

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 28, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; David Arneke; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Hoggard; Cindy Adams; and David Wharton.

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.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that there are no absences. He noted that the at-large seat of former Commissioner Lois McManus has not been filled.

Mr. Cowhig introduced the Commission's newest member, David Wharton, who is filling the seat vacated by Christina Cantrell.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 3, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Adams moved approval of the December 3, 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number 1833**
Location: 805 West McGee Street and 405 Fulton Street (Wafco Condominiums)
Applicant: Betty Sluder for Slater Management
Owner: Wafco Condominiums Homeowners' Association
Date Application Received: 12-2-14 (CONTINUED UNTIL FEBRUARY, 2015 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Removal of trees in front of condominiums on Fulton Street and West McGee Street. Replace with smaller trees.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The trees proposed for removal were started when the condominiums were constructed in the early 1980s. They have reached a size where they provide shade for the buildings and add to the quality of the streetscape and contribute to the character of the historic district.

Fact:

The tree roots are growing into underground drainage pipes and possibly causing structural problems for the building and the paved parking pads in front of the buildings.

Facts:

The City's Arborist recommends additional study and discussion of the situation to make certain that the trees are the cause of the damage and develop a plan for their replacement. He recommends that a civil engineer be engaged to assess the situation.

Guidelines (page 23):

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. *Maintain the property's natural topography, and avoid grading that adversely affects drainage and soil stability or could negatively impact existing trees.*
4. *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.*
5. *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction.*

In Support:

Joe Wheby, 405-A Fulton Street
Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1833 for work at 805 A-H McGee Street and 405 A-H Fulton Street at the Wafco Condominiums. The description of the work is to remove the trees in front of the condominiums on Fulton and West McGee Streets and replace them with smaller trees. Mike Cowhig, City staff, reviewed the history of Wafco Condominiums. The units are 35 years old and are successful. The subject trees are original to the development. The trees are damaging some of the buildings and sidewalks. Wafco Condominiums would like to replace the trees. Mr. Cowhig referred to the City Arborist, Judson Clinton, who said it should be ascertained that the trees were causing the damage to the buildings. There are additional reasons as to why parking pads can be damaged and he suggested the possibility of further studies. One of the facts is that tree roots are growing into underground drainage pipes possibly causing structural problems for the building and parking pads. Mr. Hoggard questioned if they were putting back some of the same trees that were there. The Zelcova was one of the original trees and the City Arborist suggested that it be put back. Staff felt that the proposed work was congruous citing guidelines 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 on page 23, *Historic District Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping*. Speaking in support of the application was Joe Wheby, 405-A Fulton Street, who has been a homeowner for 10 years. He is the current president of the Homeowner's Association. He explained that the historic mill and the Wafco Condominiums are two different associations. He reviewed the reasons for wanting to replace the trees and showed photographs of the tree roots. There are 66 units and 22 of these are basement units. He indicated that removal of four trees on both Fulton and McGee Streets are planned. One of the units has water mold and they feel that pressure from the tree roots caused the drain to back up. Trimming the trees has not resolved the problem. Mr. Hoggard and Mr. Wharton asked questions about the process. Mr. Smith suggested that waterproofing and root pruning might be better solutions. Mr. Wheby said they were planning to add more greenery. At the present time there are 80 mature trees on the area of the lot as well as Crape Myrtles and shrubs. They would like to plant smart and use whatever size would look the best to fill the spot. Speaking also in support of the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, speaking on behalf of the neighborhood association. The association is in support of the application. There was no one present to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Chair Bowers commented that it was concerning the applicant referred to “possible” damage. There are eight trees involved and she was uncomfortable taking the trees down without having direct knowledge that the trees are the problem.

Mr. Smith felt the Commission should be realistic about the integrity of the structure. If the tree has gotten into the wall and caused the leak, then cutting the tree down is not going to stop the leak because the wall needs to be repaired. He was supportive of continuing the matter until there is more evidence. He felt that pruning the roots back would be preferable to cutting the trees down.

Mr. Hoggard agreed that the matter should be continued so that other options can be explored.

Mr. Wharton commented that it was not clear which trees were connected to the units that had problems. He suggested that the applicant provide more schematics to allow the Commission to focus on the trees that are a problem.

Mr. Arneke agreed with the comments made by Commission members. He pointed out that if the trees are not causing the problem and are removed, the same problems will occur again. It would be a good investment to ascertain the real issues before moving forward with removal.

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the consent of the applicant is required in order to continue this application based on the date the application was received.

Joe Wheby, applicant, was amenable to continuing the matter for 30 days.

Mr. Smith moved to continue this application for 30 days, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

**(b) Location: 921 Carr Street
Application Number 1815
Applicant: Joseph Helton
Property Owner: Louis J. Towne
Date Application Received: 12-15-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

Description of Work:

A satellite dish was installed on the front slope of the roof.

Note: An application for the satellite dish was denied at the October 29, 2014 meeting. The applicant has requested that the Commission reconsider their decision which is provided for in the Rules of Procedure:

The order of business for reconsideration of applications for Certificate of Appropriateness which previously have been denied shall be as follows:

- A. *The chairman shall entertain a motion from a member of the Commission that the applicant be allowed to present evidence in support of the request for reconsideration. Such evidence shall be limited to that which is necessary to enable the Commission to determine whether or not there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence or conditions relating to the application; provided, however, that the applicant shall be given the opportunity to present the application.*
- B. *After receiving the evidence, the Commission shall proceed to deliberate whether or not there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence or conditions relating to the application which would warrant reconsideration. If the Commission finds that there has been such a change, it shall thereupon treat the request as a new application received at that time.*

Staff Recommendation:

The staff recommends that the Commission reconsider this application because there is new evidence in support of the application.

The staff could support this application if the dish was moved farther back on the roof in a less noticeable location. In the staff's opinion the dish in its current location is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (pages 38-40)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The satellite dish is located on a front slope of the roof where it is in plain view from the street, detracting from the historic character of the house and the district.

Fact:

Trees make it impossible to receive a signal if the satellite is located behind or at the side of the house.

Fact:

Under the Telecommunications Act satellite dishes cannot be prohibited. But they can be regulated in historic districts. The intent of the guidelines is to find locations for satellite dishes that are as inconspicuous as possible, usually at the back or side of a building, but where a signal can be received. In this case trees would block the signal if the dish were located at the back or side of the structure.

Guidelines: (page 40)

1. *Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building.*
2. *Locate utilities, satellite dishes, and antennae as low to the ground as possible, at the rear and side of the structure where it is not readily visible from the street. Smaller satellite dishes of 18 inches are most appropriate and create the least amount of visible impact on the district.*

Recommended Condition:

That the dish be moved to a location farther back on the roof where it is less conspicuous, preferably behind a chimney.

Mr. Hoggard moved to reconsider this application, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

In Support:

Joe Helton, 921 Carr Street
George Ewing, 311 Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Rebuttal in Support:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1815 for work at 921 Carr Street. The applicant is Joseph Helton and the property owner is Louis J. Towne. The description of work is for the installation of a satellite dish on the front slope of the roof.

The first part of this case was to ask for a reconsideration of the application. Mike Cowhig, City staff, stated that there was additional supporting evidence that was not presented previously. He reviewed the Federal Telecommunications Act and noted that the Commission cannot regulate devices except in Historic Districts and still subject to reasonable guidelines. Staff indicated support of the application with the condition the device is moved further back on the roof to a less noticeable position. In staff's opinion the application is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (pages 38-40)*. The fact is that this dish is located on the front slope of the roof where it is in plain view of the street detracting from the historic character of the house and the district. In addition, the trees make it impossible to receive a signal if the satellite is located behind or at the side of the house. The Commission agreed to rehear the application.

Speaking in support of the application was Joe Helton, 921 Carr Street. He stated that Direct TV indicated the satellite dish was in the most inconspicuous place but could not receive a signal in any other location. Mr. Arneke questioned if Direct TV was making the installation convenient for themselves. Mr. Helton said that a type of binocular was used to track the transmission signal. He questioned if an alternate source would be viable and said that Direct TV is the most affordable option. Mr. Helton is renting the house. Also speaking in support of the application was George Ewing, 311 South Mendenhall Street, who is a teacher at UNC-Greensboro. He has been in the neighborhood for five years and said that the cost of the Direct TV dish is half of what Time Warner Cable would be. He noted there are other dishes in the neighborhood in precarious positions. Mr. Ewing actually met with the technician who got on the roof to try a different position with the satellite dish. He was an actual witness to the technician's visit. Speaking in opposition to the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who said the neighborhood was opposed to the application because it does not meet the guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke lives across the street from the subject property. Although he expressed his dislike of satellite dishes, he felt it was plausible the dish would have to be on the front of the house due to the trees located at the rear of the house. The location of the dish could very well be the least conspicuous spot.

Mr. Smith stated that it would be good to know with certainty if the current location is the best for reception. He agreed with Mr. Arneke that it probably is the best location.

Mr. Wharton commented that this issue has been around for quite a while and noted that it is usually a contractor for Direct TV who handles the installation. He felt it was almost impossible for the Commission to determine if the best location has been chosen. It seems plausible that this is the best spot for the dish. The dishes do not actually damage the historic structure and eventually fiber technology will find its way to Greensboro and satellite dishes will go away.

Ms. Geary proposed that the Commission could consider conditioning the application so that the satellite dish is removed when the tenant moves out.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1815 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-- Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* and that staff comments presented at the meeting and guidelines 1 and 2 on page 40 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1815 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joseph Helton for work at 921 Carr Street with the following condition: (1) that the dish be removed upon termination of the service or the lease, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 703-705 Summit Avenue**
Application Number: 1833
Applicant: Lance Uberseder, Concord Management
Property Owner: Character Builders
Date Application Received: 12-1-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Install Duke Energy security lights.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Lighting (page 31-32)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The property owner has asked Duke Energy to install security lights on existing utility poles at the rear of the parking area to improve security for residents. This approach will require no new poles to be installed.

Fact:

Full cutoff light fixtures differ significantly from standard Duke Energy security lights. Full cutoff fixtures have no direct uplight (no light emitted above horizontal) so light trespass onto surrounding properties and glare are minimized. Reducing the height of the fixture can further minimize the effect on surrounding properties.

Guidelines: (page 32)

1. *Select lighting fixtures and poles that are compatible in scale, design, and materials with the individual property and the neighborhood.*
2. *Carefully locate low level or directional lighting that does not invade surrounding properties.*

Recommended Conditions:

That full cutoff fixtures be used and they be located no higher on the pole than needed to provide adequate light for the parking area.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1833 for work at 703-705 Summit Avenue. The description of work is installation of Duke Energy security lights. Staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. Mike Cowhig stated that staff feels the proposed work is congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Lighting (page 31-32)*, citing guidelines 1 and 2. There are two apartment buildings at the subject site and improved security is

needed for the residents. Staff recommends that the full cutoff fixtures be used and that they be located no higher on the pole than needed to provide adequate light for the parking area. Mr. Arneke suggested that it is possible for the fixtures to be appropriate for the neighborhood similar to the ones used in College Hill. Mr. Cowhig plans to relay the suggestion to the applicant. There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Referring to a photograph, Mr. Smith expressed concern that the light fixture will be mounted at 25 feet. Mr. Cowhig stated that the fixture provided in the photograph may not be the one that is used. It was provided as an example of what a fixture would resemble. He felt that the fixture would not be mounted as high as 25 feet. A condition could be added related to the concern. Mr. Wharton suggested that a condition be added that the lights only be placed as high as needed to cover the parking area.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1833 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 32 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1833 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Character Builders and Lance Uberseder, Concord Management, for work at 703 and 705 Summit Avenue with the following condition: (1) that full cutoff fixtures be used and they be located no higher on the pole than needed to provide adequate light for the parking area, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- (d) **Location: 708 Summit Avenue**
Application Number: 1843
Applicant: Tom Nguyen
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 1-13-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Construction of handicap access ramp at front porch.

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 ramp is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69-70)* and for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a non-contributing structure in the historic district.

Facts:

The wheelchair ramp is required by a new tenant of this commercial property. The ramp will be located at the front porch in order to serve the main entrance. The floor of the ramp will be concrete. The ramp will be supported by wood posts. It will have pipe railings which are usually less conspicuous than railings constructed of wood.

Guidelines (page 70):

1. *Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.*
2. *Construct fire exits, stairs, landings and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so that they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.*
3. *Design and construct new fire exits, stairs, and landings to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure.*
4. *Introduce reversible features to assist persons with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished and historic materials or features are not damaged.*

Recommended Condition:

That shrubbery be planted to soften the visual impact of the ramp.

In Support:

Tom Nguyen, 19 Windsor Castle Court.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1843 for work at 708 Summit Avenue. The description of work is for the construction of a handicap access ramp at the front porch. The applicant is Tom Nguyen. Staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. Mike Cowhig stated that the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69-70)*. The building is non-residential and it is a non-contributing structure. The wheelchair ramp is required to provide handicapped accessibility for a new tenant. The ramp will be concrete supported by wood posts with pipe railing. Staff cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 70 and recommended that shrubbery be added to soften the visual impact of the ramp. Speaking in support was Tom Nguyen, owner of the building. He stated there was not a good way to put the ramp to the side. The building has been vacant for five years. He explained that the ramp will come out to the third parking space. He has obtained a permit for the construction. Mr. Cowhig suggested that the applicant call someone in the permit department to confirm information about handicap ramps. Commissioners suggested alternate locations for the ramp.

Discussion:

Mr. Hoggard commented that there are other options for the ramp as pointed out by Commissioners that would have less impact. He felt the application should be continued. Mr. Cowhig had no objection to approval at staff level. Mr. Hoggard was supportive of bringing the ramp down the center which would create symmetry. Mr. Arneke felt that the owner should work with staff to determine placement of the ramp to find a less obtrusive arrangement. Mr. Wharton was supportive of approving the application conditioned upon the applicant working with staff on placement of the ramp and landscape design. Chair Bowers indicated her preference to approve the application with conditions rather than continue it.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1843 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 70 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1843 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tom Nguyen for work at 708 Summit Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the applicant works with staff for the design of the ramp and the landscaping plan, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Chair Bowers called a recess at 5:50 p.m. The meeting resumed at 5:57 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION FOR JAMES H. AND ANNE B. WILLIS HOUSE:

Mr. Cowhig explained that one of the responsibilities of the Commission is to participate in the review of National Register nominations. This is a public hearing to receive comments about the nomination. The City Council will consider the nomination at their February 3, 2015 meeting and then the Commission will submit comments in time for the National Register Advisory Committee meeting on February 12, 2015. Tom Sears, former Historic Preservation Commission member, is the property owner and is responsible for the National Register nomination.

Tom Sears described the James and Anne Willis House as a Loewenstein mid-century modern house. Mr. Sears acted as general contractor and restored the property over a year's time. The house was on the Loewenstein tour in 2007. The house and been carefully restored and has been deemed to be worthy of recognition. The property is an asset not only to the community but to the group of Loewenstein houses.

Members expressed their enthusiasm for the restoration work that was done and commented that the house looked fabulous.

Mr. Hoggard moved to offer a resolution recommending this structure to the National Register of Historic Places based on Section 8 of the nomination statement, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Ms. Geary urged members to register for the upcoming training workshop. The morning session will cover traditional rules of procedure, making motions and findings of fact, as well as conduct and ethics. The workshop will split into two groups to offer a CLG and Historic Preservation Fund Grant session or a tour of the Warnersville exhibit at the Greensboro Historical Museum. Warnersville was Greensboro's first urban renewal project. There will be a panel discussion after lunch followed by a tour of the Southeast Building.

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the progress of the Education and Outreach Committee. The Committee consists of members of the Commission, Historic District members, and staff. Their goal is to improve awareness of regulations in Historic Districts. He reported that improvements have already been made to the website, an outline has been formulated of steps to be taken, and a postcard reminder of the regulations has been mailed.

Ms. Geary reported that the Planning Board approved the College Hill New Urban Plan at their last meeting. The Plan will go before City Council at their February 17, 2015 meeting.

Ms. Geary announced that the Preservation Greensboro Annual Meeting will be held on February 11, 2015. She asked anyone interested in attending the meeting as a Historic Preservation Commissioner to notify her by email before Friday, January 30, 2015. The event will be held at Proximity Hotel beginning at 5:00 p.m.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:17 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
FEBRUARY 25, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; Cindy Adams; and David Wharton.

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.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of David Hoggard and David Arneke are excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 28, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Wharton moved approval of the January 28, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Adams, Wharton. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Application Number 1833**
Location: 805 West McGee Street and 405 Fulton Street (Wafco Condominiums)
Applicant: Betty Sluder for Slater Management
Owner: Wafco Condominiums Homeowners' Association
Date Application Received: 12-2-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Removal of trees in front of condominiums on Fulton Street and West McGee Street. Replace with smaller trees.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The trees proposed for removal were started when the condominiums were constructed in the early 1980s. They have reached a size where they provide shade for the buildings and add to the quality of the streetscape and contribute to the character of the historic district.

Fact:

The tree roots are growing into underground drainage pipes and possibly causing structural problems for the building and the paved parking pads in front of the buildings.

Facts:

The City's Arborist recommends additional study and discussion of the situation to make certain that the trees are the cause of the damage and develop a plan for their replacement. He recommends that a civil engineer be engaged to assess the situation.

Guidelines (page 23):

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. *Maintain the property's natural topography, and avoid grading that adversely affects drainage and soil stability or could negatively impact existing trees.*
4. *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.*
5. *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction.*

In Support:

Joe Wheby, 405-A Fulton Street
Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1833 for work at 805 McGee Street and 405 Fulton Street at the Wafco Condominiums. The description of the work is to remove eight trees in front of the condominiums on Fulton and West McGee Streets and replace them with smaller trees. Mike Cowhig, City staff, recommended that the COA be approved with conditions. The trees were started in the 1980s and are very large and have reached a size where they provide shade. However, the tree roots are believed to be growing underneath into underground drainage pipes and possibly causing structural damage. The City Arborist would prefer to do additional studies of the situation to make sure the trees are the cause of the damage. He suggested hiring a civil engineer. Mr. Cowhig commented that the Homeowner's Association had other people look at the situation and had a letter from New Garden Landscaping recommending removal and replacement. There is not a map of the removal but the original plans were approved by the Commission when Wafco Mills was constructed. Staff cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 on page 23, *Historic District Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping*. Speaking in support of the application was Joe Wheby, 405-A Fulton Street, who has been a homeowner for 10 years. He is the current president of the Homeowner's Association. The request is to replace the trees. He cited the letter from New Garden that says the trees are half mature and the constricting area will stress the trees as well as having inadequate space for the roots. The tree inventory of College Hill was 3,000 trees with 80 percent of those trees in a healthy condition. He felt that eight trees was a small percentage for replacement. Ms. Lane asked which trees were to be replaced and Mr. Wheby pointed those out. Mr. Wharton asked if the type of replacement tree had been determined and Mr. Wheby indicated he did not know at this point. Also speaking in support of the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the neighborhood association who was in favor of granting the COA.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Adams moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1833 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-- Trees and Landscaping* and that staff comments presented at the meeting and guidelines 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 on page 23 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Adams moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1833 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Betty Sluder for Slater Management and owners of Wafco Mills Homeowner's Association for work at 805 West McGee Street and 405 Fulton Street with the following condition: (1) That the eight trees slated for removal will be replaced with appropriate trees, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Wharton. Nays: Smith.)

- (b) Location: 600 Summit Avenue**
Application Number 1847
Applicant: Matthew Thomas
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 2-12-5 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove non-original addition at back of house; replace opening in back wall with windows from 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 proposed for removal appears to be a later addition that detracts from the historic character and quality of the house. It could be removed without affecting the historic character of the 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.*

In Support:

Matthew Thomas, 112 East Hendrix Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1847 for work at 600 Summit Avenue. The applicant is Matthew Thomas. The original request was for off-street parking but that has been removed from the application. The description of work is to remove non-original addition at back of house; replace opening in back wall with windows from addition. Mike Cowhig, City staff, commented that the owners are doing a nice job restoring the house. He said the addition was clearly non-original and it would be reasonable to remove it. Staff was in support of the application citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 75-76), Guidelines 1, 2, and 3*. The owners also plan to reuse two windows from the addition that were original windows and use them on the backside of the house. Speaking in support of the application was Matthew Thomas of 112 East Hendrix Street. He stated that the addition was a cinderblock addition while the foundation was

of the house was all brick and the brick was continuous. They plan to take the windows from the addition and put them back in the original position on the house. There was no one else to speak either in support or opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton was supportive of the application and felt it was a good idea. He thanked the applicant for his efforts to save this house.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1847 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—Additions* and that staff comments presented at the meeting and guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 76 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1847 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Matthew Thomas for work at 600 Summit Avenue, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Smith, Wharton. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated the Commission on the proposed Heritage Community program. Providing background information, he said that City staff was approached several years ago by members of the Warnersville Beautification Historical Society about the possibly of the Warnersville neighborhood being recognized and approved for historic designation. After review it was determined that Warnersville did not fit the criteria for local Historic District historic designation or National Register listing. The idea of a Heritage Community recognition or designation came about because there is a need to recognize historic areas of the community that do not fit the mold for historic districts.

Mr. Cowhig explained that Heritage Community designation would have no effect on property rights, zoning, or taxation and there would be no regulations as in the Historic Districts. The purpose for the designation would be commemorative and educational. Possible areas that might be interested in Heritage Community recognition are Warnersville, Mill villages, Guilford College, and Overseas Replacement Depot aka Basic Training Camp #10. Criteria have been developed for designation consideration and procedural steps have been recommended. Heritage Community designation is formal recognition by the City Council that a neighborhood or area played an important role in Greensboro's history. The recognized Heritage Community would be added to an interactive map that would be made available to the public. Information on the designation would be provided to the Historical Museum, the Public Library, and the Neighborhood Congress among others.

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff from the Public Library and Historical Museum felt there should be a stronger connection with the community if this program is carried out. There should be a committee with members from academia, neighborhoods, and City staff to review applications for the designation.

Members provided feedback and commented on benefits to the neighborhoods receiving Heritage Community designation. The program is still in the idea stage and therefore, there is currently no budget in place. Items such as signage would need to be explored more closely by others. Mr. Wharton noted earlier discussions that there should be a design standard for signage across the City and the designated neighborhoods could apply for funding from a list of resources or raise the money privately. Ms. Adams suggested interaction with realtors to promote the benefits of living in a Heritage Community. Ms. Cockburn pointed out that the program would allow neighborhoods an opportunity to explore pieces of their hidden history that are not necessarily visible today in a more meaningful way. Mr. Wharton commented that an advantage of the research would be making it available to neighborhoods that could use it in an interactive way such as at an interpretive historic site along the Greenway.

Ms. Geary stated that the Training Workshop has been rescheduled for Thursday, March 19, 2015. Items including legal matters, meeting conduct, and old versus new wood use will be discussed at the workshop. In addition, tours will be conducted at the Southeast Building and a local window restoration business.

Mr. Cowhig updated the Commission on the Spring Garden Street house previously slated for demolition. He reported that the new owner's restoration of the house has been completed. Chair Bowers commented that Preservation Greensboro recently hosted an open house at the property.

Members discussed putting time limits in conditions placed on applications for COAs.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MARCH 25, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Hoggard; and David Arneke.

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.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Ms. Adams and Mr. Wharton are excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 25, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the February 25, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Hoggard, Arneke. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Application Number 1850**
Location: 211 Isabel Street
Applicant: John Martin
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 2-27-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove chimney.

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 Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 49-50)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The chimney proposed to be removed is a secondary chimney that is located at the back of the house. It is not easily seen from the street. The primary chimney will remain.

Fact:

The chimney has structural issues that are causing it to deteriorate. Approximately the top 4-5 feet of the chimney has been replaced and has not alleviated the deterioration issues.

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. Decorative grilles and*

vents, water tables, lattice panels, access doors, and steps are character-defining features of foundations that should be preserved as well.

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:

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

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1850 for work at 211 Isabel Street. The description of the work is to remove the chimney on the back side of the house. The applicant is John Martin of 211 Isabel Street. Mike Cowhig, City staff, recommended that the COA be approved. He said the chimney was not being used. It is in poor condition and the top portion had been replaced sometime in the past. Staff felt the work was congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines* and cited *Guidelines 1* and *6* on page 50. The chimney is secondary and is at the back of the house. The chimney is not easily seen from the street and is in poor condition. The primary chimney will remain in place. Staff felt the chimney did not meet the guideline as having character. In addition, the neighborhood is not a museum district and it would be a reasonable change to remove the chimney. Speaking in support of the application was John Martin, 211 Isabel Street, who said the chimney was not used and was in poor condition. The top part has already been replaced and he planned to repair the roof where the chimney will come down. Mr. Martin commented that he was on the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund Board. He said that Carolyn LeBauer was born in the house and in addition, the house once belonged to Buddy Wild who was a well-known Greensboro citizen. Also speaking in support of the application was Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, who said the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association was unanimous in their support of the application. There was no one present to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Members expressed no opposition to the application. There was a brief discussion about features in historic homes that grow obsolete over time.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1850 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—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys* and that staff comments presented at the meeting and *Guidelines 1* and *6* on page 50 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Hoggard, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1850 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Martin for work at 211 Isabel Street, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Hoggard, Arneke. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers commented on Susan Ladd's interest in the history of the Warnersville Community as reflected in her recent newspaper articles.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the City's Planning Department has received an application to rezone property in the College Hill Historic District. The request is essentially to remove property from the district. Historic districts are overlay zoning districts and the procedure has to follow the same process as when a district is initially established. He explained the process to remove property from the district. The request will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Board, and the Zoning Commission before it is sent to City Council for the final decision. Staff shared a copy of the draft report that will be submitted to the State. Staff's assessment is that nothing has changed that would warrant amending the boundary of the district. The properties proposed to be removed from the district are part of the original development of College Hill and they could certainly be restored. No formal action by the Commission is requested at this point. The request will come back to the Commission for recommendation at a later date.

Mr. Cowhig updated members on progress being made by the Education and Outreach Committee. He distributed copies of an informational brochure that will serve as a guide for owners and residents in historic districts. The brochure can be mailed to new property owners, delivered door-to-door in the neighborhoods, given to the Building Inspections Office, placed in the reception area of the Planning Department, or distributed to real estate offices. The brochure answers frequently asked questions and addresses problem areas that have been encountered.

Ms. Geary thanked everyone who participated in the Training Workshop held last week. The event was well attended she noted that Mr. Hoggard was a panel member speaking on window restoration. Mr. Arneke commented that the event was well done and the Southeastern Building tour was very interesting.

Counsel Jones informed members that the City is in negotiations with A&T University to take over War Memorial Stadium. The property will be conveyed to the State of North Carolina following final approval by City Council next month. It will be subject to historic covenants and the City has pledged \$1.5 million to go toward restoration and preservation of the building. Members requested that they be forwarded copies of the historic covenants.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Arneke asked for an update on two after-the-fact applications that came before the Commission in the College Hill Historic District. He noted that no action has occurred at the properties. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff is aware of the property on Walker Avenue and he felt that sufficient time had been given to make necessary changes to come into compliance. Staff plans to turn the matter back over to the Enforcement Office. The second property, the University General Store, has also had plenty of time to make necessary changes. Staff also plans to turn this property over to the Enforcement Office if a nighttime inspection of the lighting indicates changes still have not been made.

At the request of Chair Bowers, Mr. Cowhig plans to follow-up on progress being made at the Magnolia Street property relative to the required planting of two trees. Members were supportive of conditioning an after-the-fact application with a deadline for the making necessary changes to the property.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:51 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 29, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Wharton; Cindy Adams; and David Arneke.

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.

Mr. Cowhig stated that an additional item, Application #1868 for work at the southeast corner of Market Street, has been added to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Mr. Hoggard is excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 25, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the March 25, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

OTHER BUSINESS:

Counsel Jones indicated that a guide for building a quasi-judicial decision was recently put out by the North Carolina School of Government and circulated to City quasi-judicial Boards and Commissions. She addressed the issue of comments made by neighbors and Neighborhood Associations and the potential for conflicts of interest. Under State law, approval of a COA is subject to quasi-judicial decision rules and the local Land Development Ordinance also makes it a Public Hearing. A Public Hearing is not necessarily subject to the rules of evidence. Testimony can be received; however, certain opinions and innuendo cannot be the basis of a quasi-judicial decision. Decisions must be based on first-hand knowledge of the property, information in the staff report, sworn testimony, or expert testimony.

Ms. Adams asked how the role of the Neighborhood Association representative and the decision of the Neighborhood Association relative to the case should be viewed when hearing testimony. Counsel Jones said when a Neighborhood Association member gives testimony, it is considered first-hand knowledge and not hearsay. The weight of the testimony is determined by the Commission. The ordinance becomes a guide relative to congruency leading to conclusions and findings of fact.

Counsel Jones clarified that a conflict of interest is related to whether or not there is a financial interest in the property or if there is a fixed opinion that is not susceptible to change. Living in the district and/or being aware of the property are not inherent conflicts of interest. Disclosure is required when a member has information outside of the record.

Mr. Wharton asked if it is considered to be ex parte communication to drive by and look at a site that is going to be considered. Counsel Jones indicated that site visits are acceptable; however, it is best to disclose anything that occurred outside of the hearing.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Application Number 1861**
Location: 201 East Hendrix Street
Applicant: Paula Wells
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-15-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Remove Magnolia tree. Replace fence.

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 Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping, Fences and Walls* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The tree was determined to be in poor health. The new fence replaced an existing fence. The new fence is four feet high and made of wood.

Guidelines (page 25):

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

In Support:

Paula Wells, 201 East Hendrix Street

In Opposition:

Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1861 for work at 201 Hendrix Street. The description of the work is to remove the Magnolia tree and replace the fence. This is an after-the-fact application. Mike Cowhig, City staff, stated that they saw images of the Magnolia tree with very brown leaves and the tree had not previously looked like that. He said that the fence was replaced with a privacy fence. He also remarked that the retaining wall was repaired and restored a year ago. The fence met the guidelines and was the type of fencing regularly approved by the Commission. Speaking in support, he cited Guideline 1 from *Historic District Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping, Fences and Walls* on page 25 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.* Speaking in support of the application was Paula Wells and James Luc of 201 East Hendrix Street. Mr. Luc said there were four types of fencing there and they wanted to have a more uniform look. Therefore, they continued the same style as one of the other fences. The fence is three feet in height. They are planning to landscape between the fence and the wall. He commented that it cost \$15,800 to replace the retaining wall. They plan to replant a tree in the location of the Magnolia tree. Speaking in opposition was Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. They did not support the application due to lack of information about the fence height and other information about the tree. There was no one else to speak on the property.

Discussion:

It was confirmed that the fence is three feet in height.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1861 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—Trees and Landscaping, Fences and Walls* and that staff comments along with guideline 1 on page 25 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1861 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Paula Wells for work at 201 East Hendrix Street with the following condition: (1) that a Magnolia or another appropriate canopy tree, as determined by the City Urban Forester, be planted in a similar location to the previous tree within a period of a year, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

(b) Application Number 1864**Location: 112 East Hendrix Street****Applicant: Matthew Thomas****Owner: Same****Date Application Received: 4-15-15 (APPROVED)****Description of Work:**

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 is congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines—Windows and Doors* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The existing door was in poor condition. It was replaced as part of the total renovation of the house. The new door is compatible with the craftsman architecture of the house.

Guidelines (page 57):

1. *Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations.*
2. *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, etc. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, etc.*

In Support:

Graham Moore, 2027 Walker Avenue

In Opposition:

Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1864 for work at 112 Hendrix Street. The applicant is Matthew Thomas. The description of work is to replace the front door. Staff recommended granting the COA and felt the work was congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines—Windows and Doors* as follows: (1) *Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations*; and (2) *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, etc. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the*

original in size, composition, material, etc. Mr. Cowhig commented that the house was under a Demolition by Neglect Order and that the owners have been restoring the house. They plan to bring the property back as a single-family home. He was very pleased to see this project progressing and he showed before and after pictures of the property. The door was probably an early 20th century style and it worked well with the heavy brick style. Also speaking in support of the application was Graham Moore, 2027 Walker Avenue, who pointed out that the former door was overgrown with ivy and was rotten. The screen door was not original to the house. The new front door has been stained. Speaking in opposition was Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. They were excited about the new appearance of the house; however, the door was very different and they felt it did not match the style of the house. The Neighborhood Association voted in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Responding to questions, Mr. Cowhig said that they do not have a picture that is good enough to really see the original door prior to being removed. He did believe, however, that the door was a six-light French door. Mr. Wharton stated his opinion that while the door does not exactly match the original door or anything that is in the guidelines, the door is not necessarily incongruous with the style of the house. He felt it was a perfectly acceptable replacement door. It does not clash with the style of the house, it matches the monumental presence of the house, and it is in keeping with the period of the house. Mr. Cowhig stated that the house was built in the 1920's. Mr. Smith stated that the work on the house was excellent but the replacement door does not meet the standards of the guidelines. The former door was a full light, painted door whereas now it is a solid, stained door. Staff pointed out that the guidelines are not rules; they are intended to serve as a guide. Mr. Arneke was surprised that these particular guidelines do not say more about doors. He felt there was not a lot of guidance available.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1864 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— Windows and Doors* and that staff comments that the existing door was in poor condition and was replaced as part of the total house renovation, that the new door is compatible with the architecture of the house, along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 57 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: Smith.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1864 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Matthew Thomas for work at 112 East Hendrix Street, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: Smith.)

(c) Application Number 1866

Location: 712 Morehead Avenue

Applicant: Ashley Brooks, AT&T

Owner: Andrew Egbert

Date Application Received: 3-15-15 (CONTINUED UNTIL MAY 27, 2015 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Install telecommunications cabinets in easement on left side 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 congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The cabinet will be located behind a fence where it will not be easily visible from the street.

Guidelines (page 57):

6. *Air Conditioning units and other similar mechanical equipment should be placed in the rear and side yards, with as little visibility from the street as possible. When equipment can be seen from the street, it should be screened with shrubbery or fencing.*

In Support:

Ashley Brooks, 6771 Old Greensboro Road

In Opposition:

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street
Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Avenue
Martha Carter, 715 Morehead Avenue

Rebuttal in Support:

Mike Brooks, 6771 Old Greensboro Road

Discussion:

Following testimony from speakers both in support and opposition to the application, members questioned if the matter should be continued to allow AT&T to explore alternate locations for the telecommunications cabinet. Mr. Cowhig noted that the City owns an adjacent piece of property that could possibly be used for the cabinet. An alternate location may address some of the concerns of speakers in opposition to the application. Concerns were expressed that included cabinet visibility, the lack of a condition requiring fencing, landscaping and screening, loss of trees, and the lack of a site plan. Mike Brooks, AT&T contractor, commented that an alternate location may or may not be possible depending on the distance between the cabinet and the service area. Mr. Brooks also pointed out that the he was informed the manufacturer's warranty on the cabinet will be lost if another type/color of paint is used that would result in heat build-up in the cabinet.

Members felt that it would be preferable to move the cabinet to a less conspicuous location outside of the boundaries of the Historic District. If such a location cannot be found, an actual site plan should be provided with as much screening as possible. Mr. Brooks was asked to ascertain if the cabinet can be painted a darker color of paint to be less obvious. Ms. Adams suggested that AT&T should work with staff and then come back to the Commission with more information, a proposal, and site plan.

Responding to questions, Counsel Jones explained since the application was received on April 15, 2015; the application can be continued until the May meeting and it will still be in compliance with the 60-day rule.

Motion:

Mr. Arneke moved to continue the application and requested that staff work with AT&T to (1) explore alternate locations, and (2) if there are no alternate locations, get a site plan and explore the possibility of moving to the other side of the fence line to the City-owned property, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

- (d) Application Number 1868**
Location: 1015 West Market Street
Applicant: Mike Cowhig
Owner: Greensboro College
Date Application Received: 4-15-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Construct a granite gateway sign.

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 Guidelines—Signs* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The new sign is part of the College Hill Streetscape Improvement Plan. It will match other entrance signs in the district. It will be constructed of a stone material that is compatible with the character of the historic district.

Guidelines:

1. *Introduce simple, unobtrusive signage in the historic districts.*

In Support:

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street
Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1868 for work at 1015 West Market Street. The applicant is Mike Cowhig. The property owner is Greensboro College. The description of work is to construct a granite gateway sign. Staff recommends in support of granting this COA citing *Historic District Guidelines—Signs*, guideline 1 on page 33, as follows: *(1) Introduce simple, unobtrusive signage in the historic districts.* The sign is part of a College Hill Streetscape Improvement Plan and it will match the other entrance signs in the district. It will be constructed of a stone material that is compatible with the character of the historic district. This is part of a long-range plan Greensboro College has allowed to be built on their property. Piedmont Stone is the contractor and this application clearly meets all the guidelines. The sign will be located on the corner of Tate and West Market Streets. Speaking in support of the application was Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood was fully in support of the application. The project will be funded by Municipal Service District funds. Also speaking in support was Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Avenue, who is on the neighborhood landscaping committee. She said the sign would be most attractive and thought it would be built before the fall. Mr. Cowhig felt that the building might actually begin in May, 2015 with plantings installed in the fall.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1868 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— Signs*, and that staff comments along with guideline 1 on page 33 *are acceptable as finding of fact*, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1868 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mike Cowhig for work at

1015 West Market Street, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Smith. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers informed members of the upcoming Tour of Historic Homes in Hamilton Lakes. The event will be held May 16-17 and is being sponsored by Preservation Greensboro.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Time Warner Cable wants to do something for Historic Preservation month next week. Staff may ask Commission members or key leaders in historic districts to participate in a remote interview with Time Warner Cable.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MAY 27, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Wharton; Cindy Adams; and David Arneke.

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.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

Mr. Cowhig stated that application number 1866 for work at 712 Morehead Avenue has been withdrawn from the agenda. AT&T plans to look for a location for their telecommunications cabinet outside of the Historic District.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that there are no excused absences.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 29, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Wharton moved approval of the April 29, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Application Number 1873**
Location: 610 Park Avenue
Applicant: Manlin Chee
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-14-15 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Apartment entrance door has been replaced.

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 not congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

Based on documentary photographs the door that was replaced was a paneled wood and glass door that matched the other entrance door on the front of the house. The replacement door is so completely out of keeping with the late-Victorian architectural period of the house that it diminishes the historic character of the property and the district.

Guidelines (page 57):

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

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1873 for work at 610 Park Avenue. The description of the work is for replacement of a front apartment door. This is an after-the-fact application that was seen to be in violation by zoning enforcement who gave the property owners two options. The door could either be returned to its pre-existing condition or a COA could be requested. The owners chose to ask for a COA. Staff recommends against granting this COA. The door that was replaced was a paneled wood and glass door that matched the other door on the house. Staff felt the new replacement door was completely out of keeping with the late-Victorian architectural period of the house and it diminished the historic character of the property and the district. Mike Cowhig, City staff, cited *Historic District Guidelines—Windows and Doors*, specifically *Guideline 2* on page 57 as follows: *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements such 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.* Staff recommended against granting the COA. There was no one present to speak in support and there was no one present to speak in opposition.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke was not in support of the application and felt that the application was clearly not in keeping with the guidelines. Chair Bowers was in agreement with Mr. Arneke.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1873 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 along with *Guideline 2* under *Historic District Guidelines—Windows and Doors* on page 57 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1873 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Manlin Chee for work at 610 Park Avenue. Mr. Arneke requested that the staff work with the property owner to identify an appropriate door and in addition, that the work be completed within 60 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

REZONING APPLICATION TO REMOVE PROPERTY AT 1107, 1109, AND 1111 WEST MARKET STREET FROM THE COLLEGE HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT: (DENIED)

Chair Bowers stated that members are in receipt of the staff report and the response from the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources relative to the rezoning application.

Mr. Cowhig provided background information on the rezoning application for properties at 1107, 1109, and 1111 West Market Street in the College Hill Historic District. North Carolina's historic districts are zoning overlay districts and property owners have the right to request rezoning. This rezoning application would constitute the removal of the historic district overlay zone for these properties which would effectively remove them from the historic district. Under North Carolina General Statutes, any changes to the boundaries of a locally zoned historic district require that a report be prepared to assess the application. The report is the same type of report that is prepared when a district is designated. Any changes to the boundary require a report that must be submitted to the State who has 30 days to do an analysis and make comments. The report must make a case for the removal of the properties on the basis of loss of historical significance and/or integrity. It must be explained in the report how removal of the properties would not diminish the overall historic character of the district.

The conclusion of the report is that the subject properties have not changed materially since the district was designated in 1980 and have not experienced a loss of historic significance or integrity. The properties still possess the physical characteristics that linked them with the surrounding neighborhood at the time of designation. The State Historic Preservation Office concluded that the properties still have a historical association and physical connection with the neighborhood which they had at the time of the designation and that association is still present today. In their opinion, the properties make an important contribution to the historic district.

The Commission has been asked to review the application and make a recommendation on the application. The process would then send the request to the Planning Board, the Zoning Commission, and then the City Council who would make the final decision on these matters.

It was noted that 1107 West Market Street has been altered more than the other subject properties because it was converted to an office building. Its form has been maintained; however, it does not have the degree of integrity of the other two properties. 1109 and 1111 West Market Street are being used as rental housing and are income producing. The former garages behind the properties are apartments. The properties are in the local overlay but they are not in the National Register District. If the properties are added to the National Register District, the property owners would be eligible for Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits for income producing properties if the properties were upgraded. The properties are in an area currently zoned for Office use.

Responding to a question, Mr. Cowhig indicated that there is one owner for these properties and a request to remove a property from the historic overlay is rare. He noted that the only time property has actually been removed occurred with historic properties on Tate Street in the commercial area. The request to remove the properties from the district occurred after they were demolished.

Speaking in support of the application was Tony Luper who lives at 4535 Randolph Church Road in Liberty, North Carolina. He was representing the property owner, Ellen W. Development Company. Mr. Luper is an officer of that company. The sole shareholder is his mother who has retired.

Mr. Luper disagreed with the report's conclusion that the location has a meaningful connection with the residential nature of the rest of the historic district. There are currently no single-family residences adjacent to these properties and there have been many changes since 1980. There has been an overall growth at UNC-Greensboro and they have taken over most of McIver Street and made that another entrance to the campus. The UNC-Greensboro Music Building replaced residences on that corner and West Market Street has become a very busy area. The State

Employee Credit Union was developed near the properties and UNC-Greensboro took over the IBM building across the street. He stated his opinion that this area is more commercial in character and it would be very difficult to market these properties as any sort of single-family residences.

Mr. Luper noted that all three buildings have some major problems. The foundations were built directly on the ground and are crumbling. There has been significant termite and other structural damage. Chimneys are falling in and major electrical and plumbing work is needed. Much of the original siding material was replaced some time ago with hazardous siding materials that would be difficult to replace. He did not see the Victorian style that was referenced in the report or the historical significance of the outside of the building. There are a few internal elements that have historic significance but some of those have been replaced as well.

Responding to questions, Mr. Luper indicated that if they were outside the historic district they would like to do some renovations to the property that would probably include demolition to the buildings. They would like to take advantage of the commercial zoning that is there. Mr. Luper anticipated that they would likely build student apartments or some sort of commercial or retail building on the subject sites. They are open to selling the property and have talked to Preservation Greensboro Development Fund to offer them an option on the building.

Mary Luper, 4535 Randolph Church Road, Liberty, North Carolina, stated that she gave Marsh Prause of Preservation Greensboro a copy of the 2010 Market Analysis of the property but she has not heard back relative to a plan for the properties. Chair Bowers noted that Preservation Greensboro Development Fund has been very busy lately and Mr. Wharton could not imagine that there was a lack of interest from them in finding a way through this that was beneficial to everyone.

Mr. Wharton commented that National Historic designation would give some financial benefit if they were to upgrade the buildings that could still be used for office or residential uses. There are guidelines for renovation that the State Historic Preservation office can provide that would allow up to a 20 percent credit on improvement made to the historic structure. Mr. Luper indicated that he was not interested in pursuing National Historic designation as an alternative to demolition. His mother has retired and because she is in a lower tax bracket the credits would not be of great benefit to her. He said it was not feasible to keep the three separate lots as they are now.

Ms. Luper explained that this property was owned by her father-in-law who has passed away. Since his death, care of the property has gone to her husband and brother-in-law. Her elderly mother-in-law is living on the income generated by the properties. There is no additional income available to put into the refurbishment of the buildings. Responding to a question, she said that potential buyers suggested to her that the properties would be more valuable if the buildings were removed.

Mr. Arneke asked Mr. Luper if his basic position was to get out the historic district in order to be able to sell the properties for redevelopment. Mr. Luper replied in the affirmative.

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, was present to represent the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Association met recently to discuss the matter and the Board voted to oppose the request. They agreed with the staff report and the recommendations from the State.

Mr. and Mrs. Luper chose not to speak in rebuttal to comments made by Ms. Haskett.

Mr. Wharton asked staff to clarify the criteria that the Commission should base their recommendation on. Mr. Cowhig stated that the recommendation should be based on the same criteria used when districts are first established. These decisions are based on historic and architectural significance and continuity with the district. When a district is designated a lot of discussion and analysis goes into arriving at boundaries that make sense for the district. This property is considered an edge of the district and West Market Street was chosen for that reason.

The goal is to try to preserve that edge and therefore, the Commission's recommendation should reflect that analysis.

Mr. Arneke stated that he could not see any reason to support this request. The convenience of the property owner does not outweigh the value of the properties as far as the historic district. The recommendation from the State Historic Office indicated that the reasons those properties were included in the district still exists and there is no reason to change the boundary in terms of the reasons they were included in the first place. In addition, the Commission needs to be careful about commercial development on the edges of the historic district. To deteriorate the edge of the historic district with commercial development would result in a negative outcome.

Ms. Adams asked if this matter was coming down to an issue of future decay versus rebuilding. Mr. Cowhig stated that when they made their report, staff looked at an analysis of the physical aspects of the building and what has changed over time. A lot of things have changed around the properties but the properties themselves are pretty much the way they were when the district was established. These buildings were part of the Lenora Subdivision from the 1890's and that physical connection still exists. They were not looking at the physical condition; rather, they were looking at the architectural and historic significance of the properties.

Chair Bowers stated her opinion that deferred maintenance should not be considered part of the application. Mr. Arneke agreed and felt that owners should not be rewarded for letting their buildings deteriorate to the point that they lose significance.

Mr. Smith asked if any COA's had been granted through the Commission in the past for work on this property. Mr. Cowhig indicated that COA's have been issued to Mr. Luper over the years for various work such as roofing, maintenance, and repair work.

Mr. Arneke moved that the Historic Preservation Commission not support a change in the boundary of the College Hill Historic District, specifically regarding 1107, 1109, and 1111 West Market Street for the reasons cited in the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office and the report prepared by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers said that the recent Tour of Historic Homes was a success. She thanked everyone who was involved and indicated it was the best tour to-date. Mr. Arneke commented that remarkable houses were included on the tour.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated the Commission on the work of the Committee that met over the winter to come up with a strategy for better education and outreach about the Historic District program. The need for better marketing material was identified and as a result, a brochure was prepared. He distributed copies of the brochure to members. Mr. Cowhig stated that one recommendation of the Committee was to improve the website and to include information such as a running list of all COA applications to be able to see what has been approved in each historic neighborhood. In addition, they are working to improve the process with inspections offices and other City departments. The process is ongoing and staff will continue to update the Commission on progress to improve awareness about the program.

Ms. Cockburn stated that the Planning Department will be co-hosting with NC APA (North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association) an event in the Empire Room on June 17, 2015. The

event will feature Beth Macy who will speak about reshoring manufacturing and what that looks like today. Nationally recognized speaker, Ilana Preuss, will also speak on the issues of small manufacturing and the types of spaces and demands they have that are different from old fashioned manufacturing. If any Commission members would like to attend, the Planning Department will be happy to cover registration fees. Information regarding the event will be sent out later in the week.

Chair Bowers informed members that Preservation Greensboro will be hosting a hands-on demonstration about window restoration on May 29, 2015 from 1:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Arneke mentioned that over the years, College Hill has had a problem with their street lights not effectively covering a lot of the streets. They have worked with Duke Energy who has provided some additional street lighting mounted on utility poles in a historically compatible style. The poles have LED lights and have made a huge difference. Additional utility poles will be installed and he encouraged other historic districts with similar problems to contact James Keith, President of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He commented that Duke Energy has been very helpful in resolving the matter.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd



**Meeting Notice
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission**

The Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission will hold its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, June 24, 2015 at 4 pm in the Plaza Level Conference in the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 W. Washington Street. The tentative agenda is as follows:

1. Approval of Absences
2. Approval of [Minutes, May 27, 2015 Meeting](#)
3. Applications for Certificate of Appropriateness (Public Hearing)
 - a. [114 Fisher Park Circle](#) – Construction of porch addition at back of house
4. Review of proposed siding material for 916 Walker Avenue
5. Consideration of Heritage Community Application for Warnersville
6. Items from Commission Chairman
7. Items from the Planning Department
8. Speakers from the Audience

Interpreter services are available at no cost in accordance with Title VI.

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JULY 29, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Wharton; and David Arneke.

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 absences of Cindy Adams and David Hoggard are excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 24, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the June 24, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Arneke. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 1117 Virginia Street**
Application Number 1880
Applicant: Ann Vaden
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-15-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Remove Sweet Gum tree located in side yard.

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 tree removal is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The Sweet Gum tree appears to be healthy and contributes to the character of the historic district.

Guidelines (Page 23):

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

In Support:

Olivia Vaden, 1117 Virginia Street
Liz Urquhart, 403 West Bessemer Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1880 for work at 1117 Virginia Street. The description of work is to remove a Sweet Gum tree located in the side yard. Staff recommends against granting this COA as it is against the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping* (page 21). Guideline 1 on page 23 states the following: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.* Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that the recommendation to deny the application was based on the fact that the tree appeared to be healthy and the guidelines are very clear. On the other hand, he said that there are reasons to remove trees and in this case the reason is for the safety of the homeowner. A year ago the Commission had allowed a tree to be taken down because of safety issues. Other reasons to remove trees are additions and new construction. Speaking in favor of the application was Olivia Vaden of 1117 Virginia Street who said safety was an issue. She and other family members have fallen on the gumballs on the back patio. The tree is not original to the property. It was a gift and was planted about 25 years ago. Their homeowners insurance sees the tree as a safety issue. They would be willing to replace the Sweet Gum tree with another hardwood tree as recommended by the City Arborist. Speaking in neither support nor opposition was Liz Urquhart, 403 West Bessemer, who was present on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association said that they would defer to the decision of the Commission.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton agreed with comments made by Mr. Smith that the COA be granted on the condition that the Sweet Gum tree be replaced with an appropriate hardwood tree within six months. Members agreed that a time limit for planting a new tree should be specified. Ms. Lane urged caution with safety hazards being the reason for trees coming down in historic districts. Mr. Arneke felt that there might be other ways to resolve the safety issue other than cutting the tree down because the tree is healthy, large and significant. Mr. Smith acknowledged the liabilities and dangers of the tree and stated that the homeowner must be able to use the property. It was noted that gumballs fall throughout the year and deteriorate slowly.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1880 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 along with *Guidelines 1* (page 23) as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district*, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 3-3 and the motion failed. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane. Nays: Wharton, Smith, Graeber.)

During additional discussion, Mr. Wharton pointed out that there is already a good canopy tree located in the front yard and there is a big Penn Oak tree in the back. The Sweet Gum tree is not the only canopy tree on the property and therefore, he was supportive of removing it. He felt that removing it would be in the spirit of the guidelines. Mr. Arneke stated that he could support removing the tree if it was replaced with a reasonably substantial tree. Ms. Geary said that the City Arborist would be consulted about the caliper and type of replacement canopy tree.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1880 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guideline 1* (page 23), are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1880 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ann Vaden for work at 1117 Virginia Street with the following conditions: (1) That they agree to plant a new tree under the recommendations of the City Arborist within six months; and (2) That they will care for the tree or replace it within two years after the time it is planted if it dies, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Graeber. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 305 Isabel Street**
Application Number 1885
Applicant: Lucinda Hahn
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-26-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Replace deteriorated railing on front balcony with a new railing constructed of a synthetic material that matches the original railing. Replace low wall and railing around side porch roof top terrace with new railing of the same synthetic material.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The original balcony railing was replaced with a metal railing and later a wood railing. Because it is exposed to the weather and the inferior quality of new growth wood, the railing rotted out.

The side porch is an addition to the house. The low wall around the roof top terrace rotted out as well.

The material proposed for the new railings has all the characteristics of wood so much so that it will be indistinguishable from wood. It will match the "size, scale, texture and detail" of the original railing and it will be far more durable and long lasting.

The change in design of the side porch addition will not materially affect the character of the house. The proposed railing is similar to railings found throughout the historic district.

Guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies:

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

In Support:

Lucinda Hahn, 305 Isabell Street
 Steve Lalumondier, 7750 Robinson Road, Summerfield, North Carolina
 Liz Urquhart, 403 West Bessemer Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1885 for work at 305 Isabell Street. The applicant is Lucinda Hahn. The description of work is (1) Replace deteriorated railing on front balcony with a new railing constructed of a synthetic material that matches the original railing; and (2). Replace low wall and railing around side porch roof top terrace with new railing of the same synthetic material. Staff recommended in favor of granting this COA and commented that this addition had been approved eight years ago. The house has no backyard and a very heavily wooded side yard. The old railing system has completely rotted out and the homeowner wants to install a standard system to match the existing one. Mr. Cowhig commented on a new synthetic material that is widely used and has all the characteristics of wood. It is indistinguishable from wood and can match the existing wood that is present on the house. He explained that new growth wood does not hold up like old growth wood and felt this was a reasonable replacement as there would be no difference between the old and new railings. This product is a PVC based solid material and the applicant has provided a sample for review by the Commission. Staff felt this was congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62), Guidelines 1 and 2*. Speaking in support was Lucinda Hahn, 305 Isabell Street, and Steve Lalumondier, 7750 Robinson Road in Summerfield, North Carolina. Ms. Hahn explained that one of the balconies had a short wall that was almost a bowl effect and held leaves. She would like to take that wall down and put up a typical railing system. She passed around pictures of proposed railings in the neighborhood. A sample of the suggested railing system was passed around. The sample takes latex paint and is from INTEX Millwork Solutions. The product has been used in historic Charleston and Southport. Speaking in support was Liz Urquhart, 403 West Bessemer, who said the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association supported the application. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1885 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines 1 and 2* under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62)* as follows: (1) *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances, and (2) Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1885 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lucinda Hahn for work at 305 Isabel Street, with the following condition: (1) That the INTEX Millwork Solutions material is acceptable by the Commission due to the failure of initial wood materials that are not long lasting

and therefore, the INTEX material would be an appropriate solution. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Graeber. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 512 Fifth Avenue**
Application Number 1884
Applicant: Thomas Lloyd
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-10-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove Walnut and Mulberry trees located in side yard.

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 tree removal is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The application is for the removal of a Walnut, a Mulberry and an Elm tree. The Elm tree is diseased and removal can be approved by staff. The Walnut and Mulberry trees appear to be healthy and contribute to the character of the historic district.

Guidelines (page 23):

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

In Support:

Thomas Lloyd, 512 Fifth Avenue
 Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1884 for work at 512 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Thomas Lloyd and the description of work is to remove a Mulberry and Walnut tree located in the side yard. Staff recommended against recommending this COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and *Guidelines (page 23)* that state: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.* There is also an Elm tree to be removed but it is dead and can be approved at staff level. In addition, pruning does not require permission from the Commission. The Mulberry tree and Walnut tree are both healthy but there are always reasons that would allow the trees to be removed. Speaking in support of the application was Thomas Lloyd, 512 Fifth Avenue, who said the neighbor wanted to cut down four trees but now they are just looking at taking down the Walnut and Mulberry trees because they are leaning and there may be liability involved. They are considering putting up a fence between the two houses. Taking down the two trees would cost approximately \$1,700. Mr. Lloyd indicated that he liked Dogwood trees. Also speaking in support of the application was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, who stated the Neighborhood Association supported the application. Chair Bowers added that the applicant provided pictures of the trees as additional evidence.

Discussion:

Chair Bowers noted that this application was turned down before although she could not recall the circumstances because it was not on the neighbor's property. Counsel Jones questioned the

relevancy of the prior case to the Commission's decision today because neither the staff nor the Commission has a complete recollection of the case. Mr. Arneke was supportive of removing the trees since they are leaning in a hazardous way. Mr. Smith said that in this particular case these trees do not contribute to the character of the historic district. Eventually the trees will become more problematic than they are now to the foundations of both houses. He pointed out that both the homeowners and the Neighborhood Association are supportive of removing the trees. Mr. Wharton noted that the trees were not purposefully planted in their present location.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1884 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guideline 1 (page 23) under Historic District Design Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1884 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Thomas Lloyd for work at 512 Fifth Avenue for the removal of the Walnut and Mulberry trees, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Graeber. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers referenced a previous tree removal case on Magnolia Street and commented that the trees have never been replaced. Mr. Cowhig indicated that staff contacted the daughter of the homeowner about three months ago. The daughter asked if Japanese Maples could be planted and members pointed out that no trees have been planted and the area is covered in grass. Mr. Cowhig stated that at some point they will be in violation of the ordinance and the ordinance can be enforced. Staff will look at the conditions placed on the application and will go forward with enforcement of the ordinance if it becomes necessary.

Responding to a question about the University General Store signage, Mr. Cowhig said that the enforcement officer has been working on the case. The owners have never followed through with the conditions of the application.

Members noted that there is a satellite dish on the front porch of a property located on the corner of Magnolia and Isabel Streets. Mr. Cowhig informed the Commission that the matter has already been turned over for enforcement.

Mr. Smith was excused and left the meeting at 5:27 p.m.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members of a special training opportunity in Salisbury, North Carolina. The event will be presented in conjunction with the North Carolina Preservation Annual Conference in September, 2015. The name of the rigorous program is Commissioner Assistance and Mentoring and is given through the University of Georgia.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 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 26, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Wharton; David Hoggard; and David Arneke.

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 Cindy Adams was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 29, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Wharton moved approval of the July 29, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Hoggard, Arneke. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 713 North Greene Street**
Application Number 1892
Applicant: Amy Thompson
Property Owner: Temple Emanuel on Greene Street
Date Application Received: 8-12-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Alterations to kitchen wing at rear of building, widen driveway, and install screening fence.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 62), Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38), and Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed plan calls for a small addition to the non-original wing at the back of the building in order to make the kitchen more functional and to meet ADA requirements. The driveway will be expanded for the same reasons and a fence will be constructed to screen mechanical equipment. One tree must be removed in order to expand the driveway.

Guidelines (Page 9):

When interpreting the Historic District Design Guidelines for their applicability to commercial and institutional properties there are two factors that must be considered when reviewing an application.

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

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.*

Fact:

A 6' wood privacy fence will be constructed around the mechanical equipment at the back of the building.

Guidelines (page 40):

5. *Air Conditioning units and other similar mechanical equipment should be placed in the rear and side yards, with as little visibility from the street as possible. When equipment can be seen from the street, it should be screened with shrubbery or fencing.*

Fact:

The driveway will be expanded to provide better access to the kitchen. It is a small increase in size and will not require changes to the existing apron at the entrance on Florence Street. It will require the removal of one tree. The tree is one of a group of trees and can be removed without adversely affecting the canopy in this area.

Guidelines (page 29):

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.*

In Support:

Amy Thompson, 1006 North Eugene Street
Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1892 for work at Temple Emanuel on Greene Street. The applicant is Amy Thompson. The description of work is for a small addition to the kitchen wing, to widen the driveway, and install a screening fence. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, recommended in favor of granting this COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 62)*, *Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38)*, and *Walkways, Driveways and Parking*

Areas (page 28). He commented that this part of the Temple was constructed in the 1950's and therefore, it is not an original wing of the building. The addition is being constructed to meet ADA requirements and create a more functional kitchen. The driveway needs to be expanded for the same reasons and the fence will be constructed to hide the equipment. One tree will need to be removed. The building will be constructed of fiber cement board. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines on page 9 which are general for commercial and institutional properties. He said that the fiber cement board would define the addition from the original structure. He cited guidelines on page 76 relating to the addition along with guidelines on page 40. He said that a 6' fence would surround the mechanical equipment. He felt that the one tree being taken down would not be a problem. It is in a group of trees and would not affect the canopy and he cited guidelines on page 29. Speaking in favor of the application was Amy Thompson, 1006 North Eugene Street, who is a Fisher Park resident. She is caretaker for the building and is very much enthused for adding screening around the mechanical equipment. The ramp was installed in the 1980's and they would like an additional entrance into the new space for restrooms so the whole level is completely ADA compliant. She also stated that removing one tree would not affect the canopy. Mr. Wharton asked about grinding the stump and Ms. Thompson said she would consult with the contractor. There was a question about the retaining wall which would require a COA and Mr. Cowhig offered that the City always likes to consult on these things. Members questioned if the curb cut would have to be widened. It was noted that the curb cut would not be widened at this point because an additional COA would be required. Also speaking in support of the application was Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She said the application was approved by the Association at their recent meeting. There was no one present wishing to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1892 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with Guidelines 1 and 2 concerning institutional uses on page 9; Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 concerning materials on page 76; Guideline 6 concerning privacy fences on page 40; and Guideline 4 concerning driveways on page 29; are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Hoggard, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1892 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Amy Thompson for work at 713 North Greene Street, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Hoggard, Graeber. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 805 Sullivan Street (Saint Leo's Place)**
Application Number 1894
Applicant: Danielle Bowden
Property Owner: Beacon Management Corporation
Date Application Received: 8-18-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replace deteriorated windows in residential buildings and clubhouse.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the

Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 62) for the following reasons:

Fact:

Saint Leo's Place is an apartment complex in the block bounded by Cypress Street, Sullivan Street and East Bessemer Avenue. The plans were approved by the Historic Preservation Commission following the guidelines for New Construction.

Simulated divided light wood windows with casings and other trim that matched that of houses in the historic district were chosen to help relate the new buildings to the surrounding historic neighborhood.

The windows have not held up well over time due in part to the quality of the wood used in their construction and the fact that they are not protected by storm windows. New growth wood has been proven to be much less resistant to the effects of weather compared with old growth wood.

Replacement windows constructed of alternative materials including composite and wood-clad match most of the characteristics of historic windows and are more resistant to the effects of weather than new wood windows. Vinyl windows do not match the look of historic windows as well but are less expensive.

Guidelines (page 79):

1. *Design the spacing, pattern, proportion, size, and detailing of windows, doors, and vents to be compatible with existing historic examples within the district.*

Recommended Conditions:

That the new windows have grilles that match the muntin profile of the existing windows as closely as possible and that the casings and other trim match the existing windows.

That the applicant works with the staff and the Aycock representative on the Commission on the window selection.

In Support:

Danielle Bowden, 805 Sullivan Street
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1894 for work at Saint Leo's Place located at 805 Sullivan Street. The applicant is Danielle Bowden with Beacon Management Corporation. The description of work is to replace deteriorated windows in the residential buildings and clubhouse. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA with several comments. This property was built 15 years ago to blend into the neighborhood and part of the detailing was the windows. The windows are wood and have rotted from moisture and are not holding up. Mr. Cowhig felt that replacing the style of window was very important. A flat profile, such as a vinyl window, is not appropriate in historic districts. Using replacement material such as wood-clad or composite would be a better match. There was discussion in support of replacing the windows but having the trim casings and muntins match the current windows. Conditions could be worked out with the staff while still remaining sensitive to cost. Mr. Wharton suggested that one over one windows might work well in this kind of operation. Staff recommended granting the COA with conditions and cited Guideline 1 on page 79. The conditions were that the windows do match the profile of existing windows and that the trim should match as well. In addition, the applicant should work with staff on the window

selection. Speaking in support of the application was Danielle Bowden, 805 Sullivan Street, who is manager of the property. She said that the problem was a safety issue because the windows cannot be operated at all because they are rotten. They sometimes have to be opened using a crowbar. Residents enjoy fresh air and like to open their windows which they cannot do due to the condition of the windows. She said that the windows will stay the same size and according to some of the bids, they will be wrapped. Members noted that this solution would cover the rot problem but would not solve it. There was a discussion about doing the wood frames in composite material versus a PVC wrap. There was a discussion about doing one over one windows and members commented that six over one windows really would go better with the type of building. Also in support of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association Board. She said that the safety issues were most important and pointed out that this is affordable housing for the elderly. She did not feel the muntins were as important as the safety issue. The Aycock Neighborhood Association Board approved the application at their recent meeting. There was no one present to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Hoggard felt that proper materials should be used so the problem of rot does not have to be addressed again in several years. Members felt that more details were needed. Chair Bowers commented that using composite material would give the look of wood but would not rot. Mr. Smith felt that Commissioners did not have a problem with alternate materials in this situation as safety and economy are important factors. However, the material being shown to the Commission is the cheapest window available. He wondered if there was another cost effective choice that might look a little nicer. He did not feel the applicant would be pleased with the look of using a PVC wrap or the efficiency of a PVC wrap as the rot will continue. He was satisfied having staff and the Aycock representative on the Commission work with the applicant on the window, trim, and casing selections. Mr. Wharton felt that the condition should reflect wording that staff and the Aycock representative on the Commission should come to an agreement with the selection to insure that everyone knows what is being done. Mr. Smith stated that his concern was the look of the finished project. Ms. Lane felt the biggest concern was the finishing of the trim and sills in addition to the replacement window itself. She felt it would be fine to give staff oversight on the window selection. There was a discussion about whether or not there will be whole window replacement. Ms. Geary said it was her understanding that the applicant planned on doing whole window replacement. The conversation for whole window replacement started before the applicant began looking at replacement products. She said that one potential approach could be a one over one vinyl window followed by a hardy or solid PVC trim board in a white casing to the correct dimension over top.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1894 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guideline 1 (page 79)* as follows: *(1) Design the spacing, pattern, proportion, size, and detailing of windows, doors, and vents to be compatible with existing historic examples within the district;* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Hoggard, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1894 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Danielle Bowden for work at 805 Sullivan Street, with the following condition: (1) that the applicant works with staff and Aycock neighborhood representatives on the Commission to agree on window and trim selection, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Wharton, Smith, Hoggard, Graeber. Nays: None.)

REVIEW OF PROPOSED SIDING MATERIAL FOR 916 WALKER AVENUE:

Mr. Cowhig indicated that the property owner is not present to review this proposal.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Ms. Geary distributed information on proposed modifications to some of the legislation that affects the Historic District. The two main changes are in regard to the ability to opt out of the Municipal Service District (MSD) and the local Historic District. The change would allow for an individual property owner to petition to be removed. Members are also in receipt of a document from the President of Preservation North Carolina who has expressed his thoughts on the legislation. Contained in the document are ways for the Commission to share their opinions on the proposed changes.

Ms. Geary commented that other proposed changes relative to the MSD legislation are in regard to contracting. The new legislation will require that new contracts hold a Public Hearing and any changes to the projects would need to be approved by City Council. In addition, notification would be required to all property owners for a Public Hearing for each contract that is being proposed. She suggested members read through the documents for their own educational purposes.

Mr. Arneke requested an update on the status of internally illuminated signs at the University General Store. Mr. Cowhig plans to follow up with the Enforcement Officer for more information. Fines have already been issued to the University General Store.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 30, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; David Wharton; Cindy Adams; and David Arneke.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, 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 Wayne Smith was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 26, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Wharton moved approval of the August 26, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Lane, Graeber, Wharton, Adams. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arneke joined the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 805 Sullivan Street (Saint Leo's Place)**
Application Number 1894
Applicant: Danielle Bowden
Property Owner: Beacon Management Corporation
Date Application Received: 8-18-15 (WITHDRAWN)

Mr. Cowhig explained that this application was to replace the windows in all the units. Staff held an onsite meeting with owners and the manager of the property, David Hoggard, and the individual who supplied the original windows. It was determined that the windows could actually be repaired and the owners have elected to do that. Therefore, the application has been withdrawn.

- (b) **Location: 914 Spring Garden Street**
Application Number 1893
Applicant: Dan Curry
Property Owner: Raleigh Bailey
Date Application Received: 8-17-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Construct sunroom addition and expand deck.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75) and Patios and Decks (page 41)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed sunroom addition will be in an inconspicuous location near the back of the house. Because of the elevation change and the mature vegetation, the addition should not be easily visible from the street. It will be attached to a non-original section of the house so it will not affect character-defining features.

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:

The sunroom will be constructed of aluminum with a bronze finish. Metal is considered to be compatible with historic materials and it will help distinguish the addition from the historic 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.

Fact:

The deck is located at the rear of the structure where it is not easily visible from the street. It will be constructed of wood and will not affect character-defining features of the house. It will be screened from the street by existing mature vegetation.

Guidelines:

- (1) Locate decks at the rear of the structure, or in a location not readily visible from the street. Decks that are visible from the street should be screened with shrubbery or other landscaping materials.
- (2) Decks should be of wood construction, and of dimensions that do not monopolize the rear elevation or significantly detract from the architecture of the building.
- (3) It is not appropriate to install decks that require the removal of historic materials, or otherwise damage or obscure architectural features. Design and construct decks so that they may be removed in the future without damage to the historic structure.

In Support:

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street
Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1893 for work at 914 Spring Garden Street. The applicant is Dan Curry and the owner is Raleigh Bailey. The description of work is to construct a sunroom addition and expand the deck on the back of the house. Staff recommends in favor citing Guideline 3 on page 75 that the sunroom addition will be inconspicuous because of its location at the back of the house and it will be screened by heavy mature vegetation. The sunroom will also be attached to a non-original section of the house and therefore, the character of the house will not be affected. Staff also cited Guidelines 1 and 2 on page 75 and said the sunroom will be constructed of a bronze finish and the metal is considered to be compatible with historic materials. The deck is also located at the rear of the house and it is not easily visible from the street. Mr. Cowhig cited *Guidelines 1, 2, and 3 for Patios and Decks* on page 41. Ms. Adams inquired why this was not done at staff level and Mr. Cowhig explained that the material was a little different and large. Staff felt that the application was in a gray area. Speaking in support of the application was Dan Curry, 305 South

Mendenhall Street, who reiterated some of Mr. Cowhig's comments. The location previously had been a concrete patio and the homeowners wanted the seasonal space of a sunroom. The location is seven feet below the street elevation and 70 feet from the street. Mr. Curry said that the addition will not damage the house and then he passed around the bronze metal samples. Mr. Arneke asked about the roof and Mr. Curry explained that asphalt shingles were planned but he wondered if there was a possibility it could be a metal roof. Also speaking in support was Virginia Haskett of 207 Tate Street. She was speaking for the neighborhood association who enthusiastically supported the application. There was no one speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Adams moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1893 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75)* and *Patios and Decks (page 41)* as follows: (3) *Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed;* along with (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;* and the final guidelines (1) *Locate decks at the rear of the structure, or in a location not readily visible from the street. Decks that are visible from the street should be screened with shrubbery or other landscaping materials;* (2) *Decks should be of wood construction, and of dimensions that do not monopolize the rear elevation or significantly detract from the architecture of the building;* (3) *It is not appropriate to install decks that require the removal of historic materials, or otherwise damage or obscure architectural features. Design and construct decks so that they may be removed in the future without damage to the historic structure;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Adams moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1893 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Raleigh Bailey for work at 914 Spring Garden Street, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 708 Summit Avenue**
Application Number 1900
Applicant: Fritz Vaneus, Jr.
Property Owner: Tom Nguyen
Date Application Received: 9-4-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Install freestanding sign.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Signs (page 34)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposal is for a relatively small freestanding sign constructed of aluminum. The total height is 6 feet. The sign will be located near the public sidewalk. The sign will not be internally lighted.

Guidelines (page 34):

- (1) Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts.*
- (2) New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street.*
- (3) Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights.*
- (4) An appropriate location for a freestanding sign in a residential area is close to the front walk and near the public sidewalk.*

In Support:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1900 for work at 708 Summit Avenue. The applicant is Fritz Vaneus, Jr. and the owner is Tom Nguyen. The description of work is to install a freestanding sign. Staff recommended in favor of the application and cited Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 34. He said that proposed sign is relatively small, constructed of aluminum, and will be 6 feet tall. It will be located near the sidewalk and will not be internally illuminated. Mr. Cowhig felt the sign was in scale with the district. Linda Lane asked about setbacks and staff explained the sign has to be placed so that vision would not be obstructed for drivers. Mr. Arneke asked about the exact location of the sign on the right side of the walk. Speaking in support was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, who was representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. They felt that if the sign was compliant, it would be acceptable. However, they did have a reservation about how much information was on the sign and felt that it was not particularly readable. They felt it took on a sort of billboard look. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Chair Bowers asked why this application was not approved at staff level. Mr. Cowhig explained that the rules say that staff can approve informational signs up to 5 feet high. This sign will be 6 feet high. Members noted that the Neighborhood Association made a good point about the amount of information on the proposed sign. Although it is not in the purview of the Commission, a suggestion can be made for the applicant to reconsider the amount of information on the sign. Ms. Adams felt that the sign was acceptable.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1900 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 (page 34) for Signs* as follows: *(1) Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts; (2) New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street; (3) Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights; and (4) An appropriate location for a freestanding sign in a residential area is close to the front walk and near the public sidewalk;* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1900 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tom Nguyen for work at 708 Summit Avenue, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- (d) **Location: 711 Summit Avenue**
Application Number 1902
Applicant: Jeffrey Anderson
Property Owner: Salem Bullard
Date Application Received: 9-15-15 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Construct front porch railing.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The concrete floor of the front porch may not be original. Houses of this period and style usually had wood porch floors.

The proposed railing will match the design of the second story balcony railing.

Guidelines (page 64):

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

In Support:

Cynthia Hunt, 718 Rollingwood Drive
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1902 for work at 711 Summit Avenue. The applicant is Jeffrey Anderson and the owner is Salem Bullard. The description of work is to construct a front porch railing. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA and felt the proposed project was congruous citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64), Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4*. Mike Cowhig commented that the front porch is probably not original as there is a poured concrete floor. The porch might have been made of wood in the past. The owners are restoring the house back to a much better condition. The owners wanted to model the porch rail

on the balcony rail. The rail will be all wood. There was a question from Commissioners about how the rail will attach to the house. Mr. Cowhig commented that the front steps needed a hand rail and he suggested a metal rail to replace the 2x4 rails. Speaking in support of the application was Cynthia Hunt, 718 Rollingwood Drive, who commented that all the rails would be wood and painted white. At this time they are 30" high, 2" squares, and 7" square posts. The pickets will be fluted and specially milled for this project. Ms. Hunt felt that the railing would add character to the house. There was a discussion about the cement floor being in existence and a question about how the balustrade would miss the windows. There was a lengthy discussion about the front porch rail and members debated back and forth about metal versus wood. It was determined that wood rails on both sides would be the nicest solution. Speaking in favor of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. The Association approved the application believing that the railings would be on both sides of the steps. Ms. Hunt came back and discussed the height of the rail, preferring 24" high. If the height off the ground makes it possible, then 24" would be the preferable height for the new porch railing. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton stated his opinion that a 24" rail would be more appropriate for the house versus the 36" rail that would be required for code. Mr. Cowhig explained that if the porch is more than 30" off the ground, then the code is triggered and the code is 36". Mr. Wharton said that a 24" rail would be appropriate and a 30" rail would also be appropriate. However, a 36" railing would not be appropriate because it would be out of proportion and would detract from the appearance of the house in that case. Mr. Cowhig commented that if the grade is adjusted to be a few inches higher, then the code could be met. Mr. Wharton said that a railing 24" to 30" tall could be approved as appropriate and if there was a code issue, the land could be built up instead of actually installing a 36" tall railing.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1902 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines 1, 2, 3, (page 64) for Porches, Entrances and Balconies* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1902 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jeffrey Anderson for work at 711 Summit Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the railing be built no lower than 24" and no higher than 30", seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

- (e) **Location: 203 South Tate Street**
Application Number 1901
Applicant: Wrenn Zealy Properties, Inc.
Property Owner: Frances Rubinsohn Trust
Date Application Received: 9-14-15 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Expand parking area and add fencing.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the

Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28) for the following reasons:

Facts:

Winburn Court was built in the late 1920s on a trolley line like most apartment buildings of that era. Most residents relied on the trolley and later buses for their transportation. Off street parking was not needed. The owners of Winburn Court also owned a lot behind the apartment building in the middle of the block. A tennis court was built on this property for the use of apartment residents.

Over the years, more and more tenants had at some point a parking area was created on this property which was accessed by Glenn Alley. For many years the City used the alley to pick up garbage and maintained it. At some point the name was changed to Edgar Street. When the City went to automated trash pickup a dumpster was placed in the parking area. The lot was in existence when the district was established in 1980.

The lot is not landscaped but is for the most part hidden from view by its location in the middle of a block and existing vegetation.

Recently gravel was put down on an area to the east and south of the existing parking area.

Guidelines:

(7.) Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing.

(9.) Divide large expanses of pavement into smaller components with planting areas. Incorporate existing large trees and shrubs into the landscaping for new parking areas when possible.

(10.) Select appropriate materials, such as concrete, brick, asphalt, or crushed stone for surfacing parking areas.

Mr. Cowhig provided background information on the architecturally significant Winburn Court Apartments and explained that this application is to expand the parking area and to add fencing. He also provided aerial views showing the apartments and a parking area located in a lot behind the building. There is also an occupied residential structure on that property. The parking lot is accessed by an alley that started out as Glen Alley but is now called Edgar Street and is maintained by the City. There is a debate over whether Edgar Street is a street or an alley. Staff feels that Edgar Street is a public right-of-way even though it does not meet normal City standards for streets.

Additional gravel has recently been put in the parking lot and the bamboo is being cleared out. The parking lot is being cleared; however, it is not being expanded. Staff would like to see additional study on possible ways to improve the lot. The lot is unusual because it is hidden from view by its location in the middle of the block and existing vegetation. Mr. Cowhig felt that the appearance of the lot could be greatly improved if the cars that parked right up against the house could be moved back. If the bamboo was removed then the lot could be widened and made more attractive. College Hill is a Municipal Service District and one of the recommended activities in the plan is parking lot landscaping. There is funding available to improve the environment of the neighborhood. He questioned if it would be possible to do landscaping around the edge of the lot. Staff has not provided a recommendation for this application because they feel the lot could benefit from additional study and landscaping.

Chair Bowers commented that the bollards were put in without a COA and this application is after-the-fact. Mr. Cowhig stated that the City said the bollards needed to be put in and the apartment manager assumed everything was okay.

During conversation it was uncertain if Edgar Street is a street or alleyway. Records cannot be located showing that the City dedicated the street through official action. The City began maintaining the area when garbage began to be collected there and they continue to maintain it today.

Speakers in Support:

Alex Wrenn, 3706 Sagamore Drive, is with Wrenn Zealy Properties, Inc. He began management of this property in 1978. Responding to a question, he stated that the work that has been done is a step in an effort to head off drug activity in the bamboo area and undergrowth. They would like to install fencing at the property to lessen the possibility of drug activity. They are trying to maintain the former tennis court as a dedicated green space. He felt that activity in the back yard would deter people who should not be there. He reiterated the need for parking at the property. The side of the property facing Edgar Street would have a chain link fence while the other three sides facing neighbors would be wood.

Responding to questions, Mr. Cowhig explained that a COA is required to construct a parking or lot or expand a parking lot.

Mr. Arneke explained that MSD funds can be spent on improvements in the City's right-of-way. Mr. Cowhig added that because College Hill has so little right-of-way, the money can be used on projects that are next to the right-of-way that are considered streetscape.

Due to the encroachment of bamboo, it was Mr. Wrenn's opinion that the original parking area will not actually be expanded; rather, it will be reclaimed.

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, was present on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Association was supportive of the request and they appreciate the discreet work that has been done so far. However, the Association does have concerns about the surface of the parking lot, security, lighting, and fencing. She asked that the applicant work with staff to address those issues in a satisfactory way. In addition, Ms. Haskett stated that she grew up in a house near the subject property and she did not remember the parking lot extending out further. She felt this was not reclaimed space.

Speakers in Opposition:

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, said that she considers Edgar Street to be a street, not an alley, because she had to deal with it as a street during the special exception process. She confirmed drug issues at the property. She felt this was an opportunity to do the right thing relative to this property.

She listed the following items that she felt should be addressed in the application:

- (1) The six-foot fence on the three sides of the parking lot is appropriate. However, on the fourth more visible side she felt the fence should be wooden instead of chain link. If it must be a chain link fence, it should be of the old style with the decorative top which is still available.
- (2) She noted the location of a light that puts off a terrible glare. If there is going to be a light at the back of the lot, she would like the current light upgraded to a full cut-off.
- (3) She has no issue with the bamboo being cut back; however, the roots should be gotten rid of.
- (4) The pet station does not make sense because no dogs live in the building.
- (5) The area where they want to put the picnic table should be returned to green space instead of gravel. The area was previously green space.
- (6) The bollards are not the best fencing option. A fence with a gate would be a more appropriate option.

Ms. Davenport stated her opinion that on the right side the grassy strip should be restored with a four foot wood fence. On the north side the bamboo needs to be removed, including all of the roots. The property manager should work with the adjoining properties to put up an appropriate fence and non-invasive ring screen on that fence. Because security is an issue, the fence should be no higher

than five feet. Since the dumpster is no longer in the location it was in for 25 years, it needs to be properly screened as required by the guidelines. There are currently four recycle cans, although more are needed, and they should also be in a screened space. She suggested a three-walled fence to contain the dumpster with a shed for the recycle cans. She would like to see the security lights improved and a low fence installed next to the little house down the side so cars cannot pull up quite so close.

Ms. Davenport cited the following guidelines for residential/commercial lots.

Guidelines for Parking (page 30):

- (6) Parking areas should be well screened to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment.*
- (7) (Commercial) Screen with landscaping and fencing.*
- (9) Divide large expanses of parking areas with plantings.*

Guidelines for Lighting (Page 32):

- (1) Compatible scale and design.*
- (2) Location should be non-invasive.*
- (3) Minimize impact on surrounding properties.*
- (4) Duke Power lights generally are stated as not being appropriate.*

Guidelines for Dumpsters (Page 26)

- (1) Not visible from the street. (She acknowledged this would be hard to do in this location, but a better job should be done than what is presently is in place.)*
- (2) Adequately screen with shrubbery for fencing.*
- (4) Relative to the guideline, she commented that bollards do not fit as an appropriate screening.*
- (5) Low picket or an open design or where visible, screen with vines. (She said that it would be good to have her property screened from the parking lot in an attractive way with something other than the bamboo.)*

Rebuttal in Support:

Mr. Wrenn offered to apply mulch to the area where the picnic table is located. He noted drainage issues in the area and felt that mulch on top of the gravel would address the problem. Ms. Davenport was agreeable to putting mulch on top of the gravel in the area of the picnic table.

Mr. Wrenn said that he wished the bamboo could be taken up by the roots. It has been done in the past and he will continue to try to work on removing the roots. He indicated that he needs more time to address the screening of the dumpster and the recycle cans.

Ms. Lane felt that a more professional drawing and plan was needed for the Commission to analyze. No dimensions are given and ingress/egress routes are not indicated. Ms. Graeber suggested that Mr. Wrenn should seek professional design services that could go through the City's design guidelines for parking lots and help lay out the areas taking into consideration comments made by Ms. Davenport. The professional design will be to scale and will indicate property lines, setbacks, site lighting, right-of-ways, and the configuration of parking spaces in the lot.

Mr. Wrenn stated that they prefer the six-foot fence which is a little bit more difficult for an intruder to climb over as opposed to a four or five-foot fence. He felt that an intruder would be deterred if there was only one way in and out. The purpose of the chain link fence is to let a potential intruder know that they are fully visible.

Mr. Wrenn plans to supply the Commission with a description and drawing that is more to scale rather than getting engineers engaged over fencing. Ms. Graeber asked for a drawing that was to

scale showing the property boundaries and setbacks along with everything else called for in the guidelines.

Mr. Wrenn asked Mr. Cowhig if permits were needed. Mr. Cowhig stated that a Certificate of Appropriateness would be needed. Ms. Graeber commented that parking lots on private property still have to follow City design guidelines when it comes to circulation, parking spaces, handicapped spaces, ingress/egress, etc. In addition, there are requirements relating to concealing the dumpsters.

Mr. Wharton pointed out that it is important to determine if Edgar Street is really a street or an alley as it relates to the guidelines. If Edgar Street is a street then guidelines for fencing would say that a chain link fence is not appropriate. If Edgar Street is an alley then a chain link fence could be appropriate.

Counsel Jones commented that the issue with alleys is complicated. Some departments consider it public for certain purposes and there is an evolving interpretation of alleys. There can be trash pick-up in alleys even though the City does not claim them as being public. The issue of alleys has not been decided by City Council. Counsel Jones stated that a Certificate of Appropriateness is required which means this is visible from a public street. Staff has made that determination. Mr. Cowhig related that while researching a special exception to a setback along Edgar Street, a survey was found that showed right-of-way which led the Zoning Department to think this is a street.

Mr. Wharton summarized that the Commission is looking for a clearer drawing to determine where everything is situated. The type and location of proposed lighting should be included along with the location for the fence gate, and the design of fence. The drawing should be drawn to scale.

Mr. Arneke moved to continue application number 1901 and direct staff to work with the property manager to resolve the questions that have been raised about specific materials and other details of the project, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bower, Arneke, Graeber, Wharton, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

(f) Location: 706 Spring Garden Street
Application Number 1903
Applicant: Angela Arnold
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-15-15 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove three trees as part of comprehensive landscape plan.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The property owner has recently completed a total renovation of the house and would now like to make improvements to the landscaping. A comprehensive landscape plan has been prepared that includes removal of three trees. The removal of these trees will allow sunlight necessary for flowers and shrubs and the mature shade trees to thrive. Because there are so many mature trees these three trees can be removed without affecting the canopy to any degree. In addition, the removal of these trees will result in a more open view of the house for the public to enjoy. Flowers and shrubs will enhance the historic structure.

Note: The guidelines do not adequately address this particular situation. In general, removing healthy trees in the historic district should be avoided. However, there are instances when tree removal can be beneficial. If it is part of a carefully designed landscape improvement plan, as in this case, it can actually enhance the historic character of the neighborhood.

Guidelines (Page 23):

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

In Support:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1903 for work at 706 Spring Garden Street. The applicant and owner is Angela Arnold. The description of work is to remove three trees as part of a comprehensive landscape plan. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and *Guideline 1 (page 23)*. The current owner is the granddaughter of Ms. Butner who had owned the house for a very long time. She has come in and renovated the house in a very good way. New Garden Nursery has done a landscape plan and recommended the removal of three trees to allow more sunlight for shrubs and flower plantings. The landscape plan is very good and comprehensive. The three trees are underneath other trees and their removal will allow the other trees to fill out more. Speaking in favor was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who said the Neighborhood Association was in favor of the application. She personally thought the yard looked too crowded. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1903 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Guidelines 1, (page 23) for Trees and Landscaping* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1903 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Angela Arnold for work at 706 Spring Garden Street, seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Adams, Lane, Graeber, Arneke, Wharton. Nays: None.)

REVIEW OF PROPOSED SIDING MATERIAL FOR 916 WALKER AVENUE:

Mr. Cowhig indicated that the property owner is not present to review this proposal and has not furnished any information of the materials.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig referred to two Webinars held earlier in the day and informed members about a table that was put together showing that tax credits actually increase the State's treasury in the long run. The second Webinar reviewed procedures. Members discussed highlights of the Webinars.

Ms. Geary stated that members are in receipt of an invitation to a reception to honor City Boards and Commissions. She asked members to please RSVP to the invitation by email before October 7, 2015.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:54 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 28, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; David Wharton; and David Arneke.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, 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 absences of Ms. Graeber and Ms. Adams were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the September 30, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Smith, Lane, Wharton, Arneke. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 203 South Tate Street**
Application Number 1901
Applicant: Wrenn Zealy Properties, Inc.
Property Owner: Frances Rubinsohn Trust
Date Application Received: 9-14-15 (After-the-fact/Continued case)
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Expand gravel 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 project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

This is an after-the-fact application. The parking area was expanded by adding gravel at the back to accommodate a few additional cars. Because of its location in the middle of a block, this parking area is effectively hidden from view and screened by existing vegetation. The effect on the neighborhood environment of a few additional cars should be minimal. It will address an acute parking shortage in the neighborhood.

Guidelines:

7. Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing.

9. *Divide large expanses of pavement into smaller components with planting areas. Incorporate existing large trees and shrubs into the landscaping for new parking areas when possible. The Commission may consider alternate locations when properly screened and landscaped.*

10. *Select appropriate materials, such as concrete, brick, asphalt, or crushed stone for surfacing parking areas.*

Condition:

1. That the applicant work with City staff and the Neighborhood Association on ways to make the parking area more compatible with the character of the historic district through lighting, landscaping and other improvements

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1901 for work at 203 South Tate Street. The description of work is for the expansion of the graveled parking area. Staff recommends in favor of this request citing the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28), Guidelines 7, 9, and 10*. Staff recommends approval with conditions. This is a continued case from ~~October~~ [September](#), 2015. Mike Cowhig reviewed what was gone over at the last meeting and said that he has since met with Alec Wrenn with Wrenn-Zealy and Elizabeth Link, City Urban Designer. During their meeting they discussed removing all the bamboo and screening the dumpster. The application is to return gravel to the parking lot, adding a lawn under the picnic table, and taking the parking lot back further but keeping the overall parameters of the existing parking lot. The remainder of the application would be postponed until 2016. Mr. Cowhig would like to see the entire area improved. Counsel Jones commented that the back parking lot is actually 225 Edgar Street. There is one owner for both lots including the small house. It was clarified that the application was for approving extra gravel and asking for an extension of about 20 feet at the back of the lot. There was no one to speak in support of the application. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the College [Park-Hill](#) Neighborhood Association. Following the second review, the Association did not feel the owners had offered any changes concrete enough to look at. They withheld their support of the application. Ms. Lane asked for clarification as to whether things listed on the application were things they wanted to do. Mr. Cowhig said that some of the things they would like to do were very aesthetic changes including screening the dumpster, asking for better lighting and landscaping, removal of the bamboo, etc.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith pointed out that the scaled site plan requested at the last meeting has not been provided by the applicant. Noting that Mr. Wrenn's email indicated their wish to only move gravel around at this point in time, he felt there was nothing in the application to approve.

Chair Bowers commented that the after-the-fact work either has to be approved or denied.

Ms. Lane said that today's description of work is only for the graveled parking area with no other aspect being considered. Chair Bowers stated that if the request relative to graveled parking is denied, the applicant would have to scrape up all the gravel.

Mr. Smith said that the City is very specific about their regulations for screening a dumpster. He questioned if the City should be involved in the matter of screening the dumpster. He asked if the

City's Zoning Department had reviewed this application. Mr. Cowhig said that Elizabeth Link, part of Planning Services staff, has looked at the application and is familiar with development regulations.

Counsel Jones said that after the last meeting she spoke with Mike Kirkman, Zoning Administrator. Considering that these are two separate lots and the parking is not an accessory to the building, Mr. Kirkman felt that it meets compliance; however, if they continue to expand the parking lot they may be violating some other lot coverage requirements.

Mr. Cowhig stated that when Mr. Wrenn was initially contacted about being in violation, they were emphatic that they were not putting gravel in an area that had previously been graveled at some point. Mr. Cowhig is familiar with the area and felt that was not true. The individual working at the lot indicated that he was cleaning out the bamboo and was not expanding the lot; however, it was determined the next day that the lot had been expanded.

Mr. Wharton pointed out that it was speculation that the bamboo covered area was previously a parking area and speculation cannot be part of the Commission's decision. Chair Bowers said that the only thing the Commission can do is to decide if the applicant can expand the parking lot. She questioned if it was possible to make a condition on something that was not requested in the application.

Mr. Smith proposed that the applicant be given 90 days to come up with a plan to fix the parking lot and if the plan is not executed, the gravel must be removed.

Mr. Arneke said that the parking lot is a zoning issue and it doesn't really affect the character of the lots. He would be comfortable approving the expansion if it is limited to the width of the original parking area subject to the approval of Zoning with everything else worked out in conjunction with staff and the Neighborhood Association. The expansion is not unreasonable from a preservation perspective.

Counsel Jones stated that it is her understanding that Zoning is not looking at this because there were no parking requirements associated with the building when it was built. The parking is non-conforming. If the lots were owned by two separate owners and there were parking requirements, zoning would require a shared parking easement for dedicated spaces. This is not required because there are not two separate owners for the lots. At this point, there is not a zoning issue with respect to the parking. If the parking lot is expanded further, there may be a zoning issue for this particular lot on Edgar Street.

Chair Bowers stated that she had no problem approving the application if the parking stayed within the same perimeters. The applicant cannot be forced to make other improvements. Other items must come up within separate applications.

Counsel Jones informed members they have the authority to approve the application with reasonable modifications or conditions. It should be clear that the fence and other items in the application are not approved by this COA.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1901 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project expansion of the gravel parking area is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and the following guidelines under *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 29), Guidelines 7, 9, and 10* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane. Nays: Smith.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1901 only for the expansion of the gravel parking area and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Wrenn Zealy and Alec Wrenn for work at 225 Edgar Street with the following conditions: (1) that the new area for parking be limited to the same width as the existing lot; and (2) that the applicant work with City staff and the College Hill Neighborhood Association on ways to make the parking area more compatible with the character of the historic district through improved lighting, landscaping, and other improvements; seconded by Mr. Wharton.

Following discussion of the motion, Mr. Arneke amended the conditions as follows: (1) that the new area for parking be limited to the same width as the existing lot; and (2) that the applicant works with City staff and the College Hill Neighborhood Association on ways to make the parking area more compatible with the character of the historic district specifically through improved lighting, fencing, and other improvements including screening of the dumpster and ways to move parking away from the edge of the house on the Edgar Street lot; (3) that the fencing and screening of the dumpster be consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines*; (4) that staff works with Zoning to make sure that all of what is done is consistent with the requirements of the property owner under the zoning for the lot; and (5) that the project be completed by the end of the second quarter of 2016. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 306 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1909
Applicant: Evagelia Eustathiou
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 10-12-15
(DENIED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Add lattice panels to top of existing privacy fence (after-the-fact).

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 changes are incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features (page 24)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

With the panels attached, the total height is at least 8 feet. The guidelines recommend that back yard privacy fences should not exceed 6 feet. In addition the lattice panels are not installed with any trim pieces and have an unfinished look.

Guidelines (page 26):

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

C. Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72 inches in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard.

In Support:

Evagelia Eustathiou, 306 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1909 for work at 306 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant and owner is Evagelia Eustathiou. The description of work is to add lattice panels to the top of existing privacy fence. This is an after-the-fact application. Mike Cowhig said that staff feels the changes were incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features (page 24)* because the total fence height is at least 8 feet and guidelines indicate that in back yard privacy yards fences should not exceed 6 feet. In addition, the lattice pattern was not installed with trim and it has an unfinished look. He cited guidelines on page 26 and guideline C where it says that privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards must not exceed 72 inches in height. He commented that in terms of zoning, this is a fence that exceeds 7 feet which is the local zoning [height limit](#). To approve this application, the Commission would need to make a Special Exception that would have to go to the Board of Adjustment. Staff recommends denial of the request as the fence does not meet the guidelines. David Arneke asked if this approach had ever been used in a historic district and Mr. Cowhig talked about existing fences that totaled about 6 feet with maybe a foot of lattice above it. Speaking in support of the application was Evagelia Eustathiou, 306 South Mendenhall Street, who said that she has lived in her home since 1985. Her lot is 165 feet deep and 60 feet of it had lattice added. She said that 308 South Mendenhall Street is a triplex and nine apartments surround her. She added the fence and plantings to take care of some of the noise. She described the plantings and passed around 15 pictures of plantings. She felt the Commission should approve the lattice work because the bushes would eventually climb over the sides and the lattice would not show. The lattice work cannot be seen from the sidewalk in front of the house. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Association could not approve the height of the fence because it does not meet the guidelines. Speaking in rebuttal, Ms. Eustathiou said that pictures 1 and 2 showed a Cypress tree which had originally been the buffer between the two houses and some of the original trees have died. She had worked with Mike Cowhig and Mike Kirkman and felt it would take too long to plant trees and that the overtaking foliage would cover the lattice work.

Discussion:

Mr. Wharton stated his opinion that the solution to the problem is a landscaping solution instead of a fencing solution. Chair Bowers agreed that landscaping might be able to provide more protection. She felt the application could not be approved because it does not meet the guidelines. Mr. Arneke was also in agreement and commented that the fence height was not even close to the allowed height. He felt there was a solution that would involve landscaping.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1909 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 based upon guidelines on page 26 as follows: *Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location, and size with original fences and walls in the Historic District; and C. Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72 inches in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard; are acceptable as findings of fact.* The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1909 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to the owner, Evagelia Eustathiou, for work at 306 South Mendenhall Street, seconded by Mr. Arneke. Ms. Lane amended her motion with the addition of the following conditions: (1) that the removal of the newly installed lattice work be done within 90 days; and (2) that the applicant will work with staff for further solutions related to the fence. Mr. Arneke seconded the amended motion. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 919 North Eugene Street**
Application Number 1912
Applicant: Erica Ringel
Property Owner: Paul Ringel
Date Application Received: 10-14-15
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of addition at back of house.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The proposed addition will be located at the back of the house. It will not be so large that it overpowers the character of the house and the property. It will not obscure, damage, or radically change any character-defining features of the house. Foundation brick, roofing and other materials will match the existing as closely as possible. Siding and trim will match the design and dimensions of the existing. Windows will match the design of the existing windows.

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.*

Recommended Conditions:

1. That the addition be distinguished by a change in wall plane (offset), or that if that is not feasible, a trim board.
2. That new windows will be either wood or clad with casings, drip cap, trim work, etc. that matches the existing windows on the house.

In Support:

Sally Atwood, 1802 Simpson Street.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1912 for work at 919 North Eugene Street. The applicant is Erica Ringel and the owner is Paul Ringel. The description of work is to construct an addition at the back of the home. Mike Cowhig said that based on information in the guidelines, staff recommends approval of this COA with conditions. Staff feels the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75)* and *Guidelines 1, 2, and 3 (page 76)*. The proposed addition will be on the back of the house and it is not a large addition. It will not obscure or damage the existing house. The roofing and siding will match the existing as closely as possible and the siding and trim will match the design and dimensions of the existing. The windows will match the

design of the existing windows. There was also a tree mentioned in the application that has already been taken care at staff level. Mr. Cowhig commented that the foundation will be brick rather than stone. There will be fiber cement lap siding that has been approved in historic neighborhoods before along with wood or clad windows. The recommended condition was to either offset the back wall or use trim board to define the addition from the existing house. Speaking in support of the application was Sally Atwell, 1802 Simpson Street, who was speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. They supported the application provided the materials are appropriate and there is an offset to delineate between the addition and the original house. There was no one speaking in opposition to the request.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1912 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 based upon guidelines on page 76 under *Additions*, are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1912 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Erica Ringel for work 919 North Eugene Street with the following conditions: (1) that the materials will be appropriate to the context of this house including fiber cement wood siding or natural wood siding to match, (2) window will be a matching style of existing windows and may be wood or clad with casings, trim work, etc. to match the existing house; (3) that there be delineation between the addition and the existing house perhaps through a process using trim board; seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

REVIEW OF PROPOSED SIDING MATERIAL FOR 916 WALKER AVENUE:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the owners of 916 Walker Avenue were not present at tonight's meeting.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Chair Bowers said that she will not be present at the next meeting. Mr. Wharton will be presiding at the meeting. The next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held **Wednesday, December 9, 2015**. This meeting will combine the November, 2015 and December, 2015 meetings.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Arneke asked about a MSD (Municipal Service District) project that is being considered by the College Hill neighborhood, particularly in the context of the new legislation that was recently passed in the General Assembly. The wording of the legislation specifies that the City has to hold a public hearing for any expenditure of MSD funds. He asked if the Historic Preservation Commission could carry out that function for the City. Counsel Jones indicated that the City Council would have to take some action to allow the Commission to hold the public hearing. City Council ultimately has public hearing and contracting authority; however, they can delegate holding the public hearing to the Commission by an ordinance. Mr. Arneke felt that the Commission was in a better position to hear these matters and would be able to move the process along more efficiently than City Council whose agenda tends to be heavy.

Counsel Jones indicated that a public notice is required to be published in the newspaper prior to a public hearing for any contract with a private agency. There was some discussion as to whether that would apply to management companies such as Downtown Greensboro, Incorporated which implements MSD funding for a portion of the downtown area. The interpretation now is that since public agency is not defined anywhere, it is defined as anyone not in the government. Any time there is a contract performed for any service, supplies, equipment, etc.; there will be a public hearing.

Mr. Arneke felt that the Commission was in a better position to hear these matters and would be able to move the process along more efficiently than City Council whose agenda tends to be heavy. Mr. Wharton felt this was a good idea, at least for the MSD funds that are expended in the two historic districts. The Historic Preservation Commission's public meeting is the most appropriate place to hold public hearings for MSD funds and contracts for the local historic districts. In addition, the Commission would be able to be involved in getting information about maintenance projects in the districts.

Mr. Cowhig commented that he did not feel the public hearings would take up that much time in the scope of things.

Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommends to City Council to delegate the responsibility for holding public hearings on expenditures of Municipal Service District (MSD) funds for the College Hill and Aycock historic districts to the Commission which would hold a hearing and make a recommendation to the Council as to approving or denying the expenditure.

Mr. Arneke accepted a friendly amendment from Counsel Jones that the recommendation is made to City Council or the City Manager, as appropriate, for the approval or denial of each specific contract. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Wharton, Lane, Smith. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig advised the Commission that a new North Carolina Historic Preservation Tax Credit program was part of the State budget. The new program would reduce the amount of tax credit from 30 percent to 15 percent with caps.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:54 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
DECEMBER 9, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Acting Chair; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; Sharon Graeber; Cindy Adams; David Arneke; and Tracy Pratt.

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

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

An election will be held to elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

In addition, Mike Cowhig said that the Planning Department has received a request for a zoning map amendment in the Fisher Park Historic District. These requests are reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission before they are heard by the Zoning Commission. Staff is asking the Commission to hear the request and make a recommendation on the matter.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 28, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the October 28, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

It was noted for the record that Ms. Graeber did not receive the packet of information that was mailed to members. She was provided a packet at the meeting.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:

- (a) **Location: 610 Greene Street**
Application Number 1918
Applicant: Decie P. Campbell
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 11-3-15
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Accessibility ramp constructed at front porch.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69-70)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The ramp is needed for the homeowner who has a disability. The ramp leads from the driveway to the front porch which is the most functional plan and provides the easiest access to the house. The ramp is designed and constructed so that no historic features of the house were disturbed and it can be removed in the future without damaging the structure.

Guidelines (page 70):

1. *Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings; and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.*
2. *Construct fire exits, stairs, landings and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so that they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.*
3. *Design and construct new fire exits, stairs, and landings to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure.*
4. *Introduce reversible features to assist persons with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished and historic materials or features are not damaged.*

In Support:

Elizabeth Urquhart, 403 West Bessemer Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1918 for work at 610 Greene Street. The applicant is Decie Campbell. The work is to construct an accessibility ramp on the front porch. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff recommends approval of the request and felt it was up to code as there is no easier access and no other options for locations. Speaking in favor was Elizabeth Urquhart, 403 West Bessemer, speaking for the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. There were no other speakers.

Discussion:

Ms. Lane cited guideline 3 and commented that ramps that are being built look jarring with the historic property. She asked if the ramp could be made more historically appropriate or if its appearance was necessary because of the City's building codes. Mr. Cowhig stated that the construction meets the building code but ramps can be designed differently for aesthetic reasons. Ms. Lane felt the ramp should be made to look more historically accurate to blend into the architecture and fabric of the neighborhood. Mr. Cowhig explained that the Commission always has the authority to place conditions on their approval of an application. Ms. Lane commented that this is an ongoing issue and she felt a standard for ramps in historic neighborhoods should be set.

Mr. Smith pointed out that a residential ramp does not have to meet commercial standards.

Mr. Pratt stated that a positive aspect of this ramp is that it is temporary and can be removed.

Members discussed placing a condition on approval of the application with a time frame. They discussed approving the ramp as a temporary structure for up to one year. If the ramp is still required at the end of the one-year period, a discussion can be held about adding pickets or other elements to make it more compatible with the neighborhood. They noted this is an after-the-fact application.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1918 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 along with Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 70 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, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1918 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Decie Campbell for work at 610 North Greene Street with the following condition: (1) That this is a temporary structure that can remain in place for one year and at the end of that time or before, another design needs to be considered; seconded by Ms. Graeber.

Mr. Smith amended his motion and added an additional condition as follows: (2) That a new COA needs to be approved prior to renovation of the structure. Ms. Lane seconded the amended motion. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Members felt that the Commission should determine a design direction to make ramps more appropriate in the historic neighborhoods. Staff indicated that there is an upcoming revision of the guidelines where the matter could be addressed. Historic guidelines are readily available online for the public.

- (b) Location: 106 East Bessemer Avenue**
Application Number 1920
Applicant: Melissa Killian
Property Owner: Hadsell W. Rich
Date Application Received: 11-9-15
(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Accessibility ramp constructed at front porch.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69-70)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

This house is used by a business and the ramp is needed for public accessibility. The ramp leads directly from the parking lot in back to the front porch. This is the most functional plan and provides easy access from the parking lot to the primary entrance. The ramp is designed and constructed so that it can be removed in the future without damaging the structure.

Guidelines (page 70):

1. Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings; and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.
2. Construct fire exits, stairs, landings and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so that they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.
3. Design and construct new fire exits, stairs, and landings to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure.
4. Introduce reversible features to assist persons with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished and historic materials or features are not damaged.

In Support:

Elizabeth Urquahart, 403 West Bessemer Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1920 for work at 106 East Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Melissa Killian and the description of work is to build an accessibility ramp constructed at the front porch. Mike Cowhig, Planning Department, said that staff recommends approval of this application. He met previously with the business owner but they did not get a COA. The Buildings and Inspections Department did not notify the Historic Preservation Commission that a permit had been approved. Mr. Cowhig indicated that the ramp can be removed and it can be painted. Speaking in support of the application was Elizabeth Urquahart, 403 West Bessemer Street. She was speaking for the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association who is in support of the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1920 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 70 are acceptable as findings of fact. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1920 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Melissa Killian for work at 106 East Bessemer Avenue with the following condition: (1) That the paint and landscaping work is achieved by May 1, 2016; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 306 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1909
Applicant: Evagelia Eustathiou
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 11-30-15
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Remove lattice panels from top of existing privacy fence. Construct trellises behind privacy fence.

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 changes are not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features (page 24)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The trellises are intended to provide privacy and landscape screening from the adjacent property. The trellises will be constructed of wood in an area that will not be easily visible from the street. They will be covered with vines and should blend in with the landscape.

Guidelines (page 26):

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

Recommended Conditions:

- That the trellises be located no farther forward on the property than the midpoint of the house.
- That the trellises be set back at least 3 feet from the existing privacy fence.
- That there is at least a 5 foot separation between the trellises.

In Support:

Evagelia Eustathiou

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1924 for work at 306 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant and owner is Evagelia Eustathiou. The description of work is to remove lattice panels from the top of the privacy fence and construct trellises behind the privacy fence. Mike Cowhig said that staff supports the application and that the proposed trellises can meet the guidelines. They have consulted with Mike Kirkman, City Planning Department, relative to code compliance. They felt that once the trellises were covered with vines, they would not be noticeable from the street and therefore, can meet the guidelines. There was no one speaking in support of the application and no one speaking in opposition.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke felt this would be a good solution and it meets the guidelines. Once the vines grow over the trellis, it will not draw as much attention as it does now.

Evagelia Eustathiou, applicant at 306 South Mendenhall, arrived late to the meeting. She was sworn as to her testimony in this matter. She answered questions from Commission members and discussed dimensions of the proposed design. Ms. Lane commented that if the element being used is a trellis and not a fence then it is open to design discretion. It is Mr. Kirkman's recommendation that the trellis not extend past 24 feet in length.

Members discussed placing conditions on the application and letting staff work with the details. Mr. Smith stated his opinion that the design aspect of the proposed plan was fine. There should be a 24-foot maximum run of the trellis and it should have a maximum height of 10 feet with a minimum of 4-foot separations. In addition, the trellis should be a minimum of 12 inches from the existing fence. The existing lattice should be removed.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1924 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 along with Guideline 1 on page 26 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, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does approve application number 1924 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the owner, Evagelia

Eustathiou, for work at 306 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) That the existing lattice is removed from the existing fence; (2) That the new trellis will be constructed a minimum of 12 inches from the existing fence to the inside of the owner's property; (3) There will be a maximum of a 24-foot run before a separation between the panels; (4) There will be a 4-foot minimum separation between the panels; (5) The existing landscaping and/or a gap of 4 feet is acceptable; (6) The maximum height of the structure will be 10 feet above the existing ground; (7) The trellis will be located no further forward than the midpoint of the side of the house; and (8) That the homeowner will coordinate with staff to come up with a mutually agreeable design based on these conditions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

- **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Mr. Smith moved to nominate David Wharton as Chairman, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

Ms. Graeber moved to nominate David Arneke as Vice-Chairman, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, Pratt. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Smith informed members that several months ago the Board of Adjustment said that an accessible ramp slope was allowed in the front setback of property but not in the level parts. They have changed the wording in the zoning to allow the entire ramp to be in the setback.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

- **Review of Proposed Zoning Map Amendments in Historic Districts**

Mr. Cowhig referred to the Dixon-Leftwich-Murphy house on the corner of Church Street and Leftwich Street that has been on the market for a long time. This property was renovated and rezoned with conditions on the request. One of the conditions was that the structure is to remain and not be expanded. The owner would like to add one category, education facility, to the list of permitted uses. An education facility use does not include a public school; however, the category does cover uses such as a seminary. The Historic Preservation Commission is responsible for reviewing any zoning map amendments and making a recommendation that would go on to the Zoning Commission. This is not a Public Hearing. The Commission is being asked if this use will be consistent with the Historic District. Staff feels that this request is a very minor change to the permitted uses that are already there and they find no reason to object to the request. These buildings need to be marketed successfully so that they can be used, occupied and maintained.

Responding to questions, Mr. Cowhig said that the existing zoning is Conditional Use-Office. This is a Guilford County landmark property. Both the interior and exterior are designated and therefore, no changes can be made without the approval of the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Cockburn confirmed that education uses are defined in the Zoning code.

David Arneke made a motion seconded by Linda Lane. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend the proposed zoning map amendment, located at 507 North Church Street, to the Zoning Commission.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd