that would meet code, but not meet the Board's specifications. Mr. Sheffield was asked to explain a metal chimney to which he responded it is called a double lined metal chimney which he explained in detail. Ms. Lane asked if an antique look could be created around it to make it look like was previously. Mr. Sheffield responded it would depend on the size of the flume inside. Any brick must be manufactured to specification air gap between the galvanized pipe and the brick. He would only be able to approve one layer of brick because it is veneer and did not think it would meet the required look.

Chair Wharton asked Counsel Jones if the vote is a tie, is the application approved. Counsel Jones responded it depends on what the motion is but if it is a tie, the motion fails. Counsel Jones stated generally in a tie neither motion would pass. Chair Wharton stated this is a difficult borderline case and he still does think this is a character defining case. He stated he thinks the consequence of denying it and having them rebuild it is very possible but would probably produce a worse result. Counsel Jones asked to clarify that if they cannot come to a motion that passes, they are going to fail to act and then if 120 days elapses, it will be deemed approved.

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2248, in a public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposal is not incongruous with the Historic District Manual Design Guidelines, the staff comments and the following guidelines under Guidelines for Masonry and Stone, Foundations and Chimneys, on page 50, number 6, is acceptable as findings of fact and that the rear chimney is not a defining character chimney. Second by Mr. Carter and Mr. Arnett. The Board voted 4-2 in favor. (Wharton, Stringfield, Carter, and Arnett. Nays: Lane, Arneke).

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application 2248 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to application Lawson W. Duhan, 701 Chestnut Street. Second by Mr. Arnett. The Board voted 6-0 to approve the application. (Wharton, Stringfield, Lane, Arneke, Carter, and Arnett. Nays, none). The application was approved.

3d. 2251, 903 N. Eugene Street, demolition of garage. (Approved with conditions)

DESCRIPTION OF WORK:

Mr. Cowhig advised this application is for the demolition of a garage at 902 North Eugene Street in the Fisher Park Historic District. Mr. Cowhig advised it is a very modest garage and is interesting because it was a shared garage which is not common in the Historic District. The garage is very delapidated and at risk of collapsing. The applicants would like to take it down and possibly rebuild in the future. The guidelines recommend if possible, to move the structure to another location but it is not an option in this case. The best they could do is record it photographically. Staff feels it is reasonable to allow them to take this garage down. Mr. Cowhig stated the other point is these old garages get torn down because they're not large enough to accommodate modern automobiles. Documentation was provided

Chair Wharton asked for any questions of staff. There were none. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone speaking in support of the application.

Ms. Tahí Hunter, 915 North Eugene Street. Ms. Hunter stated she is one of the joint applicants for this request.

Mr. Andrew Spainhour, 903 North Eugene Street. Mr. Spainhour stated they are next door neighbors even though the addresses would not have them think that. This is a joint application. Mr. Spainhour provided a photograph without the cars being in front of the garage. He stated there is a 1931 easement that makes no

mention of the garage and so it was probably built after 1931. It sits on their property line and is a 20-foot-wide structure, 10-feet of it is on his property and 10-feet is on their property. The dividing wall sits on the property line. He advised you can get a mini-Cooper in it and a Fiat in it but nothing else in it. Due to the fact there was never any kind of agreement that they have been able to find. No one has been able to maintain it. There is no agreement about insuring it, no agreement about repairing or maintaining it. If this was rebuilt, the cost would be significant and legal agreements would need to be in place regarding the joint ownership of the property with the common wall. Neither party is interested in doing that. They are good neighbors, but they do not want to own property together. The garage is in bad shape and they are very concerned about it. People have looked at it and said it really is at risk of falling and the idea of moving it is impossible

Chair Wharton asked if there were any questions. No questions. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone present to speak in support.

Jim Holsch, 812 Olive Street. Mr. Holsch is part of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Board and stated they are in approval of the application.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in support. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone in opposition to the request. No one came forward.

DISCUSSION:

The consensus was it is a shame and is striking to look at, but the situation is very unusual, and the structure is unsafe. There does not appear to be a way to save it. Ms. Stringfield had a similar experience and understood the situation.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2251 in the public hearing ,the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Property Manual and Design Guidelines and staff comments in the following guidelines under Guidelines for Demolition on page 73 and numeric cases under that are acceptable as finding of fact. Second by Mr. Carter. The Board voted 6-0 to approve the application. (Wharton, Stringfield, Lane, Arneke, Carter, and Arnett. Nays, none). The finding was unanimous in favor.

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves the conditions application 2251 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicants Richard Andrew Spainhour and Tahi Hunter for work at 903 and 915 North Eugene Street with the following conditions, which are on page 73 which say that the existing garage structure be photographed and documented by the Historic District staff and that any large trees or important landscape features be protected during the demolition. Second by Mr. Carter. No discussion. The Board voted 6-0 to approve the application. (Wharton, Stringfield, Lane, Arneke, Carter, and Arnett. Nays, none).

It was suggested that if there was anything worth salvaging to donate them to Architectural Salvage of Greensboro on Hoffman Street and if you donate there is a tax-deductible form.

3a. 2210, 820 Spring Garden Street, Appeal of Denied COA, Application Remanded back to Historic Preservation Commission by Board of Adjustment (continued from March 27 meeting). (Approved with conditions)

DESCRIPTION OF WORK:

Mr. Cowhig provided the background information regarding this case and provided design drawings done by the architect employed by the owners which he felt were helpful in understanding the building more. The issue is an entrance created on the side without a Certificate of Appropriateness. He indicated on an image the entrance on the right and now understand the entrance is to serve an apartment. It would be the front door of the apartment. He indicated there was a commercial space in the front of the building and they are planning to wall that off with a fire rated wall and add an entrance. The entrance on the left goes to the second-floor apartment. Mr. Cowhig advised the door must be a fire rated door and he has spoken to a person who said that fire rated doors don't absolutely have to be metal such as this one but if they have glass, they become very expensive. One of things talked about is the idea of possibly a fire rated wood or fiberglass door that did not have glass but a panel consistent with the light Victorian character of the house. He does not know from a code standpoint if that is possible, but that is one of the ideas.

Mr. Sheffield advised there are all kinds of fire rated doors. The problem is they took out the wired glass out of fire rated door years ago. If glass is in a fire door now, the glass must have a rating that is consistent with the rating of the door which makes it extremely expensive. Chair Wharton asked about different materials for fire rated doors. Mr. Sheffield responded there are wood, metal, and just about anything except for plastic. Mr. Cowhig asked if there would be a code requirement that it would have to have glass. Mr. Sheffield responded there is no requirement that the doors must have glass in them.

Chair Wharton asked Counsel Jones for advice when something has been remanded back to them. Counsel Jones stated there were three issues the Board of Adjustment specifically wants the Commission to reconsider which is under 2, 3, and 4 on the Certificate of Appropriateness. They are evidence presented regarding the existence of a previous door opening, to consider the proper material and design of the door, consider any fire safety issues associated with not having a door there. Those would be findings of fact and are in addition to the regular considerations of the manual and design guidelines.

Chair Wharton asked the applicants and Commissioners to focus comments on the items that need to be reconsidered. Chair Wharton asked for anyone to speak in support of the application.

Martha Mason, 607 West Front Street, Burlington. Ms. Mason indicated a door leading to downstairs and the upstairs apartments and indicated a door for the business occupants. Chair Wharton requested her to address whether there was a previous opening. Ms. Mason responded what she knew for sure is it was framed for an opening when the building was built as it has the four by four posts. Ms. Mason indicated where a door could have been added later. Chair Wharton asked Ms. Mason if she had anything to add to the proper materials. Ms. Mason responded she had nothing to add. Chair Wharton asked if she had anything to add regarding the safety issues involved with the door. Ms. Mason stated the door does not meet the fire rated standard.

Counsel Jones stated the application to keep this door is moot because a new door will have to be used or the Commission would determine that there wasn't an opening and take the door out. Mr. Cowhig advised that is the primary entrance to that part. Ms. Mason responded the downstairs apartment has one on the porch and is the primary door for the upstairs apartments as well. Counsel asked if there was a secondary door or an exit for the upstairs. Ms. Mason advised there was no tread on the risers and she did not go upstairs. Counsel asked from the exterior is it possible to see any other entrance or exits to the apartment. Ms. Mason responded no. A question was asked how the tenants got to it before there was a door. Ms. Mason did not know. Mr. Cowhig advised there is a door in the front with mailboxes beside it and he felt that was the door used. He was not sure if the commercial space was separate from the living space.

Ms. Mason indicated on the floor plan where there are just studs with poly on and indicated where it extends. Work was done and the stop work was issued, and that is where they are now. Ms. Mason indicated where the one-hour wall and two-hour walls will be. Counsel Terry asked if a permanent application has been submitted for this work. It was responded no. Mr. Sheffield advised a permanent application has not been submitted and advised the owner that while these plans should be okay, they are not ready for a permit. Ms. Mason acknowledged that. Chair Wharton asked Ms. Mason if there were any other safety issues she could address. Ms. Mason stated just repair. She didn't know exactly what would need repair, but they will go in and look at what is there and make any corrections that need to be done.

Chair Wharton asked if there was another way to reach or exit the second floor before this work started. Ms. Mason responded she wasn't involved at that time and does not know anything about that. Chair What asked if what they see here has not yet been constructed. Ms. Mason responded she was under the impression that one of the things the Commission wanted to see was how the door would be used in the plan. Chair Wharton asked if it would be possible to renovate the building and have it be a safe building under some other floorplan if the application for this door was denied. Ms. Mason responded something would be sacrificed and not be a two-income apartment dwelling with a commercial aspect. Chair Wharton stated he believes the owner is aware this is a historic district and they do not regulate the uses but regulate the guidelines and there are some things that prohibit some types of uses.

Ms. Evagelia Eustathiou, 820 Spring Garden Street. Mr. Arneke inquired what the plywood was above the door. Ms. Eustathiou replied the outside was being torn up and she asked the workers to put plywood on the inside for safety. It can be removed. Mr. Carter asked it was temporary to which Ms. Eustathiou responded yes. Mr. Arnett asked if there was a window opening there or any kind of openings there. Ms. Eustathiou responded there was not. Mr. Arnett asked why it was necessary. Ms. Eustathiou responded it is not necessary and will be

removed. Chair Wharton asked before this door was in, what was the access to the second floor. Ms. Eustathiou didn't know but thought they shared access with the front of the building. Chair Wharton asked if there was another stairway. Ms. Eustathiou responded there is only one and it has been partially torn out. Chair Wharton asked if there was interior access to the stairway. Ms. Eustathiou stated on the first floor the stairway is for the second floor. On the first floor you can get through the front or you can get through the back door. She indicated a door on the diagram where the door in the middle will be accessed from upstairs and access for downstairs. Downstairs will have two access doors. In theory when you enter, there will be an access to the downstairs in addition to this one and to upstairs. A drawing was shown indicating all the studs and advised the plaster is coming down. Ms. Mason indicated the wall with studs and indicated a new wall. Mr. Arnett asked if the stud wall separates the hallway from the commercial space. Ms. Eustathiou replied yes. Mr. Arnett asked if there was an opening framed anywhere in there or just a continuous wall that divides it. Diagrams were referenced for wall placement and openings. Chair Wharton asked if there was some type of opening from the front room to the stairs and it appeared to have been closed off. Ms. Eustathiou replied no, it is still there but there is no privacy except the upstairs door and indicated another place on the diagram.

Ms. Mason stated she took the survey, made her dimensions work and doesn't know what happens between the space indicated. Ms. Lane asked if this was proposed. Ms. Mason indicated on diagram what was proposed. Chair Wharton asked if the purpose of putting an opening on the side is because they want a separate entrance for the upstairs apartment. Ms. Eustathiou replied at one time or another there must have been a door there. The siding on this building is new siding. When looking at the inside of siding it does not look 100 years old like the other houses. She stated when it was painted it did not have multiple layers of paint, it only had one layer of paint. So, it is possible that there was a door there all along, she doesn't know, and when the siding was changed, they closed the door. She is asking to reinstate one.

Chair Wharton asked if the layers of paint were on the exterior siding. Ms. Eustathiou replied right. Chair Wharton asked if she believes the siding is new with only one layer of paint. Ms. Eustathiou replied that was correct. Chair Wharton asked if it appears to look new to her both from the fact that it has one layer of paint on the exterior and at the back of the siding it looks new. Ms. Eustathiou responded yes, because she made repairs to Building 816, which it shares a driveway and when looking at that siding, it is black, dusty, dirty, and so on. When you look at this one, it is clean. Chair Wharton said based on the condition of the siding and based on the fact there was a frame there for the door, it is her judgment there was a door there. Ms. Eustathiou replied yes. Chair Wharton stated the architect has also testified she can't say whether a door was there or not. Ms. Mason responded there was an opening that was framed and is wider than 3-feet. Chair Wharton stated it was framed but whether a door was installed there, she didn't have a judgement on that. Ms. Eustathiou responded she would not know, have not seen the door but why would it be framed if there wasn't a door. Ms. Mason pointed out a door that she did not look at to see if the framing was double studs instead of the one post indicating that it would have been a newer opening. Chair Wharton asked when talking about the framing for the door in question, that's old-fashioned framing consistent with age of the house. Ms. Mason responded yes. Ms. Mason stated she has never been in this when it was operating as a business, but it is counter intuitive to life safety to have somebody exiting through a business occupancy if it's a lesser hazard and it could have been a greater hazard. Chair Wharton asked Ms. Mason if she thought this door is necessary for life and safety, Ms. Mason responded with the graded walls and the separation between the two, indicated a wall that could be a two-hour wall.

Mr. Sheffield stated it is illegal to run a residential occupancy through a business use without having a rated corridor through the business use. You cannot just dump them into there. Mr. Cowhig asked if the door frame had to be rated. Mr. Sheffield responded door jams have to be rated. The framing does not necessarily have to be rated because you can have a one-hour rating on framing just by putting wood studs and two layers of 5/8 type x sheet rock. The jam itself must have the same rating as the door on any commercial property and this would be considered commercial property. Ms. Mason stated if they had to, they could go with a rated metal frame and just cover with wood. Mr. Sheffield responded or could get a wood frame that's rated.

Chair Wharton stated this is difficult because it is hard for the Commission to know what has been built and what hasn't been built from the plans that have been presented and in terms of getting clear testimony on the life and safety issues. It is testimony on a configuration that has not been built and if the application were denied, it would not be built. Chair Wharton asked if the life safety issue would be moot for that particular use until it was figured out how the building was going to be used. Counsel Jones responded she thought his assessment was correct. This was not an after the fact. The applicant came in and said I want to put in a new opening because I want to change the configuration of the use inside. The Commission would not be considering the life safety issues but

what happened was the applicant previously brought up that she didn't feel it was adequate for that downstairs apartment to exit through the substandard or shorter door. Counsel Jones stated the original testimony was she needed another entrance into the downstairs and there was not talk about the upstairs apartment. The assumption was the upstairs apartment has egress or ingress through some other avenue. The application must be treated as this is the plan they want to do. Chair Wharton stated it was tough because they are supposed to be rehearing a previous application, but the application has changed since it was heard last. Counsel Jones stated she thought the application is still about the door but now they are getting information about the interior use which brings in the life and safety issue. Counsel Jones stated the Commission is still deciding on the door and the opening. If you deny the door, then they are going to have to reconfigure. The other door there was no dispute over it existed. They might have to reconfigure the space to use if the door is denied. Mr. Arnett stated it seemed the Commission's scope is to determine is it appropriate for this additional door opening to be there and whether the actual door that is being proposed to be used is appropriate. It came to the Commission with a door that did not meet the guidelines and now also does not meet the fire safety requirements. The decision needs to be made if it's okay for this door opening to exist and whether it is enough for the Commission to say it needs to meet the life safety requirements and the design requirements in terms of material and design. Counsel Jones advised if they say the door can't be there it doesn't matter what the materials are. This cannot be fully approved because you don't know what doors are appropriate. Mr. Arnett stated it appears to be zoning and coding issues which is not their scope. Chair Wharton stated they cannot make a ruling on the life safety issue but were specifically asked by the BOA to make a finding of fact to consider life safety issues. Chair Wharton thinks they have been explored.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Eustathiou stated by going back and forth the issue has become muddled but does think the Commission clarified that a door can be there and the type of door is based on the conditions the fire safety would require. Ms. Eustathiou stated based on what she has seen at one time or another there was a door there. At least a door opening and she is of the opinion that it was covered. She stated whatever is decided in terms of safety and the type of door, based on the requirements they will meet them. It is evident that there were two apartments and one store or something. She would like to maintain those and provide better access to the first and second floors. The first floor will have two exit doors instead of one. The second-floor apartment will have its own entrance and exit and not share it with anyone else

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone in opposition. No one came forward. Photographs of the interior were presented to the Commission and discussed. Ms. Lane stated it is evidence of being an original opening. The photographic evidence the Commission has and the testimony about the siding from the applicant make a very strong case that there was originally an opening and framed for a door. The fact the opening did not appear on Google Maps is not necessarily contradictory evidence to that because the photographs are recent.

FINDING of FACT:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2210 at the public hearing as remanded from the Board of Adjustment, the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines in accordance with the following finding of fact.

1. The following evidence was presented regarding the existence of a previous door opening that was rough framing in the building that indicated the existence of an opening, the framing was a technique and material that indicates that it was not recent and that it was historic.

2. There is evidence that the siding is newer than the age of the house since there was only one layer of paint, therefor it is possible that this older opening had been covered up later.

Second by Ms. Lane. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Mr. Carter moved that based on the finding of facts presented in application and Chair Wharton made the finding the current door does not meet the standard but there are doors in acceptable materials that will meet the 2210 in the public hearings and was remanded by the Greensboro Board of Adjustment, the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines under windows and doors on pages 55

through 61 and under changes to non-contributing structures on pages 67 and 68 in accordance with the following findings of fact. The following evidence was presented regarding the proper material and design of the door.

1. The door currently in place does not meet code requirements.
2. The existing door does not meet code but there are other doors that could meet code and be more congruous with the design manual guidelines.

Second by Mr. Arnett. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Mr. Arnett proposed as a finding of fact. There was evidence the current door is not a fire rated door. Based on the proposed configuration of the space the opening is required because it would not meet the fire safety requirements for the upstairs apartment to exit through the building or through the other apartment. Second by Mr. Carter. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

DISCUSSION:

Discussion centered on whether to approve or deny the application. It can be approved for the current door. It can be approved with conditions which say the opening is appropriate, but they need to choose a door with materials and design that is more appropriate. Or it can simply be denied. Options and conditions were discussed. Counsel Jones advised with the consent of the applicant, they can come back when they have a door. An option was to approve the opening with a condition would be the door be not incongruous with the guidelines in terms of design and material and be left to City staff to make that determination.

A motion was made by Ms. Lane to approve the opening with a condition that the material and design of the door be reviewed and approved by staff to ensure congruity with the Historic District Design Guidelines. Second by Mr. Arnett. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

3b. 2250, 305 West Bessemer Avenue, Demolition of garage, construction of new attached garage, exterior alterations to house, and construction of new driveway. (Partly Approved and Partly Denied With Conditions)

Mr. Cowhig advised this is an application for a comprehensive renovation of this property within the Fisher Park Historic District. It includes demolition of a garage, construction of an addition and attached garage, enclose side porch, construct circular driveway, change shed dormers from flat roofs to rounded roofs, extend lintels above windows and hood above front door, rebuild right side porch, and replace windows. Mr. Cowhig went through each component of the application

Mr. Cowhig showed pictures of the property provided by Benjamin Briggs and gave the background of the house. There is a house that is identical in the Emerywood neighborhood in High Point which is a Dutch Colonial barn house per Mr. Briggs. This is a very unusual house. It is a contributing structure that has deteriorated significantly over the last 10 years or so. When he reviewed the application and went through the guidelines, it reminded him of redevelopment houses because of the extent of the work that will have to be done. He has heard from people who are very excited to see something being done with this house and it is great to see a house that has been neglected and an eyesore for many years to be renovated.

Mr. Cowhig stated the house and garage are contributing structures in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The materials of the garage match the materials of the house. The garage is in very poor condition and is not large enough. An addition is being proposed that will be located at the back of the house which combines a garage and a master bedroom and will be a large addition. Construction materials will be like those of the house and will be distinguishable from the house through the change in the roofline and wall plane. The addition will not affect the primary elevation of the house. Mr. Cowhig went through the guidelines in reference to additions.

The new garage will be an addition to the house and sited on an angle parallel to the rear of the property which is not characteristic in the historic district. It will not meet the required setback so a Special Exception will be required. The proposed new driveway will be circular requiring a new curb cut out and a possible removal of a tree. Circular driveways are rare in historic districts. Mr. Cowhig stated the guidelines pertaining to new garages and outbuildings and a circular driveway and stated the materials to be used for the driveway and edge.

They are proposing to replace or enclose the porch to match the sunroom on the left side of the house which would mean eliminating the three column clusters at the corners of the porch. 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 architectural of the structure and does not result in a loss of historic fabric or architectural details.

The right-side porch they are proposing to rebuild and replace the existing casement windows with matching new wood windows. Mr. Cowhig stated the windows do not appear in good condition. On the plans they are recommending extending the lintels above the windows and door for better rain protection. Mr. Cowhig provided the guidelines pertaining to windows and doors, including sashes, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. Mr. Cowhig stated staff does believe the extension is for a good reason. The removal of historic materials should be avoided. There should be minimum site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce destroying site features and/or existing trees.

The roofs of the shed dormers will be replaced with round roofs. The walls between the dormers will be bumped out for interior space. Mr. Cowhig stated the guidelines say to retain and preserve the original roof form, pitch, overhand, and significant features such as chimneys, dormer, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks. Preserve and maintain the original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.

Mr. Cowhig stated some thoughts that occurred to staff in reviewing the plans were to encourage the applicant to use the North Carolina Residential Historic Tax Credits available which is 15 percent and could be significant. Staff would recommend consideration be given to replacing the vinyl windows on the second story in the back. Mr. Cowhig stated replacing the shutters could have a huge impact on the character. Staff has old photographs of the house that had a front terrace extended the full width of the house and staff feels it is a feature that might restore some of the character of the property. Staff feels that if the garage is determined not to be acceptable as it is designed presently, perhaps consider a garage that is attached to the house with a porch or breezeway as was done in earlier eras so it can read as a separate structure and be sited in a more typical manner in the Historic District. Mr. Cowhig stated it is quite a project and wish them much luck.

Mr. Carter asked if the position of the garage include turning the current garage, after extreme renovations, into a garden house and if there was interest in preserving that. Mr. Cowhig thought it would encroach, but the applicant can answer that. Mr. Arnett stated whatever the site plan is, the proposed addition covers it up. Ms. Stringfield stated the shutters shown in the current garage, there is no knowledge whether there was shutters on the house. Mr. Cowhig responded there were shutters on the house and the owners took them off and stored them while making repairs but never put them back up. Ms. Stringfield asked if those were the originals. Mr. Cowhig believed so. Mr. Carter stated he is trying to figure out how the circular drive is going to keep them from having to back out on Bessemer. Discussion was held on backing out or being able to turn around. Mr. Carter asked regarding the garage and master bedroom addition, it looked to be an odd angle relative to the house and was he correct in thinking it was somewhat eccentric. Mr. Cowhig responded it would be a little out of character with siting of garages in the historic district in general, however the lot is angled and so limits what can be done.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Joe Bugni, 305 West Bessemer. Mr. Bugni advised he has lived in Greensboro previously from 2007 to 2017 in the Lake Jeanette area and when he had the opportunity to come back to Greensboro, wanted to live in Fisher Park. He stated this is not the best opportunity but is the one he has, and he is going to see this through as he absolutely loves this house. He feels it deserves to get back to the state and status that it was before, and he believes they can do that. Mr. Bugni stated the builder is here and the designer is on Face Time. The circular drive was thought of so he could back out without going into the street and then he would reverse in the circle drive as opposed to a turn around. Guests would have the opportunity to come in and go out in a forward fashion.

Mr. Bugni stated the reason for the angle in the back is to keep that addition behind the house to preserve the front structure as a barrier to what is going on behind it. The garage will be tucked behind there to appear as if it is still just a single car garage as opposed to a double garage. The front elevation should show that he is trying to keep the integrity of a garage that is in the back of the property, looks like a single garage and most of it is hidden by the structure itself.

The porches on the side he wants to match as closely as possible to keep them looking they way are. He loves them but they do need repairs and they want to try to get those back to looking better than currently. He thinks

enclosing the one on the left side will give them the symmetry they are looking for as far as balancing the structure. They are trying to get some sort of pleasing esthetic for the dormers at the top in the front of the house. Photographs displayed indicated it pulling forward and are very shallow. It would be the same shape, pulled forward slightly to give some coverage to the porch and are trying to match the dormers to tie them to the rest of the structure and demonstrate how it is coming together.

He has not seen pictures and would be interested in seeing the ones where there is a terrace across the front. Pictures were provided to the applicant. Mr. Cowhig advised it is low and hard to see. Mr. Bugni stated he does have a team that can do what they need to do to make sure that even though he has purchased an eyesore, he is not creating an eyesore for this neighborhood. He has a lot of trust in what his team can do. They have met with the neighborhood association earlier in the week and there were considerable concerns from the neighborhood association on a lot of the issues that have been gone through today. He thinks there will be things that will need adjustments, but this is the application as they have it today.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application.

Greg Seiffert, 523 Woodland. Mr. Seiffert stated he met Joe after the purchase of the home. In trying to figure out what to do in order to give him the things that he is looking for, he feels the design meets what they need. The issue is the shape of the lot. Where the current house sits on the lot, it is the biggest structure and has not been kept up at all. The saving grace of the house is it was made from terracotta because otherwise it would have been rotted out. Some of the neat features are the front door, the two side doors that flank the door and two small windows that flank the front door. They have met with Double Hung Windows about preserving those and are looking at a type of custom storm door to protect from weather once they are invested in getting them taking apart and put back together. They have all hand beveled glass, which is imperfect and gorgeous to look at. They are hoping with the storm doors get them in front of the weather. There is a lot of traffic and road noise on Bessemer and they are trying to buffer that to keep the house quieter. Another issue is the dormers are wood frame structures and must be stripped down. Inside the house there is a lot of visible signs of water damage and are going to have to peel the layers there. There is an arch over the front door they hope to mimic for the dormers.

Mr. Seiffert addressed the comment regarding the side porch and stated when it is closed it will keep the same consistency with the other side porch where there are three columns. Those types of details will be kept. In looking at the 20-foot setback he indicated a corner of the house that would be really close to it and there is not a lot of room to do anything. He looked at the house behind where they have a detached garage that is right on the property line and they have an enclosed sunroom on the back of their house. He measured it and it is approximately 12 - 13 feet from the property line.

Ms. Stringfield stated she hopes there can be a redesign. One of the things that has been suggested to make it straight, the back can be cut off to have a breezeway that would go to the addition on the back. She is not a designer but feels it should be redesigned so the garage is a separate entity. She understood wanting more room in the back of the house and understands that is a very peculiar lot but to have it approved it will have to be changed. She cannot imagine approving the circular drive in the front as the yard is small. Ms. Stringfield stated she also understood not wanting to back straight on to Bessemer Avenue as she backs straight on to Eugene Street. She appreciated staff showing the post card of another home very similar because she doesn't think quite as many arches need to be put on the front of the house. She understands the intent but doesn't think it's necessary to go that length of trying to match something that probably was never there. She understands the concerns and these are initial her thoughts.

Mr. Seiffert advised the garage is terracotta that is cracking and is falling apart. He stated there are shutters in the garage but does not want to go into the garage to get the shutters because it might collapse. Ms. Stringfield stated she did not have a problem with the demolition of that garage. The eyebrows on the front she feels is unnecessary and the driveway in the front she would have a hard time approving those even though she fully appreciates the intent.

Mr. Seiffert stated the other question is on the front porch where there is a current eyebrow, it only sticks out about 3 or 4 inches over the windows and then very little over the front door. They are looking to bring it out just a bit so when it does rain it won't be pressing on the door and the windows. Chair Wharton asked how far he thought that would go. Mr. Seiffert responded because of the terracotta, he needs to figure out how to anchor it and suspend it, so probably only 18 inches to 20 something inches at the most. There are some corbels on it right now and he would probably extend the corbels out.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the application.

Opposition Speakers:

Jim Holsch, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. Mr. Holsch stated they have the same concerns and that is why they are not supporting it. They did not feel they could support the proposal with the setbacks so radically different and they have not had that before. The circular drive is another of their concerns and the front view, the preservation of the historic view, and they are not in favor of that. They are appreciative of Joe being in the neighborhood and glad he is taking the attention that this house deserves. Chair Wharton asked if they are saying no to the setbacks, or the way the garage is angled, or the fact that it encroaches into the setbacks. Mr. Holsch responded it is the encroachment into the setbacks. Chair Wharton asked what the thought on the siting of the garage at an angle was. Mr. Holsch responded they did not have issues with that. They liked that it was angled, but their concern was the lack of setback. Chair Wharton asked if they received specific feedback from the rear neighbors saying they didn't want something that is sited. Mr. Holsch responded they did not. They were not aware of that and did not get information about that. Chair Wharton asked when he said the view, is he talking about the appearance of the house with the front. Mr. Holsch stated from the front. Chair Wharton asked if that included the eyebrow windows and if they are in favor to change the dormer from a shed roof to a curved roof. Mr. Holsch replied in looking at the book of The Valley of Greensboro Houses, it is in there and would be radically different than what they've seen. Chair Wharton asked if he would like to keep the original shed roof. Mr. Holsch responded they would like to keep the original roof.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to the application.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia. Ms. Pratt stated they are thrilled that Mr. Bugni has come to the neighborhood but are very concerned about changing the front facade of the house and stated it was in the book she handed to Mr. Arnett to look at the picture bookmarked. Mr. Pratt stated the Board itself and her personally are very concerned about the size and scope of the addition. It is a very strange lot but some of them are stuck with very strange small lots and would like to see the garage separated and perhaps something happening to where it is not running 3–5 feet from the property line. That is going from a 20-foot setback to a 5-foot setback and is a huge exception. It is covering a large portion of the lot with a building.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak in opposition. Mr. Michael Fuko-Rizzo asked if he could speak in support of suggestions. Chair Wharton stated there are several possible outcomes and invited Mr. Fuko-Rizzo to speak. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo was sworn to testify.

Mr. Michael Fuko-Rizzo, 301 Fisher Park Circle. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo stated he had looked at this property to purchase also. He stated there are a lot of cool architectural features there already and is wondering what the purpose is for some of the changes. He thinks the money that is being spent on some of these things could go to putting back an architectural roof or just changing roof lines. He had a question regarding the property itself and requested to go back to a photograph. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo indicated different ways on the drawing board that would allow enough room to back out and give the owner more space. Mr. Cowhig advised the doors are parallel with the left property line. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo stated he has never heard of a perpendicular square garage which is interesting, he never thought of something at an angle versus squared traditionally. Chair Wharton stated he does know of one garage that is configured the way. It was a new construction built in a historic district where the garage is configured the way that you just said so that you would come in make a right turn to go into the garage and there's a turnaround there. That's a possibility and is something that has been approved. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo stated there is a lot of room at the back of the house and it would be hidden.

A brief discussion was held between Mr. Seiffert and Mr. Fuko-Rizzo discussing the issue. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else to speak in opposition. Chair Wharton requested guidance from Counsel Jones regarding people speaking via Facetime and if they needed to be sworn in. Counsel Jones responded typically they must be sworn in but advised the Commissioners need to be able to observe their demeanor and judge the credibility. This is not typically acceptable in a quasi-judicial. Chair Wharton stated on advice from Counsel, they are not going to allow electronic testimony, but if they want to speak in rebuttal, please do so.

Rebuttal by Applicant:

Mr. Seiffert asked if they did an eyebrow over the center dormer only, would that be acceptable. Chair Wharton advised these things are going to be deliberated but right now they are not going to try to design the project. Mr.

Seiffert stated they were looking at the garage on the corner of Virginia and Bessemer which has an attached garage. They did consider designing a detached garage but would lose a lot of space which is why they attached it to the bedroom and don't go out further.

Discussion by Commissioners:

Chair Wharton suggested discussion be broken down into parts they could sign off on and parts that they cannot. Mr. Arnett stated he created a list broken down into things that could be decided today versus things that need further consideration. Things to be decided today were the demolition of the existing garage, the circular driveway, the repair to the enclosed porch on the right hand side of the house, the proposed enclosure of the porch on the left hand side, the extension of the hood over the front door, and the special exception to the setbacks. Things he felt needed further discussion was the design of the addition and the proposed changes to the dormers. Mr. Arnett spoke about the design of the addition and the issues associated with it. He pointed out part of the opposition was the garage being so close to the property line. If the garage was detached, depending on the height of the finished grade, it could potentially be allowed to be located as close as 3-feet to the property line as a detached structure. Chair Wharton walked through each item of the application to get feedback and a consensus from the Commissioners on what to approve and what to deny. Objections were raised to size and scale, the way the property is sited, and the setback. Discussion was also held on how to work with the applicant. The determination was made to approve some items and continue the remaining items. Items denied were the addition, the hood extension and the circular driveway. Items to approve were the demolition of the garage, repair to one porch, enclosure of the other porch.

Mr. Seiffert stated they will rework the design which will take some time. He feels it is imperative that they have guidance regarding if it's detached where can they go on the property. For the next 30 days until they can get approval, he would like to start the demo on the garage. Mr. Seiffert indicated the side porch and advised it is falling apart and needs to be torn down. They do want a partial approval and a partial denial. Mr. Seiffert indicated a tree that is right against the neighbor's garage and is leaning toward the house, close to his foundation. It has been looked at and is not very healthy, but it does need to come down.

Fact Finding:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2250 at the public hearing of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission, finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual, Design Guidelines regarding the demolition of the garage based on staff comments and the guidelines on page 76, the existing garage is not in a state that it can be safely repaired or salvaged. Second by Mr. Arneke. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Mr. Arnett moved for the new addition the Commission finds that the proposed addition is incongruous with the Design Guidelines, page 76, item 4, and does compromise the original structure. Second by Mr. Carter. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Mr. Arnett stated regarding the circular driveway, the Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the design with the Design Guidelines based on staff comments and the guideline number 3, when needed introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials, and design. Generally double width driveways and circular driveways are not appropriate. Second by Mr. Carter and Ms. Stringfield. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Mr. Arnett stated regarding the enclosure of the left side porch, the Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Design Guidelines, guideline number 7, because of their character and defining role it is not appropriate to enclose front porches, sided 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. Second by Mr. Carter. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Mr. Arnett stated regarding the repair of the right sided porch, the Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Design Guidelines based on staff comments and the guidelines.

Ms. Lane requested clarification as it is not repair but rebuild. Ms. Lane feels it is extreme to tear down and rebuild and asked if it has been looked at to the extreme and who is making that decision. Mr. Arnett responded

the testimony from the builder who has examined the project regarding the condition of the porch, the plan is to remove it, including the foundation because that area is also needed for site access during construction. They can ask about the foundation and if it is a condition that warrants a total rebuild. Ms. Lane stated she is concerned and feels other people should look at it before taking off one side of the house. Mr. Cowhig stated he has looked at it but did not look at the structure of it, but thinks it has settled and probably does have some structural issues. Counsel Jones advised if they feel they do not have enough information, that part of the application can be continued. Mr. Cowhig advised this house has suffered serious water damage over the years and there are aspects of it that have serious condition issues. Chair Wharton suggested to have the applicant speak on this issue and set the issue aside.

Mr. Arnett stated regarding the roofs of the shed doors that based upon the facts presented in the application, the Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Design Guidelines, retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks. Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original. Second by Mr. Carter. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Discussion ensued regarding the tree removal and options that can be implemented. Chair Wharton suggested a condition that an appropriate replacement tree should be chosen and sited with the advice of the City Arborist.

Chair Wharton asked Mr. Arnett if his finding of fact was not incongruous to remove this tree under guideline 2, on page 23. Second by Mr. Carter. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Discussion was held regarding the Special Exception. A question was asked if the applicants could receive guidance regarding the Special Exception and objections that were voiced by the Commissioners. Mr. Arnett feels denying the application, clearer guidance should be provided to the applicants. Chair Wharton stated Historic Preservation Commissioners are discouraged to do a Design by Commission and stated there have been many times they have approved Special Exceptions for these setbacks since they are traditional in these neighborhoods. His sense was they are not inclined to recommend this Special Exception because of the scale and siting of this design. Chair Wharton stated he has usually voted in favor of special exceptions and feels he could vote in favor of this one but feels they need to see another design. Mr. Arnett spoke about the criteria of variances for setbacks. Chair Wharton stated the objection is not to the idea of a Special Exception per se but to this site plan. Chair Wharton stated they need more information about the condition of the porch before deciding on it and asked the applicant if they can provide more detailed information. Mr. Cowhig stated he believed they are proposing to demo both porches on either side.

Mr. Seiffert advised the issue with the one side porch is the wall between the house and the porch is the block. The porch itself is a wood frame structure. There is not much framing, it is a bunch of windows that are poorly built. There are a few 2 x 4s in the corners and they're wrapped to look like columns. The issue is the roof above has been leaking for a long time and is causing separation. It is much easier to take it down and come back with new. The footings are not tied well to the existing structure. The new footings they would pour would be delved so everything will hold together. Mr. Seiffert spoke about a project like this one and set pretty much to the same situation. He feels he is well versed in what can be saved and what cannot be saved. Mr. Cowhig stated the railing will have to be new construction. Mr. Seiffert feels there are things that can be done design wise to make the new height not look so tall with the size of balustrades used and things like that.

Mr. Seiffert stated he would have to tear off the entire roof because all the wood framing is rotted which leaves him with the wall. All the windows must come out because they're not worth anything. The hardwood floors are buckled and the subfloor is rotted. Rain drips in whenever it rains but is futile to put a tarp over at this point. Chair Wharton confirmed with Ms. Lane if the explanation addressed her concerns.

Mr. Arnett move that based upon the facts in the application and the public hearing, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed rebuilding of the right-side porch is not incongruous with the Historic Program Manual and Guidelines. Second by Mr. Carter. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

Chair Wharton requested a motion to approve parts of the Certificate of Appropriateness and the rest will be denied.

Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission in part approves and in part does not approve application 2250 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greg Seiffert for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue. Specifically, they are approving the demolition of the garage, the removal of the tree, the enclosure of the porch on the left side of the house, and the rebuilding of the porch on the right side. Mr. Cowhig stated both porches are going to be demolished. Mr. Arneke stated the demolition and rebuilding of both porches, enclosing the one on the left and reconstructing as it is as close as possible the porch on the right. Those parts are approved.

Mr. Arneke stated they are not approving the change in the dormers, the addition of the master suite and two car garages, the circular drive and the changes to the hood over the door. A condition was added that the tree be replaced by a canopy tree in a size and location to be recommended by the City Arborist. Second by Ms. Stringfield. Board voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.) Chair Wharton stated it is partly approved and partly denied with conditions.

301 Fisher Park Circle – Recommendation on Application for Special Use Permit for Bed and Breakfast/Tourist Home (Favorable Recommendation)

Mr. Cowhig stated the City has received an application for a Special Use Permit for 301 Fisher Park Circle to be allowed to use the property as a bed and breakfast/tourist home. The Zoning Commission makes the decision but because it is in the Historic District it has been brought to the Commissioners for review.

Staff opinion feels the Commission should be deciding if this is consistent with the preservation of the house and staff thinks clearly it is. Mr. Cowhig spoke to other issues the Zoning Commission will deal with, but this Commission should deal with that question in that does this lend itself to the preservation of the structure.

Chair Wharton asked is their purview here has to do with the preservation of the structure, not whether they think it is a good idea to have a bed and breakfast in the neighborhood. Mr. Cowhig responded it is staff's opinion. Chair Wharton asked if the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the Zoning Commission to which Mr. Cowhig responded yes. Chair Wharton asked if staff is in favor for the Commission in making a positive recommendation to which Mr. Cowhig responded yes. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anybody present to speak in support of the recommendation.

Mr. Michael Fuko-Rizzo, 301 Fisher Park Circle. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo stated they are doing this to comply with an ordinance that doesn't exist yet regarding where it is rented Air B&B and VRBO. There are ways via the internet to rent it. They have met with every department. They have had a round table meeting. The only category this fits into is the bed and breakfast/tourist home which is fine to apply for and get that so there are not more questions about what they can or cannot do. The challenge with even that ordinance being applied is, for example, only allows one kitchen and historically believes their home has two. There is a debate whether the second kitchen is original to the home or not.

By applying for the permit in a house that is historic and protected inside and out, he is having challenges with his own home. He has an eight-bedroom home that only six guest rooms in a tourist bed and breakfast are allowed for. He is asking the Commissioners for advice on whether they should ask from a historic perspective conditions to be added and from a historic perspective should they say that the home has two kitchens and that the home is an 8-bedroom historic structure. He is asking the Commissioners from a historic perspective if he should be asking for those conditions because of the way the house is built.

A question was asked where the second kitchen is. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo replied the second kitchen is the butler pantry and pointed out various hidden places that were covered up for the show house. He stated in going to the Zoning Commission next month he wanted to ask if they could put in a condition and if this Commission supported that for documentation purposes because the permit then runs with the house. Once it is there, someone could run a bed and breakfast if that is the best way to preserve the home and he wants to make sure that it is properly documented.

Mr. Cowhig advised he thought it was just the opposite, that the permit was for him and if it was sold a Special Use Permit would no longer be good. He is not the authority on that. Counsel Jones stated a Special Use Permit would run with the land, unless there is temporal condition that it is good for five years or something like that. Typically, it runs with the land and can be passed from one owner to another.

Chair Wharton asked if his possible dilemma is he going to ask the Zoning Commission to give him use to a property that is sort of non-conforming with their standards of tourist homes currently and he wants the

Commission to decide to recommend that be done in spite of the obstacles he is facing in terms of the number of bedrooms and kitchens. Mr. Fuko-Rizzo stated simply for historic purposes, yes. He talked to Mr. Kirkman about this, it went into legal review and then here based on what Mr. Kirkman said to him. Counsel Jones clarified for Mr. Fuko-Rizzo that he is required to make a recommendation on any Special Use Permit for property located in the historic district. There are two things being talked about. A bed and breakfast in a residentially zoned district requires a Special Use Permit. She thought what Mr. Fuko-Rizzo was bringing up now about the kitchen are new standards in the Land Development Ordinance specific to bed and breakfasts and those would require variances from the Board of Adjustment. She stated he may have another step and stated variances from the Board of Adjustment would come back to the Historic Preservation Commission for a recommendation. Counsel Jones stated if the Commission has an opinion on it, it would probably expedite things to not have it come back again if it is determined that variances are needed.

Chair Wharton stated their determination is going to be whether this use is conducive to historic preservation and they could make that recommendation both for the Zoning Commission and the Board of Adjustment in terms of a special use permit.

Mr. Fuko-Rizzo asked if he was going in the right order. Should he not go to the Board of Adjustment before Zoning. Counsel Jones advised he needs the use to be approved first and if he can't meet certain criteria that goes with that use, then he would need to get a variance after that. She thinks he is going in the right order which is why he hasn't been told certain things. It becomes a non-conforming structure to that particular use. It is her understanding the two kitchens are not non-conforming right now because it was built that way. It's complicated with a lot of moving parts.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone who wanted to speak either in support or opposition.

Jim Holsch, 812 Olive Street. Mr. Holsch advised the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association does support what Michael and the crew are doing. Chair Wharton asked they support the use including the non-conforming use. Mr. Holsch responded yes.

Chair Wharton inquired if there anyone else who wished to speak on this.

Ms. Karen Anderson, 402 Fisher Park Circle. Ms. Anderson asked if once you have non-conforming permit, does it just non-conform you for those issues or is an open-door non-conforming. Counsel Jones responded in this particular situation she did not believe the house itself now be non-conforming but in changing the use from a purely residential use to a bed and breakfast or what is called a tourist home which has commercial aspects to it, it may become non-conforming to the standards that apply to that particular status as opposed to a bed and breakfast being built new and meeting all of the standards. It could also be non-conforming with setbacks and other aspects. That decision would only be with respect to the bed and breakfast/tourist home use. Ms. Anderson asked does non-conforming has special parameters. Counsel Jones responded you can be a non-conforming structure, you can have a non-conforming use, you can be non-conforming to a lot dimension. Non-conformities are different, complex, and you can have a structure that is located within the setbacks but has a perfectly acceptable use or you can have a perfectly acceptable structure that has a non-conforming use that is not allowed in that zoning district or a combination of all of those.

Mr. Arnett asked if what is proposed is a use that doesn't conform with the property's current zoning. Counsel Jones responded you are allowed to ask for Special Use Permit in order to allow this use in a residential district but this use has its own set of use requirements where there is a limit on the number of rooms and the owner or operator has to occupy it, where parking might be. Not unlike other uses that have specific standards that go just with those uses. Once the use is approved, then you must see if the structure and its operation can meet those standards. Mr. Arnett asked if this is part of the process and Zoning says this use could be allowed with its permit. Counsel Jones stated as opposed to tourist homes in a multi-family residential district are allowed as a blight and you wouldn't need the Special Use Permit. Mr. Carter stated what is being talked about is very specific regarding the use of the property for a bed and breakfast, not for anything else.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak. No one came forward.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton inquired if the Commissioners were in favor of this recommendation. Ms. Stringfield stated she is generally in favor. She advised Ms. Hodierne who is a member of this Commission but was not present at this meeting did a good job writing an article for their neighborhood newsletter where people were concerned about

this. Ms. Stringfield wanted the Commission to understand some of these things that she wrote and read the items regarding the tourist home designation restrictions and the guideline standards. Ms. Stringfield referenced the bedroom limitation of six guest rooms. Counsel Jones stated it is not really a condition because it is a requirement but if they wanted to use more, they would have to ask for a variance to increase the number of bedrooms. It would not be easy to enforce by the city. Ms. Stringfield these are the current standards the City of Greensboro Tourist Home has in place and Ms. Hodieme was sharing these same platforms for lodging which are not held to the same standards as hotels and can raise concerns about who might be using these lodging options. These are concerns for the permanent residents who live next door, day in and day out, and to be aware. Ms. Stringfield feels it is important to be aware of these things, in particular the Greensboro standards for tourist homes.

Chair Wharton stated the request is to make a recommendation to the Greensboro Zoning Commission and possibly a recommendation variance to the Board of Adjustment. The idea is to keep this as a use that is more compatible with a residential zoning district then becoming an inn or an event center where the entire building is being used for many people or large gatherings.

Chair Wharton stated they are all in favor of recommending this to the Zoning Commission to say that this use is compatible with the Historic Preservation Program. Chair Wharton requested for a motion. Mr. Arneke stated so moved. Second by Mr. Carter. The Board voted to approve the recommendation 6-0. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.)

ITEMS FROM CHAIR:

There were no items from the Chair.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

No items from staff.

SPEAKERS FROM AUDIENCE:

No speakers were present

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Carter to adjourn the meeting. Second by Mr. Arnett. The Board voted to adjourn. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Stringfield, Arnett, Carter. Nays: none.) The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

May 29, 2019

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, May 29, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair David Wharton (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Ann Stringfield (At Large, Fisher Park), Linda Lane (Fisher Park), Amanda Hodierne (Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (At Large, Green Valley), and Max Carter (New Garden). Chair Wharton inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications and meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. Mr. Cowhig responded they were.

STAFF PRESENT:

Staff present were Mike Cowhig, Stefan Lieh Geary, Planning Department, Andrew Kelly, City Attorney.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

No adjustments were made to the agenda. Mr. Cowhig advised Evagelia Eustathiou is present. After the Certificates of Appropriateness meeting, there are issues to be discussed regarding her project and there is an item from the Planning Department.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed. Chair Wharton advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission. No Commissioners had a conflict of interest and no Commissioners discussed applications prior to the meeting.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig advised Wayne Smith was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (February 27, 2019 and April 24, 2019) (Approved)

Mr. Arneke made a motion to approve the February and April minutes as amended, second by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted to approve 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter, Arnett, and Hodierne. Nays: 0.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS: (Approved with Conditions)

3a. 2261 305 W. Bessemer Avenue.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Cowhig advised this application is for work at 305 W. Bessemer Avenue in the Fisher Park Historic District. He reminded at the last meeting the applicants were here and the Commission reviewed a prior application. The Commission approved several but not all of the work. They are here now with a new application with changes in bringing the work closer to what the guidelines state and what the Commission recommended. Mr. Cowhig recapped the Commission approving the removal, demolition of the garage, demolition of all the porches in preparation to rebuild those and approved removal of a tree that would have prevented access for the construction work. Mr. Cowhig walked the Commission through the drawings of the proposed changes. He stated the left porch has been removed and will be replaced with a sunroom on the same footprint and the sunroom's exterior door will be eliminated. The footprint of the garage has been changed as the front wall is parallel with the house. The roof line will be preserved. Indicated the addition of shutters on the home. Photos were shown indicating the elevation of the house and depicting the work that has been done. Mr. Cowhig pointed out the right porch had an entrance on the front which will be eliminated. Photos indicated the left side elevation depicting how the addition will connect with the house. Mr. Cowhig stated it appears to be detached from the house but will be

part of the addition. Mr. Cowhig stated the issue of setbacks needs to be clarified today as he is not certain they meet the zoning setback requirements. A question for the applicants today is if a Special Exception will be needed. Existing floor plans were shown to the Commission. Mr. Cowhig advised the circular driveway has been eliminated. The left side porch will have all new materials. The columns supporting the porch will be eliminated and stated it may be something to pin down as to how it will be executed. Mr. Cowhig stated staff feels the fenestration on the house is a character defining feature and there is cohesiveness with the casement windows, double windows and double doors. Mr. Cowhig reiterated the guidelines regarding porches. Mr. Cowhig stated the windows that were replaced they are strongly encouraging consideration be given to replacing them with windows that match the original. Some recommendations are to move the entrance door from the side of the left side porch to the front elevation and retain the entrance door in the sunroom as they feel it works together on the house. Staff recommends considering authentic true divided light windows for the porches as opposed to simulated. Recommended consideration be given to reconstructing the masonry terrace. Mr. Cowhig stated basically they are very pleased with the changes the applicant has made.

Ms. Lane stated she has very detailed questions but perhaps that should be part of conditions. Mr. Cowhig responded he felt the applicant may have to answer to clarify. Ms. Lane stated she feels it is a nice transition from the first presentation and there is a lot to work with. Ms. Lane asked if all existing roof lines are remaining. Mr. Cowhig responded it is a point for the clarification. Ms. Lane asked except for the new portion. Mr. Cowhig responded that was correct. Ms. Lane asked if the openings currently existing for doors and windows will be retained. Mr. Cowhig responded that is his understanding except for the change on the right porch. Ms. Lane stated she noticed the door on the left porch was not symmetrical originally and now changed to a new opening on the left side. She asked if that door and window would be as exact as possible to other doors and windows. Mr. Cowhig replied that was his understanding, but it is a point for clarification. Ms. Lane asked if they will have input on the shutter design as to functionality. Mr. Cowhig responded there are existing shutters there that can be used as a model. Ms. Lane stated to retain their function because of the hinge pins. Mr. Cowhig stated they would want to make sure they are designed to fit and not ornamental or just attached to the wall. They need to be attached in the same fashion as workable shutters. Ms. Lane asked if the skin of the house on the new part will match the front so the total exterior of the house will be the same material. Mr. Cowhig responded that was his understanding. Ms. Lane asked if there was any discussion on roof samples at this time. Mr. Cowhig responded not at this point. Ms. Lane stated she would like to see more details when appropriate on the breezeway. She thinks the columns in the drawing are very simplistic and there may be more details put forth and the design of the shed looks a little out of character to the overall feel of the property and is something to investigate with more detail.

Ms. Stringfield stated looking at the drawings there was fencing and asked if it was in the application or will it be dealt with later. Mr. Cowhig responded fencing will be dealt with later. Ms. Hodierne asked since the side porches are being demolished and will be rebuilt, will the upper story railings be up to current code. Mr. Cowhig responded it will meet current code. He stated because there are doors, the roof is accessible. If there were no doors, they would not have to meet the current code but since there are doors, they do have to meet the current code. Ms. Hodierne asked what that is versus what it looks like now. Mr. Cowhig responded he believes it is 36 inches. Mr. Arnett advised that was correct. Ms. Hodierne asked what it might be now. Mr. Arnett thought possibly 24. Ms. Stringfield asked Mr. Cowhig if there was any concern from staff about ~~being~~ there not being any window openings on the part of the porch addition that would face the new back deck. It was determined that would be a question for the applicants. Chair Lester asked if there was anyone to speak in support of the application

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Joe Bugni, 305 West Bessemer. Mr. Bugni stated they listened to everything discussed the last time and thanked the Commission for all the detail. He stated the front elevation should be almost exactly like the pictures seen. Mr. Bugni stated the arches or anything previously planned to be changed, is not being done and will be consistent with what was shared previously. Mr. Bugni stated they met with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association the past Monday. They are in support with a recommendation that it would be a detached garage as opposed to attached. The designer and the builder are present. They have been working on the same footprint and flipping the inside from left to right and all around again but believe they have an option that can be detached which would make the Neighborhood Association much happier. He stated the detail questions he would like for Kevin Transue, the designer, to answer.

Kevin Transue, Kansas City. Mr. Transue stated they are focusing on the detached garage. Images were displayed for the Commissioners to view. He stated in moving the walls, they were able to have a detached garage. In order to provide a space for the planned new addition and the attached garage with a reasonable amount of space for the interior of the detached garage they are asking that the 5-foot separation of the buildings be shortened to 4 and they can cheat the property line on the left side 1-foot. That is the only difference from an architectural standpoint on the front of the building other than in the previous version where the garage was attached all the way through, a wall was angled to follow the proposed setback line and meet the building structure. It is not necessary now and works better for the interior if it is just squared off. Stated he created an arbor that provides a nice detail between the two structures and is not serving any purpose as far as keeping the rain off his head, it is there for aesthetics. They had looked at several arbors in the Fisher Park area and the different styles and opportunities used to create that look. Mr. Transue stated in the design he had submitted and presented by Mr. Cowhig was still showing everything as a detached structure and they were still playing with the concept of a two-story structure on the back side. The current version on the back line has been brought forward from the property line and is only taking advantage of a small amount of space upstairs to increase the size of the bedrooms. By doing that the second bedroom is up over the new addition backwards by about 6 to 10-feet.

Ms. Lane asked what dimension of the garage is in the footprint. Mr. Transue responded he believes it is 26-feet and the interior space is about 14-feet. Ms. Lane asked to have him elaborate on what the thoughts are on the windows in the upper level. Mr. Transue stated it was brought up if the openings were changing and advised the front of the structure is devoid of personality without the shutters. He depicted a drawing where shutters were put on where it appeared there had been shutters previously. He decreased the width of the side dorm windows approximately 6 inches, giving an extra 3 inches to each shutter for better balance and a more realistic shutter. Ms. Lane asked in casement versus double hung, what is happening on the triple window as it looks like it is a simple picture window which is not original. Mr. Transue stated all three of the dormers have the European style window and was replaced at some point in time. They are not original and he does not have knowledge of what it was previously. The first floor was beveled glass and they wish to retain the beauty of them. The windows on the second floor are casement style windows and he did not know if the dividers present were consistent from the start or not but will maintain whatever the Commission would like.

Mr. Cowhig stated what they understood is the two smaller dormer windows are double casement windows and as such there is a consistency with the double French doors and double hung door and feels it is a character defining feature. Mr. Transue stated what he was trying to show was the size of the opening with shutters. He picked whatever default window was in there. He is happy to do whatever. Ms. Lane asked what he thought about regarding the middle section on the triple window as it exists. Mr. Transue stated if he was designing the center window and it was operable and desired to be operable, he would design it with an awning style because of the weight and size but there is no need for it. The windows above can remain operable for air flow. Mr. Cowhig stated the three-part window was removed and replaced with windows that had interior grids and the grids are gone. Mr. Arnett asked if the windows in the side dormers also were not original. Mr. Cowhig responded they may not be original, but they are double casement windows. They match the look of the double French doors on the lower level. Agreed it appears similar in design. The window will be replaced regardless of the design. Mr. Transue stated the windows there currently are not the originals and in various states of disarray. He would prefer something consistent with the structure, the split casement and the divided light is even better.

Chair Wharton asked if he was thinking of narrowing the side dormers. Mr. Transue responded the dormers themselves, no. He is just trying to make the shutters fit. Chair Wharton stated for himself it is hard to figure out what the masking of the house will look like since it was going to be a attached garage and has shifted to the other side of the house and is hard to see what the roof lines will look like and it is something they definitely have to consider. Mr. Transue stated he has everything on the computer that he can show. The roof line is consistent with what was presented the last time other than the separation of the two structures. The shed roof is the only thing not consistent with the 12 pitch front and back or the 8 pitch in the other parts, because in order for the shed roof to work and not interfere with the appearance of the left side balustrade on the deck, on the second floor, he wanted to keep the roof line below the point of the deck interaction. So, when looking through the balustrade on the second floor, you are not seeing a roof there.

Ms. Lane asked if there would be more detailed drawings at that point or make it part of the conditions that the details would be presented for staff and if necessary, come forward to the Commission. Ms. Geary asked if the applicants were withdrawing the design plans that were submitted with the Certificate of Appropriateness and putting this new design as the one for the Commission to review or are they asking for both to be considered. Mr.

Transue speaking on behalf of Mr. Bugni, they have tried to listen to everyone and make whatever changes they can in order to give Mr. Bugni the nicest house possible but live up to everyone else's desires. They thought they had done that with what was submitted but the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association said they liked everything but would like to see what they could do with a detached garage. They worked on that and produced the other two drawings. He would like consideration of either one but the intent is to not upset the homeowners and so they will go with the detached garage. Ms. Geary stated she thought that was one of the reasons why they're not seeing the detail. The information pulled up in the email was new as they were trying to be responsive to the neighborhood's considerations and was the reason why the Commission is not seeing that level of detail.

Chair Wharton stated they appreciate they are sensitive to both the Commission and the Neighborhood Association, but it is tough for them to do due diligence on a project of this size unless they have a detailed plan of what it is being approved. Mr. Transue asked if it would be reasonable to request what is submitted but when the permit is submitted, they will turn it in as a separate structure. Ms. Geary stated it could not be done because a permit would not be issued if it is not on the Certificate of Appropriateness. Chair Wharton stated the property owners have been very cooperative and good natured and is not their desire to put the brakes on this process. They do like to speed it along as best they can and the applicants co-operating with the Neighborhood Association is great. The Commission has certain requirements in terms of what needs to be submitted and approved. They require a more detailed plan in order to approve that. They can approve what has been submitted with the application, but it doesn't sound like it is what the homeowner wants to do. Mr. Transue asked about the timeframe in-between because he can generate in 10 minutes the PDF to send back to them. Chair Wharton asked Ms. Jones about taking a recess and allowing him to present detailed drawings. He would be willing to consider that if the other Commissioners agreed with that action. Ms. Jones advised they could recess or conduct their other business and resume. Mr. Transue asked what they are looking for that he can provide. Chair Wharton suggested elevation drawings like those already submitted. He felt the Commission would be able to work with that and perhaps place conditions on the details. He does feel they need the measured drawings indicating the roofing lines. Mr. Arnett stated he would like to know which preferred alternative is being used. Is the one in the packet the preferred alternative and the detached option is a Plan B because of the neighborhood feedback or is that option being discarded and they are only considering the detached. Mr. Bugni responded there is very little difference between Option A and Option B. Option B being the detached garage which he would prefer to submit for the neighborhood and the Commission.

Ms. Hoderne referred to the SV1 drawing submitted in their packet and asked what the hatched gray area is. Mr. Transue responded it is the decking at the step-down level and is the flooring. Ms. Hoderne asked where are the stairs to the left leading to. Mr. Transue responded it is the egress staircase going down into the new foundation underneath the addition. Mr. Arnett asked how much of that would change under the detached option. Mr. Transue replied it is the same. He indicated on the diagram how the change came about. He took the space for the pedestrian entrance into the garage and used it for the separation space. Stated the garage and the car is the same. He only used the pedestrian portion where trash cans were going to be stored and used it for the separation space. The side of the building is the same, structure and footprint is the same except he removed the clip on the back corner as it wasn't necessary. Ms. Hoderne asked if he knew what the rear setback is. Mr. Transue referenced a dashed line on the diagram away from the fence with Xs, the dash line toward the house is a 3-foot setback line and along the driveway is another 3-foot setback line. The property line that matches the survey point, they differ by 3. Ms. Hoderne asked if the setback off the rear property is 3-feet. Mr. Transue responded to that point of the garage, yes. Ms. Geary stated they would need a Special Exception for that piece. The new design between the house and the garage must have a 5-foot separation between the buildings. Ms. Hoderne stated she has counted three variances and asked if there were any utility easements back there that would need to be released. Mr. Transue responded there are none shown on the survey. Mr. Arnett believes that the allowed setback for a detached structure is 3-feet. There would be two exceptions for the side setback and the exception to the building separation, but the rear setback would be okay if it's detached. Ms. Geary felt the 3-feet depended on the size of the accessory structure as related to the main line. Ms. Hoderne asked if it was less than 15-feet. Mr. Transue responded it is 14-feet, 9 inches.

Ms. Hoderne advised they will decide and will need to go before the Board of Adjustment for other decisions which will be a different case with a set of circumstances they consider and if that did not work out, it would be back before the Zoning. Mr. Transue asked what is necessary for him to do to have this be the last meeting. Ms. Hoderne responded it is not possible and advised of the Board of Adjustment requirements. Ms. Geary stated because of the lot constraints, they would need a Special Exception for either of the plans with the encroachment

into the setback and the separation between the buildings. This will not be the last meeting unless a break is taken and comes back with a revised plan.

Mr. Arnett stated at the last meeting it was proposed extending the hood over the front door and is that still part of the proposal. Mr. Transue responded it is not. The front is the same, other than the additional of the dormers and replacement of windows that need to be done. Ms. Stringfield spoke to her concern over lack of a permeable surface and hoped the applicant is thinking of how water diversion will be done if there is a heavy rain season.

Chair Wharton asked if there was a motion to table this item. Mr. Arnett so moved, second by Mr. Arneke. Board voted to approve 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter, Arnett, and Hodierne. Nays: 0.)

3b. 2242 106 E. Bessemer Avenue. (Approved with Conditions)

Mr. Cowhig advised this is for a construction of accessibility ramp. Pictures were displayed of the home. Mr. Cowhig stated a ramp was approved in the same location for this house a few years back. The ramp was constructed to provide access on this commercial property. The previous ramp was removed and rebuilt with this current one. He thought they felt it was approved once and so can be built again. Technically, a building permit is required for a ramp. It would need to be inspected and a new COA submitted. Staff feels if the ramp was modified it probably would meet the guidelines but should be painted and the handrail modified to be like the porch handrail. Mr. Cowhig read the guidelines for safety and codes, **Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.** In this case, the primary entrance to the house is in the front and the ramp accesses the front of the property. **Construct fire exits, stairs, landings and ramps, in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.** Mr. Cowhig stated they put the original railing back up when the ramp was removed. **Design and construct new fire exits, stairs, landings, to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure and introduce reversible features to assist a person with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished and historic features are not damaged.** Staff is recommending Condition 1, the ramp be painted or stained, and the rail be modified to be closer to the design of the front porch rail.

Chair Wharton asked if there were any questions for staff. Mr. Arneke asked is there was a plan and if they were talking about just rebuilding as it was. Mr. Cowhig responded it is as built. Ms. Lane inquired if they had gotten a building inspection or permit. Mr. Cowhig responded they did not. He thinks it is exactly in the same location as the ramp approved by the Commission. Ms. Lane asked if it was not permitted, how would they know if it was built properly with the footings and so on. Mr. Cowhig responded it would need to be inspected. Chair Wharton asked regarding the original porch railings, what style were the pickets. Mr. Cowhig responded the boards for the hand railing are like the porch railing. They are somewhat flat and not a typical railing. Chair Wharton asked if there was any type of beading detail. Mr. Cowhig responded the pickets are just flat board. Chair Wharton stated the porch railing has trim pieces at the top and bottom and then a broader cap and asked if that is being recommended. Mr. Cowhig stated that is what staff would recommend. Chair Wharton asked if they are recommending for the railing to be painted white like the porch railing or something else. Mr. Cowhig responded it was something to think about and discuss. Ms. Lane stated they do not have control over color but would like to have the whole ramp minimized and recommended it be stained dark and referred to a previous house on Elm. Chair Wharton stated they don't normally regulate paint colors on houses but in this instance, he felt it would be within their authority to minimize its impact. Mr. Carter asked if landscaping could be recommended such as tall bushes. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Karen Anderson, 402 Fisher Park Circle. Representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. Ms. Anderson stated their Board voted in support of the recommendation but are asking for the ramp be painted white to match the rest of the porch railing. Indicated the portable railing that is natural wood and would like to recommend it be painted to match the other railing. It is a wooden rail for the pet. The whole front would then be consistent.

Ms. Hodierne asked if that was within the scope. Ms. Geary stated it is like a baby gate and might be taken under consideration but under the Historic District Design Guidelines and the Ordinance, the Commission can only govern permanent changes. Ms. Geary stated she can certainly ask for it to be painted but the Commission does not have the authority to require them to paint it.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked for anyone to speak in opposition. No one came forward.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arneke stated he thought the staff recommendation of modifying the railing and painting it a darker color would minimize the impact and liked the landscape suggestion by Mr. Carter. He would be in favor of painting or staining the entire ramp and railings a darker color. He feels painting it white would be better than leaving natural but feels a darker color would make it stand out less. Ms. Geary referred the Board to the **Guidelines, page 69** indicating a painted ramp for examples and reference. Mr. Arnett stated he was good with the conditions as worded by staff, that the ramp be painted or stained and not be more specific than that. Chair Wharton asked if the Commission is in favor of the staff condition that it be painted or stained and their proposed condition that it be made to look more like original portrayal. A discussion ensued regarding the type of landscaping Mr. Carter had suggested. Ms. Geary suggested consulting with the staff architect landscaper.

Ms. Stringfield moved that based the facts presented in application 2242 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the historic district program manual and design guidelines and that the staff comments and the guidelines under Safety and Code Requirements, page 70, numbers 1-4 are acceptable as findings of fact. Second by Ms. Hodierne. The Commission voted to approve the finding of fact 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Arnett, Carter, Hodierne. Nays: 0.)

Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application 2242 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Applicant Hollyn Essa for work at 106 E. Bessemer Avenue with the following conditions:

1. That the handicapped ramp be painted or stained.
2. That the ramps railing be modified to be closer to the design of the front porch railing with final approval by the Historic District staff.
3. Minor landscaping of the front edge of the top ramp landing with approval by City Historic District staff.

Second by Ms. Lane. Commission voted to approve the COA 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter, Arnett, and Hodierne. Nays: 0)

Chair Wharton stated the applicant from item A has not yet returned and moved on to items from the Planning Department.

ITEMS FROM CHAIR:

None

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Mr. Cowhig reminded the Commission of the approval of an entrance at 820 Spring Garden Street for Evagelia Eustathiou at a previous meeting. The selection of the door was up to Evagelia to present to staff for approval. Mr. Cowhig advised the door decided on as the most reasonable was a four-panel door, made of smooth fiberglass which closely resembles wood. There is no glass in the panel because obtaining fire rated glass would be cost prohibitive. Staff has found a door that is four panels typical of door styles of the era of this house. Stated Ms. Eustathiou has been looking and pricing doors and has learned the price of that door is very expensive and would like to address the Commission about that issue. She prefers a six-panel door, a typical colonial door. Mr. Cowhig is not sure how much it matters at this point for that entrance or how different it will look compared to the panel arrangement that was recommended. Mr. Arnett asked what is the material of the proposed six panel door. Mr. Cowhig stated what is shown is metal and they want to see smooth fiber glass. Mr. Cowhig feels the material is more important at this point.

Ms. Jones advised this has not been advertised as a public hearing and is not quasi-judicial and did not know if final action could be done as it was not advertised. Mr. Cowhig advised he told Ms. Eustathiou that he was hesitant to approve it on his own without the Commission at least being aware of it. Ms. Jones stated it was her understanding the neighborhood was not notified of this either. Chair Wharton stated it would be advisory and will give advice on what they feel would be the correct decision, but the decision would be up to staff. Ms. Lane asked is there any ability to create a panel design superficially to the door so it can be whatever is decided to be more

appropriate as this is only aesthetics at this point. Mr. Cowhig responded he thought it may be possible. Ms. Lane added it would just be an applied molding. Ms. Geary stated one of the reasons they haven't done that is typically it is recessed into the door to obtain that detailing but could be done. Chair Wharton stated there are drawings in the guidelines for different styles of doors. Chair Wharton asked for staff opinion on the style of this house. Mr. Cowhig advised this is a Late Victorian style house. Ms. Geary advised to keep in mind this is a side entry and would be more of a utilitarian style whereas the ones on **page 61 in the guidelines** would be more for a front formal entrance.

Ms. Hoderne stated she was struggling with this procedurally as the Board made a decision that is not being met. Shouldn't she come back and ask for an amendment to what was approved. Ms. Jones stated it was delegated to staff and if staff denies it, it comes back as a public hearing. If staff approves it, it's approved but Mr. Cowhig has some reservations about approving this item. Today all that can be done is to provide Mr. Cowhig with advice on how to proceed.

Ms. Evagelia Eustathiou, 820 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Eustathiou stated she does not have any drawings with her. She stated the difference is four panels versus six panels. She stated the six panel can be obtained in metal and fiberglass. The four panel is available as a special order which makes the difference. Ms. Eustathiou provided quotes from New Home Building Supply. She has gone to three different places. New Home Building Supply provided a price for the six panel and it can be metal or fiberglass. The four panel is different as it is unusual and significantly more expensive whether it is metal or fiberglass and would be a special order with an additional charge resulting in more than double the price. She is asking for the six panel to be approved. The design is similar except for the two smaller panels on top. It can be fiberglass or metal. She stated BMC told her they had the four panel in the past but there was not much demand and it was dropped. New Builders Supplies can only order with a significant price.

Mr. Carter asked if the six panel were horizontal or vertical. Mr. Cowhig responded they are vertical. Ms. Eustathiou stated they are like the four panels.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton asked for opinions and recommendation to staff. Mr. Arneke stated the difference between four panels and six panels would be insignificant and has no strong feelings either way. A consensus was made for a six-panel fiberglass door. Chair Wharton stated the recommendation is to allow the six-panel door in fiberglass which was confirmed by Ms. Eustathiou. Chair Wharton inquired if there were any objections regarding the recommendation. There were no objections.

Chair Wharton advised they are returning to application 2261 as the applicant has returned.

3a. 2261 305 W. Bessemer Avenue.

Kevin Transue, Kansas City. Mr. Transue stated he regenerated plan sets with new imagery. Presented images reflecting a 3-D perspective and they are the same views with new architectural design. Mr. Transue walked through the new imagery photographs and explained the changes made to the Board. Indicated the setbacks by dashes on the diagram and discussed how they would be affected and showed the new roofline. Mr. Transue displayed views previously shown with the survey overlay and the different structures to the garage.

Ms. Lane requested to go to EL2 and asked if in haste a window was dropped out. Mr. Transue responded it was. Ms. Lane asked where the chimney is and confirmed it was not being touched. Mr. Transue advised it was dropped out. The chimney is in the same spot and nothing will be done to it. Mr. Carter was wondering how insistent Fisher Park Board was regarding the detached garage as he likes the roof line with the attached garage more. Mr. Transue advised he is good either way. Chair Wharton confirmed the detached drawing is the one they are voting on with the owner of the home.

Chair Wharton thanked Mr. Transue and inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Karen Anderson, 402 Fisher Park Circle. Representing Fisher Park Neighborhood Board and stated they are in support,

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired if anyone was present to speak in opposition to the application.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:

Tracy Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street. Mr. Pratt has a different interpretation of the Design Guidelines than what was previously presented. He stated some comments may not be entirely accurate or appropriate based on the design being changed at the last minute. He felt it was presumptuous of the applicant to present an alternative design at the hearing and expect the Board to approve and vote on something with not enough time to fully review.

Mr. Pratt stated there are three main points he feels are not being complied with. First is the garage. Historically garages in the historic neighborhoods were small and detached in the back corner of lots. He referenced **guideline 3 on page 36 of the manual regarding the size and scale of garages and accessory structures**. He feels the guideline addresses the garage being attached to the addition. It has been separated with the latest design but still attached. Feels the setbacks are there for a reason and does not see the city granting a variance as they are usually for hardships. Mr. Pratt feels this is a self-imposed hardship in trying to build a large addition where there isn't room to do it. Mr. Pratt was unaware both porches would be demolished and rebuilt. The open porch will now be enclosed and feels that significantly alters the appearance of the porch **per guideline number 7 on page 64**. He stated a sunroom implies it will be a glass enclosure this proposed design appears to be much opaquer eliminating the architectural columns and entablatures. There are significant original details that should not be removed or eliminated and feels that takes away from the uniqueness of the house. The last item being addressed is the size of the addition. He stated the latest design submitted is smaller, but still has a major impact on the property as it is still over the required setbacks. Stated the owner knew the size of the lot when purchased and is trying to almost double the size of the footprint. He understood accessory structures had to be 15-feet from the main structure and they are proposing 4-feet. It would need a reduction in the side yard setback. Mr. Pratt feels this design will significantly impact the character of the house and does not feel the design is compatible with the Design Guidelines. Stated if the COA is granted, it will set a negative and detrimental precedent for the neighborhood. Mr. Pratt urged the Commission to deny the COA.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any questions for Mr. Pratt. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition. No one came forward. Chair Wharton advised the applicant can rebut testimony made in opposition. The applicant declined the opportunity.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton stated the statement regarding columns and entablatures is something that can be addressed in the conditions in terms of reconstructing those items. The detailing of the two side porches was discussed and if the plans submitted showed enough level of detail for the columns and the renovations. The columns were discussed being rebuilt on the porches and the level of detail. Ms. Lane felt the drawings need much more detail and suggested a general condition be that doors, windows, additions and elevation need to be further examined by the Commission or staff. The placement of doors was discussed. Windows replacement and casement was discussed. Conditions to be added to the COA were discussed. Mr. Carter noted his preference to not have a door in the side porch and did not feel five entrances to the front were needed. The consensus of the Board was they did not have enough information regarding detailing on the porches, columns, or windows.

Mr. Arnett asked Ms. Jones what specific language the Board of Adjustment would be looking at in this case for the variance being granted. Ms. Jones responded it was not her understanding it is a variance but is a Special Exception and would need to look it up. Ms. Geary stated it was her understanding it is a Special Exception to better meet the requirements of the Historic District Guidelines. She stated she reached out to a staff member regarding setback requirements and has a document which states it is a 5-foot setback requirement between accessory dwellings smaller than 600 square feet and the main building. Larger than 600 square feet it would be a 10-foot setback and 3-foot from the rear end side property line as earlier discussed. Chair Wharton stated he is thinking of a continuance so the applicants could provide a more detailed diagram and asked for a consensus from the Board. Mr. Arnett would be in favor of a continuance. Ms. Stringfield is in support of the new design and referenced **page 75 of the manual** which stated, additions that radically change the portion of the built area to the green area on the site are not appropriate. **Guidelines for additions, number 4, states limit the size and scale of the additions, so the integrity of the original structure is not compromised**. She is very impressed with the design but is concerned with the size at the back of the building and would like it lessened. Ms. Stringfield is concerned about the size and what is happening in the back of the building. She would not mind a continuance. Chair Wharton asked Ms. Jones if they would need the permission of the applicant to have a continuance. Ms.

Jones responded there is a new submittal today and they would have 120 days from today as this is not what was in the original application advertised. Ms. Jones asked if they wanted an answer on the Special Exception. Mr. Arnett felt it would be helpful to know the criteria for the applicant and the Commission. Ms. Jones read Part 1 is all street setbacks, interior setbacks, building coverage and height requirements shall comply with the applicable zoning regulations unless a Special Exception is approved the Board of Adjustment. The Special Exception may be approved only if the Historic Preservation Commission finds that granting such an exception meets the intent of the Historic District Program and Manual Guidelines and makes a recommendation for approval. Then the Board of Adjustment may only grant a Special Exception if the evidence presented by the applicant persuades it to reach of the following conclusions, the Special Exception is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Land Development Ordinance and preserves its spirit. The granting of the Special Exception assures the public safety and welfare and does substantial justice. Chair Wharton asked if that is what the applicants would be up for in terms of making their case to the BOA, not to them. Ms. Jones responded that was correct. If it is not recommended by the Historic Commission, they cannot go to the Board of Adjustment.

Amanda Hodierne left the meeting already in progress at 6:01 p.m.

Chair Wharton stated he thought it was highly unlikely they would approve the COA and not make a recommendation to the BOA. They would need to consider if the Special Exception met the intent of the guidelines in making that recommendation. Ms. Lane asked if they vote on that, must it be unanimous or can be the majority. Ms. Jones replied a simply majority and noted for the record Ms. Hodierne was not excused and would be an affirmative vote.

A discussion ensued regarding thoughts about the application and whether it should be continued. Consensus by the Commission was more detail was needed regarding the porches and opening. Ms. Stringfield stated this is one the most unusual and unique lot shapes in the neighborhood and is challenging. The house is also very unique. Mr. Arneke is in favor of approving the application and asked if it could be approved with conditions. Ms. Lane was in favor of approving the application with conditions. Chair Wharton asked the applicant would they be able to move forward if parts were approved and had to come back with detailed plans or would it not make any difference to continue it.

Mr. Transue stated the concerns regarding the porch and the windows can be easily addressed. He is willing to design a new porch identical to what was already there. The illusion of the columns sitting on newels can be done by either running the posts clear through making it appear they are sitting on a Newel or can build it as columns running full height. The two porches were not the same. One was on Newels, one was sitting on full structure. Either one would come out beautiful when completed. The window sizes, placement, type, height from ceiling, height from the floor are identical to what was already on the enclosed porch on the right side. The detailing regarding the columns will be identical to what was there. He feels from a text standpoint, everything could be referenced with all of the information stated.

Chair Wharton asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Transue. There were none. Chair Wharton stated he is persuaded that these issues can be handled through conditions. Ms. Stringfield asked if the deck is also being approved on the back. Chair Wharton responded it is part of the application, yes. Ms. Geary stated the deck can be approved at staff level and does not need to be included. It could be added as a condition. Chair Wharton stated the finding of fact is first. If they find this is generally not incongruous and then after will do conditions to be included in the motion.

FINDING OF FACT:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2261 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. **Guidelines regarding porches are in 62, windows and doors, page 55, additions on page 75, entrances and balconies on page 62** are acceptable as finding of fact. Second by Mr. Arneke. Ms. Stringfield asked if they were approving the fences. Ms. Geary responded that is staff level. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the finding of fact. (Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter, and Arnett. Nays, 0).

DISCUSSION:

Conditions were discussed to be part of the motion. Concerns regarding columns, newels and entablatures was heavily discussed. Window concerns were addressed and side dormers were discussed. Twin casement being

preserved was requested and to retain double casement windows with simulated or true divided light. ~~W~~ It was suggested the details of the windows and doors be submitted to staff. Mr. Arnett felt it would be more appropriate to see more detailed plans at the next meeting instead of the Commission dictating the details. He personally would like to review a more detailed submission and then discuss the merits. Window openings and the elevation issues were further discussed. Original details were further discussed. Ms. Lane suggested the shutter design be approved either by the Commission or at staff level. Ms. Geary advised it was stated to replicate the original. Ms. Stringfield felt the shutters could be replicated. Ms. Stringfield asked if anyone on the Commission would support a reduction in the size of the back deck to be approved by city staff. She referred to the mass of the structure and the impermeable surface on the small piece of land. Chair Wharton stated he did not think the deck was an impermeable surface as water goes through and goes into the ground. Mr. Arnett asked Ms. Jones if the Special Exception recommendation a part of the approval for the COA or is it separate. Ms. Jones responded it is usually a separate motion and vote.

Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2261 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joe Bugni for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue with the following conditions entered by David Wharton.

1. The appearance of the right porch in terms of the wall, columns, and the entablatures be identical to the original documentation and that the appearance of the left porch include the columns and entablatures that go down to the foundation and the enclosure otherwise adheres to the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. There is no requirement for door openings on either of the porches on the front and side elevations but should adhere to the architectural drawings.
2. The windows in the front dormer be double casement windows with either true or simulated divided light.
3. The original window opening sizes be retained.
4. The shutter design should replicate exactly the design, materials, and size of the original shutters.
5. The window openings on the addition be congruent in size and design with the windows on the house and to be approved by city staff.
6. If a door is added on the rear elevation it is to be approved by staff.

Chair Wharton asked for any further discussion. No further discussion. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion with conditions. (Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter, and Arnett. Nays; 0).

Chair Wharton inquired on how many Special Exceptions were being recommended. Ms. Geary stated she thought they could do a general Special Exception. A Special Exception is needed for the setback between the buildings. Mr. Arnett thought any overhanging elements must be at least 3-feet from the property line. Ms. Jones suggested a recommendation to any necessary Special Exceptions based on the plans submitted at this meeting. Chair Wharton stated they would be recommending to be in favor of any Special Exceptions that would be required based upon the application given to them today because they find that the application meets the intent of the guidelines. Chair Wharton asked if there was someone to make that motion. Mr. Arneke so moved, second by Mr. Carter. No further discussion. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the special recommendation. (Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter, and Arnett. Nays; 0).

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIR:

There were no items.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Ms. Geary presented the guidelines and code of conduct adopted by City Counsel with changes to attendance and punctuality, code of conduct, communication and personal data. Ms. Geary detailed each of the specific changes in the Commission Guidelines handbook and in the Code of Conduct and addressed any concerns. Ms. Geary specified this handbook was only for the Historic Preservation Commission. She thanked each of the Commissioners for their service and assured them there have been no problems with the Commission.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

A motion was made by Mr. Carter to adjourn the meeting, second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to adjourn. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Stringfield, Arneke, Lane, Carter and Arnett. Nays; 0). The meeting was adjourned at 6:57p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

July 31, 2019

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Vice Chair David Arneke (College Hill), Ann Stringfield (At Large, Fisher Park), Amanda Hoderne (Fisher Park), Linda Lane (Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (At Large, Green Valley), and Max Carter (New Garden).

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications and meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. All responded they had.

Vice Chair Arneke advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission. No Commissioners had a conflict of interest and no Commissioners discussed applications prior to the meeting. Mr. Cowhig responded they were.

STAFF PRESENT:

Staff present were Mike Cowhig, Stefan Lieh Geary, Planning Department, Terri Jones, City Attorney.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

No adjustments were made to the agenda.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed. Vice Chair Arneke advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig advised Wayne Smith and David Wharton were excused absences. Ms. Jones asked if they were sick. Mr. Cowhig advised Mr. Wharton was on vacation and Mr. Smith is sick. Ms. Jones stated under the new attendance policy vacation is not an excused absence and that there may be 3 in a calendar year. Mr. Wharton's absence was amended to unexcused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (May 29, 2019) (Approved)

Ms. Hoderne made a motion to approve the May minutes as amended and submitted, second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hoderne, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

3a.1110 W. McGee Street. (Approved with Conditions)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application was originally a request to construct a railing in the front porch which has been withdrawn due to the restrictions of the code. This request is only to relocate the existing driveway currently on the right side of the property, to the left side of the house as there is more room on the left side. Mr. Cowhig showed a rendering of where the driveway will be located on the left side and provided a picture of a deck located in the back of the house which has been approved at staff level. Staff feels relocating the driveway would be consistent with the guidelines but does feel the existing apron and curb cut should be removed and the existing curb should be reconstructed. Mr. Arneke inquired if it was granite, to which Mr. Cowhig responded it is concrete. Mr. Cowhig advised the applicants have gone with a monolithic curb in an attempt to make it compatible. Staff does feel the existing apron should be removed and the curb put back and that it does meet the guidelines. The new driveway will be constructed with concrete, wide enough for a single vehicle, and will lead from the street

directly to the side of the property. The other projects can be approved at the staff level. Mr. Cowhig referred to the guidelines on page 30 for the need of driveways and walkways compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials, and design. Generally, double width and circular driveways are not appropriate. Construct new driveways and walkways in locations that require a minimum of alterations to the historic site features such as landscaping, retaining walls, curves, and sidewalks. Usually driveways should lead directly to the rear of the building and the walkways should lead directly to the front steps and select appropriate paving materials, including concrete, concrete strips, tracks, McAdam brick, and pressed stone. Staff does recommend that the curbing be put back in the opening and that a canopy tree be started where the original driveway is currently located to offset the removal of vegetation elsewhere on the property as part of the new driveway location.

Mr. Arnett asked if the 16-foot dimension is the side of the driveway or the distance from the house to the property. Mr. Cowhig responded he assumed it was the distance from the property line to the house. Mr. Carter asked how much vegetation would have to be removed for the new driveway. A photograph was projected indicating how close the oak tree was. Staff would recommend that care be taken to ensure the tree is not harmed while doing the work. Ms. Hodierne asked if there was a survey submitted. Mr. Cowhig responded staff does not have a survey but would be a question for the applicant. Ms. Lane stated she did not feel any excavation would impair the roots. Ms. Lane asked if it was permitted. Mr. Cowhig responded a permit is required for new driveways and the City has standards for driveways. Ms. Stringfield asked if the back deck was approved after the fact. Mr. Cowhig responded it was.

Chair Arneke asked if there was anyone speaking in support.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Anthony and Lee Meley, 6204 Ricotta Drive, Summerfield. Ms. Meley stated based on the photograph depicted, there is no vegetation. It is overgrowth. Mr. Meley stated there were two reasons why they wanted to place the driveway on the left as it is wider to get to the backyard and on the right the fence is close to the home. Ms. Meley stated it is only 10 feet from the house and with a car it is very hard to get through. A passenger would need to exit the car where the apron is located. The other side is 16-feet. The vegetation would be trimmed back and will not rip up any roots or other vegetation. No trees will be taken down. They are moving an air conditioning unit to the back which will add privacy as there is a natural landscape barrier.

Chair Arneke asked what the design of the building will be. Ms. Meley stated they will go with the Board's recommendation. Ms. Hodierne asked if they were planning any connection for the front porch or walkway from the driveway. Mr. Meley responded they will make a walkway and indicated on the photograph where it would be. Mr. Meley stated no one has lived in this home for a long and it is very hard to tell what the pavement was made of and indicated on the photograph where it was dirt. They will have a walkway from the driveway to the steps. Ms. Geary advised the walkway is not on the application and they would need a COA before replacing the walkway. Ms. Lane asked if the existing old one would be usable if lifted and moved to the other side. Ms. Meley responded it is regular square concrete stones and not slate or anything like that. They have saved them and if they are usable and will make the house look more original, they will definitely use them. Mr. Cowhig stated McGee Street does not have sidewalks and ordinarily the walkway would come out to the sidewalk but there is no sidewalk. Stated staff would want to know where the ACHC unit would be relocated to and should be in an inconspicuous location. Ms. Meley stated she has asked for it be behind the house. Mr. Cowhig stated he felt it would be a good idea when the apron will be built to have the City arborist look at the property and advise of the best approach for minimal damage to the tree. Ms. Stringfield asked if it was suggested the tree be planted on the right side, would the applicants be opposed to that, to which they responded they were not opposed to the suggestion.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor or opposition to the application. No response. Mr. Cowhig advised the Commission that he had received an email in support of the application from the Neighborhood Association and that they did want the other driveway apron eliminated as mentioned by staff. Vice Chair Arneke asked Mr. Cowhig if a curb by the apron would be done by the City or by the property owner would have to do. Mr. Cowhig believed it would be the property owners' responsibility but would need to be verified.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based on the facts presented in application 2274 and the public hearing, the Greensboro's Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program and Manual and Design Guidelines, staff comments, and the following guidelines under **Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways, and Parking, page 30, numbers 3 through 5** are acceptable as findings of fact. Second by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierno, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

Vice Chair Arneke asked if there were conditions to be added. Mr. Arnett stated the conditions mentioned in staff comments and with the addition of his suggestion that the City Arborist be involved in the selection and caring of the roots of the existing tree. Ms. Jones stated approval is delegated to the City Arborist who will make a recommendation. Ms. Geary stated typically when there is a condition that a new tree be planted, it is dealing with the removal of a healthy tree and usually it is stipulated that it needs to be 2-inches diameter at breast height. She did include that as part of the condition because there is no healthy tree that is being removed. She stated it would be up to the Commission to decide on the 2-inch, but very likely what the Arborist would recommend as that standard came from him.

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions, application 2274, and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant Lee Meley for work at 1110 West McGee Street with the following conditions:

1. Remove the existing driveway including the driveway apron
2. Seed the driveway with grass.
3. The addition of a canopy tree, approved by the City Arborist where the original driveway was located, right of the house.
4. Protect the left front street side tree as best as possible when installing the new driveway.
5. A new concrete driveway be added to the left of the house, along with a concrete apron and curbing matching the original.

Discussion was held regarding if a type of driveway material type condition should be specified. The Commissioners generally felt it was not needed.

Vice Chair Arneke requested a second. Second by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierno, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

3a. 108 Fisher Park Circle. (Approved with Conditions)**DESCRIPTION:**

Mr. Cowhig advised the Commission this is for work at 108 Fisher Park Circle in the Fisher Park Historic District. There are two items. One is for an enclosed side porch and the other is replacement of a balustrade on the rooftop of the porch. Plans and elevations indicating the projects were provided. The balustrade is very unusual and staff is not sure if the existing balustrade is an original but believes it is from 1982. The balustrade is in very bad condition and is unlike any other balustrade staff has seen in the neighborhood. The house is a Prairie style home but has classical porch columns. Staff does feel it is likely it is the original railing and to put something more typical of this type for the house would be reasonable. Ms. Geary added she did research trying to find examples of the louver and a shuttered railing, and was unable to find any examples of that to establish some type of architectural significance. Staff also reached out the State Historical Preservation office but have not heard back.

Ms. Lane asked if the new balustrade code height of 36 inches applied. Mr. Cowhig responded it is staff's understanding it would need to be 32 inches if it is accessible. There is a doorway leading out and if that is a working doorway and is actually used, it would have to be code height. If the door was sealed and inaccessible, they could build in and match the existing height. Ms. Lane inquired who would make that determination. Mr. Cowhig responded the Building Inspector would make that determination. Vice Chair Arneke asked if it could be repaired. Mr. Cowhig responded it could be repaired without a COA. Discussion ensued regarding repair versus replacement. Mr. Cowhig stated it is unknown what the existing height of the railing is, but staff feels if it can be worked out, the new design of the railing would meet the guidelines. Mr. Cowhig referred to the **Guidelines on Porches, page 64. Because of their character as a defining role 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. Staff does not feel it will result in loss of any architectural details. Staff would recommend as a condition either wood, or clad divided light windows and doors be used in the porch enclosure. Mr. Cowhig stated the clad material that is painted will probably last longer than wood simulated divided light. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there were further questions for staff. Ms. Stringfield asked by clad, what cladding material did that mean. Mr. Cowhig responded aluminum or vinyl. He stated vinyl clad windows appear to be painted. Mr. Arnett stated compared to a true vinyl window, it looks better and feels the bigger consideration is the way divided lights are treated and with clad windows there are options with vinyl or fiberglass.

Vice Chair Arneke asked if there were any other questions for staff. No further questions. Vice Chair Arneke asked for anyone speaking in favor of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Scott Richardson, General Contractor, 440 Carefree Lane, Stokesdale and Kyle Schwarz, 5402 Blue Heron Drive. Mr. Richardson stated they would like to demolish the existing rail as it is falling apart and there are some pipe concerns. Mr. Richardson indicated in a photograph one rail that he stated had about a foot of drop inside the roof. He indicated the shortest point of 29 inches on the railing. He did not know if the Chief Building Inspector would allow it to be repaired or make esthetic changes to how it looks and still call it a repair. They hope to be able to rebuild at the same height and in the style indicated with composite materials that would be painted white and would not distinguishable if was wood or vinyl. It will be per Mr. Sheffield's request for what will be done. Mr. Richardson referred to the screened porch area, and stated it will have casement windows, door, simulated divided light and there would be a mutton glue to the exterior of the glass and wooden glue. Between the multi panes of glass, a shadow bar would be installed that would allow it to appear as two separate panes and not a single pane window. They would prefer most of the building to be composite which will be painted and when installed, very difficult to tell whether it is wood or not.

Mr. Cowhig stated the composite material referenced is a wood-based product that has resins. Mr. Richardson stated there are two choices. One is resin product much like Trex or PVC. PVC comes in a 1 x 6-foot board, the same as a wooden 6x1 board, cut and installed with the same fasteners, painted the same way and unless cut into you can not tell the difference. Mr. Cowhig stated the plastic really does not look like plastic at all. Mr. Cowhig stated staff's experience with the Redevelopment Program has been that some of the new wood has not held up to standard. Ms. Lane asked if there were any pictures of the existing sunroom. Mr. Richardson referred to a picture indicating three panels with the door in the middle, a screened in door. Ms. Hodierna asked if everything being proposed on the side elevation is currently screened. Mr. Richardson responded yes and to the back side which will look just like the front porch. Ms. Stringfield asked if there was any evidence at the top of the upstairs balustrade that a former balustrade used to be there, any shadow lines. Mr. Richardson responded they have not seen them yet but have not taken the rotten piece apart. Research has been done and they have not been able to locate a match. A brief discussion was held regarding the types of clad. Mr. Cowhig advised he thought aluminum clad has been approved. He stated they have seen vinyl clad that has looked very good and have seen wood windows. The windows would have to be made of good quality wood and are available. Mr. Richardson stated because of the exposure of the windows, they would prefer to put in vinyl clad window. Chair Cowhig stated the most important thing is getting the mutton size in profile that will be as close to the original as possible and the closer to the original mutton, the better.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there were any other questions for the applicant. No further questions. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the application.

Jim Holsch, 812 Olive Street. A member of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. Mr. Holsch stated the documents were reviewed and the Association supports the request.

Vice Chair Arneke asked if there were any questions. No further questions. Vice Chair asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition of the request. No one came forward.

DISCUSSION:

The general consensus of the Board was for clad simulated divided light windows painted resulting in being indistinguishable from wood.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 2281, in the public hearing, **the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, staff comments and Guidelines, page 64, 2, 4, and 7 are acceptable as finding of fact.** Second by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

Ms. Lane therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application Number 2281 to Jennifer Schwarz for work at 108 Fisher Park Circle, Greensboro, NC. The recommended conditions are"

1. Wood or clad simulated divided light windows and doors will be used.

Second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

3.c. 909 North Elm Street. (Approved with Conditions)**DESCRIPTION:**

Mr. Cowhig stated this house was acquired by the Preservation Greensboro's Development Fund approximately 3 years ago and had been on the market for a long time and actively deteriorating. The house was sold and the purchaser did quite a bit of work, sold it and the new owners took the work to the next level. This is a beautiful house once again. The applicants would like to add shutters on the front of the house. Mr. Cowhig stated **the Shutter Guidelines say window shutters should be used and designed to fit the window opening and attached to the window casing, shutters should only be introduced when historically appropriate to the architecture of the building or when it has been documented that shutters are on the building. Aluminum or vinyl shutters attached to the side of the building are inappropriate.** Mr. Cowhig stated in the early 20th century houses, shutters were used more for decorative purposes than for functional purposes. The shutters are usually on selective windows typical of houses in the district. Mr. Cowhig stated if they're used decoratively, it would be appropriate for this house and to use guidelines in terms of fitting the opening and attached to the casing and not the wall, using traditional shutter hardware. Staff stated how nice it would be to restore the rooftop balustrade, which was one of the losses when the house was owned by someone who did not do any type of maintenance for decades and the balustrade disappeared. Staff heard that it was being stored in the basement but that was untrue. Staff supports this proposal. Vice Chair Arneke asked was it the four windows across the second floor. Mr. Cowhig responded that was his understanding. It is four shutters for two windows on the application.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Shelly Segal, 1 Staunton Court. Ms. Segal stated this is her husband's office building and when purchased, they noticed the balustrade was missing and the beveled glass was missing in the front. There were some indigenous features that were missing. She has been trying to find squirrel or regular shutters and is open to any recommendations the Commission has. She is a fan of old wood and stated if there is someone who can design something that is a period piece she would be interested as she prefers period materials. She will discuss the balustrade types with her husband. Different materials were discussed for the balustrade. Ms. Segal stated she has spoken to the former owners who provided pictures depicting the home. Mr. Cowhig stated the applicant has done a fantastic job. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if the shutters would be on the two windows at the end or all four windows. Ms. Segal responded she would prefer all four but will take the Commission's recommendations. Ms. Segal stated she wants to have the shutters done the way it was done. Ms. Lane stated if there were to be a pair of shutters on both, they would overlap and has seen where there is a single shutter over each window and they open back which might be the scale issues here if the appropriate size of the shutter touched the other shutter on the interior. Ms. Lane stated maybe they overlap, maybe they don't. Ms. Segal asked if there was someone that could be referred to her and they could design it to the Commission's specifications, she would welcome that. Vice Chair Arneke asked if it would be a single shutter on the outside of the casement that would cover each window. Ms. Lane stated as far as making a decorative feature maybe the safest thing would be to do the simple divided louver approach so that it would a rail in the middle. There are examples in the guidelines. Cutouts were

discussed. Ms. Segal asked if there was a name the Commission could recommend for this work. Ms. Segal stated someone removed a lot of the bevel glass out of the house. It was missing from the china cabinet. The transoms are there but the beveled glass was missing and she has been trying to find something to replace it with.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there were any other questions for the applicant. No further questions. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application.

Jim Holsch, 812 Olive Street. Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board. Mr. Holsch stated the Board has reviewed and approve the application.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was anyone in opposition. No one came forward. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was any discussion by the Commissioners. No discussion was held.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 2282 and the hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines, staff comments, and the following guidelines under **Windows and Doors, page 58, number 7** are acceptable as a finding of fact. Second by Ms. Hoderne. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hoderne, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

Mr. Arnett therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application Number 2282 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Shelly Segal for work at 909 North Elm Street with the following conditions:

1. That the shutters be wood and sized to the opening and attached to the casing with traditional shutter hardware.

Second by Ms. Hoderne The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hoderne, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

Chair Arneke stated the public hearing was closed.

ITEMS FROM CHAIR:

Vice Chair Arneke stated for anyone that has not received their City ID to please obtain that at the Washington Street entrance. He also stated the Commission will probably be receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City within the next year or so possibly to pave Edgar Street in College Hill for the first time and stated there was about 70 % in support as there are some issues to resolve such as traffic.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Mr. Cowhig presented a brochure on the Guilford College New Garden Heritage Community. Mr. Cowhig stated this Commission was the producer of the Heritage Community Program and it is to recognize areas like Guilford College, New Garden and College Grove that are historic and very important to the city but does not meet the criteria to be listed on the National Register. Guilford College is on the National Register but the larger area is not but is very historic.

Mr. Carter stated Mr. Cowhig did an amazing job with research, photography, and input.

DISCUSSION:

The Commission discussed the historical significance and impact historically.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

Vice Chair Arneke advised with nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

August 28, 2019

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, August 28, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Vice Chair David Arneke (College Hill), Ann Stringfield (At Large, Fisher Park), Linda Lane (Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (At Large, Green Valley), Amanda Hodierne (Fisher Park), and Max Carter (New Garden).

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriation (COA) applications and meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. All responded yes.

Vice Chair Arneke advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest or discussed applications prior to the meeting. All responded they had no conflicts of interest and had no discussions regarding applications.

STAFF PRESENT:

Staff present were Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Terri Jones, City Attorney.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

No adjustments were made to the agenda.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary advised David Wharton was an unexcused absence. Wayne Smith is an excused absence. Ms. Geary stated Mr. Smith's term expired August 15. She has reached out to him to determine if he wanted to formally resign. Ms. Geary stated the way it is written, Commissioners serve until a replacement is made but are not obligated to do that. Ms. Geary stated Mr. Smith has asked for medical excuse for the last few months. A new member has been appointed by Sharon Hightower who was not able to attend this meeting. Staff will be meeting with her in another week.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (July 31, 2019) (Approved)

Mr. Carter made a motion to approve the July minutes as amended and submitted, second by Ms. Hodierne. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hodierne, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Application #2287 3a.126 S. Mendenhall Street. (Approved with Conditions)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig advised this application is to remove an American Holly tree at 126 South Mendenhall Street. Mr. Cowhig stated when staff receives a COA application and there is any question whatsoever about the condition of the tree, the City arborist, Judson Clinton, is requested to look at it and advise staff. Mr. Clinton did look at this tree and feels the tree is healthy and because of that, staff cannot approve its removal and it has to come before the Commission. The tree is very close to the house. One of the leaders is aimed toward the house and if it fell would hit the house. This is a tree that has been there for a long time and is healthy. Staff is recommending against approval but acknowledge there may be extenuating circumstances involved. Mr. Cowhig advised they have talked to the next door neighbor who also is concerned about the tree and would like to see it removed.

Vice Chair Arenke inquired if there were any questions for staff. Ms. Stringfield asked in the discussions with Judson Clinton, did he speak about removing one of the two leader trunks. Mr. Cowhig stated that is a possibility. It is questionable about what will be left when it is removed. Mr. Arnett inquired if the homeowner has had any other arborists look at the tree as the application implies a threat and the arborist finds it to be a healthy tree. Mr. Cowhig stated he believed the applicant has. Mr. Carter asked if trimming or pruning was addressed with the arborist. Mr. Cowhig stated Mr. Clinton did not mention that as a possibility and normally he would say this tree could stand some corrective pruning. Mr. Cowhig advised this is a very narrow lot and very little room between the house and the property line.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there were any more questions of staff. No further questions. Vice Chair inquired if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Becky Brown, 126 South Mendenhall. Ms. Brown stated this holly tree does not go dormant and is constantly shedding and filling up the gutter system. Ms. Brown provided pictures of the soffits depicting the damage being done to the gutter system. Ms. Brown stated this tree has two leaders growing. One going to the neighbor's house, Dr. John, and one to her home. They are not sure who really owns the tree but have decided to split the cost as they don't know. Nobody wants to go through the trouble of finding out and they are good neighbors. All of the older soffit boards will need to be replaced. This issue continues to get worse by the clogging of gutters. The tree limbs hit the windows and scrape the windows and side of the house. She has to go upstairs and hang out of a window with a blower once a week to clean the gutters. Ms. Brown had an arborist look at the tree who stated that the root system is shallow and because it is leaning toward the house a lot of damage could be done if a big storm were to happen. There is approximately 15 feet between their homes. Ms. Brown stated they do not like to cut down trees but this tree is going to be a major problem. Ms. Brown stated both houses are affected by this tree and if strong storms continue, the tree will fall on something. No one is in opposition to taking the tree down. Ms. Brown stated they have talked to 3 arborists and all said the tree needs to come down before it damages her home or the neighbor's home. Ms. Brown advised her neighbor wants to continue his fence once the tree is removed.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired of any questions for the applicant. Ms. Stringfield clarified if the neighbor wanted the tree to stay. Mr. Cowhig stated the neighbor wants it taken down. Ms. Brown stated they both do and will split the cost as they don't know who owns the tree. Mr. Carter asked if there was an estimation on how old the tree was. Ms. Brown responded it is not as old as the house but she does not know for sure. Ms. Stringfield asked if there was a place on her property for an approved size replacement tree. Ms. Brown stated she did not think there would be room for a replacement tree. Ms. Brown indicated on a photograph where the other side are bush tree types and advised they have a lot of trees. Ms. Brown stressed her neighbor wants to extend their fence. Ms. Brown stated they talked to 3 different tree men who stated the tree needs to come down before it damages her or her neighbor's home.

Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there were any additional questions for the applicant. No further questions. Vice Chair Arneke inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition. No one came forward. Vice Chair Arneke requested discussion.

DISCUSSION:

All of the Commissioners were sympathetic to the issues being caused by the tree. Mr. Arnett stated the Guidelines for Trees and Landscaping on page 23, number 1, retaining mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district. It did not appear that this tree, even though it is large and mature, is not a character contributing tree and because of its location it is not critical to the character of the neighborhood. Most of the Commissioners were in favor to have the tree removed. Ms. Lane was in favor to save the tree. She would rather see a serious pruning to give more air space and would not vote to take it down. Ms. Lane stated she would rather err on the side of serious pruning and have the applicant back in a year to see what has happened with the tree.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in the application 2287 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic

District Program Manual, Design Guidelines, and that the following guidelines, on page 23, retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district are acceptable as a finding of fact.

Second by Ms. Hodierna. The Commission voted to approve 5-1. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierna, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: Lane)

Vice Chair Arneke stated what was heard from Ms. Geary was a possible condition for the City Arborist to determine whether there is an appropriate place on the property for a new canopy tree to be placed. Ms. Stringfield stated she would not necessarily recommend it had to be canopy tree and to let the arborist decide.

Mr. Arnett therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application number 2287 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Catherine Brokaw for work at 126 South Mendenhall Street with the following condition.

1. That the property owner consult with City Staff on the appropriateness of adding a replacement tree somewhere on the property.

Second by Ms. Hodierna. The Commission voted to approve 5-1. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierna, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: Lane.)

Application #2289 3a. 818 Walker Street. (Denied)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this property is located on Walker Avenue in the College Hill Historic District and the applicants have submitted an application to construct a carport in the rear of the lot. Mr. Cowhig showed images depicting the property and how the carport would be difficult to see from the street. The purpose of the structure is to protect vehicles from things that fall from the trees as there are a lot of trees there and this is their solution to that problem. They do not want to build a garage or a carport and presented a photograph of a structure of what the applicants feel would protect the vehicles. It does not look like a historic structure. Mr. Cowhig and Ms. Geary visited the property and spoke to the property owners. There are very tall fences back there and the structure would not be visible from other properties. There currently is a storage shed to the right. A photograph was shown indicating where the slab is located. Staff feels given its very open design, it will not be visible from anywhere in the historic district and doesn't know if it has any visual impact on the character of the historic district. If you walk back there, you will see it, but if passing by on the sidewalk you would have to stand right at the driveway to look back and see it. Mr. Cowhig stated staff does support the application because they feel the visual impact on the property in the historic district will be minimal because of its location on the property and its open design with no walls. The proposed structure will address a practical need to protect the vehicles. It is not a structure designed to be similar to the historic house. Mr. Cowhig stated there are a lot of things within historic districts that are allowed because they meet a practical need and that is to have them in an inconspicuous location as possible. **The guidelines on page 36, say design new garages and out buildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot or a materially designed using existing historic out buildings in the district as an example. Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so the integrity of the original structure or the size of the existing lot is not compromised or significantly diminished. New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the center line of the house.**

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Mr. Cowhig stated the applicants were on vacation and is why they are not here.

DISCUSSION:

Discussion was held regarding the visual impact and design being located within the historic district community. Everyone felt it was very creative but not a good fit within the community.

Mr. Arnett referenced the **guidelines, page 36, 2, design of garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design using existing outbuildings as an example, and 5b, it is not appropriate to use these prefabricated metal accessory structures in the historic district.** Mr. Arnett stated for him, the guidelines could not be any clearer on this particular proposal.

Ms. Geary asked if the applicants were to propose something similar with a center structural piece and more of a flat roof that came out, if that would be something to consider. Ms. Geary feels the applicants were trying to avoid the creation of a structure. Ms. Lane stated the design could be achieved in the intent of a traditional car

protector. Vice Chair Arneke suggested a structure with four columns and a shed roof. Ms. Geary stated she was thinking of a wood roof that had a center beam and wings that came out but didn't have the modern arc. Ms. Stringfield addressed caution with the topography and the trees currently there. Ms. Lane stated it did not matter where the structure is placed, it only needs to be more sensitive to the house.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based on the facts presented in application 2289 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District per the Manual and Design Guidelines, staff comments, and the guidelines under Garages and Accessories Structures, page 36, numbers 2 and 5b are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Lane Hodierna, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0.)

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application 2289 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant Adriene L. Wagner for work at 818 Walker Avenue.

Second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to deny the application. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierna, Lane, Arnett, and Carter. Nays: 0).

Mr. Cowhig stated he was concerned with applicants' absence but will advise them that he did not think it would have mattered.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Vice Chair Arneke stated Preservation Greensboro will hold an open house at the Christian Advocate Publishing Company on Friendly Avenue on September 25. All are welcome to attend. The Preservation Greensboro Development Fund are seeking a tenant for that building. The Masons will continue to own it but they are willing to do a ground lease agreement for a tenant there.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Mr. Cowhig stated the City received a grant award from the State Historic Preservation office to conduct a survey of African/American heritage resources. The first year will focus on the Benbow Park area because all of the mid-century modern architecture is located there. They want it to be a community-oriented project where the community is involved and suggested the Historic Preservation Commission take on a role in the project. Staff does expect it to be more than just an architectural survey. It will be a comprehensive project to identify African/American resources throughout the community and will be phased over two or more years. Mr. Cowhig advised the grant was for \$12,000. They will hire an architectural historian to conduct the survey of that general area probably in the fall sometime. The new member, Ms. Stanbeck, lives in the Benbow Park area and staff is excited to have her on the committee.

Ms. Geary stated she has sent emails regarding training on September 20 to everyone. Ms. Geary thanked Ms. Stringfield for attending a training session the past week. Ms. Stringfield stated part of the training was to remind Historic Preservation Commissioners that the Commission can apply for money from the State Historic Preservation Office for grants to do projects that might help the communities and encourage Commissions to think about projects doing unusual things for grants.

Ms. Jones stated the Zoning Commission denied the tourist home application of the Julian Price Hillside House and is tentatively scheduled to be heard in the Superior Court for Guilford County on October 7.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

Mr. Carter moved to adjourn the meeting. Second by Mr. Arnett. (Ayes: Vice Chair Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hodierna, Arnett, and Carter. Nays 0). The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 25, 2019**

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, September 25, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair David Wharton (Fisher Park), David Arneke (College Hill), Ann Stringfield (At Large, Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (At Large, Green Valley), and Amanda Hodierne (Fisher Park).

Chair Wharton inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications and meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. All responded yes.

Chair Wharton advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission. Chair Wharton inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest or discussed applications prior to the meeting. All responded they had no conflicts of interest and had no discussions regarding applications.

STAFF PRESENT:

Staff present were Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Terri Jones, City Attorney.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

No adjustments were made to the agenda.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary advised Linda Lane and Max Carter were unexcused absences.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (August 28, 2019) (Approved)

Ms. Stringfield made a motion to approve the August minutes as amended and submitted, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierne, and Arnett. Nays: 0).

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Application #2298 3a.1014 N. Eugene Street. (Approved)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for work at 1014 N. Eugene Street involving quite a bit of landscaping and site work, rebuilding the front stoop which would be replacing the existing steps, with the steps going up in front of the house. There will be construction of a retaining wall, a landing beside the driveway to be done in pavers, a brick patio in the back, fencing, and other site work. Mr. Cowhig advised the rear yard landscaping can be approved at staff level. Mr. Kantlehner provided a large-scale drawing of the plans. Mr. Cowhig stated the applicant's driveway is narrow and there is no parking on the street. The landing will allow people to get out of the car and walk to the front door without being intrusive. Mr. Cowhig stated there are walkways in the front, a metal fence fencing in the back yard with a metal sculpture being a part of the fence. Mr. Cowhig referred to the **Guidelines on page 64, under porches as entrances and balconies, page 30, fences, walls and type features, and page 26, walkways, driveways, and parking areas.** Mr. Cowhig stated staff does not view the front stoop as a defining feature and is a very minimal change that should not affect the historic character of the house or the district. The retaining wall fencing and other side improvements will be constructed with appropriate materials and be in an appropriate location. Staff does support this application.

Mr. Arnett asked if the only change to the front stoop was to the stairs. Mr. Cowhig responded that was correct. Mr. Arneke inquired if the stoop was original or added or changed at some point. Mr. Cowhig stated it was possible but that was way it was in the file photo from '81.

Ms. Stringfield inquired about the fencing difference of 42 inches in the guidelines and the application stated 48 inches. Mr. Cowhig stated staff feels in the location it is still well back from the street and thought the 42 inches was intended for fences that come up to the street. Ms. Stringfield also asked about the trees in the front of the house. Mr. Cowhig responded both were inspected by the Judson Clinton who advised both trees were diseased.

Chair Wharton asked if this COA includes new paving for the driveway. Mr. Cowhig stated that is a future plan and felt the patio will be under staff approval. Mr. Arnett stated the application does make reference to a new driveway changing from asphalt to cement. Chair Wharton requested the applicant to come forward to speak.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Robert Kantlehner, 1014 N. Eugene, stated the plan is to redo all of the landscaping. The driveway will be replaced as currently it has asphalt over concrete halfway and then goes to all concrete. It is broken up and the plan is to replace it and widen it to 10 feet. There will be a cobblestone walkway and patio area. The fence is on the front of the side yard and will go down to the other fence adjoining the existing chain link fence and will be on the corner to hide the existing chain link fence that is in disrepair. Trees will be planted along the back hiding the chain link fence. Mr. Kantlehner stated he did not know if the stoop was original but there is a piece missing and the sides are breaking apart. There will be a sculpture gate on the side that they carried with them when they moved. Mr. Kantlehner stated they are putting a tree on the far left of the property and another one on the side with bushes all along the front.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any additional questions for the applicant. No further questions. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

Jim Halsch, 812 Olive Street, stated the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board supports this proposal.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired of the Commissioners for discussion.

DISCUSSION:

The Commissioners stated their appreciation for the drawings presented.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2298 at 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 the staff comments and the following guidelines. Trees and landscaping, page 23, numbers 1 – 6; Guidelines for fences, poles, and site features on page 26, numbers 4 – 5; Guidelines for walkways, driveways, and parking areas, page 30, numbers 1-6, Guidelines for porches, entrances, and balconies on page 64, numbers 1 – 2, are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, and Arnett. Nays: 0).

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2298 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Kantlehner for work at 1014 N. Eugene Street.

Second by Ms. Hodiernne. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, and Arnett. Nays: 0). Chair Wharton stated it is approved with no conditions.

Application #2299 3b. 634 N. Elm Street (APPROVED)

DESCRIPTION: Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for work at 634 N. Elm Street for construction of a rock wall to match the wall on the left side of the driveway. Due to the location being in a prominent location, staff thought it best to go before the Commission. Mr. Cowhig stated the material is appropriate. Staff spoke to the stone mason who will be doing the work who stated he would be able to match everything, including the joint profile and could

match the random nature of the granite. Mr. Cowhig stated staff is in support of this application. Ms. Geary presented a sample block of the material for the Commissioners to view.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any questions for staff. Ms. Stringfield asked if the driveway will need to be cut wider to accommodate stone walls on each side. Mr. Cowhig responded it is a fairly wide driveway but will have the applicant respond to that question. Ms. Stringfield inquired if the applicant owns the other side of that space. Mr. Cowhig responded that would need to be addressed by the applicant. Ms. Hoderne inquired if the new wall would stop where the old one does. Mr. Cowhig responded it was his understanding that it will match exactly.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone present to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Angelia Espinoza, 634 N. Elm Street, stated she is the current homeowner and there was about a foot of driveway covered up by the bank that keeps falling down. The plan is that the stonemason can set the stone on the driveway that is her property. Ms. Espinoza stated if they do go back further, she would need to speak with the homeowner who has recently purchased the property and is renovating it currently. Ms. Espinoza felt fairly confident that Mr. Gentry, the new owner, would give her a right of way or easement rights. Noel Coltrane, the stonemason, has repaired the front twice due to damage incurred by accidents and weather. Ms. Espinoza stated she would like a delineation for her driveway and the property next door. At some point would like to expand the wall.

Chair Wharton asked if there would be a cap feature that will match. Ms. Espinoza stated it will exactly match the column and the cap. The left hand side will be exactly the same as the right hand side depicted in the photograph. Mr. Cowhig inquired if Ms. Espinoza knew anything about the granite curb. Ms. Espinoza responded that was under dirt that she had washed off and does not anything about it. Ms. Stringfield was concerned with large trucks needing to up the driveway for deliveries and asked if it would be wider. Ms. Espinoza responded she does not plan to make the driveway wider as she would have to on the neighbor's property line and there is not enough property for that. Her property line is her driveway.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in support of the application.

Jim Halsch, 812 Olive Street, stated the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association did review and approve this proposal.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application. No one came forward.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Hoderne inquired if this required a building permit. Mr. Cowhig responded it did not.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2299 at the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the **Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that the staff comments and the guidelines on page 26, numbers 4; introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, and concrete in a design consistent with the property are acceptable as a finding of fact.**

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoderne, and Arnett. Nays: 0).

Mr. Arnett therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2299 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Angelia Espinoza for work at 634 N. Elm Street.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoderne, and Arnett. Nays: 0). Chair Wharton stated it is approved with no conditions,

Application #2300 3c. 424 Fisher Park Circle, Unit A (APPROVED)

Ms. Hoderne recused herself from this application.

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for work at 424 Fisher Park Circle, Unit A. The Abermans have recently completed construction of the condominiums at the corner Fisher Park Circle and Florence Street. One of the landscape items would be a privacy fence along the western property line. The application stated it was to match the fence currently behind their property but does belong to a property on Simpson Street. It is a painted space fence. This fence is in the location that was approved and is a privacy fence but does not match the fence that was there. The guidelines recommend that standard unpainted privacy fences should be confined to rear yard use. Mr. Cowhig stated staff has a rule of thumb that the mid-point of the house separates the front from the backyard for purposes of fences. Staff stated this is one item left unresolved, everything else has been completed, but the fencing needs to be resolved. **Guidelines stated introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must exceed 72 inches in height and the midpoint of the house marks the division between rear and front yards.** Mr. Cowhig stated staff has discussed this issue and one of the ideas was if the boards could be moved so that there was some spacing and possibly painted. Staff was very pleased with the outcome of this construction as it is a real plus for the neighborhood. This fence a very visible conflict from the guidelines.

Ms. Stringfield asked if this was an after the fact application. Mr. Cowhig responded originally it was approved, but is a detail that needs to be approved, similar to a change order with a construction project. Ms. Stringfield stated in the guidelines under fences, walls and features, 5a, does mention finish in white or another color stain compatible with the building. Ms. Stringfield stated she would like the Commission to think about not removing the painting suggestion as she thinks some of the natural fences actually are appropriate and attractive.

Mr. Arneke asked if the change was going from a semi-privacy fence to a solid look. Ms. Stringfield asked what the height of the fence was. Mr. Cowhig responded it is 6 feet. Mr. Arnett asked on the original COA application was it a condition of the approval to have a space design. Mr. Cowhig responded they referred to an existing fence that they plan to match and when the time came, a concern was expressed about the condition of the property next door and trying to get some screening from that. Mr. Arnett stated based on the photographs it appears to come past the mid-point of the house. Mr. Cowhig responded when looking at the fence, it visually appears to be associated with the house next door but it is their property and that guideline was written with the property where the fence is located in mind. Mr. Cowhig was not sure where the fence comes in with respect to their building but is something to think about. Mr. Cowhig stated they have started a lot of landscaping in that part of the property. Chair Wharton asked if the original COA did approve a fence up to that point. Mr. Cowhig responded that was correct.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Ms. Debbi Aberman, Manager, 424 Fisher Park Circle, provided color pictures of the property involved. Ms. Aberman stated when the project was started, they fully intended to match the existing fence in the backyard. As the fence was going up, the sub-contractor asked why not place the slats closer together if the intent is to have a screen from the house next door. The weeds are very bad and their intent is to keep them from coming up to their property. The weeds have been cleaned out twice during construction. There is no maintenance being done on that house or the yard. Ms. Aberman stated if you stood in front of the house and looked down the front yard, you cannot see the fence. The intent was to paint the fence white and after the fence was built, neighbors who lived at the end unit requested them to leave it natural because it is beautiful and is a beautiful backdrop to the landscaping. They will be adding a white oak in the front yard. Ms. Aberman requested the fence be approved as built.

Chair Wharton inquired of questions for Ms. Aberman. There was none. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Jim Halsch, 812 Olive Street, stated the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board reviewed and support this application.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. There was none. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone in opposition to the application. No one came forward.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Arnett asked if the fence was built in the location previously approved and built in a manner consistent with the guidelines and not contrary to the specific conditions that were on the previous COA, what action is necessary. Ms. Jones stated from here understanding on the application it was stated they would match the existing fence and this is a deviation from that. Ms. Geary stated at staff level they cannot approve privacy fences that go further forward than the midpoint of the house and was why it has to be approved by the Commission.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2300 at the public hearing of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the **Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that the staff comments and the guidelines under fences, walls, and site features, on page 26, numbers 3 - 5, are acceptable as a finding of fact.**

Second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, and Arnett. Nays: 0).

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2300 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Debbi Aberman, Zen Holdings, LLC for work at 424 Fisher Park Circle.

Second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, and Arnett. Nays: 0). Chair Wharton stated it is approved with no conditions,

Application #2301 3d. 116 Cypress Street (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for work at 116 Cypress Street undergoing a major renovation. Staff stated there will be a new set of exterior stairs constructed on the back of the house required by code which replaces stairs that were there. Mr. Cowhig referred the Commissions to drawings within their pack depicting the proposed new outdoor stairs. Staff's concern was that they extend way into the backyard. This is a corner lot and will be very visible which staff felt would impact the character of the historic district to some degree. Staff preferred the stairs to be reconfigured so they were closer to the house and did not extend so far into the backyard and be less noticeable and less of a visual impact. Other work would be repairing or replacing some windows at the back of the house. Staff stated from what they know, old windows can almost always be repaired and would strongly encourage repair. Many of the items staff felt could be approved at staff level. Gutters will be added to the house and will need to be done in a way that does not require removal of the crown molding as this is a Victorian structure and has very nice crown molding at the eaves. Suggestion would be to use half round gutters. There is a missing section of railing on the side porch. Code requires for them to have a 42 inches railing and would not match the existing railing and they would like to use lattice above it to address the safety issue. Some of the chimneys will be rebuilt, landscaping will be completed, parking spaces will be created. Staff did not have problem with those. The major concern for staff is the exterior stairs at the back of the house. Mr. Cowhig referred the Commissioners to the **Guidelines on page 57, relative to windows, and to page 70, relative to safety and code issues.**

Mr. Arnett asked for clarification for the items staff could handle. Mr. Cowhig responded staff would handle all of the repair work and the location of the HVAC equipment and things like that. The stairs, gutters, railing, windows, lattice work and driveway will be discussed by the Commission. Chair Wharton asked if a tree was recently removed. Mr. Cowhig responded the Commission approved tree work on the property a while back and it was only completed recently. The applicants did come before the Commission for the tree work. Chair Wharton stated the normal condition in tree removal was for the stump to be cut level with the ground or grind it. Mr. Cowhig stated what is said is to remove the stump completely or is as close to the ground as possible. The applicant will address that issue. Ms. Stringfield asked if the guidelines cover the chimney. Mr. Cowhig responded the chimney is repair work and the roof does not require a COA at all.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Dean Driver, 4701 Land Road, stated the property is 116 Cypress Street and his wife is also an owner. Mr. Driver provided the Commission with drawings depicting a solid bank of vegetation about 13 to 14 feet in height and will completely obscure the backyard. Mr. Driver stated he tore the old steps down as it was a safety issue. Mr. Driver stated he has been attempting to make the least impact on the house and the visibility of what used to be a

sleeping porch. Mr. Dean presented drawings to the Commissioners depicting how the steps were created and why. They did not move the stairs over to the house as it would make a dismal living space and moved it out as far from the house as possible for minimal impact on the structure of the house. They have been deemed by the city to be a commercial structure, everything must be a bigger and more robust.

Chair Wharton asked what was the zoning on the house? Mr. Driver responded it is multi-family. Upon finding this particular home, they checked with the city to ensure it was a tri-plex with the city. Chair Wharton stated commercial is different than multi-family and did not believe commercial was a zoning category. Ms. Jones stated this is a building code category. There is a code for one and two family dwellings, but above that it is treated more like a commercial multi-family type. Mr. Driver stated a design could be done where the edge of a deck intersected at the window. It was more of an aesthetic and a structural issue to have the rail tie into wood and not glass. Chair Wharton stated the reason for the width is not because of code but aesthetic. Mr. Driver responded it is aesthetic in nature but he had the choice of making a catwalk as wide as the doorframe but that would not be allowed by the commercial code as being too narrow. Mr. Driver stated part of what is being done is to achieve higher end apartments. It is an opportunity to get people in the upstairs unit and provide a nice outdoor area on the deck. They are trying to improve the quality of life to those in the apartments. Previously there was a 6 x 8 space that appeared to have used frequently and he wanted to give that to their tenants.

Chair Wharton asked if there questions for the applicant. Ms. Stringfield stated she felt this looks more like a beach house and is hopeful something can be reconfigured on the back so that it is not so large and does not intrude so far into the backyard. Ms. Stringfield appreciated the reasons for their initial decisions. Mr. Driver stated wood decks deteriorate in 30 years and a deck will always be inappropriate to some degree. This is on the back of the house which will have a solid bank of foliage. Mr. Driver addressed the issue of the trees and stated Duke Energy did take the trees down for them free and they waited until that happened. Mr. Driver did request for them to be taken all the way down, they did, and there will be stump grinding to take them all out.

Ms. Stringfield inquired about a picture in their packet to which Mr. Cowhig responded it was a set of stairs that staff felt were done so well that they should become the standard for how to dress up a set of exterior stairs. Mr. Driver stated the other reason for the design ties into the parking situation, to allow parking and would take care of at least two cars as neighbors were concerned about parking on the street. Chair Wharton asked Mr. Driver if he felt it would be feasible for him to imitate the design located on Elm Street. Mr. Driver stated he did not know since this is commercial and everything is bigger. Mr. Driver has consulted with a structural engineer but the design has to be done by code. There are five or six sashes in the house needing to be replaced or rebuilt. The rest are reparable. Some of the sills need to be replaced. They are not replacing anything that they do not have to. Mr. Driver stated all the windows at the back-porch area drop into the wall which means there cannot be studs. There can be a screen door on the back for air flow. There are two windows that have a divider and it was unknown if they are original. Mr. Cowhig stated they were more concerned with the two over two windows as that is a defining feature. Mr. Driver responded they will be fixed windows. The door and the upstairs entry are required to ensure two means of egress. Chair Wharton asked Mr. Driver if he would consider using replacement double hung windows. Mr. Driver stated he would be open to that suggestion and possibly having a screen door which he indicated on the drawing which would require staff approval. Ms. Stringfield asked if the front lower right window was originally a two piece window. Mr. Driver stated he does not think it was original and would like to make it a single window there, with stained glass installed at a later time. Mr. Arnett asked what is the plan for the gutters. Mr. Driver responded he has not priced the half round gutters but this is what he was thinking of using and stated his roofing person has suggested spacers below it. Chair Wharton stated the half round gutters preserves the proportion of the roof to the eaves in a way so the aesthetics of the house are not damaged.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any further questions for the applicant.

Mindy Zachery, 604 Summit Avenue, stated she was representing the Neighborhood Board. The Neighborhood Board had the same concerns the Commission had expressed. The Neighborhood Board knew the Commission would talk about the footprint for the back. The homeowners are trying to make it as small as possible within the constraints of the code. The Board was wondering if the deck necessarily had to be as big as is shown and Mr. Driver has explained that. There was some question regarding the concrete pad going below that and if that needed to be the size that it is and maybe that would be a consideration. The Board stated the neighbors are concerned about the two condensing units that will be placed along the side of the driveway which their side porch faces. Ms. Zachary stated the Neighborhood Board is in support of this application overall. Ms. Zachery

personally thanked the Drivers for their work on the house and expressed appreciation regarding how time consuming and expensive it is to renovate this house.

Chair Wharton asked if there were any questions for Ms. Zachary. There were none. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application.

Shawn Patch, 107 Cypress, stated he was in support of this application and also thanked the Drivers for purchasing this property. They have made a significant investment and appreciated the investment they made and are supporting their application. Mr. Patch does shared concerns regarding the deck size and proportion. He understood the code issues involved but if there could be a way to creatively reduce the footprint or the scale, he encouraged the property owners to do that.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION:

Betsy Forth, 114 Cypress Street, stated she lives on the other side of the driveway and does appreciate the Drivers for what is being done to the house. Ms. Forth stated most of the things on the COA they do not object to and thought they were the right things to do. Ms. Forth provided the Commission with a written statement of what she would be speaking about. Ms. Forth stated 116 Cypress is on the corner of Yanceyville and Cypress and the deck is in the backyard but on the front yard of Cypress. The City is putting a lot of money into the Summit Avenue corridor and are investing in Cypress which will be the historic flavor of what people see when they drive by. Ms. Forth read her prepared statement. First was the request for a large deck and stairwell and referenced the guidelines, decks and patios, page 41, being hidden from the street. Ms. Forth expressed concern with the Duke Power lines along Yanceyville and the possibility of cutting down trees to maintain their lines, exposing the 2nd floor deck/porch and staircase for those driving on Yanceyville. Ms. Forth and her spouse are concerned about the historic design of the sleeping porch being lost. Ms. Forth referenced the Guidelines, page 66, numbers 4 and 5 regarding the style of porch and page 43, referencing compatible decks. Ms. Forth does not feel the proposed design fits the guideline and the design is not compatible with a 1902 home. Ms. Forth is concerned if there will be a new entrance to the apartment and referenced page 7 of the Historic guidelines. Ms. Forth stated the COA is requesting permission to place two HVAC units alongside the side of the driveway and referenced the guidelines, pages 40 and 42. Ms. Forth stated the COA shows disguising the units from the street but by following the guidelines on page 43 is not being a good neighbor. Ms. Forth stated they are hopeful the owner will reflect on how to design his property in a way that will fit within the nature of the Dunleath community.

Chair Wharton inquired of any questions for Ms. Forth. There were none. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton advised the applicant has the right to respond.

Mr. Driver responded the units are split system units which are smaller and the closer they are mounted to the air handling unit, the more efficient they are. Mr. Driver stripped everything off the outside of the house and running everything through the walls. Mr. Driver understands HVACs are a noise issue but there is a condensing unit much closer to the Forths when sitting on their porch and is a unit that make a lot more noise than the small ones. The most efficient way will be to place it very close to the inside of the unit. Mr. Driver stated in reading the Historic Guidelines, they were within those guidelines. Mr. Driver understands the loss of privacy in reference to the deck. There was a deck there previously with an umbrella and chairs. Mr. Driver stated they are trying to give the renters some amenities that were not there before. They do want to have higher rents but also want people in that are respectable and will be hand chosen. Mr. Driver stated their intention continuously was to have a house there that no one would recognize as a rental property, other than the three mailboxes and the numbers on the doors. Mr. Driver stated they are open to ideas how to whittle back the size of the stairs and still have the use of it.

Chair Wharton stated the Commission had previously been shown a photo indicating how high the vegetation would be in order to obscure the deck from the street and asked what the height was. Mr. Driver stated it appeared to be about 13 feet. Mr. Driver stated Duke Energy does not have a say in planting trees, unless it affects their lines. Chair Wharton stated Duke Energy can trim the trees. If something is planted vertical, it will not encroach into that space and the City Arborist could recommend. Mr. Driver stated there are two small HVAC units that are not central air and is a split system inside.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any other questions for Mr. Driver. Ms. Stringfield inquired about the drawings. Mr. Driver responded he had several renderings of the rear deck area and steps. Mr. Driver stated they are trying to have a minimum effect on the structure of the house within the restraints of the guidelines. Mr. Driver stated he is open to a better plan but given the space constraints and a desire to have parking in the rear, going straight out appears to make the most sense. A discussion between Mr. Arnett and Mr. Driver ensued regarding the possibility of how to decrease the size of the deck and stairs and move the posts.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton stated even if the size of the deck was reduced what would be the aesthetic gains. There would still be a large stair structure visible from Yanceyville Street which the guidelines for exterior stairs and for decks would request screening. Mr. Arnett stated this is an instance where applying the guidelines come into conflict with each other. In looking at page 70, guideline 2, to construct fire exits, and stairs, etcetera, in such a manner that they don't damage historic materials and features which is what this configuration does do versus the original stairs that were removed built on top on the roof. This rendition reads as an add-on that could be removed rather easily and without damage to the historic structure which in this particular case requires a larger structure. Mr. Arnett stated his personal opinion was to screen the underside would be a reasonable request. It would help to ground it visually along with a dark color and hide some of the elements that appear to make it look like a beach house and thought tall evergreens on the property would help for Yanceyville Street side. Chair Wharton stated that the guidelines require for these types of things to be screened, the Commission is within their authority to put in a condition for screening.

Chair Wharton stated they understood the objections to having utilities close to the side porches and was one of the difficulties living in a historic district as the houses are close together and these types of things do come into conflict. The guidelines help the Commission to deal with those issues in the best way possible that may not always be totally satisfactory to everyone.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2301 at 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 the guidelines on page 70, exterior stairs and landings, page 57, windows and doors, page 52, 1, retain and preserve original form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades and corbel belling, are acceptable as a finding of fact.**

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, and Arnett. Nays: 0).

The conditions were discussed to be included in the motion.

Mr. Arnett therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2301 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kenneth Dean Driver for work at 116 Cypress Street with the following conditions.

1. The HVAC utilities located on the side of the house be screened by fencing or landscaping.
2. The windows in the original part of the house are repaired rather than replaced.
3. The owner will have the option for the windows in the additions to be all wood, double hung windows and that none of the windows being replaced will be vinyl or aluminum.
4. Half round or other appropriate gutters that preserve the existing crown molding will be used.
5. The proposed stairs and deck be stained a dark color and include appropriate screening on the underside of the stairs and landing using 634 N. Elm Street as a model.
6. The railing and posts match that of 634 N. Elm Street as closely as code allows.
7. Evergreen landscaping along Yanceyville Street should be planted at the top of the embankment with consultation with the City Arborist and with the recommended minimum height at 5 feet

Second by Ms. Hodiernne. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodiernne, and Arnett. Nays: 0). Chair Wharton stated it is approved with conditions.

Application #2292 3e. 702 Cypress Street (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for a tree removal at 702 Cypress Street in the Dunleath Historic District. Mr. Cowhig stated when staff receives applications for Certificate of Appropriateness for tree removal, they wait until they have four or five and then ask the City Arborist to examine the trees. If the trees are obviously dead, staff will issue the COA. If there is any question, Mr. Clinton will accompany staff to examine the tree on the homeowner's property and if the tree is diseased, dying, or causing structural issues, it would be approved at staff level. In this case, Mr. Clinton advised the tree appeared to be healthy to him and stated this tree was a good example of when so many limbs have been removed it creates a problem for the tree as it changes the aerodynamics. When there is a wind event, the lower limbs that would buffer the upper limbs and prevent breakage are not there and the tree is more susceptible to wind damage. Mr. Clinton did state this tree was in a problematic state at this point and is why staff is recommending in favor of removing the tree. Ms. Geary stated this is a section of land that actually belongs to the City of Greensboro who had allowed this area to be a natural area for a while. Several of the trees were dying and staff received a complaint that they were dying. Because of that, the city facilities came in and did an COA and removed them. All of the trunks that were not cut down must be contracted out and the bid process for that is currently taking place.

Chair Wharton stated this strip of property has over the years created several disputes regarding who should maintain this property and how it should be maintained between different property owners of the house and the City. His understanding was the City has come to a resolution about maintaining that strip of property. Mr. Geary stated it has been maintained and mulching has been done. James Deaver is the staff person of facilities and has met with this property owner.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Mindy Zachery, 604 Summit Avenue, stated the Board voted to approve the removal of the tree. The homeowner was confused because she thought this was a staff level approval and that Mr. Cowhig would receive a letter from the arborist that said it was diseased and did not plan to be here and is speaking on Ms. Earl's behalf. Ms. Zachary stated the homeowner is dodging tree branches continuously. Chair Wharton stated it was in the COA regarding falling branches.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition. No one came forward.

DISCUSSION:

The general consensus of the Commission was to make a condition that another tree be planted since this is problematic as opposed to dead.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2292 at 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 the guidelines under Trees, page 23, retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the Historic District**, are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Ms. Hodierno. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierno, and Arnett. Nays: 0).

Mr. Arneke therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2292 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Anne-Marie Earl at 702 Cypress Street with the following condition.

1. An appropriate canopy tree be planted in the back yard. The type of tree is to be selected in consultation with the City Arborist and also the diameter at breast height for the tree requirement.
2. The current tree be removed and the new tree planted within 6 months after the removal of the current tree.

Second by Ms. Hodierno. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Hodierno, and Arnett. Nays: 0). Chair Wharton stated it is approved with no conditions.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

No items from the Chair.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Mr. Cowhig advised Ms. Geary and himself have been working on the contract with the State of North Carolina for the grant to be used for a survey of African/American resources beginning with the Benbow Park area. Staff's goal is to make this a community oriented process. Mr. Cowhig would like to have the Historic Preservation Commission as the face of the project and are hoping to put a committee together. Mr. Cowhig requested the Board to be thinking of that idea and if there would be any interest in being a part of the project.

Ms. Jones advised the Board the Zoning Commission of PO 301 Fisher Park Circle, the Julian Price house, is scheduled for court on October 7, at 10:00 a.m., Superior Court, courtroom 3H if anyone would like to attend.

Ms. Geary stated Max Carter, Mr. Cowhig, Ms. Jones and herself attended the CLG training in Fayetteville which was very informative. One of the things they are looking at is making the applicant's attendance mandatory at these meetings. The possibility of requiring applicants to be present was discussed among the Board members with no resolution.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

Chair Wharton adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OCTOBER 30, 2019**

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, October 30, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair David Wharton (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Jesse Arnett (At Large), Linda Lane (At Large), Amanda Hodierne (Fisher Park), Ann Stringfield (At Large), Max Carter (At Large), Sylvia Stanback (At Large).

Chair Wharton inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications and meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. All responded yes.

Chair Wharton advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission. Chair Wharton inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest or discussed applications prior to the meeting. All responded they had no conflicts of interest and had no discussions regarding applications.

EXCUSED ABSENCES:

No absences.

STAFF PRESENT:

Staff present were Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Terri Jones, City Attorney.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

No adjustments were made to the agenda.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (September 25, 2019) (Approved)

Ms. Hodierne made a motion to approve the September minutes as amended and submitted, seconded by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

3a. 2303. 108 Fisher Park Circle (Approved w/conditions)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for the property located at 108 Fisher Park Circle in the Fisher Park Historic District and the applicants are Todd and Jennifer Schwartz. Ms. Cowhig refreshed the Commissioners memory of the applicants appearing before the Commission recently for enclosure of the side porch and other work being done to the house. They have purchased the property recently and are doing major renovation work and are back with several items that they would like to do. The first item is they would like to construct an addition to the garage to add a second bay to allow for parking of two cars. The other items are to replace the garage doors, widen the driveway, and to enclose two windows at the back of the house. A picture of the garage was displayed. It is a shared driveway and the garage was designed and constructed to match the construction materials and details of the house. It is itself considered a contributing structure in the National Register for the neighborhood.

Considering the importance of the structure in the Historic District, staff consulted with the State Historic Preservation Office. They pointed out to staff that adding and doubling the size of the garage would result in losing its contributing status as far as in the National Register and Historic District. If there was an update done, it would likely be labeled a non-contributing. However, staff from the State Historic Preservation Office did provide a

sketch which was provided in the Commissioners packet and is a way to construct an addition that would have much less of an impact on the historic character of the district. It is set back somewhat from the front wall of the garage and the roof would be lower. The detailing has been simplified. All of it would be done to make the addition less of a compromise to the character of the garage. Mr. Cowhig felt the State Historic Preservation Office did a great job of addressing a design problem with the simplified design. The applicants have agreed that they could work with that design. The replacement of the garage doors is a fairly common request to replace original garage doors with automatic, remote control operated doors. Doors have been shown capturing the character of historic garages. The driveway is fairly narrow and is a shared driveway and widening the driveway would make it more functional. Mr. Cowhig referred to a photograph indicating the location of the two windows that would be closed in. The windows would be closed in with wooden window shutters that would maintain the fenestration pattern of the house as opposed to filling in with. Mr. Cowhig stated he felt the key is this is not a principal elevation, as the guidelines make allowances for changes that are not on principal elevations.

Mr. Cowhig referred the Commissioners to the **Guidelines for Additions on pages 73 – 76 and one of the guidelines for accessory structures and garages on page 36, which says retain the original materials and features of historic drives and out buildings**, etc. Mr. Cowhig stated one of the key guidelines for additions is to limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.

Ms. Lane asked if the windows were enclosed in the rear, would they be covered over so in the future if someone wanted to open that up again, they could. Mr. Cowhig responded he will have the applicants confirm but his understanding was that it would be walled over on the interior but would still be recessed. Ms. Lane stated that it should be part of the overall construction in a way that could be easily uncovered in the future for whatever reason.

Mr. Arnett asked if there were pictures of the proposed new garage doors. Mr. Cowhig responded there are none currently but the applicants may have brought some to the meeting. Ms. Stringfield asked what was the material of the proposed garage door. Mr. Cowhig responded he believed it would be wood. Ms. Lane asked if the existing roof was slate or asphalt on the garage. Mr. Cowhig stated it was asphalt.

Chair Wharton stated in looking at the sketch the State Historic Preservation Office offered, it looked similar in a way but had a lowered roof on it. Mr. Cowhig advised it is a hip roof. Chair Wharton asked if that roof would not endanger the status of this garage as a contributing structure. Mr. Cowhig stated SHPO's point was if the size of the garage was doubled, it is likely when the nomination was updated it would not be a contributing structure. Chair Wharton stated but if it is not doubled, an addition could be done and still have it be a contributing structure. Mr. Cowhig responded yes and that is a determination that would need to be made at the time an architect is doing the survey. Ms. Stringfield asked who did the sketch provided by the applicants. Mr. Cowhig responded rehabilitation architects, Mitch Wilds and David Christenburg. Ms. Lane asked if it would be wise to have a more formal approval. Mr. Cowhig stated if the Commission felt this was acceptable, staff would want to have a new set of drawings. Ms. Geary added when she reached out to the SHPO, she expressed her concern about the structure losing its contributing status and then asked outside of that if they had any designs or suggestions regardless of whether it was contributing or noncontributing. The role of this Commission is to determine does it have an adverse effect on the historic district. Ms. Geary thought that was part of the reason why that design came back. They were trying to achieve the project but minimize its impact on the overall character of the district. It was not necessarily a blessing that says if you do this and an architectural historian relooks at the National Register report that it would maintain its contributory status. It was how to minimize the impact.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any other questions for staff. Hearing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Todd Schwarz, 5402 Blue Heron Drive, stated they are the owners of this house which will be their primary residence once it is completed. Mr. Schwartz provided additional pictures of the garage and driveway and stated the initial thought was to mimic what was there to keep the character of the structure. Mr. Schwartz stated Joe Wiesner (ph.) drew the sketches and went to a lot of lengths to put the additional details in the sketch. Mr. Schwartz indicated the corbels as one feature. The feedback received from staff after going to the State was interesting and is actually a lesser structure and should be easier to build. The initial thought was to make it a substantial structure and double what was there. A lot of time was spent within the neighborhood looking at other projects and garages. The one they really wanted to consider is located at 900 Carolina Street as it is a similar

brick structure in the back of the property. Mr. Schwartz stated they are very fortunate with this lot being able to accommodate a garage. They like the way this garage looks and wants to keep it and work with the design. It is not quite a double and if the inset is brought back on both sides it will make it a lesser structure which hopefully will come into play if they are able to build it. Mr. Schwartz referred to drawings included in the Commissioners package. There is lesser detail with the corbels in the lower roofs and in the offsets. It is their intention to keep the same elevation that is there with a slight retaining wall that will be moved slightly allowing their neighbor more room. Mr. Schwartz stated they like the alternate design better than what was drawn originally.

Ms. Lane asked if the windows would be added to that exterior elevation. Mr. Schwartz stated there are windows on the existing structure and they like the light coming in and are going to use the existing windows. Mr. Carter asked why they chose to have the addition on the right side rather than the left side as it appears the right side may crowd his neighbor. Mr. Schwartz advised there is not enough room on the left side to maneuver and it appears right side is the only direction they could go. Mr. Schwartz advised the setback is 3 feet and they would leave a 4 foot area between the two. The space is not very usable currently and getting rid of the fence will give the neighbor the ability to maneuver his car. Ms. Stringfield asked if part of the request is for the City Zoning Commission to give a special exception for the 3 foot setback. Mr. Schwartz stated they have checked and it is actually a 3 foot setback and is city zoning. They will not have to request more. Mr. Cowhig stated the garage building is probably right at the 15 foot height. If the building is 15 feet in height, then the setback is 10 feet and you would need a special exception or a variance.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any additional questions for the applicant. No further questions. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

Jim Haslch, 812 Olive Street, stated the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board supports this project.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any questions for Mr. Halsch. No questions. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support. There were none. Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired of the Commissioners for discussion.

DISCUSSION:

It was agreed the Commission would need additional detailed sketches of the garage to approve. It appears to be the right idea and does have the endorsement from the SHPO. Chair Wharton was hesitant to have staff provide approval as this is a fairly detailed project and would put staff in a position to approve designs on the fly. Chair Wharton did not want to hold the project up but it is worth extra time. The example shown was on the right track but more detailed drawings are needed with perhaps an actual door to review. Ms. Lane stated she did not feel wood was 100% required and feels there are other considerations. Chair Wharton stated if the garage is not approved at this meeting, he was not sure a motion should be made at this time. Mr. Cowhig stated if the Commission was comfortable with the conceptual design, they could approve it conceptually on the condition of final detail drawings being submitted at the next meeting and the special exception could be started. The expansion of the driveway was further discussed. Mr. Arnett stated he felt it was reasonable. Chair Wharton felt conditions could be stated in the record regarding the windows and doors. Chair Wharton inquired if someone would like to make a finding of fact.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2303 in 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, numbers 1 – 4, page 36, number 1, page 57, number 1, and page 30, numbers 1-2** are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodieme, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

DISCUSSION:

Discussion was held regarding conditions related to the garage with the consensus being the garage plans and door selection be continued and requested new measured drawings be submitted to the Commission. Ms. Lane stated she would like the windows to be retained in place, if possible. Mr. Arnett suggested if the windows are removed, to have the windows retained on site. Ms. Hodieme suggested condition(s) regarding the material and appearance of the shutters.

MOTION:

Mr. Arnett therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2303 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Todd and Jennifer Schwarz for work at 108 Fisher Park Circle, with the following conditions.

1. That the approval of the garage expansion and replacement of the garage doors be continued pending more detailed architectural drawings of the expansion and a submittal of a garage door for consideration with the Commission at the next meeting December 11, 2019.
2. That the existing windows be retained in place if feasible and if not, that the existing windows be removed and stored on-site.
3. That the new shutters should match the existing shutters on the house in design and material.

Seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierno, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

Chair Wharton stated in terms of the special exception to the Board of Adjustment for the conceptual plan for a garage addition for a motion would be recommended.

Mr. Arneke made a motion to recommend a special exception be made to the Board of Adjustment regarding the conceptual plan for a garage addition. Seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierno, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

3b. Application #2317 114 Fisher Park Circle (Approved with conditions)**DESCRIPTION:**

Mr. Cowhig stated this is for tree removal at 114 Fisher Park Circle. It is a large Willow Oak tree that is right at the sidewalk and directly beside and pushing up on the granite steps. The City Arborist has looked at the tree and noted that this tree had been severely topped at one time and will likely lead to its early demise. The City Arborist felt it would reasonable to take it out. It would be an opportunity to place a condition to plant a new shade tree in the front yard in a more suitable location. The granite steps are a contributing resource and the current tree will continue to damage that resource. Staff does support this application.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any questions for staff. Mr. Carter stated removing the tree will show a very pretty house. Ms. Hodierno asked if the arborist said where the new location might be for a replacement tree and if it will still be along the front streetscape between the sidewalk and the fence. Mr. Cowhig responded the yard is not very large and would need to be looked at very carefully. Chair Wharton inquired if there were any more questions for staff. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone present to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Jim Halsch, 812 Olive Street, stated the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association supports this project.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked if the Commissioners had any discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Arneke stated he was glad this was being done before any real damage occurs. Ms. Stringfield stated she feels it is important to have a tree diagnosed as this one was, than to let it go despite how everyone loves the trees so a new canopy tree can begin to prosper in the yard. Chair Wharton requested to have a Finding of Fact. Chair Wharton stated a condition can be imposed that another canopy tree be planted with the advice of the City Arborist within six months. Ms. Lane added a certain caliper that would be appropriate for a major canopy tree.

FINDING OF FACT:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2317 in 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 the staff comments and the following **Guidelines under Trees and Landscaping, page 23, numbers 1, 2, 5, 6**, are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierna, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Arnett stated given one of the guidelines is replacement trees of a similar canopy and in the same location and asked if it was necessary for that condition to be on there or is it assumed in the granting of the permission. Mr. Arneke responded he thought the timeframe was the most important to add as it is not covered in the guidelines and feels it should be stated. Chair Wharton felt if the condition was not stated, it probably would not happen. Chair Wharton stated they would need the advice of the City Arborist regarding the species, size and location.

MOTION:

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with a condition, application number 2317 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Katherine R. Davey for work at 114 Fisher Park Circle, with the following conditions.

1. To replace the tree to be removed with a new canopy tree to be approved by the City Arborist for the size, location, installation and species within 6 months from this date, 10/30/2019.

Seconded by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierna, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

3.c Application 2316 802 Cypress Street (Approved with conditions)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for property in the Dunleath Historic District, 802 Cypress Street and is an after the fact application. Things done were the front door was replaced, a privacy fence was constructed, patio drains were installed and artificial turf was placed. The fence is a wood privacy fence that encloses the backyard made of pine boards installed horizontally and topped with lattice strips. It is proposed for the fence to be stained a brown color. The lot slopes away from the street and from what staff observed, is not easily visible from the public right of way. If it were to be stained a dark color, staff felt it would have minimal visual impact on the character of the historic district. Mr. Cowhig referred to **Guidelines for Fences, introduce new fences and walls compatible with material, design, scale, location size with original fences and walls within the historic district and (b), install a utilitarian fence of woven wire or chain link in rear yards only. Where they are visible from the streets, screen with shrubby lines, etc. and introduce privacy fences or walls in rear yards only that should not exceed 72 inches in height.** Mr. Cowhig stated there is a rule of thumb that the midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yards. The only guidelines that comes close to something like this are, **Place miscellaneous items such as swimming pools, playground equipment, concrete pads, and basketball goals, treehouses, dumpsters, and trash receptacles only in areas such as rear yards where they are not visible from the street.** Mr. Cowhig reiterated that because of the location where they are completely out of view from the street, these miscellaneous items are not directly referenced in the guidelines and have little or no visual impact on the character of the historic district in staff's opinion.

Mr. Cowhig stated the front door was replaced with a salvaged wood French door with a fan light at the top and is a common style in the historic district. It is not a style found commonly in the Dunleath Historic District. In this instance, the entrance does have side lights and panel doors were often used in combination with side lights. It does have the look and feel of an authentic door because of the characteristics. It is a very solid door and from the period and it could be argued that it fits the style of the house.

Chair Wharton inquired there were any questions for staff. Ms. Lane asked if picture of the two car garage was an after the fact issue. Mr. Cowhig stated he believed it was done by a previous owner. Staff does have a slide, which is not available for this meeting, indicating the original garage doors photo that Ms. Geary took several years ago. It appears the doors have clearly been replaced and vinyl was used to cover the soffits. Mr. Cowhig stated it is his understanding that the previous owners did that before the house was placed on the market. Ms. Lane stated it is very visible. Mr. Cowhig stated it is a contributing garage and is not part of the application at this time but will need to be addressed in the future. Ms. Lane asked how that type of situation would be addressed. Mr. Cowhig stated staff would talk to the attorney before addressing. Ms. Jones stated if it is discovered work was done without a COA, a notice of violation would be issued. The issue would have to be researched as to whether

there are records available. Ms. Lane asked if the design of the fence was finished. Mr. Cowhig did not think so as there are posts that are not finished. Mr. Arneke asked if the horizontal design of the fence was historically appropriate. Mr. Cowhig did not know for sure but stated there have been wire fences, chain link fences, picket fences and picket fences for this historic district were introduced later. Ms. Geary stated for purposes of the Guidelines, she thought this was being categorized as a utilitarian fence which are sort of makeshift and vary in material since it is in the rear.

Chair Wharton asked if there were more questions for staff. Ms. Stringfield asked if there were less trees around the house making it highly visible, would staff still recommend approval of the fence. Mr. Cowhig responded there are many different types of privacy fences. In his opinion if the fence was stained a dark color it probably would not be noticed as much and the application stated it would be painted. Chair Wharton stated that could be a recommended condition.

Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Matthew Cashwell, 802 Cypress Street, stated the fence is not completed. It was stopped when they discovered they would need a Certificate of Appropriateness. Other things not completed are the driveway side. The posts will be level with the top of the fence and will be stained. The chair depicted in the pictures was an example of the color. Mr. Cowhig asked if the strips at the top were intended for vines. Mr. Cashwell responded it is a decorative choice. Mr. Cashwell advised there are no trees in the front of the house blocking the view of the fence and the fence is visible from the top of the slope. There are trees between this property and the backyard neighbor's property. Mr. Cashwell stated the first four months at the house the yard was underwater. They have 3 dogs and two children and came up with a plan for the backyard to be dry for them. Mr. Cashwell stated they are willing to make changes that need to be made and may need to back pedal because they did not know they needed approval before making changes. Ms. Lane referred to a slide depicting the garage and asked if the driveway would be in line with the outer corner indicated on the slide. Mr. Cashwell stated the fence would be the horizontal lattice chain fence. In response to a question from Ms. Lane asking what that would tie into, Mr. Cashwell advised it will tie into the side of the garage. One side of the garage will serve as a barrier and the fence ties into the back corner and into the front left corner. Mr. Cashwell indicated a deck on the picture. It can be seen if someone walks down the driveway but not from the street.

Lindsey Bell, 802 Cypress Street, stated it is difficult to see the garage from the street and at best only the top of the garage would be seen as everything slopes back. In response to a question by Ms. Lane on what will be the finished height of the fence, Mr. Cashwell responded it is approximately 5 feet. Ms. Bell stated the top decorative piece was added because the dogs can jump the solid bottom fence. Once completed the fence will be about 5 feet, 2 inches. Ms. Bell stated she picked the style of the fence for the broken pattern in the top and did not want solid fencing resulting in not being able to interact with neighbors. Due to having 3 large dogs, the fence is a necessity. The thought was to have the top more open to converse with neighbors and not lose a dog. Ms. Stringfield stated this a different fence design that has ever been approved in the past. Ms. Bell advised their back neighbor and side neighbor have a chain link fence.

Ms. Hoderne asked what precipitated the front door choice. A picture of the original door was displayed that matched the side lights exactly. One of their children put their hand through one of the panes on the door necessitating the need to replace the door. They went to Architectural Salvage with the dimension of the opening and found a door with that size opening. The door has been refurbished and installed.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were more questions for the applicants. Seeing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, stated this application was reviewed at their recent Board meeting and the Board supports the application. Ms. Zachary stated the Board went over the **Windows and Doors Guidelines, page 55**, "**The front door is usually the focal point. Original doors found in historic districts typically are wood panel doors with thick panes of glass. Solid wood doors are also seen in the districts and usually have side lights and fan lights.**" Ms. Zachary stated when looking at the fence issue, it is a different type of fence but everyone at the meeting thought it was a much better choice than a chain link fence and were very happy with that type of fence.

Ms. Zachary spoke on a personal note regarding the issue of the drains. The 3 drains in the back yard was a necessity to improve drainage. If they are on a slope, like they are, there should not be a drainage issue. Ms. Zachary stated this is now year 11 of the storm drain issue in the alleys that still has not been addressed. Ms. Zachary stated the fact that the applicants had to build 3 drains to drain their backyard or it would have been a lake for days at a time without this help. This is a very serious problem in the neighborhood and would like to make sure that the Commission is still on top of this issue. Ms. Zachary thanked the applicants for placing the drains, apologized for the applicants having to do place drains and stated they should not have had to do that.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. Seeing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone in opposition to the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton asked for further thoughts or discussion,

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton stated there is a recommendation in favor from staff with a proposed condition of staining the fence. Chair Wharton stated he concurred with the Board's opinion that even though the fence is out of the ordinary, it is a rear fence and not visible from the street and would find it aesthetically preferable to a chain link fence. The general consensus of the Commissioners was this is a utilitarian fence and compared to other fences submitted, is less obtrusive than others approved. It was concurred that this is a later house and the door did not look out of place. The artificial turf is temporary and impermanent.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2316 in 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 windows and doors, page 57, numbers 1 -2. Fences, walls, and site features on page 26, 5a – c. Guidelines for patios and decks**, are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodieme, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

Chair Wharton stated the condition by staff proposed was the fence be stained a dark color within six months.

MOTION:

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves, with conditions, application number 2316 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant Matthew Cashwell for work at 802 Cypress Street with the following conditions.

1. That the fence be stained a dark color within six months.

Second by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodieme, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0). Chair Wharton stated it is approved with one condition.

PUBLIC HEARING ON DUNLEATH BEAUTIFICATION CONTRACT:

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, October 30, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

Ms. Geary advised the Dunleath Historic District and the College Hill District participate in what is known as the Municipal Service District Program which means they pay a small percentage of .05 cent per \$100.00 of property value in the Dunleath District and pay .01 cent per \$100 property value in the College Hill District. The money is collected by Guilford County and carried over to the City. The funds are administered to make improvements for the benefit of the historic character of the District. Approximately two years ago legislation at the state level was enacted requiring the City to go through a formal review process when entering into contracts for expenditures with MSD funds. The legislation is written that a public hearing is required originally at the City Council level but in working with Ms. Jones, City Legal Counsel, it was allowed for the Commission to hold the public hearing. The decision today will go on to the November 19th City Council agenda to ultimately approve or deny the contract. This project is for the beautification and identification plan, and landscape maintenance service, in the Dunleath District. The District changed its name from Aycock to Dunleath. It has been a long time in achieving the naming change. An image was depicted indicating the brass lettering of Charles B. Aycock and Ms. Geary advised that will be eliminated as part of the Summit Avenue corridor improvements. The neighborhood name was selected

from the Dunleath Estate originally on Chestnut Street but is no longer there. They are utilizing the Dunleath home and in particular the ironwork that was part of it as inspiration for new signage throughout the neighborhood. There will be 3 or 4 meetings with the neighborhood and the designer regarding the scope of work and developing the overall type of branding and plans in order to identify and rebrand the neighborhood. Ms. Geary provided photographs depicting landscape areas in existence currently which have been maintained by a landscaping firm for maintenance. The median on Yanceyville Street is maintained by the City and is only grass. The Summit Avenue new medians will have a landscape plan in place as part of the Corridor project. There is an option within this contract to have the designer design landscaping to be added to the basic landscaping and under the maintenance agreement to maintain those areas as well.

Ms. Geary depicted on the projected slide the brick sign. Part of this project may be a redesign of this particular sign to match where new signs are identified and new gateway features are identified in order to have a consistent and cohesive flow. Currently there is a brick wall there. Ms. Geary identified on the project slide images of the Max Thompson Pedestrian Bridge connecting Fisher Park to College Hill. A previous contract with a landscape company re-evaluated this landscaping area that had been forgotten and overlooked, looked at what was in existence and what could be reused. This area needs to be redesigned and be a part of this contract for redesign and new installation work. Ms. Geary depicted two images on the Fisher Park side and advised the majority is on the Fisher Park side and one area on the Dunleath side, both of which would benefit both historic districts. Ms. Geary referred to the 2016-2019 Dunleath (Aycock) Municipal Service District MSD Plan which was adopted with the Aycock name. These projects align under enhanced neighborhood gateways and neighborhood identify. The contract specifications are for a 24-month period with the option to extend 12 months. The total amount expended cannot exceed \$100,000.00 under this contract. The selected firm is Randal Romie of Designature, who has worked with Greensboro Beautiful. Mr. Romie has a long history in Greensboro and his reputation follows his work. Mr. Romie is subbing under the contract with Green and Clean Landscaping who will be doing the maintenance and installation work.

Randal Romie, 208 S. Tremont Drive, stated his firm is Designature and he is a landscape architect. They will be subbing with Green and Clean who provide maintenance and installation. Mr. Romie stated he is looking forward to the rebranding, new signs, and working with the neighborhood and feels this project will be better than it ever has been starting with a new name and a new look. The rest of the design needs some help currently, some things will be cleaned up and new plants will be placed.

Mr. Carter stated there are two different spellings of Dunleath and inquired what was the correct one, E-A or E-I. Ms. Geary responded it is D-U-N-L-E-A-T-H. It was spelled both ways and the neighborhood researched it to choose which one to use. Chair Wharton stated there was a lot of research and the neighborhood was in partnership with the Greensboro History Museum and even in these measured drawings made in the 1960s or so, (*pointing to drawings of the historic ironwork in the presentation*), the owners at that time were spelling it E-I but the History Museum had written documents from the 19th century where the owners spelled it E-A in handwritten letters and so the neighborhood went with that spelling. Mr. Carter asked if the plants would be local and native and if that was a consideration given. Mr. Romie responded it will be the number 1 priority.

In response to an inquiry by Stefan-Leih Geary, Terri Jones, legal counsel, advised that the minutes of the public hearing will be provided to City Council and if the Historic Preservation Commission wishes to, they can make a recommendation in favor of the contract. The Planning Department has recommended this particular contractor.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Drive, stated this was discussed at the Dunleath neighborhood Board meeting on Monday evening and everyone is very excited and would like to recommend the Commission be in favor of supporting the contract.

Ms. Hodierne stated this is a great idea and overdue as the signs can be confusing to people who do not know the area and the beautification process will enhance the historic district. Mr. Arneke agreed as sometimes people do not know where they are and the new signage will be a big help in establishing the identity and the location for people who are not familiar with the neighborhood. Chair Wharton stated this is well timed in terms of the execution of all of the Summit Avenue corridor improvements that are being implemented. This will be an opportunity to integrate all of the efforts. Ms. Stringfield stated Fisher Park Neighborhood had contributed several thousand dollars to the Church Street side of the former landscaping.

Ms. Hodierne therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommend supporting the beautification contract. Second by Mr. Carter. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, Carter, and Stanback. Nays: 0).

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

No items from the Chair.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Ms. Jones advised the Board the Zoning Commission of PO 301 Fisher Park Circle, the Julian Price house, is scheduled for court on October 7, at 10:00 a.m., Superior Court, courtroom 3H, if anyone would like to attend.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

Chair Wharton adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
December 11, 2019**

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, December 11, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. in the Plaza Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair David Wharton (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Jesse Arnett (At Large), Linda Lane (At Large), Amanda Hodierne (Fisher Park), Ann Stringfield (At Large), and Sylvia Stanbeck (At Large). Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih-Geary were present of the Planning Department. Chuck Watson, City Attorney was also present.

Chair Wharton inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications and meeting minutes were made available to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. All responded yes. Chair Wharton inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest or discussed applications prior to the meeting. All responded they had no conflicts of interest and had no discussions regarding applications.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES

Max Carter's absence was approved.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER MINUTES (October 30, 2019) (APPROVED)

Ms. Hodierne made a motion to approve the October minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (September 25, 2019) (Approved)

It was noted that the September minutes did not have Sylvia Stanbeck indicated as present and will be amended.

Ms. Hodierne made a motion to approve the September minutes as amended and submitted, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

Chair Wharton advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Historic Preservation Commission.

SWEAR/AFFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS:

Staff and those speaking were affirmed.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

3a. Application # 2303. 108 Fisher Park Circle (Approved)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for the property located at 108 Fisher Park Circle in the Fisher Park Historic District. Mr. Cowhig advised this was continued from the October 30, 2019 meeting with the approval for an addition to an existing garage and alterations to the home. At that time there had been drawings submitted by the Historic Preservation Office indicating their concepts for the addition that they felt displayed the least impact on the integrity of the structure. Mr. Cowhig provided the background of the drawings that had been submitted to the Historic Preservation. The Historic Preservation Commission did make recommendations to the addition that they felt would minimize the impact on the historic structure. Mr. Cowhig presented the renderings to the Commission for their review and indicated the one that was settled on with the lowered the roof line setting it back slightly from the front wall of the building and stated the windows on the right side were being reused.

Staff had originally recommended against the addition but does feel out all of the proposals, Option A is the least impactful on the historic character of the structure and is the closest to what State had recommended. Mr. Cowhig stated the other item was a discussion regarding the garage door. The applicants had proposed to replace the existing door with an automatic door. Mr. Cowhig stated the staff comments are from the last meeting and should not be considered. The COA was technically approved with conditions. Mr. Arnett clarified that the state office concerns were how the addition would jeopardize the placement on the National Register which is different than what the Historic Preservation Commission is considering in meeting the guidelines.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any other questions for staff. Hearing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Todd Schwarz, 108 Fisher Park Circle, stated they took the recommendation from the last meeting to heart. The structure on top of the roof architecturally was changed making the structure look better. The roof was lowered, insets were placed and corbels were removed. By his measurements, the new structure will be 42% of the structure and 58% was the old. Mr. Schwarz distributed materials regarding the new proposed garage door, PT113, along with renderings of the previous garage door.

Scott Richardson, 440 Carefree Lane, Stokesdale, provided the details implemented in matching as much items as possible with the existing structure. Mr. Arneke asked if there would be new windows. Mr. Richardson stated they are using the existing windows.

Jim Weisner, 1714 Caspar Oak, Greensboro, introduced himself as also being a member of the team.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any other questions for the applicant or those assisting in the project. Hearing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application. There were none. Chair Wharton inquired if there were any other questions for staff. Hearing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application.

Jim Haslch, 812 Olive Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board who are in support of the project and diagram AA was their preference.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support. Having none, Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired of the Commissioners for discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Lane asked if the rear windows were a part of the condition previously for the COA. It was responded it was. The applicants will need to apply to the Board of Adjustment regarding the setbacks, if they have not as of yet.

FACT FINDING:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the finding of facts presented in application 2303 in 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, numbers 1 – 4, page 36, number 1** are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hoderne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

MOTION:

Mr. Arnett therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2303 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Todd and Jennifer Schwarz for work at 108 Fisher Park Circle. Seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hoderne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

3b. Application #2319. 625 Park Avenue (Approved)

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig advised this is an application for the removal and demolition of an accessory building at 625 Park Avenue. Ms. Geary projected the photographs of the property. Staff felt this property was an old carriage barn as there were a lot of carriage barns in the Dunleath area at one time. Mr. Cowhig stated when checking the National Register Nomination, he was surprised to learn it was not a contributing structure because of the way the National Register Nominations are prepared. Boundary lines are drawn to leave out as many non-contributing, non-historic properties as possible. This property was in an area where there were non-contributing buildings and is not in the National Register district. Mr. Cowhig stated he thought it may have been because the house next door is non-contributing. A photograph was projected indicating the state of the building which staff feels is in very poor condition with serious structural issues. These types of structures are becoming obsolete unless someone is willing to invest money into the restoration. Staff does hate to lose these structures but understand the severity of the deterioration and is the reason staff is in support of the application.

Mr. Cowhig stated the Guidelines refer to **“the following questions should apply. As a last resort could the building be moved to another location, does the site have known or potential archeological significance, is the structure of national, state, or local significance.”** The answer to the last question is no, based on the National Register Nomination. **“If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition granted, record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and reporting identifying features of the building, record the landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site, and protect any large trees or other important landscaping features during the demolition.**

Ms. Lane asked who would have that responsibility. Mr. Cowhig stated the Guidelines do not say. Staff usually takes a lot of images of buildings before they are demolished.

Chair Wharton inquired if this was built on a foundation. Mr. Cowhig responded it appears it was built on the ground. Chair Wharton inquired if there were any further questions for staff. No further questions. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone to speak in support of the application. Ms. Devon Harvey was sworn.

Devon Harvey, 625 Park Avenue, stated she had done research before the COA was done and looked on the Sanborn map which indicated there was a structure there but was not where this structure is currently. This structure is not the original structure on the Sanborn map. The Sanborn map was passed among the Commissioners for review. Ms. Harvey also provided the public records for Guilford County indicating the storage building being built in 1978. Ms. Harvey stated in looking at the back it appears to be very pieced together.

Chair Wharton asked if there were questions for Ms. Harvey. Ms. Stringfield thanked Ms. Harvey for doing her homework. Ms. Harvey was unsure of the cupola condition and if anything could be saved inside or outside of the building. Ms. Stringfield asked if there would be fencing in its place. Ms. Harvey stated part of the fence was put in in 2015 with approval but did not put a fence where the building was because it was somewhat serving as a fence. Ms. Harvey will fill in the gap with the exact fencing that is there presently and stated there is a space where a car can be parked in front of it which will be extended further to the street.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any further questions. Hearing none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, stated the Board met the previous Monday evening and voted unanimously to support this application. Ms. Zachary stated she suspected the structure was built out of the remaining materials from the original 1919 version which is why it looks so old. She thought the 1919 one was torn down and reused all the board with the Cupola being a part of the original structure. Ms. Zachary indicated on a projected photograph where a sink hole is located behind the Women’s Resource Center and have been having this confrontation or non-meeting of the minds for a long time and was advised by Ms. Harvey that she does have significant flooding issues also.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else present in support of the application. Having none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone present in opposition to the application. Having none, Chair Wharton asked if the Commissioners had any discussion. Chair Wharton asked if someone would make a finding of fact.

FINDING OF FACT:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2319 in 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 the staff comments and the following **Guidelines under Accessory Structures and Garages, page 36, number 1, and guidelines mentioning demolition on page 72** are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted to approve 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

MOTION:

Ms. Stringfield therefore moves that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application 2319 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant Devon Harvey for work at 625 Park Avenue, with the following condition.

1. The existing fencing be added when the shed is removed and the parking area be expanded to how it was previously.

Seconded by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

3.c Application #2326. 206 S. Tate Street (Approved)

Mr. Arnett abstained from voting in this matter.

DESCRIPTION:

Mr. Cowhig stated this application is for work at 206 S. Tate Street to construct a garage. Mr. Cowhig refreshed the Commissioners' memory of a tree severely damaging an existing garage at this address approximately a year ago. At that time, they would come back with a proposal to build a new garage and this is what is being proposed. Mr. Cowhig referred to a photograph projected where the garage appeared to be very true regarding the look and character of the garage being replaced. Staff is very pleased and felt it was ideal to have been able to obtain compatible construction for an accessory such as this. If the structure is taller than 15', it will require a special exception to the zoning setback requirements which would otherwise be 10'. The Commission can make that recommendation to the Board if the design meets the intent of the Historic District Guidelines. The homeowner would have to apply to the Board of Adjustment for the Special Exception. Staff heartily supported the application.

Mr. Arneke inquired if it was the same footprint. Mr. Cowhig responded it was very close, but was not sure if it matched completely. Ms. Lane inquired if the original garage was considered original to the building of the house. Mr. Cowhig responded it is so close in terms of its construction, but was uncertain on that point.

Chair Wharton inquired if this could potentially be used as a dwelling unit at some point. Mr. Cowhig responded under the City's Zoning Ordinance, homeowners are allowed in any residential zone to have an accessory dwelling unit. There are requirements that must be met, but it could be an accessory dwelling unit at some point.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any further questions for staff. Having none, Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in support of the application.

SPEAKERS IN SUPPORT:

Dean Wilson, 206 Tate Street, stated a tree hit the garage and want to rebuild it. Mr. Wilson provided a photograph depicting what had been designed by Mr. Arnett. Mr. Wilson stated it was similar to the way it was

previously with two windows in the front. A few changes were made but the overall design is pretty much the same as it was.

Mr. Arneke asked if the old garage was still standing and if he was able to retrieve items. Mr. Miller stated he went to the top and took a few things close to the door but had not ventured in and was very hesitant as it is probably not safe. It will probably be costly to assemble and remove items and may not be worth the cost to remove the items. Mr. Arneke asked if there was anything worth salvaging within the structure. Mr. Miller responded not safely.

Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive, stated the footprint of this structure is larger than the existing structure. He was unable to field measure himself but according to the insurance information, the existing structure was a little over 19' by 19' which is very small and too small for a two-car garage. Changes were made to the footprint and believed the new design to be 22 feet wide, which is the smallest he would go for a two-car garage with two separate doors. It was felt to be very important to have two separate doors to maintain the character of the garage. There is an exterior metal staircase accessing to the second floor. The steps were moved to the interior of the garage increasing the depth. Mr. Arnett stated in regards to the Special Exception, the survey that was completed indicates the existing structure over the property line, right on the side property line and over the real property line by a foot. That has been brought in and is fully on the owners' property and shows 1 foot, 6 inches on the side and the rear. The dwelling unit is intended to be used for storage and has been designed if a future owner desired a separate arrangement that would be possible. The stairs have been positioned such so that a future exterior door could be added at the foot of the stairs on the side of the building separate from the garage.

Ms. Stringfield asked Mr. Arnett if he would discuss the fence situation. Mr. Arnett indicated where the fence is currently located and are proposing to remove that in order to accommodate the new footprint and location. There will be a chain link fence with the same idea of connecting the corner of the garage to the corner of the house.

Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone present to speak in support of the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone present to speak in opposition to the application. No one came forward. Chair Wharton inquired if there was a staff COA to demolish the existing structure. Mr. Cowhig responded there is and has been approved. Chair Wharton asked if the Commissioners had any comments.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Arneke stated it was sad to lose the structure but necessary. Chair Wharton inquired if someone would like to make a finding of fact.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2326 in 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 the following **Guidelines under Guidelines for Accessory Structures and Garages on page 36, numbers 2 through 4 and the Guidelines for fences, walls and site features on page 26, under 3 and 5b**, are acceptable as findings of fact.

Second by Ms. Stanbeck. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

MOTION:

Ms. Stringfield therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2326 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to applicant, Nancy C. Wilson, at 206 S. Tate Street.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodierne, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

Chair Wharton requested a motion be made requesting a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception to the setback. Mr. Arneke so moved recommending in favor of a special exception for the

setback. Seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodierna, Stringfield, and Stanbeck. Nays: 0).

Ms. Stanbeck left the meeting in progress.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

818 Walker Avenue (Granted and Approved)

Mr. Cowhig advised at the August meeting the Commission had denied a Certificate of Appropriateness application to construct a carport at 818 Walker Avenue. The applicants were not present at that meeting. Staff met with the applicants and had discussions about what they were trying to do and staff explained that to the Commission. The Commission felt that it did not meet the guidelines and denied the application. Mr. Cowhig personally was troubled by the fact that in talking with the applicants subsequently, there was information that the Commission did not have knowledge of the concerns the applicants had. There is a provision within the ordinance allowing for reconsideration and is why the applicants are present today requesting the consideration. Mr. Cowhig explained the way the process works is for a member of the Commission has to make a motion to allow the applicant to make their case that there is additional information and then the Commission would vote to reconsider it. It would be treated as a new application received at that point. The first step was for a Commission member to make a motion that the applicants be allowed to present their case for reconsideration. Mr. Cowhig stated it personally troubles him when he feels the Commission made a decision and didn't have all the information, especially when homeowners do not get their day in court and feels that there should be a requirement for applicants attend the meeting or the request is continued. Mr. Cowhig felt it would be reasonable to allow the applicants to present information that he did not believe the Commission had at the time.

Chair Wharton asked if the process would be if the Commission wants to, would move to rehear. It would be voted on and if the vote was favorable, would rehear the application. Mr. Cowhig responded that was correct. Ms. Hodierna asked what the new information was. Mr. Cowhig responded the information is related to the geometry of the site and the constraints the applicants are dealing with. Staff went out and talked with the applicants at length and he did not fully understand the difficulty they were working with in accomplishing what they were trying to do at that time. Staff recommended in favor of it after meeting with the applicants again and getting an idea of what they were trying to do and sympathizing with them. Mr. Cowhig stated he personally saw this as more of an item that is a category of miscellaneous items allowed in the backyard of properties that are not allowed anywhere else needed for practical reasons. Mr. Arnett inquired if the structure is the same one in the packet. Mr. Cowhig responded as far as he knew but would need to hear from the homeowners.

Mr. Arneke moved the Commission hear the request for reconsideration. Seconded by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodierna, Arnett and Stringfield. Nays: 0). Mr. Cowhig advised the Commission they were hearing new information justifying reconsideration. If it is decided to be heard, another motion would be needed.

Adriene Wagner and Jeff Wagner, 818 Walker Avenue. Ms. Wagner stated she has a copy of the guidelines and there was no reason for the Commission to approve the structure but felt they did have circumstances that would require special consideration and were hoping to be heard. The first consideration of the rendition indicating what the finished product would look like was very inaccurate and presented a more to scale image of what the structure should look like. Ms. Wagner stated the area is very tight and circulated an image more to scale and type. It is smaller than the original rendering indicated. Various photographs depicted what the structure could look like. Ms. Wagner stated the backyard is a tight spot with very limited space. The carport structure will be in the rear of the lot and cover an existing concrete pad used for parking. The existing trees and fences will screen the area from surrounding properties and there are fences surrounding the location. The design is different from other historic structures but would have very little impact on the property or historic district due to its location and open design. This structure is needed to protect the automobiles from branches, berries, sap, and other droppings from the trees. Over the years the vegetation has increased and poses a danger. Ms. Wagner stressed they are not looking for a cosmic garage or a renter in the backyard. They are interested in using

repurposed wood for the structure cover and paint it green to match the trim on the house. Mr. Wagner produced a photograph depicting the view from the street in how much of the area would be obscured from public view.

Chair Wharton asked about the material of the substructure holding up the translucent panels and what was the color. Ms. Wagner responded the color is called oak moss and is a dark brown color. Having no more questions, Chair Wharton asked if there was a motion to rehear the application and then there would be another vote to accept the application.

Mr. Arnett moved to rehear the application. Seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Arnett, Lane, Hodierno, Stringfield and Arnett. Nays: 0).

Chair Wharton stated they have heard the testimony from the applicants and requested if the applicants had anything further to add.

Mr. Wagner stated they are open to any suggestions and realize the modern aspect of the design is part of the reason for the previous application being denied. They have stated why they felt this is the best design for their particular situation but if deemed inappropriate, suggestions would be helpful as there is nothing in the guidelines that could work in their situation and would again have the issues with clogged systems, flooded cars and other problems.

Chair Wharton asked if the Neighborhood Association was notified of the hearing being reheard. Mr. Cowhig advised they had been notified of the previous hearing. Chair Wharton noted there is not a representative from the Neighborhood Association. Chair Wharton inquired if there was anyone else to speak in support of the application. Seeing none, inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application. There was none.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wharton stated his thoughts were if this was to be approved it would be best to not make it something other than what it is and perhaps have the base be painted as opposed to wood. Mr. Arnett stated he has discussed this project with Mr. Cowhig since the initial hearing and feels the owners have done their due diligence in considering all the options and the center post design does make the most sense for the particular constraints. Mr. Arnett referred to the **guidelines on page 36** regarding accessory structures in having this structure fit within the description. Mr. Arnett asked if this structure was approved what are the justification grounds and referred to **Guideline 5b on page 36**. Ms. Lane stated there have been many discussions in the past regarding so called inappropriate structures and does not adapt to modern life. Ms. Lane felt the Historic Commission needs to be somewhat forgiving and move along with specific cases that do fall out of the guidelines but could and should be looked at more carefully in the future. Mr. Arneke referred to **Guidelines 3 and 4** and stated this structure is very much in align with those guidelines and did not feel it would stick out and damaging the house or surrounding area. Ms. Stringfield felt the structure was quite visible and did not feel she could approve this contemporary structure. Ms. Hodierno stated an accessory structure is just a detached structure and is customarily incidental to that of which the principal structure located on the same lot as stated in the LDO. Mr. Arnett referred to page 24 and some of the items were trellises, sculptures and other outdoor art work. Ms. Hodierno stated this is an item that is removeable. Chair Wharton felt the intent of the guidelines regarding fabricated metal structures was aimed specifically at the pre-fab metal sheds as opposed to this structure. Ms. Hodierno stated the Commission needs to embrace this structure as something different and not try to plat in within the guidelines.

Ms. Geary referred to page **26 of the Guidelines** for miscellaneous items. Ms. Geary suggested when the Commission is making a motion where a project is somewhat contrary to the guidelines, in the finding of fact it could be stated in the facts of the case that given the constraints of the property, the fencing, and the parking lot in the back corner and not easily visible from the street. The structure design being suggested is streamlined and can cite Guidelines 3 and 4 under accessory structures as it meets those. The Commission could then go back to page 26 under **Guidelines for fences, walls, and site features and cite Guideline 1, which speaks to “placement of miscellaneous items such as swimming pools, playground equipment, concrete pads, and basketball goal, treehouses, dumpsters, and trash receptacles only in areas such as rear yards where they are not visible from the street.”** Ms. Geary stated if it is being treated as something of an oddity, patch together the guidelines

as they are the resources the Commission has at their disposal. Ms. Hodierna stated she felt it was very important the Commission be mindful that the decision not be so nuanced and can be applied to other cases in the future if need be. Further discussion was centered on the role of the Commission.

FACT FINDING:

Ms. Hodierna moved that based upon the facts presented in application 2289 in 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 the following **Guidelines under Guidelines for Accessory Structures and Garages on page 36, numbers 3 and 4** and the following considerations that there are extenuating circumstances in this case that limit the use of a more traditional and more obvious compatible structure in this location. That coupled with the fact the applicants are experiencing very real and intense reasons for shelter and the fact that the Commission wants to have residents have full use of their homes in a more modern capacity and to utilize them in the way that all would in 2019. In addition, considering the structure as some type of additional site feature that is de minimis referenced in the **Guidelines on page 24**.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodierna, and Arnett. Nays: 1, Stringfield).

MOTION:

Ms. Hodierna therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2289 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the extent it is required to Adriene L. Wagner for work at 818 Walker Avenue.

Second by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodierna, and Arnett. Nays: 1, Stringfield).

RECOMMENDATION, REZONING APPLICATION:

901 Spring Garden Street (Recommended)

Mr. Cowhig reminded the Commission of the procedure regarding zoning applications located within the historic district. First step is being presented to the Historic Commission to make a recommendation to the Zoning Commission. The Historic Commission has been instructed to confine their comments to the question surrounding historic preservation on whether a proposed use or a proposed zoning category would be compatible with the historic preservation of a structure. In this particular case, there is a new owner of this building who moved in and received a notice of violation from the City that the property was in violation of the zoning ordinance. Apparently there is a dwelling unit in the back portion of the building. Likely was put in by an owner at some point in time and probably did not go through a review or permit process, which is why the new owner is stuck with this problem. Staff feels it would not be inconsistent with the preservation of the property.

Chair Wharton inquired if Ms. Hodierna was presenting the case to the Commission.

Amanda Hodierna, 804 Glen Valley Road, Greensboro, stated she was representing the new owners, Brett and Amanda Van DerVeen. The Van DerVeens purchased the property in August of 2018 and have been long time residents, individual and corporate citizens of Greensboro. They have a photography business in Greensboro and have relocated that business to this location. Photographs were displayed indicating the building. The Van DerVeens moved in and started operating their photography studio and were utilizing the apartment already existing in the structure and received a notice of violation that it was not okay. This is a case about maintaining status quo and compliance. For purposes of this hearing, it is uniquely simple in terms of historic preservation as this is exactly what the Commission wants to see as there are literally no changes proposed.

Ms. Hodierna presented the application that stated the conditions. One of the conditions is to maintain the current footprint of the building and the second condition is to limit the uses on the building. The uses they are limiting are office and personal/professional services encompassing the use of the photography studio, household living, and overnight accommodations, allowing the use of the apartment. Those are the two uses that have been in use

on this site since the 50's, as far as they have been able to determine. From what is known so far, one of the earliest uses of the site was as a jewelry store and perhaps an apartment for someone to be on site with the jewelry store having valuable inventory and things of that nature. The applicants are trying to maintain and keep the functionality of what they purchased and bargained for. The issue is the current zoning commercial neighborhood does not allow for commercial use and a residential use in a side by side fashion. It is allowed for in a vertical fashion but not side by side.

Ms. Hodiernie stated the property needs to be rezoned to office to allow the horizontal layout they are working with and have conditioned it back to closely resemble that and continue the ongoing use. The Van DerVeens have been there for over a year and moved in with no other goals. They would like to utilize the property as it had been used. The apartment structure is less than 350 square feet and will be something very limited in use. Ms. Hodiernie stated her client wants to do this right way and to that end, the unit had been inspected. The unknown is whether it was built with a building permit. After the fact, it has been inspected by building inspections to ensure safety and has been permitted and is safe. Now they would like to have it zoned so it is not a zoning violation.

Mr. Arneke inquired if the entrance was on Spring Garden Street. Ms. Hodiernie stated it is. Office use is in the front and there is ability internally to move between the two uses, if need be, but their ideal is to function separately. Mr. Arneke inquired if parking was onsite for whoever lives there, whether it is a tenant, Air B&B, or whatever. Ms. Hodiernie responded that was correct. Ms. Hodiernie added that her clients are not absentees in the sense that this is mailbox income for them. They own and operate the business and are onsite every day, 8:00 to 5:00 or longer, operating their business and is very much something they can keep an eye on. The stakes for them are very day to day. Ms. Hodiernie stated at this stage just for zoning, this property would be considered a dwelling unit. If they wanted to be considered a tourist home, bed and breakfast, they would have to obtain a Special User Permit and meet all of the requirements of a tourist home, bed and breakfast. There are 6 standards in the LDO and if you cannot meet those, a variance would be needed and require a public hearing.

Chair Wharton inquired if there were any further questions. Chair Wharton inquired if the applicants wished to speak.

Brett Van DerVeen, 719 Fifth Avenue, stated the history of the building was a jewelry store in the '70s and before that it was a commercial air conditioning business. On the other side it used to be Pratt & Whitney Machine Company, a large multi-acre property. The property has a history of industrial, light industrial, mercantile uses. The neighborhood has gone very far afield from that. Student housing was built where previously it was light industrial. There have been numerous owners, to include a squatter living there. The Van DerVeens saw this as an opportunity to have something there they could use short term, move their daughter into as she attends UNCG, and possibly as a residential use as they get older. They would love to have the vertical slat but the horizontal slat is just as good for their purposes and easier for accessibility. The designer created a garage door that raises up and inside are double doors with access through there to load anything that will not fit through a typical door. They want to keep the building as flexible as possible.

Chair Wharton asked if there were any further questions. Having none, Chair Wharton asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak.

Ms. Hodiernie added that the HOA representative was not present but the request did receive approval at their meeting.

DISCUSSION:

The general consensus of the Commission was to support sending to Zoning Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

Mr. Arnett moved to recommend to the Zoning Board approval of the rezoning request. Seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodiernie, Arnett, and Stringfield. Nays: 0).

TEMS FROM COMMISSION AND CHAIRMAN

No items from the Chair.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated they have received four proposals for the African/American Architectural Resources Survey and is time to make a decision. That project will be starting soon. Mr. Cowhig thanked Chuck Watts, City Attorney, for filling in. Mr. Arneke stated if anyone was interest Erich Woodward, who has published this issue has made public presentations on the neighborhood and the relationship between the architectural and the civil rights movement, and Greensboro's history. It is really interesting and he will probably be doing those again. Mr. Cowhig stated Mr. Woodard was going to send a power point presentation to him, which he has not received to date.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

Ms. Stringfield moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:32 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted to approve 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Hodieme, Arnett, and Stringfield. Nays: 0).

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
SS/cgs