

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 27, 2016**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, and Hanna Cockburn, Department of Planning and Community Development. Also present was Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 9, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Adams moved approval of the December 9, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Adams, Arneke, Pratt. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 306 Parkway
Application Number 1931
Applicant: Robert Kantlehner
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 1-13-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

Description of Work:

Replace existing picture window on left side of house with French doors.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

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

Fact:

The location of the proposed work is a wing that appears to have been added to the house sometime after WWII, or it was a side porch that was enclosed. The window to be replaced is a "picture" window, popular in mid-century residential construction at the time but sharply different from original windows of the house. This is not a prominent location on the house.

Fact:

French doors are found commonly on houses of this style and from this period.

Guidelines (page 55):

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

Recommended Conditions:

That the new French doors be true or simulated divided light doors with muntins that match the profile of other French doors in the house.

In Support:

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway
Anne Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1931 for work at 306 Parkway in Fisher Park. The applicant is Robert Kantlehner, owner of the property. The description of work is to replace an existing picture window on the left side of the house with French doors. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that the window was on a part of the house that probably was not original and is typical of post WWII windows. It is not on a prominently visible location. He stated that staff believes the proposal meets the intent of the guidelines and recommended in favor of granting a COA with the condition that the French doors be true or simulated divided light doors with permanently attached interior and exterior muntins. Additionally, the exterior of the door could be clad. Speaking in favor of the application was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, who noted this window is on an addition of the house possibly from the 1940's. The plan is to remove the window and leave the horizontal dimension of the rough opening the same and expand it downward to the level of the ground. French doors will be added with simulated light windows with permanently attached interior and exterior muntins with a metal aluminum clad exterior. The building of a step was not necessary. Also speaking in support of the application was Anne Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, who reported that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association had unanimously approved this COA. There was no one speaking in opposition to the request.

Discussion:

Mr. Pratt indicated his preference to see the simulated divided light window have permanently fixed muntins on both the inside and outside rather than grid between glass.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1931 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments regarding the fact that this is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District and *Guideline 1* on page 57 are acceptable as findings of fact.

Chair Wharton made a friendly amendment to use the language "not incongruous" instead of "congruous" as previously discussed. Ms. Lane accepted the friendly amendment and Mr. Arneke seconded by motion. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1931 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Kantlehner for work at 306 Parkway with the following condition: (1) That the simulated design for the lights be applied to the exterior, permanently affixed to the exterior and interior of the new window, fixed doors, and new doors. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams. Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 622 South Mendenhall Street
Application Number 1928
Applicant: Paul Carlone
Date Application Received: 1-12-16
(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replace original windows with new vinyl windows with same muntin pattern.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 41-42)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill National Register Historic District. The windows appear to be original and are characteristic of the architectural style and the period.

Facts:

The existing window sash appears to be in sound condition. They are probably constructed of old growth wood which is denser and more resistant to rot than modern lumber. Any deterioration to the window sill or other window parts is likely due to water infiltration that is almost always correctable without replacing the windows.

Guidelines:

2. Preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, hardware, thresholds, and shutters. If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail. Vinyl "clad" windows are an example of an inappropriate replacement for wood windows.

In Support:

Paul Carlone, 622 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1928 for work at 622 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Paul Carlone and the description of work is to replace all the original windows with new vinyl windows with the same muntin pattern. Mr. Cowhig, Planning Department, said that the windows appear to be original 6 over 6 true divided light. The sashes appear sound although there is some deterioration on the sills because they are not draining properly. The damage could be due to water infiltration which is correctable. He said the windows are characteristic of the period of the house and repairing them might be eligible for certain tax credits. Storm windows are a recommended approach for window protection, either wood or aluminum low profile. Mr. Cowhig cited *Guidelines 2 and 3* on page 57 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines and Program Manual*.

Speaking in support of the application was the owner, Paul Carlone, 622 South Mendenhall Street. He said the deterioration around the windows was worse than it appeared. It has been caulked and repaired many times. He was not aware of the window guidelines when ordering the replacement windows. He noted there are other vinyl windows in the neighborhood and asked for advice on who to get to repair the windows. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who reported that the College Hill Neighborhood Association has recommended against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness.

Discussion:

Comments were made that this request is straight-forward and that the guidelines speak directly against the replacement of original windows..

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1928 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as presented and the following guidelines under *Windows and Doors* on page 57, numbers 2 and 3(a) are acceptable as findings of fact. Mr. Arneke read the guidelines on page 57 into the record as follows: (2) Preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, hardware, thresholds, and shutters. If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, placing, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic material shall be avoided; (3) When repair is not feasible as determined by City staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows when designed to match the original in appearance, detail and material profile, and overall size as closely as possible. Double paned glass may be considered when they are true divided and can accurately resemble the original window design; and (3a) It is not appropriate to replace true divided light windows with vinyl windows or windows with snap-in muntins. The staff comments and these guidelines are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1928 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Paul Carlone for work at 622 South Mendenhall Street, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 615 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1932
Applicant: Riley Driver
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 1-13-16
(PARTIALLY APPROVED/PARTIALLY DENIED)

Description of Work:

Removal of chimneys.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the changes are incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill National Register Historic District.

Fact:

There are three chimneys. Two are fireplace chimneys that appear to be original to the house and are prominently located. They probably vented coal fireplaces. They contribute to the historic character of the house. The third is a short brick chimney near the back of the house that probably vented a cook stove or a boiler. It is not prominently located and is less important to the historic character of the house.

Fact:

The chimneys appear to be in need of repair including re-pointing the brickwork and possible rebuilding along with proper flashing to prevent water infiltration.

Guidelines (page 50):

1. Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps.....

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

In Support:

Riley Driver, 615 South Mendenhall Street
Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1932 for work at 615 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant and owner is Riley Driver at the same address. The description of work is removal of chimneys. Mr. Cowhig, Planning Department, noted that the house has been fully renovated. There are two fireplace chimneys that are original to the house that are prominent and contribute to its historic character. One of the chimneys is corbelled and there are several of these in College Hill. There is a third chimney in the back that is not prominent and is less important. He noted that at least one of the chimneys appeared to not be flashed with the appropriate step flashing and that at least one of the chimneys appears to need repair and re-pointing. He cited *Guidelines 1 and 6* on page 50. Commissioner Arneke noted that the house had previously been apartments but now is single-family. Commissioner Pratt noted that flashing appears to be missing on one of the chimneys and Commissioner Lane noticed that the front chimneys do not match. Speaking in support was the homeowner, Riley Driver, 615 Mendenhall Street, who noted she had been renovating the house since she purchased it in November, 2015. Some flashing has been done but she noticed a few weeks ago that there is moisture damage. The contractor she engaged said the chimney was the cause of the moisture damage and it had possibly been counter-flashed. He recommended removal of the chimneys. She noted the rear chimney is not leaking and is not connected to anything. None of the fireplaces or chimneys is functioning. Also speaking in support of the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who said the College Hill Neighborhood Association supported the removal of the rear chimney only. There was no one to speak in opposition. Ms. Driver offered a correction to the summary and said that the house still has three apartments and is not a single-family dwelling. She also noted that there is a possibility that the original rear chimney, not the chimney on the flat roof, may be leaking because she has observed water damage.

Discussion:

Ms. Lane said that she would like to see the chimneys matching at the top and recommended that as a condition. Counsel Jones explained the application is for removal of the chimneys which can be

approved or denied. She did not feel that a condition could be added to repair the chimney if the application is denied. Ms. Adams felt that the Commission should be flexible when needed to serve the greater interest of historic districts. Guidelines say it is not appropriate to shorten or remove "original" chimneys and it is hard to discern what is original. She pointed out that the chimney in the rear is clearly part of a later addition. The chimney on the viewer's right has corbelling while the one on the left has no significant chimney detail and does not contribute to the architectural structure. She questioned why someone would build two radically different chimneys. Without knowing more information she was not comfortable with removal. Chair Wharton commented that it is within the Commission's power to grant removal of one, two, or three of the chimneys. Mr. Arneke said it seems clear there was an original chimney on the left in the picture. Ms. Lane said the chimneys could be identical; however, visually from the photograph they do not look identical. At one point, they probably were identical. Ms. Adams said that without plans or a picture of the original, members are only guessing. Mr. Pratt stated his opinion that the two main chimneys are original because there are fireplaces below in the house. The top part of one of the chimneys was probably removed due to damage over time. Rather than repair the corbelling, it was more than likely just removed. He did not have a problem allowing removal of the chimney on the addition in the back. He was unsure about removing the other chimneys because there is a possibility the house may be sold in the future and may be turned back into a single-family home and people who buy these kinds of houses like the old detail and character of these chimneys associated with that period. Ms. Adams reiterated that she would like to know more about the chimneys and whether or not they were original to the house because that is the basis to denying or approving the application. Chair Wharton said that the evidence given by Mr. Cowhig that the chimneys, particularly the corbelling, are typical of College Hill is strong evidence beyond speculation that they were original to the house. The fact that the second chimney goes down to an actual fireplace in the house is strong evidence as well. Chair Wharton noted his concern that the one chimney that appears to be the most originally intact is the one where the most water infiltration is happening. He felt that getting a second opinion on the flashing on the two chimneys was important. The rear chimney is not significant and is not visible. He was supportive of removing the rear chimney but pursuing other options before removing the two chimneys that are visible from the street. Ms. Lane suggested that if the Commission votes to remove the third chimney at the rear, every piece of brick from it should be retained for the possible reconstruction of the other chimneys either now or in the future. The brick is probably from the same vintage and wear. Noting the difference in mortar on the chimney on the left, she felt there probably was a repair at some point. Chair Wharton stated that denial of removing the two front chimneys would put it upon the owner to find some way to repair the moisture problems. The owner can always come back at another time and apply again to remove the chimneys if a successful solution cannot be found.

Responding to a question Ms. Driver, owner, said that the rear chimney does not appear to be leaking now; however, it probably will be leaking soon due to the inferior type of roofing material on the addition. They plan to reroof the flat addition.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1932 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is in part not congruous and in part congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines under *Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys* on page 50 as follows: (1) *Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative cap; and* (6) *It is not appropriate to shorten or remove original chimneys when they become deteriorated. Chimneys and furnace stacks that are not essential to the character of the structure, or that were added later, may be removed if it will not diminish the original design of the roof, or destroy historic details;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission partly approves application number 1932 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the owner, Riley Driver, for work at 615 South Mendenhall Street, specifically approving the removal of the non-original chimney at the back of the structure on the flat section of the roof but not approving the removal of the other two chimneys. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Arneke mentioned that there will be an open house/tour of 919 Spring Garden Street this Sunday. This is the house that the City, Preservation Greensboro and the College Hill Neighborhood Association worked very hard to save.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Ms. Geary distributed copies of the City of Greensboro's Growth and Development Trends to Commission members. The Planning Department completes this report on a regular basis to analyze growth and development in the City.

Counsel Jones reported that last week the City Council gave approval for the Historic Preservation Commission to have public hearings on contracts that use Municipal Service District funds in Charles B. Aycock and College Hill historic districts that participate in the MSD program. The Commission will not be approving the contracts but will be holding the public hearing and making a recommendation to City Council to approve or deny the contract.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MARCH 30, 2016**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Olivia Byrd, Department of Planning and Community Development. Also present was Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

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

Chair Wharton welcomed the Commission's newest member, Ann Stringfield.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 27, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the January 27, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Adams, Arneke, Pratt. Nays: None. Abstain: Stringfield.) Ms. Stringfield is a new member and did not attend the January 27, 2016 meeting.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 301 South Tate Street**
Application Number 1951
Applicant: Woody Hazelwood
Property Owner: Greensboro Primitive Baptist Church
Date Application Received: 3-15-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Replace entrance doors with metal fire rated doors.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 41-42)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This house is a "contributing" structure in the College Hill National Register Historic District. It was built in 1907 as a frame, Gothic Revival style church and was brick veneered in the 1940s or 1950s. The original entrance doors were likely replaced at the same time.

Fact:

The solid wood entrance doors have been deteriorating for some time. Replacing them with metal doors of the same dimensions and adding trim pieces to match the existing would not significantly alter the historic character of the structure.

Guidelines (page 57):

1. *Preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, hardware, thresholds, and shutters. If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail. Vinyl "clad" windows are an example of an inappropriate replacement for wood windows.*

In Support:

Woody Hazelwood, 3805 Patterson Avenue
 Clarence Edwards, 3449 Alamance Church Road
 Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1951 for work at 3301 South Tate Street in College Hill. The applicant is Woody Hazelwood and the property owner is Greensboro Primitive Baptist Church. The description of work is to replace the wooden entrance doors with a single fire rated door. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff recommended in favor of granting this COA. In staff's opinion, the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Guidelines—Windows and Doors*. He noted that this is a contributing structure in College Hill built in 1907 as a frame Gothic Revival style church and was brick veneered in the 1940s or 1950s. The original entrance doors were probably replaced at the same time. The solid wooden doors have been deteriorating for some time and replacing with metal doors with the same dimension and adding trim pieces to match would not significantly alter the character of the structure. He also noted that safety is an issue in this case. The Fire Marshall indicated that current doors do not meet safety and code standards. Mr. Cowhig said that from a preservation standpoint, it is better to repair the doors but from a safety standpoint, replacement would be desirable. Speaking in support was Woody Hazelwood, 3805 Patterson Avenue, who was told when he applied to replace the door that it must be a 36" fire rated door with an emergency bar to comply with the code. He planned to fill the gap on each side with wood trim. The current doors are deteriorated and bowed and the threshold needs to be replaced because rain is seeping in. Also speaking in support was Clarence Edwards, 3449 Alamance Church Road, who reiterated comments made by Mr. Hazelwood and said that he was willing to work with staff. Also speaking in partial support was Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She noted that although they had not seen the revised application, they were in support of changing the material for safety reasons. The material could be painted to resemble wood as long as the trim was also appropriate. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Adams noted that the door shown on the historic photo was dark in color and she asked if there was any fire coded appropriate door that could be painted or stained to be more in line with the original door. Counsel Jones said that the decision of the door color is up to the church and it can be painted any color. Ms. Lane said that a wood grain door would be more appropriate from a design point of view. Chair Wharton said that the Commission tries to avoid having people do faux painting unless that was what was originally present. Chair Wharton said that a flat metal door is going to be very close to being incongruous. However, if the applicant can get some kind of trim on the door that is appropriate and will not dimensionally harm the nicely proportioned opening, then that would be the best option. Mr. Pratt pointed out that another possibility would be to use an embossed metal door that is fire rated. It would be necessary to ascertain the fire rating of the door and then find out what design options are available at that rating. Members felt that the applicant should work with staff to help them make an appropriate choice. The application could be approved with a condition that the door is to be chosen in consultation with staff.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1951 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and *Guideline 1* on page 57 as follows: *1. Preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, hardware, thresholds, and shutters. If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail. Vinyl "clad" windows are an example of an inappropriate replacement for wood windows;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1951 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Woody Hazelwood for work at 301 South Tate Street with the following condition: (1) That the applicant works with staff to identify the specific fire rating of the door and the design options for the door and work out details on the trim on and around the door. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Arneke stated that the Guidelines require trash cans to be screened either in back yards or screened from view from the street. Since the large City cans came into use this guideline has not been enforced. In College Hill a great number of houses have trash cans sitting in the front yard or in side yards. He felt that this is a serious concern for the historic nature of the neighborhood. Mr. Arneke and Mr. Cowhig have discussed developing a plan to possibly notify property owners of that condition and give them some period of time to come into compliance and then after that, the guideline will be enforced. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that another step that needs to be done first is to bring in the City's Legal Department to address the question of whether or not it is a violation of the Historic District rules if the trash cans are placed in the front yard. He felt that a proposal needs to be developed to be added to the guidelines relative to this matter.

Chair Wharton asked if it was a general City-wide ordinance that required screening the cans or if it was only in the Historic Districts. Mr. Cowhig said there was a general City-wide ordinance about the trash receptacles. Mr. Arneke stated there is a guideline that requires garbage cans to not be visible from the street.

Olivia Byrd informed the Commission that the Solid Waste guideline was that the can had to be behind the house and there is a 7-7-7 rule that you can only bring the can to the curb at 7:00 a.m. on the day of collection. The cans have to be off of the curb by 7:00 p.m. that same day. The cans are to remain behind the house and out of view. Neighbors can call to report that a garbage can is continually at the curb or is not behind the house. The Call Center will write up a report and Solid Waste will place a warning on the trash can with consequences that include eventually removing the trash can.

Mr. Arneke stated that the subject guideline is located under *Guideline 2 -- Walls and Site Features* on page 26 as follows: *Trash receptacles and dumpster areas must be adequately screened from view of the public right of way and adjoining residences with shrubs and/or fencing.*

Mr. Cowhig commented that the trash receptacles that are permanently in the front yard near the sidewalk could be identified as an area that should be screened. Another option is to pursue this matter from the City-wide ordinance. A letter could be sent out to the entire neighborhood alerting people to the issue and asking for their cooperation.

Ms. Lane said that the water bill sent out monthly has an excellent folder with topics such as this. She felt that including information on the 7-7-7 rule in the water bill folder would be a good way to make the public more aware of the issue.

Chair Wharton noted the problem of tenant enforcement of this issue in rental properties.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that a Tax Credit Workshop is being sponsored by the Planning Department, Preservation Greensboro and Downtown Greensboro. The event will be held April 5, 2016 at the Historical Museum from 9:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. There will be an informational session in the morning and tours of renovated downtown historic buildings will be offered in the afternoon.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
APRIL 27, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Cindy Adams; David Arneke; Tracy Pratt; Ann Stringfield; Wayne Smith; and David Hoggard.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 30, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the March 30, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Pratt, Stringfield, Hoggard, Smith. Nays: None.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 508 South Cedar Street**
Application Number 1949
Applicant: Kevin Watts
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 3-21-16
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Flowering Cherry tree was removed; 2 Crape Myrtle trees were severely trimmed.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work, with conditions, is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-22)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

According to the College Hill Tree Inventory the Cherry tree was in fair health and the Crape Myrtles were in good health.

Guidelines (page 25):

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
2. *When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.*
3. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*

Recommended Conditions:

- (1) That 2 trees of a species and size recommended by the City Arborist be started within 30 days.
- (2) That the Crape Myrtles be fully removed.

In Support:

Kevin Watts, 508 South Cedar Street

In Opposition:

Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Avenue

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1949 for work at 508 South Cedar Street. The applicant and owner is Kevin Watts. The description of work was removal of flowering Cherry tree and trimming two Crape Myrtles. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA and in their opinion, the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping* (page 21-22), citing *Guidelines 1, 2, and 3* on page 25. According to the College Hill Tree Inventory, the Cherry tree was in fair health and the Crape Myrtles were in good health. Staff recommended the following conditions: (1) that 2 trees of a species and size recommended by the City Arborist be started within 30 days, and (2) that the Crape Myrtles be fully removed. Speaking in support of the application was Kevin Watts, 508 South Cedar Street. He said that he bought the property in foreclosure and the insurance company had required tree trimming from the Crape Myrtles to the light post and trimming of the bushes to the level of the porch. He also asserted that the Cherry tree had broken off at the top and the remaining trunk was 2/3 rotted. He asserted that the trimmed Crape Myrtle trees are both budding and he asserted that since he bought the property in foreclosure, he was not aware that he needed to apply for a COA. Speaking in opposition to the application was Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Avenue, who said that the house had previously been beautifully landscaped and she thought the Crape Myrtles were dead. Speaking in rebuttal was Kevin Watts, 508 South Cedar Street, who asserted that the Crape Myrtles are in fact alive. He said that one of the Crape Myrtles had broken into the lamp post fixture and they are now budding.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke stated that he could appreciate Mr. Watts's frustration. This is hardly the first time there has been a situation where a homeowner has been put in a difficult position like this. To his knowledge, the Commission has never required a fully grown, large tree to replace another. He did not feel there would be any reason to be concerned about what the City Arborist and Mike Cowhig would recommend. Since there is an opinion on the health of the Crape Myrtles, he felt the conditions recommended by staff were appropriate. He felt the City Arborist should give his opinion about the Crape Myrtles and condition anything further based on his opinion.

Mr. Smith asked if there had ever been any conversation about moving the street light out of the tree rather than cutting the tree down. Mr. Watts spoke from the audience against removing the street light. Following an exchange, Mr. Smith moved to continue this case until the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. Due to the date of the application, it was determined that the case cannot be continued without the permission of the property owner. Chair Wharton asked Mr. Watts to allow the Commission to continue their deliberation without any further interruptions. Counsel Jones explained that if Mr. Watts was unhappy with the decision of the Commission, he could appeal it further. Mr. Watts was informed that the meeting is akin to a court proceeding and he would have to leave if he could not be quiet during the deliberation.

Mr. Cowhig stated that the light could not be moved without great expense and normally there is pruning done around streetlights. Chair Wharton commented that removal of the light would require a separate COA and that is not likely to happen.

Ms. Stringfield pointed out that if the Crape Myrtles were not 4 inches in diameter at breast height, which is what the Guidelines say, then what somebody did to them is really not of concern. She commented that she drove by the property earlier and rot was visible in the tree to the right that was cut down. She would have no concern with that tree having been cut down due to the rot. She said there is limited space in that part of the yard where the replacement tree would go and questioned if the replacement tree should be put elsewhere on the property.

Mr. Hoggard asked for clarification on the rating scale used by the Arborist. Mr. Cowhig explained that fair is rated below good, yet not quite in poor condition. He noted that the Crape Myrtles were severely pruned but it is possible they may come back.

Chair Wharton stated that the Commission's interest in trees is primarily for the tree canopy. The Cherry tree is an ornamental tree and he questioned asking for a canopy tree to be planted when there wasn't one there in the first place. In addition, he commented that Crape Myrtles are hardy and difficult to kill and it should become apparent in a few weeks whether or not they are dead. His inclination is to grant the COA without conditions. However, if the Crape Myrtles are in fact dead, then the only condition would be to ask the owner to remove them fully. If they are alive, then there is no problem.

Ms. Adams referred to *Guideline 3* and said that when same site location is not practical, then there is no need to predicate any approval on replacement. She felt there was nothing in the guidelines to restrict the owner to a certain standard of landscaping and she did not want to impose any conditions.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1949 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments, discussions, and *Guideline 1, 2, and 3* on page 25 are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1949 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kevin Watts for work at 508 Cedar Street, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 110 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1953
Applicant: William Burckley
Property Owner: Greensboro Boxwood Associates, Inc.
Date Application Received: 3-28-16
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Restoration of granite retaining wall in front of property.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24-27)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The granite retaining wall is considered a historic resource in the College Hill National Register Historic District. It is situated prominently near a major entryway into the neighborhood and it is an important component of the setting of the historic district. The wall is in poor structural condition and a section was removed to replace a broken water line.

Guidelines (page 26):

3. *Retain fences and walls that contribute to the historic character of the property and the district where possible. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in dimension, proportion, material, texture, and detail.*

In Support:

Bill Burckley, 701 Morehead Avenue
Kevin Watts, 508 South Cedar Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1953 for work at 110 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is William Burckley and the description of work is to restore a granite retaining wall in front of the property. City staff recommended in support of the COA and in their opinion, the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* on pages 24 through 27. The retaining wall is considered a historic resource in the College Hill National Register Historic District. It is situated prominently near a major entryway into the neighborhood and it is an important component of the setting of the historic district. It was also noted that the wall is in poor structural condition and a section was removed to replace a broken water line. Speaking in support was William Burckley, 701 Morehead Avenue, who is the Vice-President of the company that owns the property. He indicated the company has been saving money to save the wall and his desire is for the Commission to rescind the previous COA to demolish the wall and to repair it to its original condition. Also speaking in support was Kevin Watts, 508 Cedar Street. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1953 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24-27)*, specifically *Guideline 3* on page 26 as follows: (3) *Retain fences and walls that contribute to the historic character of the property and the district where possible. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in dimension, proportion, material, texture, and detail;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1953 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to William Burckley for work at 110 South Mendenhall Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 442 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1956
Applicant: Parker Washburn
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-16-16
(CONTINUED UNTIL MAY, 2016 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Replace slate roof with asphalt shingles.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs* (page 51-53) for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing resource in the College Hill National Register Historic District. Originally it housed a fire station that served the West End section of the City. The building features a slate roof and decorative rafter tails.

Although the slate roof is not necessarily a character defining feature, it is the original historic material and helps to define the building's overall historic character. Only a few of these fire stations from the 1920s and 1930s survive in Greensboro. Clearly they were designed to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Slate was typically used for the roofing material.

Guidelines:

1. *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhand, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks.*
2. *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission tiles" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original.*
3. *Retain historic roofing materials such as asbestos shingles, metal shingles, and standing seam metal roofing. If replacement is necessary due to deterioration, substitute roofing materials such as composition shingles are appropriate. Since historic roofing materials were traditionally dark in color, light colored composition shingles are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*
4. *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*
5. *Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters.*

In Support:

Zach Meyers, 6402 McLeansville Road, McLeansville, North Carolina

In Opposition:

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1956 for work at 442 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Parker Washburn. The description of work is to replace the slate roof with asphalt shingles. City staff recommended against granting this COA. In their opinion, the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs* on pages 51 through 53. Staff said this is a contributing resource in the College Hill National Register Historic District. It was originally a fire station that served the West End of the City. The building features a slate roof and decorative

rafter details. Although the slate roof is not necessarily a character defining feature, it is the original historic material and helps to define the building's overall historic character. Only a few of these fire stations from the 1920s and 1930s survive in Greensboro. Staff cited *Guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5* from pages 51 through 53. He noted that although replacement of slate with asphalt is permitted in the Historic Districts, slate can sometimes be repaired at a reasonable cost. This property is eligible for state and federal historic tax credits. Speaking in support was Zach Meyers, 6402 McLeansville Road in McLeansville, North Carolina. He is the property maintenance manager. He noted that some repairs have been done to the slate roof but have failed. The plan is to replace the slate with a product called Hyland Slate Asphalt shingle that is not an ordinary three tab or architectural shingle but imitates the shadow lines of slate. It imitates the appearance of slate and has a life span similar to but not as long as slate. It was also noted that in order to repair the roof all the roofing material and flashing would need to be repaired. Speaking somewhat in opposition was Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street. He looked up Hyland Slate on his smartphone and recommended that the Commission get a product sample to see the color and design of what is proposed. Speaking in rebuttal was Zach Meyers, 6402 McLeansville Road, who noted that the Hyland Slate replacement product would be of a similar color as the original slate roof.

Discussion:

Ms. Adams and Mr. Arneke felt that a product sample should be made available before the Commission considers the matter any further. Mr. Hoggard said that it was important for all options to be explored fully. He also wanted to see a sample of the product that will be used. Chair Wharton stated that it appeared the Commission would like to give the owner more time to get additional information about the cost of repairing the roof or reusing the original roof tiles. Mr. Smith informed the Commission that there is a life expectancy for slate. Each piece is different and soft inclusions can develop that will eventually flake. Chair Wharton and Mr. Pratt indicated they would like to see a sample of the proposed product.

Members agreed that there should be a continuance of this case until the next meeting and that they would like to see a sample of the replacement material. The Commission recommended that repair options be explored.

Mr. Hoggard moved to continue this case until the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Pratt, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Stringfield. Nays: None.

PUBLIC HEARING ON COLLEGE HILL MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT BUDGET:

Mr. Cowhig stated that College Hill is a Municipal Service District and the residents participate in the planning of projects that they would use the funds for. A plan with a budget has been prepared that will be presented to City Council. This is not a required Public Hearing; however, it gives people an opportunity to review the budget and make comments.

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street, was representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association Board of Directors and presented the plan to the Commission. The plan was approved by the College Hill Board of Directors earlier in the week. A comprehensive, multiyear strategy was put together for undertaking projects in the neighborhood using Municipal Service District Funds. Projects will be funded that improve the environmental quality and marketability of the neighborhood and that will also address public safety issues in the neighborhood. Public meetings were held to identify possible activities using this funding source. The plan is the result of meetings held with property owners and residents in the neighborhood. He described details of the plan and offered to answer questions from the Commission.

There was no one from the public to comment on the plan.

Mr. Hoggard moved to endorse the plan, seconded by Ms. Stringfield.

Mr. Arneke stated that he would like to recognize the City's Planning Department for their work on the neighborhood plan. He made a friendly amendment to thank City staff for their work as well on the plan. Mr. Hoggard accepted the friendly amendment.

The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Pratt, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Stringfield. Nays: None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Arneke commented on the number of cases of after-the-fact applications that have been received and the decisions that required some level of enforcement. There have been other cases that have not come before the Commission that Code Enforcement personnel have had to look after. Some of those issues have not been resolved in a timely manner. He suggested that a supervisory representative of the Enforcement office should attend monthly Commission meetings to provide a list of all the cases they have in the three Historic Districts and the status of the cases. He was hopeful that this would lead to a quicker resolution of enforcement issues.

Counsel Jones recommended that with after-the-fact applications dealing with corrective actions, a deadline should be placed on the corrective action. This would make it easier for there to be a follow-up action.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that he met with the Solid Waste Department recently about the dumpster behind the parking lot at Winburn Court. They discussed that one way to resolve the issue would be to move the dumpster back to its original location. They also talked about the issue of the carts being placed near the street on a permanent basis and not taken behind the buildings, which is typical for apartment buildings. Solid Waste indicated that this is not really a problem for them. Mr. Cowhig stated that another way to address this problem is through Historic District rules. A legal interpretation would have to be made as to whether or not it is a violation of the Historic District ordinance for the carts to be sitting there permanently in front of the building. Mr. Cowhig plans to keep the Commission updated on this matter.

Mr. Cowhig said that the Southeast Building on the corner of Elm Street and Market Street has been beautifully restored after being vacant for close to 10 years. He indicated that the Planning Director is very interested in applying for an award under the American Planning Association's "Great Places Contest" in the category under Great Historic Renovations. This is a people's choice award. A panel will narrow the finalists down to six and then the voting will begin for the award.

Mr. Cowhig asked for help from the Commission to get the word out about the people's choice voting for the contest. Ms. Adams suggested engaging readers on the O'Henry Magazine's Facebook page for recognition of the award.

Ms. Geary stated that the Tax Credit Workshop was held earlier in the month. The workshop was a success with over 60 people participating in the event.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MAY 25, 2016**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

Chair Wharton explained the procedures used at the Historic Preservation meetings.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Wayne Smith was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 30, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the April 27, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Pratt, Stringfield, Hoggard, Lane. Nays: None.

Historic District Violations

Mike Cowhig submitted a listing of the current Historic District Violations as of 5/25/16. The listing also updated the progress of each violation. He stated that Ron Fields and Beth Benton, Code Compliance Office, are in attendance to answer questions from the Board members. He explained that the Historic District Program is a zoning overlay and it falls under the Zoning Ordinance and is enforced by the Zoning Enforcement Officers. He feels that food progress is being made in their efforts but there are always enforcement cases to be addressed.

Beth Benton, Compliance Coordinator, stated that she just wished to back up what Mike Cowhig has already stated. The cases on the list provided shows that actions have been taken on these and Notices of Violation(s) have been issued. These matters will go through the Minimum Housing Standards Commission for decisions to be made, if necessary. If cases are not in compliance, they must go through the proper process.

Mr. Hoggard stated it would be helpful if there were dates on each project on the list indicating when the work was started. Mike Cowhig responded that he would do that in the future.

Public Hearings:

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 442 S. Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1956
Applicant: Parker Washburn
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-06-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replace slate roof with asphalt shingles.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff has spoken with a roofer that specializes in this type of slate roofing and he did the repairs at 919 Spring Garden Street. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (pages 51-53)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing resource in the College Hill National Register Historic District. Originally it housed a fire station that served the West End section of the city. The building features a slate roof and decorative rafter tails. Although the slate roof is not necessarily a character defining feature, it is the original historic material and helps to define the building's overall historic character. Only a few of these fire stations from the 1920s and 1930s survive in Greensboro. Clearly, they were designed to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Slate was typically the roofing material.

Guidelines (page 51-53):

1. *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and window's walks.*
2. *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission files" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original..*
3. *Retain historic roofing materials such as asbestos shingles, metal shingles, and standing seam metal roofing. If replacement is necessary due to deterioration, substitute roofing materials such as composition shingles are appropriate. Sine historic roofing materials were traditionally dark in color, light colored composition shingles are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*
4. *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown moldings, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*
5. *Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters.*

Recommended Conditions:

- (1) The copper flashing will be used in the new installation at the drip edge, the chimneys, the valleys, and the color of the asphalt shingles to be used will be dark gray.
- (2) The architectural ornamental design features on the ends of the peak of the roof at the gable ends will be retained.
- (3) The ridge detail will be maintained and the ridge cap will be retained.

In Support:

Parker Washburn, 1007 N. Elm Street
Zack Meyers, 6402 McLeansville Road

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1956 for work at 442 S. Mendenhall Street. The applicant and owner is Parker Washburn. The description of work was to replace the slate roof with asphalt shingles. Staff does not recommend in favor of granting this COA and in their opinion, the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs(pages 51-53)* for the following reasons: *This is a contributing resource in the College Hill National Register Historic*

District. Originally it housed a fire station that served the West End section of the city. The building features a slate roof and decorative rafter tails. Although the slate roof is not necessarily a character defining feature, it is the original historic material and helps to define the building's overall historic character. Only a few of these fire stations from the 1920s and 1930s survive in Greensboro. Clearly, they were designed to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Slate was typically for the roofing material. Speaking in support was Parker Washburn, the applicant, who noted that she had done repairs last year in the amount of \$6,000 and had a bid to repair the slate roof for \$18,000 for slate and the cost for replacing with asphalt would be \$8,000. About 20 – 30% of the slate roof is failing in various places. There was no one speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke stated that he has seen the types of asphalt shingles presented by the applicant on another structure and they are very close looking to the original slate shingles. He would have no objection to these asphalt shingles being used on the subject property. Mr. Hoggard stated that he would be amenable to the use of these shingles if the flashing could be maintained with copper to maintain the original look as it would add to the authenticity of the repair. Zack Meyers, the roofing contractor, stated that they would re-do all the flashing in copper, the valleys around the chimneys and the peak pitch of the roof will be maintained without ridge vents on the front, but will be on the rear portion of the roof. The architectural wood detail on the roof will also be retained.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1956 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments, discussions, and *Guideline 1, 2, and 3* on page 25 are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1956 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Parker Washburn for work at 442 S. Mendenhall Street, to follow the guidelines as presented, with the condition that copper flashing will be used, and the architectural ridge detail at the ends of the roof will be kept and maintained, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**(b) Location: 218 South Park Drive
Application Number 1972
Applicant: Jennifer Weathersby
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-28-16
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Rebuild chimneys that have been parged and stuccoed.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. This house is unusual because it was original built as a duplex so there are twin porches on the structure. The front chimney is exposed on the front wall of the house and is an original feature. When the house was renovated and the front porches were removed and the side of the porch was closed in they stuccoed these chimneys and parged them. In the past, this was a fairly common way to do renovation work on old houses. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The chimneys help define the character of the house.

Guidelines (page 48):

1. *Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps.*
6. *It is not appropriate to shorten or remove original chimneys when they become deteriorated. Chimneys and furnace stacks that are not essential to the character of the structure, or that were added later, may be removed if it will not diminish the original design of the rood, or destroy historic details.*

In Support:

Jennifer Weathersby, 218 South Park Drive

Ann Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1972 for work at 218 South Park Drive. The applicant is Jennifer Weathersby and the description of work is to rebuild chimneys that have been parged and stuccoed. City staff recommended in support of the COA and in their opinion, the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)*, for the following reasons: *This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The chimneys help define the character of the house.* At some point in the history of the house, there had been alterations and the front porches removed and closed in and stucco applied to the foundation and front chimney. Rebuilding the chimneys would match the original design and the historic character of the house. Speaking in support of the application was Jennifer Weathersby, the applicant; and Ann Bowers, stating that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association supports the request. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Adams moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1972 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)*, #1 and #6, for the following reasons: *This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The chimneys help define the character of the house* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Adams moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1972 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jennifer Weathersby for work at 218 South Park Drive, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 622-624 N. Elm Street**
Application Number 1971
Applicant: Geri Petit
Property Owner: Magnolia Place at Fisher Park Condominium Association, Inc.
Date Application Received: 5-11-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replace existing windows with simulated divided light, double-hung vinyl windows..

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. The windows installed have not held up well and are badly deteriorated. Staff feels that the windows were inferior quality of new growth wood products; this building was built without roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features that would help shed water so the windows don't get wet. Staff met with the Homeowner's Association and looked at what they are proposing and feel that the windows they are proposing, for a lot of reasons, will still meet the guidelines for new construction. This is a non-contributing structure and, in this case, the windows are somewhat recessed within the brick wall and the new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 77)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

These buildings were constructed in 2005 so they are "non-contributing". The windows are wood and have not held up well for a number of reasons including the inferior quality of new growth wood products. There are no roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features designed to keep water away from the windows. Other window options such as aluminum or vinyl clad or fiberglass would be significantly more expensive than vinyl windows and would not have the look of original designed windows. The new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. Because the sashes are so large and there is such a high percentage of glass versus frame, the material itself should not be easily distinguishable. The sash will have muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass so the artificial look of interior muntins will be avoided. The visual impact of the new windows on the character of the building and the historic district should be negligible. The buildings should still meet the guidelines for new construction and a chronic maintenance problem will be resolved.

Guidelines:

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

Conditions:

- 1) That the proposed Simulated Divided light windows also have a shadow bar between the glass.
- 2) That Commissioner Hoggard be involved with staff in the selection of the proposed windows.

In Support:

Jim Smothers, 5328 Groometown Road

Geri Petit, 622-A N. Elm Street

Ann Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1971 for work at 622-624 N. Elm Street. The applicant is Geri Petit. The description of work is to replace existing windows with simulated divided light, double-hung vinyl windows. City staff recommends granting this COA. In their opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines— New Construction (page 77) #4 and #5, for the following reasons: These buildings were constructed in 2005 so they are “non-contributing”. The windows are wood and have not held up well for a number of reasons including the inferior quality of new growth wood products. There are no roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features designed to keep water away from the windows. Other window options such as aluminum or vinyl clad or fiberglass would be significantly more expensive than vinyl windows. The new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. Because the sashes are so large and there is such a high percentage of glass versus frame, the material itself should not be easily distinguishable. The sash will have muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass so the artificial look of interior muntins will be avoided. The visual impact of the new windows on the character of the building and the historic district should be negligible. The buildings should still meet the guidelines for new construction and a chronic maintenance problem will be resolved.* Speaking in support was Jim Smothers, Geri Petit and Ann Bowers. There was no one speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

Mr. Pratt stated that he would support the application if the Homeowner's Association could provide a full sample of the proposed window, including all of the paning systems, trim and accessories that go along with it. It sounds as if there may be cases where only the sashes are being replaced and other places where the frame and brick mold will be replaced. With that being the case he thinks whatever paning system the window unit has would need to match the profile of the brick mold. He also agrees that there needs to be a shadow bar between the glass, and staff can approve the actual window selection. Mr. Hoggard stated that he would like to be involved in the window selection by staff.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1971 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under Historic District Design Guidelines— New Construction (page 77) #4 and #5, for the following reasons: These buildings were constructed in 2005 so they are “non-contributing”. The windows are wood and have not held up well for a number of reasons including the inferior quality of new growth wood products. There are no roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features designed to keep water away from the windows. Other window options such as aluminum or vinyl clad or fiberglass would be significantly more expensive than vinyl windows. The new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. Because the sash are so large and there is such a high percentage of glass versus frame, the material itself should not be easily distinguishable. The sash will have muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass so the artificial look of interior muntins will be avoided. The visual impact of the new windows on the character of the building and the historic district should be negligible. The buildings should still meet the guidelines for new construction and a chronic maintenance problem will be resolved are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1971 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Geri Petit for work at 622-624 N. Elm Street with the following conditions that the proposed simulated divided light windows with a shadow bar between the glass, and that the staff and Commissioner Hoggard will look at the sample window to ensure that they are in keeping with the guidelines, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Hoggard. Nays: Stringfield.)

- (d) **Location: 918 Carr Street**
Application Number 1967
Applicant: Carl Robbins
Date Application Received: 5-19-16
(CONTINUED TO JUNE MEETING)

Description of Work:

Foundation was parged (covered with cement)

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff received a report that the front foundation was parged and covered with cement. This is a contributing structure in the College Hill National Register of Historic Districts. The foundation had cement put on it from previous repointing jobs and the owner was trying to correct that issue. However, it is clearly stated in the guidelines that masonry and stone, painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry and can accelerate deterioration. There is no recommendation for an alternative treatment because once a foundation is parged, it is difficult to reverse the results. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page48) #4, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The brick foundation has been covered with cement.

Guidelines:

4. Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry/stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry/stone feature, and can accelerate deterioration. Previously painted surfaces may remain painted.

In Support:

Carl Robbins, 918 Carr Street

In Opposition:

None.

Discussion:

Mr. Pratt stated that the work was done without a COA and is in violation of the guidelines and this work is something that cannot be un-done, he thought there should be some consequence. Counsel Jones stated that if the Commission approves the COA there would be no fine, however, if the Commission chooses to not approve the COA, a fine may be in order because they are in violation. The City could give the owner time to see if he could remove the parging. Mr. Arneke pointed out that even if he removes the parging that is still not going to address the deterioration to the foundation. There was a suggestion that maybe this matter should be continued to give the owner a chance to see if other alternatives could be used on this property.

Mr. Robbins stated that he bought this house over 40 years ago and this is the original foundation. He tried to get rid of the old and ugly foundation and this was the only thing he could think of to address the deterioration of the foundation. He would like input and advice from the Commission on better ideas for addressing this matter. Ms. Adams suggested that it may be possible for the foundation to be covered in an antique brick to make it look better.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission continue this application to allow the applicant an opportunity to investigate other means of covering the foundation and the paving and report back to staff with his results, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (e) **Location: 909 Morehead Avenue**
Application Number 1975
Applicant: Ken Baucom
Date Application Received: 5-11-16
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

A concrete block retaining wall was constructed along the driveway.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. This is an after-the-fact application for a low wall constructed along the driveway of this property. This occurred during landscape renovations at the property and in trying to hold soil, they constructed this low wall. This is a non-contributing building in the College Hill Historic District and the property owner came before the Commission some time ago concerning the wall in front of the property at the sidewalk. Staff has been working with him since that time to try to come up with a solution to that issue. The Neighborhood Association would like for the tree to be saved, but the roots are causing the problem with the front wall. Staff has talked with the Field Operations Department about the idea of rebuilding that wall and moving it out slightly to give the tree a little more room. The new property owner is working with staff on that and a final determination is needed from Field Ops before they can move ahead with that idea. If that is accepted, staff would recommend a low wall of landscape blocks that sit directly on the sidewalk that would come down to meet the existing low wall at the driveway. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24) #4, for the following reasons:

Fact:

A low wall of landscape blocks was built along the driveway. While natural stone or brick is preferred for construction of retaining walls, landscape blocks of concrete can sometimes be an affordable option that is reasonably compatible with the character of the historic districts.

Guidelines:

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

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1975 for work at 909 Morehead Avenue. The applicant is Ken Baucom. The description of work is that a concrete retaining wall was constructed along the driveway during landscape renovations. City staff recommends granting this COA. In their opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines— Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24) #5 for the following reasons: A low wall of landscape blocks was built along the driveway. While natural stone or brick is preferred for construction of retaining walls, landscape blocks of concrete can sometimes be an affordable option that is reasonably compatible with the character of the historic districts.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton pointed out that the applicant needs to be mindful of choosing materials that match so there aren't several different kinds of wall materials used, as well as the height of the wall construction should taper down to match the new wall construction. Ms. Stringfield stated that the applicant has done a good job on the new low wall. Mike Cowhig stated that Justin Clinton who is an engineer and an arborist is involved in this so he will be providing guidance on this project.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1975 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under Historic District Design Guidelines— Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24) #4, for the following reasons: A low wall of landscape blocks was built along the driveway. While natural stone or brick is preferred for construction of retaining walls, landscape blocks of concrete can sometimes be an affordable option that is reasonably compatible with the character of the historic districts are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1975 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ken Baucom for work at 909 Morehead Avenue, related to the after-the-fact low wall construction, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

PROPOSED AYCOCK UPDATE: (RECOMMENDED)

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that the 2016-2019 Plan for the Aycock Neighborhood and the Neighborhood Association and residents have been working very hard over the last 4 months to get to this point. They will go before City Council on June 7th with a recommendation for or against. This is a Plan that builds on a Plan that has been in place for about 13 years, the Strategic Plan for Aycock Neighborhood. That Plan was derived from some other planning work that had been done in the neighborhood and had some larger goals. They tried to stay in keeping with the spirit of that plan but there have been some new initiatives since that time. In this new Plan, there are 6 goals; enhance the neighborhood gateways; neighborhood identity; preserve historic architecture' preserve the historic neighborhood setting; neighborhood amenities; safety and security. One of the most changed initiatives is to preserve historic architecture. The goal of the previous plan was to preserve historic architecture, but in this new Plan, there is now a specific recommendation that a program be put in place that would allow some of the municipal service district dollars to be used to acquire property that could then have some easements or restrictive covenants put in place by 919 Spring Garden Street house as a model, and the City's Redevelopment Program, kind of looking back to

those earlier years. Aycock was never a redevelopment area like College Hill but with the use of Municipal Service District funds some more work could be done in a similar vein to redevelopment work. The other piece that is in this Plan is that the neighborhood has shown support for setting aside some MSD funding to look and potentially fund the ordinance to prevent the demolition by neglect order, which has been on the books for a number of years. There are also initiatives with Sternberger Park, under Neighborhood Amenities, which is a huge asset to the neighborhood, Safety and Security continues to be an on-going objective in the neighborhood. Over the years they have looked at signage, security camera types of installations; some things have come to fruition and some have not. Enhanced neighborhood gateways is part of the neighborhood branding effort, as that area is in a catch-22 right now with being able to move forward with branding and signage. There is a lot of discussion about the origins of the neighborhood's name; potentially Aycock Middle school's name may be changed in the future. The neighborhood is not directly named for Governor Aycock, it is named for the historic institution that's within the neighborhood boundaries. Preserve the Neighborhood Setting focuses on things like period street lights.

Mr. Arneke stated that they have worked very closely with Stefan-Leih in terms of understanding the new legislation and how that is working, and also the public process in making sure that everyone in the neighborhood has an opportunity to weigh in on the money that is being spent. There were two public meetings where every property owner was invited to attend and a lot of valuable feedback was obtained through those meetings.

Stefan-Leigh stated that the Planning Board will also hold an informational meeting and June 7th it will go before the City Council meeting. There has been a great effort to reach out to property owners and the Neighborhood Association also reaches out to residents that may not be property owners in the area.

The public was invited to speak on the Plan.

Patima Abelgasin stated that she is attending today's meeting as a class project. She wanted to know why there is no money for safety and security? Stefan-Leih stated that the neighborhood did not identify in this budget year, any specific needs in that particular area. So the Municipal Service Dollars have to be spent in ways that enhance the historic character of the district, so there is a constraint on the use of the funds.

Mr. Arneke stated that he would like to recognize the City's Planning Department for their work on the neighborhood plan.

Mr. Hoggard moved to recommend the proposed Aycock Neighborhood Plan, as presented by staff, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Pratt, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Stringfield. Nays: None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Hanna Cockburn said that the Southeast Building on the corner of Elm Street and Market Street has been beautifully restored after being vacant for close to 10 years. He indicated that the Planning Director is very interested in applying for an award under the American Planning Association's "Great Places Contest" in the category under Great Historic Renovations. This is a People's Choice award. A panel will narrow the finalists down to six and then the voting will begin for the award.

The project has been selected and will be recognized in the state legislature in June as part of Town Hall Day and there will be a local ceremony here and will also be included in the North Carolina Planning Association State Chapter Conference in September.

Mr. Cowhig asked for help from the Commission to get the word out about the People's Choice voting for the contest. Ms. Adams suggested engaging readers on the O'Henry Magazine's Facebook page for recognition of the award.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JUNE 29, 2016**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Also present was Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 25, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the May 25, 2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 918 Carr Street**
Application Number 1967
Applicant: Carl Robbins
Date Application Received: 5-19-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Foundation was parged (covered with cement).

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work, with conditions, is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The brick foundation had been repaired and patched in multiple areas on the front foundation wall. Instead of repointing the bricks as the guidelines recommend, the foundation was covered with a thin layer of cement to create a uniform appearance.

Fact:

The cement cannot be removed without damaging the surface of the brick. Tearing out this section of foundation and rebuilding with appropriate materials would be expensive.

Fact:

The negative effect of the parging could be mitigated by applying a stain in a color more in keeping with the original brick.

Foundation plantings would also help make the parging less noticeable.

Guidelines (page 50):

Introduction: Previously painted foundations should be painted in darker colors that reflect the colors of masonry or stone.

4. Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry/stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry/stone feature, and can accelerate deterioration. Previously painted surfaces may remain painted.

Recommended Conditions:

1. That the cement be stained a “brick” red color or dark brown.
2. That shrubbery be planted in front of the foundation.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1967 for work at 918 Carr Street. The applicant is Carl Robbins and the description of work is to parge the foundation. Mike Cowhig, City staff, recommended in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness and in staff’s opinion, the proposal is congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines—Masonry and Stone*, citing *Guideline 4 (page 50)*. He also noted that the brick foundation had been repaired and patched in multiple areas. In staff’s opinion, the parging could not be removed without damaging the surface of the brick. The negative effect of the parging could be mitigated by applying a stain in a color more in keeping with the original brick. In addition, foundation plantings would also help make the parging less noticeable. There was no one present to speak in support or in opposition to the request.

Discussion:

Mr. Hoggard felt that the proposed conditions were the best alternative moving forward. Mr. Arneke agreed provided that the work is subject to staff’s approval and there is a six-month deadline on the work.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1967 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that *Guideline 4 (page 50): Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry/stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry/stone feature, and can accelerate deterioration*; are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1967 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carl Robbins for work at 918 Carr Street with the following conditions: (1) that the cement be stained a brick red color or dark brown, (2) that shrubbery be planted in front of the foundation, (3) that both of the preceding conditions are subject to staff’s approval of the color and of the landscaping plan for the shrubbery in front of the foundation; and (4) that there be a deadline of 6 months from today for the work to be

completed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Graeber, Lane. Nays: Hoggard.)

- (b) Location: 706 Walker Avenue**
Application Number 1980
Applicant: Kenneth W. Rochelle
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-6-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Trees were removed without a COA.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work—with conditions—is congruous with *the Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-22)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The Bradford Pear tree was removed because it was showing signs of disease and decline. The trunk shows decay in the center of the stump. The other tree was in a large group of trees along the property line.

Guidelines (page 25):

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

Recommended Conditions:

1. That a tree of a species and size recommended by the City Arborist be started within 90 days.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1980 for work at 706 Walker Avenue. The applicant is Kenneth Rochelle. The description of work is tree removal without a COA. Mike Cowhig, City staff, recommended in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In staff's opinion, the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 25)*. He said the Bradford Pear tree was removed because it was showing signs of disease and decline. Another tree in a large group of trees along the property line had also been removed. He noted that Bradford Pears were planted long after the period of significance of the neighborhood. There was no one speaking in support or in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Stringfield commented that there were already too many trees on the left side of the driveway and she would not recommend putting a new tree in that location. Mr. Hoggard felt that another Bradford Pear definitely should not be planted. Mr. Arneke said that he would like to see two trees planted since two trees were removed. The two new trees do not need to be put back exactly where

the other ones were and presumably, there should be room in the back yard for a planting. Even though the Bradford Pear tree did not look good in the yard, there is no evidence in the application that it was diseased and no evidence it was taken out for anything other than the convenience of the property owner. Mr. Arneke expressed his frustration that this application was entirely inadequate, particularly because it is after-the-fact. He would be supportive if the City Arborist recommends a species and size for two trees for the lot. Members felt that it would be okay if one of the trees was a canopy tree and the second was a smaller under-canopy tree.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1980 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and *Guidelines 1 and 2 (page 25)* under *Trees and Landscaping: 1. Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district; and 2. Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1980 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kenneth Rochelle for work at 706 Walker Avenue with the following conditions: (1) that two trees are planted on the property and those trees are selected by the City Arborist as to species and location; and (2) that the plantings are completed within 120 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 810 Olive Street**
Application Number 1982
Applicant: Shelley Reisdorf
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-17-15
(APPROVED WITH SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)

Description of Work:

Construction of back porch addition.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75)* and *Patios and Decks (page 41)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The location of the proposed back porch addition is at the back of the house and not visible from the street. It will be attached to a one-story wing and will not affect character-defining features of the historic structure.

Guidelines:

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

Fact:

Construction materials will include wood and brick which are compatible with historic materials. The back porch addition is not commonly found on houses of this style and it will not duplicate the original structure.

Guidelines:

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.*

Note

The proposed back porch addition will encroach slightly into the required side yard setback. Therefore, a Special Exception is needed. Special Exceptions can be granted by the Board of Adjustment if first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

In Support:

Michelle Reisdorf, 810 Olive Street
Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1982 for work at 810 Olive Street. The applicant is Shelley Reisdorf. The description of work is construction of a back porch addition. City staff recommends in favor of granting this COA. In their opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75)* and for *Patios and Decks (page 41)*. The location of the proposed porch is in the back of the house and is not visible from the street. It will be attached to a one-story wing and will not affect any character defining features of the structure. Mr. Cowhig cited *Guidelines 1 and 2 (pages 75 and 41)*. Speaking in support of the application was Michelle Reisdorf of 810 Olive Street who read a letter of support from her next door neighbor. Also speaking in support was Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, who enthusiastically approved of the application. There was no one speaking in opposition to the request.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1982 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments that the porch is at the back of the home and it does not negatively affect the character defining features of the home along with *Guidelines 1, 2, and 3* under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Addition (page 75)* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1982 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness for a back porch addition at 810 Olive Street to Shelley Reisdorf with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.

Motion for Recommendation for a Special Exception:

Mr. Hoggard moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment in favor of a Special Exception to the setback requirements, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.

- (d) **Location: 211 Isabel Street**
Application Number 1984
Applicant: John Martin
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-15-15
(APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Construction of driveway.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 30)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The location of the proposed driveway is in keeping with an existing driveway cut in the curb indicating that a driveway may have once existed.

Fact:

The proposed driveway will be concrete and no wider than the existing opening in the curb. It will lead directly to the back of the property.

Guidelines:

1. *Retain historic driveways and walkways, including steps and sidewalks, in their original locations. When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original.*
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.*
4. *Construct new driveways and walkways in locations that require a minimum of alteration to historic site features such as landscaping, retaining walls, curbs, and sidewalks. Usually driveways should lead directly to the rear of buildings, and walkways should lead directly to the front steps of the house.*
5. *Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracks (narrow strips), macadam, brick, and crushed stone. Conceal edging materials used for gravel driveways. Keep new driveway aprons and curb cuts to the minimum width possible.*

Recommended Conditions:

1. That the width of the driveway be no wider than the existing driveway cut.
2. That during construction of the driveway, precautions are taken to protect the foundation of the historic building.
3. That consideration be given to a driveway consisting of two concrete strips with an open center of grass, brick or another appropriate material.

In Support:

John Martin, 211 Isabel Street
Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1984 for work at 211 Isabel Street. The applicant is John Martin and the description of work is construction of driveway. City staff recommended in favor of granting this COA and in their opinion, the work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas-- Guidelines 1, 3, 4, 5 (page 30)*. Staff noted that the location of the driveway is in keeping with the existing driveway curb cut and that the proposed driveway will be concrete and no wider than the existing opening in the curb. The driveway will lead to the rear of the property. Staff recommended the following conditions: (1) that the width of the driveway be no wider than the existing driveway cut; (2) that during construction of the driveway, precautions are taken to protect the foundation of the historic building; and (3) that consideration be given to a driveway consisting of two concrete strips with an open center of grass, brick or another appropriate material, or pavers. Speaking in support was John Martin, 211 Isabel Street, who noted the plan was to take the driveway up to the fence at the backyard and also to remove the Nandina plantings on the left side of the house as you face the house. Also speaking in support was Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She said they supported it as long as it was not a shared driveway, which it is not. There was no one speaking in opposition to the request.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1984 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and that Guidelines 1, 3, 4, and 5 (page 30) are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1984 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Martin for work at 211 Isabel Street with the following conditions: (1) that the width of the driveway be no wider than the existing driveway cut; (2) that during construction of the driveway, precautions are taken to protect the foundation of the historic building; and (3) that consideration be given to a driveway consisting of two concrete strips with an open center of grass, brick or another appropriate material, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED NEW GARDEN/GUILFORD COLLEGE HERITAGE COMMUNITY:

Max Carter and Willie Taylor were present to represent the Guilford College group who put together the application for the New Garden/Guilford College Heritage Community.

Mr. Carter described the area for the proposed Heritage Community as being roughly bounded by Bryan Boulevard to the north, West Market Street to the south, I-73 Loop to the west, and Westridge Road to the east. This area incorporates the historic New Garden Meeting property that was

purchased in 1757 along with Guilford College and surrounding historic woodland. He described numerous historic buildings in the area and their significance. He discussed historic individuals connected to the area along with historic events that occurred such as the Battle of New Garden. In addition, he discussed ideologies that the district represents, specifically its history in the struggle for equality. He also provided an overview of the Underground Railroad in the New Garden/Guilford College community. Tours of the New Garden and Guilford College communities are offered throughout the year to highlight its wealth of history.

Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Preservation Commission endorses this application for the proposed New Garden/Guilford College Heritage Community, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Stringfield, Hoggard, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.

Willie Taylor stated that they also represent the West Friendly Avenue Guilford College Area Alliance. They recently went before the Participatory Budgeting Committee to ask for a sign on Friendly Avenue. If approved, the sign will identify the New Garden community as a historic Quaker settlement established in 1751. They would like the City to realize that the New Garden area represents a significant piece of local history.

A brief recess was taken by the Commission from 5:30 p.m. until 5:37 p.m.

Mr. Hoggard left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Acting Chair Wharton acknowledged Councilwoman Sharon Hightower's attendance at the meeting.

Acting Chair Wharton asked Counsel Jones to review possible changes to the State's law regarding Municipal Service Districts (MSD).

Counsel Jones gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed changes that will affect the College Hill Historic District, the Aycock Historic District, and the Downtown Business Improvement District. She reviewed the new process to adopt new MSDs, how to make changes to an existing MSD, special provisions for Historic Districts, and the abolition of MSD contracting procedures. In addition, another change that will occur in the fall is setting the tax rate. City Council must consider the current needs and long range goals for the MSD. The tax rate must be set for the budgeting process so there is no accumulation of excess funds beyond what is necessary to meet current needs, fund long range plans and goals, and maintain a reasonable fund balance.

Mr. Arneke commented that he attended both of the hearings for the MSD changes and felt that the sentiment was negative toward the entire concept of Municipal Service Districts although everyone testifying before the Committee was positive toward MSDs.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

None.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JULY 27, 2016**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Also present was
Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Staff noted that the absences Ms. Adams, Ms. Graeber, and Mr. Hoggard were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 29, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the June 29, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by
Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield,
Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 206 Leftwich Street**
Application Number 1988
Applicant: Ashley and Hillary Meredith
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-11-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Exterior alterations due to fire damage and construction of dormer.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this
Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work, with conditions, is not
incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55), and Safety
and Code requirements (page 69)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The property suffered severe fire damage; however, much of the original exterior is still intact.
Repairs will be made with new materials that match the original.

Fact:

Original windows will be repaired. In locations such as the main façade where the windows were fire
damaged and beyond repair, a wood window replacement to match the design, dimensions and
muntin pattern will be used.

Fact:

A shed dormer will be added to the rear elevation to provide more interior space to the second story
unit. The dormer will use wood materials and windows to match the existing house.

Guidelines (page 57-58):

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.
3. When repair is not feasible as determined by City Staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows when designed to match the original in appearance, detail, material, profile, and overall size as closely as possible. Double paned glass may be considered when they are true divided and can accurately resemble the original window design.

Guidelines (page 76):

1. In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.
2. Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of historic structures are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.
3. Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.

Fact:

The stairs to the second story apartment will be replaced according to the design shown with a landing in the middle rather than a straight run as they are now. Rather than being less visible from the street and less conspicuous, they will be more prominent than they are now.

Guidelines (page 70):

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

Recommended Conditions:

1. That the replacement windows are wood true or simulated divided light with a shadow bar between the glass.
2. That the stairs be re-designed so that they are less noticeable from the street.
3. That a double window be used in the new dormer instead of a single window.

In Support:

Ashley Meredith, 402 West Smith Street
Ann Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1988 for work at 206 Leftwich Street. The applicants are Ashley and Hillary Meredith and the description of work is to repair fire damage to house, exterior alterations, and construction of dormer addition. City staff recommended in favor of granting this application and in their opinion, it is not incongruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines*. They cited *Guidelines 1 and 3* under *Windows and Doors* on pages 57-58 and in terms of materials, they cited *Guidelines 1 and 2* on page 76. Conditions suggested for the application are as follows: (1) That the replacement windows are wood true or simulated divided light with a shadow bar between the glass; (2) That the stairs be re-designed so that they are less noticeable from the street; and (3) That a double window be used in the new dormer instead of a single window.

Speaking in support of the application was Ashley Meredith, 402 West Smith Street, who noted the change in the stairs was primarily for safety. Most of the roof will have to be replaced and she had no objection to the double window. Also speaking in support was Anne Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She said they were in support and liked the staircase. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke stated his opinion that although it is a bit of a visual obstacle, the proposed staircase would be an improvement.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1988 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that *Guidelines 1 and 3 under Windows and Doors (page 55) and Guidelines 1 and 2 under Safety and Code Requirements (page 76)* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1988 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ashley and Hillary Meredith for work at 206 Leftwich Street with the following conditions: (1) That the replacement windows are wood true or simulated divided light with muntins and a shadow bar between the glass; and (2) That a double window be used in the new dormer instead of a single window. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

- (b) Location: 819 Rankin Place
Application Number 1989
Applicant: Stephen Elrod
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-18-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Construction of accessory building.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work—with conditions—is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (page 35)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The accessory structure is a prefabricated unit that is 20' x 12'. It will be customized to meet historic district design guidelines to include deeper overhangs, knee brackets (corbels), corner boards, wood lap siding on exterior walls and cedar shingles in the gable ends. The roof pitch will match the roof pitch on the house. A steel roll-up door will be used.

Fact:

The building is not located in the traditional sitting pattern for garages that would align with the driveway but it is located at the rear of the house and not easily visible from the street. The footprint of the proposed building does not dramatically alter the amount of open space on the lot.

Guidelines (page 36):

2. *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example.*
3. *Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished.*
4. *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*
5. *Prefabricated wooden accessory structures are appropriate when they are designated to be compatible with the principal structure on the side, and with other outbuildings in the district.*
 - A. *Accessory structures with gambrel style roofs are considered a modern outbuilding and therefore an inappropriate design for the Historic Districts.*
 - B. *It is not appropriate to introduce prefabricated metal accessory structures in the Historic Districts.*

Recommended Conditions:

1. That tree preservation measures are taken so that significant trees on the property are not adversely impacted.
2. That a different style of door be used that better reflects the character of the historic districts.

In Support:

Stephen Elrod, 819 Rankin Place.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1989 for work at 819 Rankin Place. The applicant is Stephen Elrod. The description of work is construction of accessory building. City staff stated their opinion that the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and they recommended in favor of granting this COA. They cited *Guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5* on page 36 under *Accessory Structures and Garages*. They noted that the accessory structure is a prefabricated 12' x 20' unit and the applicant proposes to customize the unit to include deeper overhangs, knee brackets, corner boards, wood lap siding on the exterior walls and cedar shingles in the gable ends. The roof pitch will match the pitch on the house. The building is not located in the traditional siting pattern for garages that would align with the driveway. Staff recommended conditions that tree preservation measures are taken so that significant trees on the property are not adversely impacted and that a different style of door be used that better reflects the character of the historic districts. Speaking in support was Stephen Elrod of 819 Rankin Place. He stated that the shed is used for storing tools. He had not considered this siting for location of trees. He is open to suggestions about scale and detail and he will site the shed to avoid damaging trees. He preferred the metal roll-out door for purposes of security. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Chair Wharton commented that members could continue this application or ask staff to approve details of the shed in terms of siting and architectural detail. Members felt that staff could approve details of the shed.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1989 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and *Guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5 A&B (page 36)* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1989 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Stephen Elrod for work at 819 Rankin Street with the following conditions: (1) That he sites the building in such a way to preserve all the significant trees on the site; (2) That he works with staff for design detail approvals; (3) That his metal garage door will be positioned toward the brick wall on the neighbor's property; and (4) That all proper permits are obtained. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

PUBLIC HEARING ON COLLEGE HILL STREET WALL PROGRAM MATCHING GRANT APPLICATION FOR 110 SOUTH MENDENHALL STREET:

Ms. Geary stated that this is the first application under the College Hill Street Wall Program that is funded through the Municipal Service District funds. This is a very significant retaining wall in the College Hill Historic District that is in need of repair. Following the public hearing, the Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to City Council.

William Burckley, 701 Morehead Avenue, provided a brief history of the wall. Approximately a year and a half ago, the City determined that the wall had to be repaired or torn down because it is five inches out of plumb. There were insufficient funds to repair the wall so a COA was filed to tear the wall down to prevent the City from demolishing it. This strategy allowed for up to one year to figure out a way to pay for the repair of the wall. Subsequent to this, the neighborhood worked with the City and came up with a way to match funds for repairing granite walls in the neighborhood. He explained that there was a water line leak and a portion of the wall had to be taken down as a result of the emergency. The process for repairing the wall will be to take down the remaining wall, finish excavating soil to be able to pour a footing for a retaining wall to hold the soil back, and then the granite wall will be put back up against the retaining wall.

Mr. Burckley asked the Commission to make a recommendation to City Council that they approve the matching funds for the repair of the wall.

There was no one else present wishing to speak on this matter.

In regard to the application provided by Bill Burckley for wall repair at 110 South Mendenhall Street, Mr. Arneke moved that the Historic Preservation Commission recommends to City Council that that the funding comes from the College Hill Street Wall Program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that a Preservation North Carolina conference is scheduled for September, 2016. Additional details will be provided when they become available.

The next meeting of the Commission will be held on September 28, 2016.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
AUGUST 31, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield;
Cindy Adams, Wayne Smith; and Sharon Graeber.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Also present was
Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Staff noted that the absences Ms. Lane and Mr. Pratt were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 27, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the July 27, 2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Adams, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 203 South Tate Street**
Application Number 1996
Applicant: Dyyeun Walker, Wrenn Zealy Properties, Inc.
Owner: Frances Rubinsohn Trust
Date Application Received: 6-22-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Placement of dumpster in parking area.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (pages 24-27)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

A dumpster was placed in the parking area that serves the Winburn Court apartments when the City began automated garbage collection. A Certificate of Appropriateness was not obtained for the dumpster. More recently the dumpster was moved from its original location to its present location.

Guidelines (page 26):

1. *Place miscellaneous items such as swimming pools, playground equipment, concrete pads and basketball goals, tree house, dumpster, and trash receptacles only in areas such as rear yards, where they are not visible from the street.*

Condition:

1. That the dumpster be screened with landscaping or an enclosure.

In Support:

Alexander Wrenn, 3706 Sagamore Drive
Samuel Richardson, Attorney, P.O. Box 310, Oak Ridge, North Carolina

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1996 for work at 203 South Tate Street. The applicant is Wrenn Zealy Properties, Inc. and the description of work is to keep the dumpster in its current position. City staff cited *Guideline 1 (page 26)* concerning miscellaneous items such as dumpsters and noted they should be placed in areas such as rear yards where they are not visible from the street. City staff recommended in favor of granting this COA with the condition the dumpster is screened with landscaping or an enclosure. Mr. Cowhig noted a COA should have been obtained when the dumpster was first introduced and then later when the dumpster was moved. The dumpster is visible from Edgar Street. Mr. Chris Marriot, City of Greensboro Solid Waste Department, said he wasn't sure whether the City Ordinance required the dumpster to be screened and Terry Jones, City Legal Department, indicated that this determination would have to be made by the City Zoning Administrator. Speaking in support of the application was Alexander Wrenn, 3706 Sagamore Drive, and Mr. Samuel Richardson, P.O. Box 310, Oak Ridge, North Carolina. Mr. Wrenn and Mr. Richardson noted that Wrenn Zealy did not initiate moving the dumpster; rather, Greensboro Solid Waste Department moved the dumpster. It was their opinion that the dispute should be between the Historic Preservation Commission and Greensboro Solid Waste Department, not Wrenn Zealy, Inc. He noted Wrenn Zealy had also installed bollards and changed their color at the request of the neighborhood and Preservation Commission. In opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who indicated the College Hill Neighborhood Association did not support the application. She noted the conditions of a previous COA on this property had not been met. Speaking on behalf of herself, she said the recycling bins were also noticeable from Tate Street and there is overflow and vermin present. She read an email circulated to some members of the neighborhood. Speaking in rebuttal, Mr. Wrenn and Mr. Richardson noted the dumpster had previously been placed in the center of the rear area and the photograph showed no trash. No rodents had been reported to Wrenn Zealy, Inc. In addition, the City decides the number of recycling cans placed at the site. When asked if the dumpster could be moved to a better location, Chris Marriot, City of Greensboro Solid Waste Department, indicated it would require serious upgrading of the drive and tree removal.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke pointed out that *Guideline 2 (page 26)* reads: *Trash receptacles and dumpster areas must be adequately screened from view of the public right-of-way and adjoining residences.* If in fact Solid Waste Operations told the owners where to put the dumpster or moved it themselves, this is not the first time a department failed to point out a COA would be required. However, this does not absolve the property owner from responsibility for knowing the requirements. He was comfortable if the current location is the only place the dumpster can go; however, the guidelines do call for trash receptacles and recycling cans to be screened. If there is no other safe location for the dumpster, Mr. Arneke felt it should be screened to be in keeping with the guidelines. If this application was before-the-fact, it would not be approved by the Commission without screening. As pointed out, the previous COA required the owner to work with the City on landscaping the lot, including the dumpster.

Providing clarity, Mr. Cowhig said that the owner decided not to do the work approved on the prior COA. The owner did not expand the parking lot but instead, they put it back to its original condition and eliminated the violation. They are not subject to the conditions of the COA since they essentially withdrew their application.

Mr. Arneke pointed out that the *Historic District Guidelines* still apply to the dumpster as a condition of approving this COA.

Chair Wharton commented that City Solid Waste caused the initiation of the changes and that is not something the property owner can control. He was reluctant to impose financial burden on the owner. He questioned how the dumpster could be screened and still allow access to the garbage truck. Mr. Smith said the enclosure would have doors to allow access. Mr. Cowhig said there are two concepts, screening with landscaping and enclosure.

Mr. Smith felt it was clear the dumpster needs to be screened but due to the extenuating circumstances involved; he was uncomfortable determining responsibility for the violation. Mr. Arneke said this property is in a historic district and the *Historic District Guidelines* must apply.

Chair Wharton said that Mr. Marriot indicated it is not the City's dumpster; rather, it belongs to the property owner. Mr. Arneke commented that the dumpster is owned by the property owner and the service is provided by the City.

Ms. Adams asked if there were any exclusions for just simple orange cans versus a dumpster in such a crowded parking lot. Chair Wharton noted a similar case in Fisher Park at Cannon Court Apartments where a dumpster was located in the only place it could go. The Commission determined there was no way to screen the dumpster and a COA was granted.

Ms. Geary said she has done research on the history of alleys. While the Commission is referring to Edgar Street as a public street today, it originally was a utilitarian alley for the purposes of servicing things just like this. Its front façade faces the original historic street and its rear façade faces the historic alley which is where the utilitarian functions would have taken place. If the dumpster is moved further back on the lot, then the dumpster is right next door to the houses behind it. There is no perfect spot for this and if Edgar Street is considered an alley, it was considered for a functional utilitarian use. Mr. Arneke said he did not see any exceptions in the Guidelines and Ms. Geary pointed out the Guidelines are not hard fast rules but are used as guidelines.

Counsel Jones said there are inconsistencies between the Guidelines and for instance, the height of the screening fence, and what would be required for a new dumpster under the LDO (Land Development Ordinance). If this is considered a street, the fence cannot be more than 48 inches but if screened in accordance with the LDO, the screen must be 8 feet tall. This would need to be worked out with the Zoning Administrator as to how it would comply with both. She reiterated that these are guidelines. If the LDO applied, then it would generally preempt the guidelines because it is an ordinance.

Mr. Arneke said that Edgar Street is being used as a street and not an alley. From the perspective that garbage trucks come through, it is used for the purpose of an alley. However, from Rankin Street to Walker Avenue where Edgar Street ends, it is used as a cut-through and has traffic at all hours of the day.

Mr. Smith commented that nobody would disagree that the dumpster and recycling cans are unattractive. He could approve the location but asked if the owner could make some sort of accommodation to uplift the visual impact of the area.

Ms. Springfield felt the dumpster is probably where it needs to be and she reiterated that guidelines indicate it is to be screened.

Mr. Cowhig said that another alternative would be to remove some of the bamboo behind the dumpster and move it back. Ms. Springfield felt moving the dumpster back on the property in the same space to make it less visible would be an interesting and not terribly expensive alternative.

Chair Wharton asked if it would be possible for the Neighborhood Association and the property owner to talk through a solution that would be acceptable to both of them. The case could be continued and possible solutions could be discussed for approval at the next meeting. Mr. Wrenn indicated he did not feel they had an equal footing in past negotiations. He does not mind sitting and talking as he did with Mr. Cowhig but the cost factor plays a large part in this matter. He is tasked with protecting the property owner from undue expense but he is willing to make a reasonable compromise. He brought up the matter of who would open and close the enclosure doors for the garbage truck driver. Mr. Marriot, City Solid Waste Disposal, said that the truck driver is not required to open and close the enclosure doors although they have been known to do so. It is the property owner's responsibility to open the enclosure doors and if they are not open, the garbage truck driver does not have to stop to empty the dumpster.

Ms. Springfield reiterated that moving the dumpster back would be a good solution because the dumpster would blend in more with the surroundings. Ms. Graeber suggested that it would also be good to paint the dumpster another color such as green so that it would blend in even better.

Mr. Wrenn indicated he would be glad to meet with the City to discuss cutting back the bamboo, moving the dumpster further back, and asking the City to supply a green dumpster. He said there could be expenses involved that he cannot commit to at this time. Additional crushed rock will have to be added where the dumpster will sit.

Chair Wharton stated that the applicant's permission will be needed to continue this matter until next month; otherwise, the Commission will have to vote on a solution right now. Mr. Wrenn asked if it would be possible to work with Mr. Cowhig in the matter of cutting bamboo and adding crushed rock. He would rather not continue this for a third time. Members were amenable to the applicant working with staff on these matters.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1996 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that *Guidelines 1 and 2* on page 26 are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Adams, Graeber, Smith. Nays: Arneke.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1996 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Wrenn Zealy Properties, Inc. for work at 203 South Tate Street with the following conditions: (1) that the dumpster be pushed backwards from its existing location as far as possible into the existing bamboo and therefore, creating a screen on at least three sides, (2) that crushed rock will be installed to settle the dumpster and maintain a reasonable approach for City vehicles to get to it; (3) that regarding options for color of the dumpster, green is the preferable color. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Adams, Graeber, Smith. Nays: Arneke.)

- (b) Location: 613 Joyner Street**
Application Number 1992
Applicant: Sanford and Laurie O'Neill
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-9-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Screen in front porch; replace front door.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work—with conditions—is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (pages 62-64) for the following reasons:

Fact:

There is a tradition of screening in porches that goes back to the early twentieth century. The framing was constructed so that it could be removed without changing original elements of the porch. It was cut to fit around existing details such as columns, molding, etc. As backyard patios and decks became more popular, fewer front porches were screened. It was often removed to avoid the cost of maintenance and repair.

Fact:

Lumber used for screening in porches was usually of slightly smaller dimensions than today's standard framing lumber. Original porch features were not removed to accommodate screening.

Guidelines (page 64):

1. *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.*
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 balustrades, and the framing can be removed in the future without damaging historic elements of the porch.*

In Support:

Laurie O'Neill, 613 Joyner Street
Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1992 for work at 613 Joyner Street. The applicants are Sanford and Laurie O'Neill and the work description is to screen in the front porch and replace the front door. City staff recommended in favor of granting this COA and said that the proposed project is congruous with *Historic District Guidelines* (pages 62 - 64), *Guidelines 1 and 6*. Speaking in support was Laurie O'Neill, 613 Joyner Street, who noted in the course of the project they might have to remove the shutters which are metal and not original to the house. Also in support was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who said the College Hill Neighborhood Association supports the project but recommends in favor of reducing the number of slats supporting the screen. No one was speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

Members felt this was a good project. Chair Wharton recommended removing the shutters as well because they are not original. They are not really appropriate in terms of the architecture of the house.

Members felt the number of slats should be reduced as a condition of the application. The slats should be no closer than 3 feet apart. In addition, the applicant should work with staff to select an appropriate wooden door.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1992 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and *Guidelines 1 and 6 (page 64)* are acceptable as finding of fact.

A friendly amendment was offered by Ms. Stringfield to include *Guideline 2 (page 57)* in the Findings of Fact. Mr. Arneke accepted the friendly amendment.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1992 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sanford and Laurie O'Neill for work at 613 Joyner Street with the following conditions: (1) that the number of slates across the front of the screened in porch be reduced from what is shown in the application so they are no closer than 3 feet; and (2) that the property owners work with City staff to select an appropriate wooden door to replace the existing door. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 307 Victoria Street**
Application Number 1991
Applicant: Mary Ann Stewart
Owner: Michael and Carla Burns
Date Application Received: 8-4-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Remove Short Leaf Pine tree located in the back yard of 307 Victoria Street.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The tree is at the very back of the lot. The lot is adjacent to the lot at 914 North Eugene Street. The tree has been visually inspected by the City Arborist and an arborist with a tree service. It is a mature Short Leaf Pine tree. They both say that the tree appears to be healthy and poses only normal risk of falling.

Guidelines (page 23):

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

In Support:

Mary Ann Stewart, 914 North Eugene Street.

In Opposition:

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1991 for work at 307 Victoria Street. The applicant is Mary Ann Stewart. The description of work is to remove a Short Leaf Pine tree located in the back yard of 307 Victoria Street. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, met with the City Arborist about the tree. It was determined that the tree was healthy with no particular risk of falling. He said the tree is considered a canopy tree and staff recommended against this COA. Speaking in support was Mary Ann Stewart who showed photos of her outdoor electrical heater and electrical line under the tree. Pine needles have been damaging her roof and falling into the air conditioner. She expressed fears for her safety. Speaking in opposition was Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association does not support the application because they could find nothing in the Guidelines to support removal of a healthy tree. In rebuttal was Mary Ann Stewart who said she understands the tree is healthy but the tree is dangerous to her life, her house, her family, and her pets.

Discussion:

Ms. Stringfield indicated that she understands the Neighborhood Association's position on this matter. She has observed this tree and noted that it has quite a lean to it which is a concern. She acknowledged that sap from Pine trees is problematic. This is a very well-treed area. She noted that the Commission recently approved taking out two healthy Magnolia trees from a front yard because of a safety concern. She felt it was challenging to meet the Guidelines while recognizing particular situations that may impact safety. She felt inclined to support the application although it is against the Guidelines.

Mr. Arneke commented that only normal risk was determined by two arborists and he felt it would be difficult to approve this COA. He also pointed out that the safety concern that prompted the Commission in the earlier case to approve removal of the two Magnolia trees reflected an actual safety hazard and not a potential safety hazard.

Ms. Adams reminded the Commission that the Guidelines are suggestions and not set rules. The homeowner and the neighbor have worked together to come to an agreement to request that the tree be removed. She indicated support for the application. In addition, she questioned the Commission's culpability if this application is declined and there is damage in the future.

Chair Wharton said there is an opportunity for the Commission to recommend as a condition that the owner plant another canopy tree. The tree is not on the owner's property and the owner of the property where the tree is located is not present. Mr. Arneke suggested that Ms. Stewart should replace the tree located on her neighbor's property.

Mr. Smith commented on the Short Leaf Pine tree and expressed his doubt that the tree actually contributes anything to the house and it may not be that bad if the tree was removed. He questioned the meaning of normal tree risk.

Chair Wharton felt that other trees would contribute more to the canopy as well.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1991 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and *Guideline 2 (page 23) -- Trees and Landscaping* where it is mentioned that when replacing trees that are causing structural problems, careful consideration should be given to their position so the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner; and *Guideline 5 (page 23)* as follows: *Replace mature trees with similar canopies in similar locations when they are damaged or diseased. When the same site location is not practical, select locations for replacing trees where they will*

enhance the character and appearance of the historic streetscape; and also Guideline 1 (page 23) as follows: Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district, be acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Stringfield, Adams, Graeber, Smith. Nays: Arneke.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1991 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mary Ann Stewart for work at her neighbor's home, 307 Victoria Street, with the following conditions: (1) that the applicant pay for the total cost of tree removal and pay for the purchase and installation of a replacement tree of her neighbor's choice with consultation by the City's Arborist; and (2) that the tree be planted within 6 months of today's meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Adams, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton announced that the Guilford County School System has made the decision to begin the process of changing the name of the Aycock Middle School. The Charles B. Aycock Historic District is named after the school and the Neighborhood Association voted last night to begin a process of deciding whether or not the Association would like to change its name and if so, what to change the name to. If the Association decides to pursue changing the name, City Council may be requested to approve the name change for the locally designated historic district.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Arneke has asked that the Commission resume its discussion on how to deal with the issue of trash receptacles that are left in full view in the front yards at some apartment buildings in College Hill.

Mr. Cowhig spoke with Sheldon Smith, City Solid Waste Management, who said their only concern is that the trash receptacles are brought away from the street. They don't require that they be brought to the rear of the property. This raises the question of whether or not these receptacles left in front of the house are in violation of the Historic District Ordinance. They also talked about the idea of a campaign to seek neighborhood cooperation in this matter. Mr. Arneke felt that a campaign of this type would prove unsuccessful based on past history of residents who have appeared apathetic. He noted that the Guidelines say the receptacles are not to be left in the front yard but this is widely ignored. It is clear that the 96-gallon cans do not improve the appearance of the historic district.

Mr. Cowhig said the Guidelines make a broad set of recommendations for the neighborhood but then there are some things that are clearly a violation of the Historic District Ordinance. The Guidelines say that trash receptacle areas should be screened from view.

Mr. Arneke said that the City Ordinance indicates that all containers or carriers placed on any street to be emptied shall within 12 hours after the contents therein are emptied and collected, be removed from the street to the rear of the premises by the owner or occupant of the premises.

Counsel Jones commented that it has come up that Code Enforcement staff is too understaffed to address this issue, especially on a repetitive weekly pick-up schedule.

Chair Wharton stated that even though there is a City-wide shortage of staff to deal with these matters, there can be strategic enforcement when City government and staff decide this is a problem they care about, and then they can focus staff resources for a certain amount of time.

Mr. Cowhig suggested notifying the neighborhood of the rules and encouraging people to follow the ordinance and place receptacles in the rear of the property. Chair Wharton pointed out that there is often an issue of apathy with tenants who will not place their receptacles in the rear of the property, versus compliance by the property owner.

Mr. Arneke felt there must be enforcement of the ordinance to insure compliance. Ms. Stringfield said that information about the ordinance concerning receptacles being placed in historic district neighborhood newsletters would be helpful. In addition, official stickers with information on the receptacles might encourage their proper placement.

Ms. Geary stated that earlier in the year members were provided with copies of a document prepared by the Planning Department that focuses on development trends. Mr. Cowhig and Ms. Geary were asked to provide a focused issue on historic preservation in the community and she distributed a draft copy of the document to members. The final document will be released at the end of the week and will be available on the Historic Preservation website.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 28, 2016**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn, Planning Department.
Also present was Terri Jones, Attorney for the Commission, and Andrew Kelly,
City Attorney's Office.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 31, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the August 31, 2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Mr. Cowhig informed members that application #2000, a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for property located at 201 East Hendrix Street, has been removed from the agenda.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 708 Simpson Street**
Application Number 2002
Applicant: Gregory Seifert
Owner: Thomas Wear
Date Application Received: 9-6-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of an addition.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The addition is approximately a 100 square foot single story area at the side rear elevation. It will have wood siding and windows to match the existing windows and siding on the house. It will have a flat roof to match the existing open side porch.

Fact:

The foundation will be brick with an arch design helping to delineate the addition from the existing structure.

Guidelines (page 76):

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

Condition:

1. That the new windows and transom windows are wood Simulated Divided Light windows with interior/exterior muntins and shadow bars or wood True Divided Light windows.
2. That the rear elevation be a series of three windows to match what is shown on the left side elevation.

In Support:

Greg Seifert, 523 Woodlyn Drive
Ralph Wear, 708 Simpson Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 2002 for work at 708 Simpson Street. The applicant is Greg Seifert and the property owner is Thomas Wear. The description of work is for the construction of an addition. Stefan-Leih Geary, speaking for City staff, said that staff supports this application and believes that it is not incongruous with the Design Guidelines. She cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 75-76), Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4*. Staff recommended a condition that the new windows and transom windows are wood Simulated Divided Light windows with interior/exterior muntins and shadow bars permanently attached or wood True Divided Light windows. They also recommended a condition that the rear elevation be a series of three windows to match what is shown on the left side elevation. Speaking in support of the application was Greg Seifert, 523 Woodlyn Drive, who noted the arched foundations shown in the plan open to the basement window that is hidden by a planting and that the roof lines of the addition will merge with the current porch rooflines. They are planning to use Pella Simulated Divided Light windows with spacer bars. The HVAC units will be moved to the rear of the addition. Also speaking in support was Ralph Wear, 708 Simpson Street, who confirmed there is a walk-out basement in the rear and that there is a non-original bay window that will be removed from the current kitchen elevation. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke drove by the property and commented that it seems natural for the addition to be located behind the porch when looking at the house from the street. He felt the addition would fit in very well.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2002 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the guidelines for *Additions (pages 75-76)* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr.

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

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2002 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greg Seifert for work at 708 Simpson Street with the following conditions: (1) that the new windows and transom windows are wood Simulated Divided Light windows with interior/exterior muntins and shadow bars or wood True Divided Light windows; and (2) that the rear elevation be a series of three windows to match what is shown on the left side elevation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSAL TO AWARD LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE CONTRACT FOR THE CHARLES B. AYCOCK MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT (MSD):
(FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION)

Ms. Geary stated that this is an overall landscaping rejuvenation project for the Aycock neighborhood. She described the four components of the project. **Area A** is a new installation area at the neighborhood brick sign that was installed a year ago. The intent was to have the sign landscaped quickly after it was initially constructed but with changes in legislation, there were some delays in moving forward until now. **Area B** involves the medians on Yanceyville Street. They plan to hold off doing an overall restoration; however, they will be planting some endcap landscaping beds at each of the medians. They are waiting to do an overall restoration due to the Summit Avenue Corridor and uncertainty about impacts from changes in turn lanes and intersections. The future goal is to completely overhaul the medians. **Area C** involves the landscaped area in front of Breedlove Radiator Company. The area will be spruced up, dying plants will be replaced, and then there will be a monthly maintenance contract for this area. **Area D** is the Max Thompson Pedestrian Bridge that will also be spruced up. Areas facing both the Aycock neighborhood side and the Fisher Park side will be under a monthly landscaping contract. This contract will be for a two-year period and will be up to an amount of \$75,000 which allows for changes to the plans if additional mulch or plantings need to be purchased and installed.

Responding to questions from members, Ms. Geary explained that the \$75,000 will be spent over the course of two years. The amount includes the new installation in Area A and covers monthly maintenance on all of the areas.

Chair Wharton opened the Public Hearing.

Chair Wharton commented that this matter received very strong support from the Aycock neighborhood.

Ms. Geary stated that the landscaping effort is part of the neighborhood's MSD Plan that was adopted by City Council in June, 2016 and can be found under the goal of *Enhanced Neighborhood Gateways*.

This has been a longstanding type of MSD work in this neighborhood. The neighborhood has had a monthly maintenance contract for at least 15 to 20 years with a vendor in the community until last year. City Field Operations has been managing these areas during the transition from the expired contract until a new contract can be secured.

Chair Wharton noted that this proposal, as a part of the overall MSD plan, was discussed and approved without any dissent at a well-advertised neighborhood meeting.

There being no speakers from the audience, Chair Wharton closed the Public Hearing.

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

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSAL TO AWARD DRAINAGE STUDY CONTRACT FOR THE CHARLES B. AYCOCK MUNICIPAL SERVICE DISTRICT:
(FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION)

Ms. Geary explained that this proposal is for a drainage study to be conducted in the Aycock neighborhood.

James Steber, Stormwater Division Manager, was present to represent City staff. He has been working with the Aycock neighborhood for several years on drainage related issues. At the request of the neighborhood, it was determined that a study should be made on drainage problems throughout the neighborhood. Problems have been associated with public as well as private drainage systems and it has been difficult to determine who is responsible for the issues. He explained that this proposal represents the private side of the drainage system study because historically, the City only studies and maintains public drainage systems. The City is funding the public part of the drainage study and the neighborhood will fund the private drainage study. This proposal will facilitate a study to investigate historical private drainage related issues throughout the neighborhood. There are no records of the private drainage structure and this study would help determine the connectivity of the private drainage system to the public drainage infrastructure.

Ms. Geary commented that this effort was approved by the neighborhood. It was included in their strategic MSD Plan and falls under the goal of *Preserve Historic Architecture* as follows: *To partner with the City of Greensboro to conduct an engineering study on the drainage infrastructure in the neighborhood.* Staff felt that if water poses a threat or risk to historic structures, then this is something that would fall under the goals and objectives of Municipal Service District dollars.

Chair Wharton said that it is important to note this is not directed toward any particular properties; rather, the drainage issues are potentially neighborhood-wide problems. Many of the historic properties were built with terracotta drainage infrastructure to get water away from the houses that in the past one-hundred years have failed. Moisture is a significant preservation problem. The neighborhood feels that this is a legitimate way to spend MSD funds to preserve the historic structure of the neighborhood.

Mr. Steber explained the process and said that the Water Resources Department has an on-call list of engineering consultants. There are 10 prime consultants with 6 to 12 sub-consultants under each of the prime consultants. Bids were sent out to approximately 75 consultants and only one bid was received. The legal department advised that the single bidder was eligible for selection. The Water Resources Department and the neighborhood have already approved the selection of the consultant.

At the request of Ms. Lane, Chair Wharton provided an overview of MSD districts and funds.

Chair Wharton opened the Public Hearing.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, spoke in support of the proposal. She said the bulk of private drainage issues have to do with alleys that were designed as part of the plat throughout the neighborhood. When the neighborhood was laid out and constructed, storm drain lines were installed in the alleys connecting them together all the way down to Muddy Creek. In addition, the neighborhood association bylaws state that they are supposed to be taking care of the alleys and neighborhood infrastructure, and this proposal addresses that objective.

There being no other speakers, Chair Wharton closed the Public Hearing.

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

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton reminded the Commission that there is a drop-in session regarding the Summit Avenue Streetscape Improvement project at the Greensboro Public Library in the Nussbaum Room following this meeting. The public can view the different proposals and give their feedback on the options.

Chair Wharton reported that the Charles B. Aycock Historic neighborhood has begun a process to have a neighborhood-wide discussion on what they think the new name of the neighborhood should be. The Guilford County School System has decided to change the name of the Charles B. Aycock Middle School and the historic neighborhood is named after the school. A recommendation for the new name will be submitted to City Council for their approval.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed the Commission that the City is looking at the possibility of assessing fees for services and Certificates of Appropriateness for the Historic District program. This has been proposed in the past but fees have not been instituted at this point. He described results of a fee survey of other cities in the state. Greensboro is one of the few cities not charging a fee for services and Certificates of Appropriateness for the Historic District program.

Ms. Cockburn stated that each year the City produces a plan that discloses the true cost of producing a variety of permits. The City's goal is to never to recover the cost but to get to 50 percent of the recovered cost. The City almost never reaches the 50 percent goal. In the case of the COA, they are incorporating not only staff cost but the possibility of appeal which includes advertisement. Staff will continue to study the issues but input of the Commission and the neighborhood is important.

Mr. Arneke commented that considering the large number of after-the-fact applications with no fee at all, it would be reasonable to expect more people to try to evade the process. To address this possibility and encourage people to do a COA application prior to their projects, Ms. Cockburn said that staff has discussed an additional fee that would not be part of the cost recovery piece but would be more in the range of a fine.

For information purposes, Ms. Geary said that there were nine after-the-fact application last year.

Ms. Cockburn invited members to attend a reception for Board and Commission members on October 4, 2016. October is National Community Planning Month and the reception is an opportunity for staff to thank Board members for the service they provide to not only the community but the Planning Department as well.

Counsel Jones introduced Andrew Kelly who is a new Attorney in the City's Legal Department. He will be filling in for Counsel Jones from time to time if she is not available for the meeting or if Commissioners have questions.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
OCTOBER 26, 2016**

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Ms. Graeber, Ms. Adams, and Mr. Pratt are excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the September 28, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard, Smith. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 717 Percy Street**
Application Number 2009
Applicant: Jonathon C. Hein
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 10-13-16
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Remove 4 trees.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-22)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The trees to be removed have been inspected by the City's Arborist, Judson Clinton. Judson agrees with the reasons stated in the application for trees #1 and #4. In the case of tree #3, he feels there are measures that could be taken to address the concerns in the application. Tree #2 is a very large Mulberry tree but is rated only fair by the tree inventory. It could benefit from careful pruning.

Guidelines (page 25):

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
2. *When replacing trees that are causing structural problems, carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.*

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

Condition:

1. That the Willow Oak tree be retained and that consideration be given to pruning the Mulberry tree in lieu of removing it.

In Support:

John Hein, 717 Percy Street.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 2009 for work at 707 Percy Street. The applicant is John Hein. The description of work is for the removal of trees. Staff recommended in favor of this COA with conditions. Speaking in support was Mr. Hein and there was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

In his presentation Mr. Cowhig identified the subject trees inspected by the City arborist as follows: **Tree #1: Beech tree** located at the left rear corner of the backyard; **Tree #2: Mulberry tree** located in the right rear corner of the back yard; **Tree #3: Willow Oak tree** located to the left of the back corner of the house; and **Tree #4: Mulberry tree** located on the right side of the house.

Mr. Hoggard said that it is the Commission's job to protect the tree canopy and some trees can be detrimental to the canopy. The Pecan tree on the right and the Silver Maple in the rear of the property are canopy trees and the Mulberry trees are affecting their well-being. He felt both of the Mulberry trees and the Beech tree should be removed but the Willow Oak tree should remain.

Chair Wharton commented that the Mulberry trees are considered understory trees and are not canopy trees. The Beech tree is not in good condition. He was supportive of removing the Mulberry trees and the Beech tree as they are not relevant to the canopy. The Pecan tree may be part of the original use of the property going back to the Dunleith estate.

Relative to the tree canopy, Mr. Smith commented that the Willow Oak is a better tree than the Mulberry tree that has gotten out of hand. Based on the arborist's experience, he was inclined to remove the Beech tree, Tree #1, and the Mulberry tree, Tree #4. Tree #2, the second Mulberry tree, is one that has gotten out of control and should also be removed. He felt that the Willow Oak tree should remain.

Chair Wharton said that Tree #s 1, 2, and 4 are not that relevant to the tree canopy and Mr. Hoggard commented that these trees are affecting the health of the canopy.

The Commission agreed that permission should be granted to remove the invasive Ailanthus tree, as recommended by the City arborist. The tree appears to be wider than 4 inches at breast height and meets the requirement of needing approval to remove it. It was noted that the arborist indicated the Ailanthus tree has some toxins in the soil and it is a good idea to treat the soil after the tree is removed.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2009 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not

incongruous and incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the *Guidelines 1, 2, and 3 (pages 25)* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2009 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Johnathon C. Hein for work at 717 Percy Street with the following conditions: (1) that Trees 1, 2, and 4, according to the presented sketch, be removed along with the Ailanthus tree (The Commission recommends treating the soil after the Ailanthus tree is removed); and (2) That the existing Willow Oak be carefully pruned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 602 Fifth Avenue
Application Number 2014
Applicant: Lisa M. Haywood
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-26-16
(CONTINUED UNTIL DECEMBER 7, 2016 MEETING)**

Description of Work:

Request approval of existing windows.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the replacement windows are incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Historic District. The original two-over-two windows are a characteristic feature of the late-Victorian architectural period. Some of the original windows were replaced with vinyl windows.

Guidelines (page 57):

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

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

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

B. Window products will be reviewed on an individual basis using the following criteria:

- 1. Kind and texture of materials.*
- 2. Architectural and historical compatibility.*
- 3. Comparison to original window profile.*

4. *Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building.*
5. *Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards.*
6. *Material performance and durability.*

In Support:

Lisa Haywood, 602 Fifth Avenue.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 2014 for work at 602 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Lisa Haywood. The description of work is to request approval of existing windows. Staff recommended against approval of this application. Speaking in support was Lisa Haywood and no one was speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

Ms. Haywood said that this is the first historic property she has owned. She did not know anything about existing issues with the house until she received a letter from Code Enforcement stating that she was in violation due to the windows that were installed prior to her ownership. When she purchased this property in January of 2016, the previous owner had owned the property for 10 years. The windows have been an issue since 2012 and the previous owner had ample time to fix the issue prior to her purchase in 2016. She purchased the property as-is from Blade Properties. She has had no conversation with Blade Properties regarding this issue. Regular maintenance will have to be done to the property but she has no plans for improvements beyond that scope.

Chair Wharton stated that this is not a situation the Commission likes to be in where they are trying to enforce something when a property owner is not responsible for the changes. The Commission's job is to preserve the historic character. The Commission is responsible for enforcing the guidelines regardless of when or by who the violation was created.

It was clarified that this is an application to keep the windows that are presently on the house because they are in violation. Members did not see how they could approve this application because the windows are in violation.

Counsel Jones pointed out that the Commission can agree that the work is incongruous with the guidelines but approve it. Chair Wharton noted that the Guidelines are not definite zoning standards and members under certain circumstances can override the Guidelines.

Mr. Smith said this has been going on for four years. It is the Commission's job to protect the character of the neighborhood but at the same time, Ms. Haywood has inherited a mess that has only been made worse over time. He noted that there is a basic issue of fairness in this matter.

Ms. Geary offered the solution of spreading the replacement of windows over a period of time to ease the financial burden to the owner. She noted that this has been done successfully in the past.

Mr. Arneke said that if the COA is approved, any kind of deadline for replacement could be placed on the application as a condition. Considering there is a legal issue involving the home owner with the windows, he asked if a deadline of a year could be placed which would allow her to proceed with legal remedies against the previous owner.

Counsel Jones explained that a COA is good for a period of one year. The deadline can be shortened but if a special deadline is imposed, the owner would have a year to comply.

Chair Wharton was uncomfortable placing a deadline on the replacement to pursue legal remedies with Blade Properties because that would impose time and legal costs on the applicant.

Responding to questions, Counsel Jones stated that at this point, an action must be taken today because the sequence of the next meeting is outside of 60 days. If no action is taken today or if the property owner doesn't agree, the application would automatically be approved. The matter can be continued if the property owner consents to a continuance.

Members felt that a continuance would allow the Commission to have all the facts at hand. There would be an opportunity for a solution to be found and Blade Properties to be contacted. A letter can be written to Blade Properties asking them to attend the December 7, 2016 meeting.

Ms. Haywood gave her permission to continue this matter until the December 7, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Arneke moved to continue this matter until the December 7, 2016 meeting, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Hoggard, Smith. Nays: None.)

REPLACEMENT DOOR FOR 613 JOYNER STREET:

The Commission approved enclosing the front porch of this residence with a screen porch and the replacement of the front door at an earlier meeting. The condition was that the owner would work with staff on the style of door to be used. Staff showed a photograph of a window style found by the owners at an architectural salvage facility that would be their first preference. It is not a bungalow style door but this house has been renovated to the point it does not have a historic look anymore. It is possible that a previous owner would have chosen this type of door; however, it is difficult to determine what kind of door was originally on the house.

The owners also found a door at Home Depot they would like to use. Staff does not feel the Home Depot door is one that would have been seen on a bungalow either. Therefore, staff is requesting advice from the Commission if either of these doors is acceptable.

It was noted that there are examples of appropriate doors on page 61 of the Guidelines that would be in keeping with the modest style of bungalow. The elaborate Home Depot door is a prairie style door and would not be in keeping with the bungalow house. The first door is a Queen Anne style door and there is always the possibility that someone in 1925 decided they wanted to replace their craftsman style door with this kind of door.

Ms. Geary stated that she would much rather see the Queen Anne style door than the faux prairie style door from Home Depot. A salvaged door would be more appropriate than the Home Depot door. However, if the salvaged door needed to be cut down a great deal to fit the door space, it could look very wrong.

Mr. Arneke was comfortable using the salvaged Queen Anne style door if it could be made to fit without significantly altering the width.

Ms. Stringfield suggested that the owners visit Architectural Salvage to continue looking for a bungalow style door before they decide to use the Queen Ann style door.

Chair Wharton commented that the Queen Anne style door does not seem quite right; however, it is not completely wrong either. If the guidelines are not incongruous, he felt the property owner should be given as much flexibility as possible without doing damage to the historical context of the neighborhood.

Ms. Geary said that there are new construction doors at Lowes that are more appropriate craftsman style doors.

The Commission's advice to staff was to encourage the owners to keep looking for a better door. They agreed that the salvaged door was not quite right and recommended that the owners look on the top two rows of page 62 of the Guidelines for appropriate doors.

DEBRIEFING:

- **Commissioners Training, Preservation North Carolina Conference**

Ms. Geary stated that she attended the two Commissioner training events with Ms. Smith, Mr. Arneke, Ms. Stringfield and Chair Wharton. Legislative requirements were discussed in one of the events and staff has spoken with the legal department about how these interpretations may affect Historic Preservation in Greensboro. It was determined that the City is in keeping with the legislation through current processes. Ms. Geary asked Commissioners who attended the events for their comments.

Based on what he learned about other municipalities, Mr. Smith felt that Greensboro is very reasonable in what is asked of property owners.

Members commented on the increased property values of historic districts in Charlotte and Raleigh.

Mr. Arneke felt that the events were very illuminating although some of the information was a little more basic than he needed. Overall, the events were very informative and he got a lot out of the sessions.

Staff thanked Chair Wharton for participating on a panel discussing about historic preservation and urban renewal and specifically, the Heritage Community Program. Chair Wharton felt that the event was a positive experience. He was pleased about the opportunity to speak on the Heritage Community Program that was started in Greensboro.

Ms. Springfield informed members that Chair Wharton recently gave a presentation to the Greensboro Neighborhood of Congress about the benefits of supporting the neighborhood and some of the distinctions of working with historic neighborhoods.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig said that he, Ms. Geary, and Ms. Cockburn will be making a presentation on Historic Districts to the Greensboro Area Realtors Association on November 17, 2016. The presentation will be at 11:30 a.m. at their office located on Oak Branch Road.

Mr. Arneke informed members that the Troy Bumpass House is going to be sold.

Mr. Cowhig responded to a question from Ms. Lane and updated members on 634 Elm Street. The house was sold and is being renovated by the new owner. The new owners have also acquired the Julian Price House on Fisher Park Circle.

Mr. Cowhig stated that the wall at 110 South Mendenhall Street has been finished and looks beautiful. The owners secured a grant through the Municipal Service District Fund to pay for half of the project.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stefan-leih Geary
Historic Preservation Planner

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
DECEMBER 7, 2016**

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 26, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the October 26, 2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt, Smith. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 602 Fifth Avenue**
Application Number 2014
Applicant: Lisa Haywood
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-26-16
(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replacement of vinyl windows with new wood, SDL (simulated divided light) windows.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the replacement windows are incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Historic District. The original two-over-two windows are a characteristic feature of the late-Victorian architectural period. Some of the original windows were replaced with vinyl windows.

Guidelines (page 57):

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

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

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

B. *Window products will be reviewed on an individual basis using the following criteria:*

1. *Kind and texture of materials.*
2. *Architectural and historical compatibility.*
3. *Comparison to original window profile.*
4. *Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building.*
5. *Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards.*
6. *Material performance and durability.*

In Support:

Lisa Haywood, 602 Fifth Avenue.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 2014 for work at 602 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Lisa Haywood. The description of work is the retention of vinyl windows. City staff recommended against granting a COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (pages 55-61), Guidelines 2 and 3 (page 57)*. Speaking in support was Lisa Haywood, 602 Fifth Avenue, and no one was speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig explained that this item was continued from the October 26, 2016 meeting. Staff has reached out to the previous owners who received a COA and never followed through with work they had agreed to do.

A letter was written by Counsel Jones on November 8, 2016 to the previous owner, Blade Properties, LLC in care of James Nathan Duggins, III, located at 1515 West Cornwallis Drive in Greensboro, North Carolina. The letter was read into the record. The letter stated that the previous owner violated the Land Development Ordinance by replacing windows at 602 Fifth Avenue without first obtaining a COA. A COA was subsequently issued on September 25, 2013 and required the replacement of existing vinyl windows with new wood windows by the end of 2013. Blade Properties failed to bring the property into compliance with the Ordinance. Blade Properties subsequently transferred the property to Lisa Haywood by deed as recorded on January 4, 2016. Ms. Haywood submitted a COA to retain the existing windows. At the Historic Preservation Commission hearing on October 26, 2016, Ms. Haywood testified that she was unaware of any zoning violation on the property when she acquired the property. The matter was continued until the December 7, 2017 hearing and the previous owner was asked to attend the hearing.

Counsel Jones contacted Mr. Duggins by phone in November, 2016 after the issuance of the letter to discuss this matter. At that time he did not have much recollection of the transaction but said he would look into the matter. Earlier this afternoon, Mr. Duggins replied by email that he would not be able to attend the hearing and said that they do not view this as their problem since Blade Properties is no longer owner of the property. He said that Ralph Jones, who brokered the deed, confirmed that the current owner was aware of the issue when she purchased the house.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Counsel Jones stated that the assertion of Ralph Jones that Ms. Hayes was aware of the violations at the time the deed was transferred is considered hearsay.

Chair Wharton asked Counsel to comment on the Commission's ability to enforce the COA granted to Blade Properties. Counsel Jones said that in her opinion, the COA runs with the land and because it was not complied with before the deed transferred, it becomes the obligation of the new owner. Civil penalties were issued to Blade Properties, LLC but because they were not issued until after the property had already transferred, they have been rescinded by the City. There is no pending obligation for civil penalties against Blade Properties, LLC.

Mr. Smith noted there was a three-year gap between when Blade Properties was told they were in violation and when the penalties were assessed for that property. Counsel Jones communicated with the Inspector and learned that Blade Properties was given additional time to comply with the window replacement. Mr. Smith summarized that the original violation occurred sometime in 2012 and Blade Properties was given until the end of 2013 to comply. They did not comply and the penalties were assessed and rescinded in 2016. During this time, Mr. Cowhig said that the applicant said they were working on the windows but needed a little more time to complete the project. To his knowledge, no work was actively done.

Chair Wharton asked if disclosure to a buyer is required for zoning violations or penalties on a property. Counsel Jones said it is her understanding that disclosure is not required but if a licensed real estate agent is involved and they are asked the question and have knowledge of something, then they have an ethical obligation to disclose under threat of sanction from the Real Estate Board.

Responding to a question from Mr. Pratt, Mr. Cowhig said the previous owners came before the Commission on several occasions. They came to the Commission initially to request that the replacement windows be retained and that request was denied. They returned at another hearing with a plan to replace some of the windows and that application was continued. The request was finally approved at a third hearing.

Mr. Smith noted that if this request is denied, the owner has 15 days to appeal the decision. The matter would then go to the Board of Adjustment (BOA) and then after that an appeal would go to Superior Court. Counsel Jones clarified that the appeal in both situations is based on the record created at the HPC hearing and there is not an opportunity for new witnesses. The Board of Adjustment would not take additional testimony but they do have the ability to reverse, affirm or modify the decision of the Commission.

It was pointed out by the Commission that members can carefully approve things that are incongruous with the guidelines. A very good reason in the findings of fact would need to be given for finding something incongruous yet still acceptable.

Ms. Haywood explained that Ralph Jones has been her insurance agent for several years and is responsible for renters insurance on her properties. She was unsure if Mr. Jones was acting in a dual relationship in this matter. Mr. Jones did not tell her that there were pending violations on the property at the time of purchase. However, he did say that the City had contacted them in regards to windows but it was not a problem because the windows had been there for four years before she purchased it. This was an as-is cash buy with no agents involved. She did not know to check with the City regarding the windows during the due diligence period.

Ms. Haywood said she is not opposed to making the issue right; however, she cannot afford to replace all the windows from a violation that has existed for four years. Had she known there was a penalty, she would have negotiated the price or had the seller fix the problem. She did not know the windows were an issue.

Ms. Stringfield pointed out that there are five windows to be replaced in the house. Architectural Salvage of Greensboro has two over two windows available at \$20.00 per sash or \$40.00 per opening which is much more reasonable than the cost of new windows. A time period could be set to allow for replacement of the windows.

Ms. Geary clarified the time line of events for this particular project. The previous owners were issued a COA at the October, 2013 meeting and were given a short window of time until January 1, 2014 to comply. The enforcement officers gave extended compliance time and staff was working with the owners during that time frame. The case was reopened in January, 2016 and therefore, there was a two-year window where staff was trying to work with the previous property owner to rectify the situation. Due to staff turnover in zoning enforcement last year, this case slipped through the cracks. This has been a two-year process, not four years, where staff was actively working with the previous owner.

Mr. Cowhig said that he personally reached out to the previous owners on several occasions to remind them of their responsibility and offer assistance. The previous owners said that they were working on the matter but there was no follow through.

Ms. Lane asked if a schedule could be created for replacement of the two over two windows. Mr. Cowhig said that the application is for the windows as they exist and a replacement schedule could not be done without the agreement of the applicant.

Counsel Jones clarified that if this application is denied, the situation reverts back to the property being in violation and the applicant may be subject to civil penalties. To save the applicant the trouble of making a new application, Chair Wharton asked about the legalities of approving this request with the condition that the vinyl windows can be retained for a certain amount of time but would have to be replaced with wood windows on a schedule. He did not want to put the applicant in a situation where she will immediately be liable for civil penalties.

Counsel Jones stated that if this application is approved, the property will come into compliance. If the application is denied and conditions are put on the record that a certain amount of time is appropriate for this owner to replace with wood windows, Zoning Enforcement staff will not be taking action before that time runs out.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2014 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and guidelines for *Windows and Doors, Guidelines 1, 2, and 3--A and B* as follows: (1) *Retain and preserve the pattern arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.* (2) *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided;* (3) *When repair is not feasible, as determined by City staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows, when designed to match the original in appearance, detail, material, profile, and overall size as closely as possible. Double-paned glass may be considered when they are true divided and can accurately resemble the original window design.* A. *It is not appropriate to replace true divided light windows with vinyl windows or windows with snap-in muntins;* and B. *Window products will be reviewed on an individual basis using the following*

criteria: 1. Kind and texture of materials, 2. Architectural and historical compatibility, 3. Comparison to original window profile, 4. Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building, 5. Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards, and 6. Material performance and durability; are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt, Smith. Nays: None.)

Mr. Cowhig indicated that he received a communication from the president of the Aycock Neighborhood Association who said the board discussed this item and felt strongly that the owner should not be held responsible for the window replacement.

Mr. Arneke was in agreement that the owner should not be held responsible but the Commission has no power to enforce replacement on the party who is actually responsible for this situation. He would hate to see the vinyl windows remain but he does not want to unduly burden the new owner who has been already victimized by the previous owner. However, he did not think the Commission should make it acceptable for a property owner to dodge the inspection process long enough to sell the property.

Mr. Smith said that the Commission's role to preserve the character of the neighborhood is clear in this situation. The previous owner took the original windows out and created the violation on their own. Whatever circumstances came about, this went unchecked for three years and follow-through should have happened with the owner who created the problem. He is sympathetic to the new owner's situation but the Commission's role is to preserve the character of the neighborhood and the vinyl windows are clearly a violation and are not appropriate. He advised the new owner to research other ways to go with the window replacement. He felt there was unfairness in the way this situation has been handled between the City and the new owner.

Mr. Pratt agreed with comments made by Mr. Smith. It is unfortunate that the burden has fallen on the new owner but something needs to be done about the vinyl windows. He felt the COA should be approved with conditions that allow a convenient schedule for the windows to be replaced which may give the applicant time to pursue ways of recouping whatever costs may occur from the previous owner.

Chair Wharton asked if in a denial of this COA, a recommendation could be made that the property owner be given a certain amount of time to fulfill the requirements of the previous owner. Counsel Jones did not feel this particular COA could be conditioned to require the owner to do something; however, in denying the application it could be noted that a COA was already previously approved to replace the vinyl windows with wood windows and a time for completion could be recommended. She noted that the original COA had a deadline in 2013 that was given extensions so that enforcement action would not be taken.

Mr. Arneke moved to amend the finding of fact to add the fact that there is an existing COA for the replacement of these windows.

Ms. Geary offered an alternate option that if the motion is denied, staff will work with the property owner to get staff level approval for wood replacement windows. The COA would carry with it a one-year expiration date.

Ms. Stringfield stated her opinion that the application should be denied and suggested there should be another COA very quickly giving the owner a time period for replacement.

Counsel Jones clarified that the current property owner cannot get out of the violation until she complies in some way. The time in which the violation should have been corrected has expired; however, the violation has not been corrected. She suggested that if the Commission is going to

allow the owner to apply for a new COA then a very clear deadline to apply should be given or the same situation will likely occur.

Chair Wharton summarized that the consensus of the Commission is to deny the application but to give the applicant ample opportunity to bring the house back into compliance and to shield her from civil penalties in that time period.

Mr. Arneke withdrew his motion to amend the finding of fact to add the fact that there is an existing COA for the replacement of these windows.

Lisa Haywood, 602 Fifth Avenue, said she does not want to be in violation. She would never have replaced the wood windows with vinyl windows. She reiterated that she did not know the house was in violation when she bought it. She has no problem trying to rectify this situation but putting brand new windows in is not an option due to cost.

Mr. Smith stated his opinion that the application should be denied and Ms. Haywood should submit another COA to replace the vinyl windows with wood windows for approval at staff level. The Commission is going to try to give Ms. Haywood two years to complete the replacement. It was noted that if the time period given for replacement is more than one year, then the applicant would need to request an extension from the Commission at that time. Ms. Geary indicated that another option if the owner is unable to complete the work within a year is to come back at staff level to have the COA renewed.

Counsel Jones suggested putting a deadline on the application for a new COA. Members felt that a 60-day deadline would be appropriate given the upcoming holidays.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2014 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lisa Haywood for work at 602 Fifth Avenue based on the findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt, Smith. Nays: None.)

Ms. Stringfield moved the applicant, Lisa Haywood, applies for a new COA within 60 days and that City Enforcement fines be staid for one year to bring the property into compliance with five (5) two over two wood windows (with the suggestion that the applicant check with Architectural Salvage of Greensboro for the windows).

Ms. Stringfield withdrew her motion.

Mr. Arneke moved to recommend to staff that enforcement of violation be staid for a period of one year, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt, Smith. Nays: None.)

Chair Wharton said that the Commission would like to see a new COA application within 60 days.

Counsel Jones said that the owner still retains the ability to appeal this decision to the Board of Adjustment.

- (b) Location: 612 Park Avenue
Application Number 2013
Applicant: David Hudson
Owner: John Worsley
Date Application Received: 10-18-16
(DENIED)**

Description of Work:

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

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

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

Guidelines (page 26):

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

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 2013 for work at 612 Park Avenue. The applicant is David Hudson and the owner is John Worsley. The description of work is for construction of a retaining wall (after-the-fact). Staff recommended against granting this COA and in their opinion, the proposed work is incongruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines, Guideline 4 under Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24)*. There was no one present to speak in support of the application and there was no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith said that the retaining wall is really not retaining the soil because the dirt is visible after the second stone. He pointed out that the wall is on City property. It violates the setbacks because it is on the sidewalk and may need to be removed for that reason alone.

Chair Wharton said that the steps are concrete and they have a concrete side feature that doesn't interface at all with the wall.

Ms. Stringfield noted the variety of retaining walls in the neighborhood where the land meets the sidewalk. She felt the Commission should consider that these are concrete blocks that are not allowed. She is not in support of this application and felt that members should be clear because this is a commonly used product and the matter is likely to come back to the Commission again.

Mr. Arneke said that the contrast between the mortared wall and this wall is so great that it strikes him as a great incongruity with what else is in the neighborhood.

Mr. Pratt felt that the wall was almost a wasted effort and it is really not a retaining wall. It does not address the purpose it was intended for.

Ms. Stringfield pointed out that there is a "for sale" sign at the property and it is important that the Commission deals with this situation effectively.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2013 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the staff comments and *Guideline 4* (page 26) under *Fences, Walls, and Site Features* which says (4) *Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood. It is not appropriate to construct retaining walls of inappropriate materials such as landscape timbers, railroad ties, or concrete blocks where visible from the street.* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 2013 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Hudson for work at 612 Park Avenue based on the findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Pratt, Smith. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arneke offered a friendly amendment to place a time frame of 90 days for removal of the wall. Ms. Stringfield accepted the amendment.

Chair Wharton called for a brief recess at 5:49 p.m. The meeting resumed at 5:58 p.m.

PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO RULES OF PROCEDURE:

Counsel Jones stated that under existing rules in order to amend the Rules of Procedure the revisions must be presented at one meeting and then they can be voted on at a subsequent meeting. Members are in receipt of a draft Rules of Procedure reflecting the proposed changes.

Counsel Jones said that her initial recommendation was to dispense with the Chairman's summary. Many other quasi-judicial boards and commissions have much lengthier meetings and do not do a summary. In addition, because appeals are on the record, the Board of Adjustment would have to consider the discrepancy that would be created if the summary does not match the testimony. Other changes include changing to gender neutral language and changing the Design Review Committee, which is no longer in use, from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee. If there is either a complex project or a great number of applications all at once, a Design Review Committee could be appointed to assist staff on making comments and recommendations to the applicant prior to coming before the Commission. The other change involves notice. The City has not been posting the properties and does not feel it is necessary to post the properties in that the notice by letter and notice to the neighborhood associations seems to be adequate.

Mr. Arneke referred to the section on applications where it is specified that applications must be accompanied by sketches, drawings, specifications, descriptions, etc. and commented that the Commission receives a lot of applications with incomplete information. He suggested that element of the rules and procedures should either be eliminated or enforced. It would be helpful to the Commission if there was more information on the application. This would speed up the hearing because Commissioners would have the answers to some of the obvious questions. Mr. Cowhig agreed that better documentation is needed and that the reference should remain in the rules and procedures. He pointed out that if the Commission feels the information is inadequate to make a good decision, then the application can either be denied or continued based on the inadequate information.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff has done research on after-the-fact applications and he pointed out that there is really no mechanism for people to be made aware they are in a historic district. In addition, people don't really fully understand what is covered by the rules. Every step should be taken to reduce after-the-fact applications but the reality is that they will always occur in the historic district.

Ms. Geary said that staff has been discussing ways to strengthen enforcement and monitoring of the Historic District. She went back to 2007 and presented a document to members tracking the status of after-the-fact applications that have come before the Commission. Discussions have been held with Hanna Cockburn, Division Manager, trying to figure out what HPC staff can do on their end to monitor after-the-fact applications given the enforcement staffing situation. Ms. Geary said that staff will work with zoning enforcement staff to be able to get the data base up to the present day and then there will be a regular system of monitoring moving forward. Members indicated that they would be interested in periodic presentations of this information.

Ms. Geary stated that Greensboro is a Certified Local Government (CLG) which requires the City to do an annual report to the State Historic Preservation Office. She shared the annual report with the Commission. The cycle for this report ran from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 and contains information such as the number of COAs received; the number of COAs approved, approved with conditions, or denied; minor works; major works; and after-the-fact COAs.

Mr. Cowhig informed members about two significant homes in the Fisher Park Historic District that were in foreclosure. The house at 634 North Elm Street is now under renovation and work is proceeding nicely. In addition, the Julian Price House on Fisher Park Circle has been purchased and renovation work has begun.

Mr. Cowhig said that the City received a letter from the Department of Cultural Resources about the issue of monuments. He explained that monuments that are on state property would have to go through a review process before they can be removed

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd