

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JANUARY 29, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Linda Lane; Cindy Adams; David Hoggard; and Wayne Smith.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Hanna Cockburn, Department of Planning and Community Development.

Mr. Cowhig introduced and welcomed the Commission's newest member, Wayne Smith.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 4, 2013 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the December 4, 2013 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that there were no approved absences for today's meeting.

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

- (a) **Location: 321 South Tate Street**
Application Number 1721
Applicant: Terri Wallace
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 1-15-14
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS, SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)

Description of Work:

Construction of garage and addition according to attached site plan and elevation drawings. (The smaller outbuilding can be approved at the staff level.)

Note:

Because the proposed garage is closer than 20 feet to Edgar Street (a dirt alley at the back of the house) a Special Exception to this zoning requirement must be approved by the Board of Adjustment. It must first be recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

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—Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-36) and *Additions* (pages 75-76) for the following reasons:

Facts:

321 South Tate Street is a "contributing structure" in the College Hill National Register Historic District. The proposed garage is not large and the site is consistent with historic site patterns for

garages in the historic district. Shed roofs are a common roof form for garages and lap siding is a common exterior construction material for historic garages.

Guidelines (page 36):

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

Facts:

The proposed addition is small and located at the back of the house and not visible from the street. It will not affect any character-defining features of the house. It will be easily distinguishable from the original structure.

Guidelines (page 76):

1. *In terms of material, style, and details, 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.*

In Support:

Terri Wallace, 321 South Tate Street
Raymond Cassell, 1519 Countryside Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1721 for work at 321 South Tate Street. The owner is Terri Wallace and the description of work is for the construction of a garage and an addition. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that part of the application is asking for a Special Exception because the garage is closer than 20 feet to Edgar Street, the alley in the back. This must be approved by the Board of Adjustment. Based on the information, staff feels this project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and he cited *Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-36) and *Additions* (pages 75-76). The garage is not large and the site is consistent with historic site patterns. In addition, shed roofs and lap siding is very common in the neighborhood and he cited guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 36. The addition is attached to an addition so it is not even attached to the original house and he cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 76. Ms. Cantrell asked if an addition to an addition would still need to be clearly identified and staff replied in the affirmative. It was confirmed that the setback was for the garage. Speaking in support of the application was Terri Wallace, 321 South Tate Street, who is the homeowner. She purchased the home in 2012 and brought it up to standards. She commented that there are many garages on Edgar Street but she wanted to keep the privacy fence where it was. All materials for the garage will be matching brick foundation and wood siding. It was clarified for Mr. Arneke that no trees will need to be removed. Also speaking in favor was Raymond Cassell, 1519 Countryside Drive, who is the contractor. He said that the house had been mistreated and they are trying to bring it back close to

its original shape. Future work should be in the same style. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Members felt this was a nice addition that will fit the character of the street.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1721 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 the following guidelines on page 36: (2) *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example;* (3) *Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished;* and (4) *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house;* are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Hoggard, Smith, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1721 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Terri Wallace for work at 321 South Tate Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Hoggard, Smith, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Ms. Cantrell moved to recommend a Special Exception for application number 1721 to have a setback of 12 feet rather than the recommended 20 feet on the alley, Edgar Street, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Hoggard, Smith, Adams. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Mr. Hoggard moved to nominate Ms. Bowers as Chairwoman of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Hoggard, Smith, Adams. Nays: None.)

Mr. Hoggard moved to nominate Ms. Cantrell as Vice-Chairwoman of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Hoggard, Smith, Adams. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig provided an update on the relocation of the AT&T telecommunications cabinet that was located on South Mendenhall Street. He stated that the cabinet has been successfully relocated to the Boxwood property, owned by Bill Berkley, at the corner of South Mendenhall Street and West Market Street. The cabinet is not visible from the street and vehicle access is off of West Market Street. Bill Berkley, 701 Morehead Avenue, provided details of the relocation.

Mr. Cowhig reported that the Board of Adjustment recently upheld the Commission's ruling relating to the Singh property located on South Mendenhall Street.

Ms. Cockburn announced that Mike Williams, attorney for the Commission, will be retiring from the City of Greensboro at the end of January, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 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 OFFICE BUILDING
FEBRUARY 26, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Linda Lane; Cindy Adams; David Hoggard; Lois McManus; and Wayne Smith.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leigh Geary and Hanna Cockburn; Department of Planning and Community Development. James Dickens, Attorney for the Commission, was also present.

It was noted that Mr. Smith has a conflict of interest in regard to application number 1724 for work at 1012 North Eugene Street. He was the architect for the project.

Mr. Hoggard indicated that he has a conflict of interest in regard to application 1724 for work at 1012 North Eugene Street. He has been awarded a contract for work on this project. In addition, he disclosed a conflict of interest with application number 1730 for work at 919 Spring Garden Street. Although an award has not been made yet, he has placed a bid for work on the project.

Commissioners agreed to change the order of items listed on the agenda to allow Counsel Dickens time to research and determine if Mr. Hoggard's disclosure relative to application number 1730 represents a true conflict of interest.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that there were no approved absences for today's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 29, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the January 29, 2014 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Smith, McManus. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

Mr. Smith and Mr. Hoggard recused themselves from this matter due to conflicts of interest.

- (a) **Application No. 1724**
Location: 1012 N. Eugene Street
Applicant: William Norman
Property Owner: same
Date Received: 2-10-14 (GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

General renovation of house including removal of small addition at back of house and construction of new 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 (page 75)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The exterior of the house will be repaired and painted with only selective replacement of deteriorated elements to match the original materials and dimensions. The addition to be removed is not original and is in poor condition.

Fact:

The proposed addition is small, located at the back of the house and will be constructed using materials that match the house. It will not affect the principal elevations or the main block of the house or harm character-defining features.

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.*
5. *Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.*

In Support:

Wayne Smith, 1710 Madison Avenue
Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street

Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1724 for work at 1012 North Eugene Street. The work is for the general renovation of house including removal of small addition at back of house and construction of new addition. The second floor structure will be completely removed and the back porch will be expanded. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, reported that that they intend to reuse windows and other materials. He cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on pages 75 and 76. Staff's only question was how to distinguish the addition from the original house. He commented this is restoration of a significant home in Fisher Park. Cristina Cantrell asked if there was a foundation and staff indicated that there was a foundation. Speaking in support of the application was Wayne Smith, 1710 Madison Avenue, who answered technical questions as the architect. He said the differentiation would be a downspout to define changes. Ms. Cantrell asked about windows and doors. Mr. Smith indicated that there would be one new window and the deck would also be built with piers that will not touch the house. Also speaking in support was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, from the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association is in support of the application. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1724 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, on page 76 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Arneke.

The Commission voted 6-0-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None. Abstain: Hoggard, Smith.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1724 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to William Norman of 1012 North Eugene Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None. Abstain: Hoggard, Smith.)

(b) Application No. 1730

Location: 919 Spring Garden Street

Applicant: Preservation Greensboro Development Fund

Property Owner: City of Greensboro

Date Received: 2-12-14 (GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Based on Chapter 2 of Section 142 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances, Counsel Dickens stated his opinion that Mr. Hoggard does have a conflict of interest and should not vote on this matter. Therefore, Mr. Hoggard was recused from this item.

Description of Work:

General renovation of house including removal of fire-damaged addition and kitchen wing at back of house, construction of addition, and replacement of slate roof with asbestos shingles.

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—Exterior Materials and Finishes (page 44), Roofs (page 51), Porches, Entrances, and Balconies (page 62) and Additions (page 75)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The exterior of the house will be repaired and painted with only selective replacement of deteriorated elements to match the original materials and dimensions.

Fact:

The addition at the back of the house and the kitchen wing will be removed and replaced with a new addition. These are the areas that suffered the worst fire damage. The original two story main block of the house will remain. This is the most architecturally significant portion of the house.

Fact:

The house features a slate roof and built-in drainage system. These are significant features. They are not in good condition due to neglected maintenance and will be costly to repair. A much less costly alternative would be asphalt shingles and external gutters.

Guidelines (page 47):

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

Guidelines (page 53):

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

Guidelines (page 64):

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

Recommended Conditions:

- That final elevation drawings and project details be submitted to staff for approval.

In Support:

Steve Johnson, 491 Hiatt Drive
Jason Harvey, 419 East Radiance Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1730 for work at 919 Spring Garden Street. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, reviewed the history of the house saying that there had been a delayed demolition of 365 days. Preservation Greensboro Development Fund worked with the church to have the property acquired by the City to save it from demolition. The description of work is for the general renovation of the house including removal of the fire damaged addition, the kitchen wing at rear of house, and construction of addition replacing slate roof with asbestos shingles. Mr. Cowhig commented that there have been many alterations of the house in the past years. He reviewed *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Materials and Finishes (page 44,)* *Roofs (page 51)*, *Porches, Entrances, and Balconies (page 62)* and *Additions (page 75)*. Only the elements of the house that are deteriorated will be replaced using original materials and dimensions. The only part of the house to be removed would be the addition in the back where the worst fire damage is located. The house does have a slate roof and a built-in drainage system which are significant features. The slate roof and built-in drainage system are not in good condition. It is less costly to have asphalt shingles and gutters. He also cited guideline 1 on page 47 along with guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 53. He observed that the slate was not as critical to the architecture of the house. In response to a request from Ms. Cantrell, he stated that there is a request for Covington Foundation to restore the gutters and the slate. Mr. Cowhig also cited guidelines 1 and 2 on page 64 and *Additions* on page 75. He said the addition will qualify for tax credits. He would really like for the slate roof to be

repaired and kept and the built-in gutter system retained. Wayne Smith had some questions regarding the fact the addition will not have a slate roof. He questioned the roof line of the addition into the existing home. He also asked about the percentage of slate roofs that were restored versus allowed to be demolished in historic districts. Staff indicated that there was really not any record in recent memory. Responding to a question from Ms. Adams, Mr. Cowhig replied that there was a green light to proceed with the project and the removal of the addition. Removing the addition will reduce the size of the project and allow for additional green space and there is still hope for the gutters and the slate. Ms. Geary pointed out that the Commission can decide on the gutters and slate and a presentation on it can be made later. Speaking in support of the application was Steve Johnson, 491 Hiatt Drive, who is an architect and contractor on the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund and the president of Preservation Greensboro. He is also representing the owner in this matter. He stated that the roof would be slate if the grant is obtained. He also intends to keep the structure of the internal gutters and attach new gutters so that the homeowner can choose to restore the internal gutters at some time in the future. He admitted the roof line was large. It matches the existing pitch of the roof and also the house across the street but it could be changed. The addition is for the future owner and is not a spec house. There have been other additions before and there has been much research done on the old basements. The addition will be supported by piers rather than the old foundation but the old foundation will be retained. Also speaking in support was Jason Harvey, 419 East Radiance Drive, who is the pastor of College Place Methodist Church. He said the church and the bulk of the congregation are in support of this application. The house is very close to the church and they are excited about the project. There was no one else in support or opposition to speak on the application.

Discussion:

Responding to a question regarding guidelines on page 75, Mr. Cowhig originally cited guidelines 1, 2, and 3 but felt that the application also met guidelines 4 and 5 with respect to height. Ms. Cantrell indicated that she could support the removal of the fire-damaged addition; however, the removal of the slate roof and gutters was bothersome. She would prefer that the slate be retained on the main portion of the home. Retaining the slate would be a way to distinguish the addition with another roofing material. Mr. Arneke was in agreement but felt the slate roof should not be a deal breaker. This house is so prominently located in the neighborhood and either way, the renovation would have a beneficial effect. Chair Bowers pointed out that the Commission can put a condition on the application to consider the matter of the slate roof at a later date when the status of the grant is determined. Ms. Cantrell felt that the absence of a slate roof would change the character of the house. Mr. Smith commented on the issue of not adhering to historic guidelines due to the expense of the slate roof. Ms. Cantrell suggested that the replacement of the slate roof be contingent on the economics of the grant. Expanding on comments made by Mr. Smith, Ms. Cantrell questioned if preserving historic integrity and features outweighs the addition or does the addition outweigh historic integrity. Chair Bowers pointed out that this is a living community and as such, functionality for families must be considered. Responding to comments made by members, Ms. Geary stated that the Commission does have jurisdiction over the rear elevation of a structure where more flexibility is warranted. Mr. Smith and Ms. Cantrell commented that cost cannot be the only justification in this matter. Mr. Arneke stated that slate roofs are unique among historic characteristics of houses because they are so expensive, not only to install but to maintain. During conversation, members commented that an addition to the guidelines may be warranted relative to how slate roofs are handled.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1730 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and guideline 1 on page 47; guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 53; guidelines 1 and 2 on page 64; and guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 75 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by

Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Smith, Arneke, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None. Abstain: Hoggard.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1730 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro at 919 Spring Garden Street with the following conditions: (1) that final elevation drawings and project details be submitted to staff for approval, and (2) that the decision on the replacement or repair of the slate roof and concealed gutter system come back to the Commission for consideration, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Smith, Arneke, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None. Abstain: Hoggard.)

(c) Application No. 1729

Location: 812 N. Elm Street

Applicant: Charles Harris, AT&T

Property Owner: Bessemer Improvement Company

Date Received: 10-4-13 (GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Install utility pole and telecommunications cabinets in easement at rear 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 cabinets and utility pole are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The utility pole and cabinets will be located at the rear of the property where they will not be easily visible from the street. Therefore they will have little impact on the character of the Historic District.

Guidelines (page 40):

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:

Jason Franza, Resource Manager with AT&T, 100 South Eugene Street

In Opposition:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street

Rebuttal in Support:

Jason Franza, Resource Manager with AT&T, 100 South Eugene Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1729 for work at 812 North Elm Street. The applicant is Charles Harris, AT&T. The property owner is Bessemer Improvement Company. The description of work is to install a utility pole and telecommunications cabinets in easement at rear of property. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that based on previous experience he felt this was very sensitive use of placement of the equipment. Staff recommends granting this COA citing guidelines on page 38, even though not specific for this kind of equipment, based on the fact the fact the utility pole and cabinets will be located at the rear of the property where they will not be easily visible from the street. Therefore, they will have little impact on the character of the Historic District.

He cited guideline 6 on page 40 as follows: *(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.* AT&T owns the easement. The project will take up about two parking spaces including the utility pole. The cabinet is lower than the fence. Speaking in favor of the application was Jason Franza, AT&T, 100 South Eugene Street. He stated they will do a better job this time due to their recent experience in College Hill. The utility pole will be wooden and the cabinet will be much shorter than the fence. The cabinet cannot be seen from Magnolia or Elm Street. In opposition was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. Mr. Large, who was sworn as to his testimony in this matter, requested consideration of letters sent by members of the Association who could not be present at the meeting. He read a letter sent by Sherry Dickstein and Curt Lowenstein, 807 Magnolia Street, who were unable to be at the meeting. They expressed concerns about the equipment. He also read an email from Kay Lovelace, 903 Magnolia Street, who asked for a continuance or postponement because no one from the neighborhood could attend the meeting. She expressed concerns about noise and light pollution. Speaking in rebuttal was Jason Franza, AT&T, who said the noise would be very minimal. He indicated this was the quietest equipment that they owned. There will be no tree damage as a very small crane will be brought in to place the equipment. AT&T does not install lighting and cannot speak to what may be done by Duke Power or the City relative to the lighting. There was no one else wishing to speak on this matter.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Franza to clarify his schedule for installation of the equipment. Mr. Franza stated that installation for service will occur in the middle or end of September, 2014. Responding to a question, Mr. Cowhig stated that if the application is continued without the approval of AT&T, a decision must be made within 60 days. With the agreement of the applicant, the application can be continued indefinitely. Ms. Bowers felt like this was a good application. Mr. Hoggard commented that the application assuages the questions brought up in the communications read by Mr. Large. The application also meets the guidelines.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Adams moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1729 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 on information contained in the application and staff's recommendation in favor of granting this COA because the cabinet and utility poles are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38): (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;* are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Smith, Arneke, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Adams moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1729 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Charles Harris, AT&T, for work at 812 North Elm Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Smith, Arneke, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

Ms. Cantrell moved to excuse Ms. Adams from the meeting, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted in favor of the motion.

Ms. Adams left the meeting at 5:53 p.m.

- (d) **Application No. 1726**
Location: 701 N. Greene Street
Applicant: Tim Millisor
Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church
Date Received: 2-12-14 (GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Create a community garden. Place prefabricated storage building on the site. Install backflow preventer.

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—Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

Community gardens are becoming more and more popular especially for their charitable benefit. This garden is sponsored by members of First Presbyterian Church and will be located on a property the church owns at the corner of W. Fisher Avenue and N. Greene Street. Gardens were common during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in Greensboro before mass produced and shipped food. Community gardens represent the growing local food movement. Their natural characteristics help maintain the character of the historic district.

Fact:

The accessory structure is needed to securely store tools. It is a small building constructed of wood and located some distance from the street. It is a simple structure with a gabled roof.

Guidelines (page 36):

4. *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*
5. *Prefabricated wooden accessory structures are appropriate when they are designed to be compatible with the principal structure on the site, and with other outbuildings in the district.*
 - A. *Accessory structures with gambrel style roofs are considered a modern outbuilding and therefore an inappropriate design for the Historic Districts.*
 - B. *It is not appropriate to introduce prefabricated metal accessory structures in the Historic Districts.*

Recommended Conditions:

- That the backflow preventer be screened with landscaping.
- Because of the prominent location of the garden, consider custom building a garden shed based on historic outbuildings in the neighborhood.

In Support:

Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church, 701 North Elm Street
Jane Trevy, 2015 Pembroke Drive
Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1726 for work at 701 North Greene Street. The applicant is Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church. The description of work is to create a community garden, place a prefabricated unit on the site, and install a back flow preventer. Staff recommends in

favor of granting this COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Garages and Accessory Structures* (page 35). Mr. Cowhig commented that community gardens are becoming more and more popular in neighborhoods. In addition, accessory structures are needed to store tools and the proposed unit for this site is small with a simple gabled roof. He cited guidelines 4, 5, 5A, and 5B on page 35. The only recommended condition was that the back flow preventer be screened with landscaping and because of the prominent location of the garden, there should be consideration of a custom garden shed based on the neighborhood. He showed examples of that kind of building. Speaking in favor was Tim Millisor, 617 North Elm Street, who works for First Presbyterian. He explained the intent of the garden and the circles repeating the rose window along with other aesthetics. Signage is similar to other signs by the church. The project will be done in phases by volunteer labor. Also speaking in favor was Jane Trevy, 2705 Pembroke Road, who explained that the produce will be going to soup kitchens, StepUp Ministry, and similar organizations. The Church has offered to pay for Charlie Hedgington to give recommendations for the aesthetics of the community garden. Also speaking in favor of the application was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, who is the president of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the Association approved the application at their recent meeting. There was no one to speak in opposition to the request.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1726 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 the following guidelines under *Garages and Accessory Structures* (page 35): (4) *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline; and (5) Prefabricated wooden accessory structures are appropriate when they are designed to be compatible with the principal structure on the site, and with other outbuildings in the district; (A) Accessory structures with gambrel style roofs are considered a modern outbuilding and therefore an inappropriate design for the Historic Districts; (B) It is not appropriate to introduce prefabricated metal accessory structures in the Historic Districts;* are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Smith, Arneke, Lane, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1726 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tim Millisor of First Presbyterian Church for work at 701 North Eugene Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Smith, Arneke, Lane, McManus. Nays: None.)

(e) Application No. 1728

Location: 1015 West Market Street

Applicant: Troy Matthew

Property Owner: Greensboro College

Date Received: 2-12-14 (GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construct 4' high wood spaced picket fence to enclose community garden located behind the Reynolds Center.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

Greensboro College students maintain a community garden behind the Reynolds Center, formerly the YMCA at 1015 West Market Street in College Hill. They would like to enclose the garden for security reasons by attaching a picket fence to existing fencing. The proposed fence would match an existing section of fence that remains from a fence that was removed years ago. It is constructed of wood, 4' high with spaced pickets.

Guidelines (page 36):

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

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

In Support:

Matthew Troy, 207 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1728 for work at 1015 West Market Street. The applicant is Troy Matthew and the property owner is Greensboro College. The description of the work is to construct a 4' fence to enclose a community garden behind the Reynolds Center. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA citing the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* on page 24. They would like to enclose the garden for security reasons due to animals and theft. The fence would be four feet high and would have a natural finish. The fence will be picketed and made of wood. Four feet is six inches above the norm but considering the application, staff felt it was appropriate. Mr. Cowhig also cited guidelines 5 and 5A on page 36. Speaking in support of the application was Matthew Troy, 207 South Mendenhall Street, who is a senior at Greensboro College. He commented that all fruits and vegetables would go to Urban Ministry and over 1,000 pounds have been donated so far. The amount would be greater but animals have been eating the produce. There has also been theft of the produce. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1728 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* based on staff comments and the guidelines 5 and 5A on page 36 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, McManus, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1728 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Matthew Troy for work at

1015 West Market Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, McManus, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (f) **Application No. 1731**
Location: 810 Olive Street
Applicant: Pam Frye
Property Owner: Same
Date Received: 2-12-14 (GRANTED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

General renovation of house including construction of an addition at back of house.

Note: A COA was issued by staff to remove the aluminum siding and repair the original siding, trim, windows, etc.

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—Porches, Entrances, and Balconies (page 62) and Additions (page 75)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

A dormer at the back of the house will be enlarged in a manner that maintains the design and detailing of the home. New construction materials will help distinguish the addition and it will not affect any character-defining features.

Fact:

A side porch that had been enclosed to make a closet will be restored.

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

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:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1731 for work at 810 Olive Street. The applicant is Pam Frye. The description of work is general renovation of the house. Staff remarked that a COA was issued by staff to remove the aluminum siding, repair the original siding, trim, windows, etc. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA. The rear of the house will be enlarged from one small dormer to a three window dormer. The side porch that had been enclosed will be restored to a porch. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances, and Balconies (page 62) and Additions (page 75)*. On page 64, he cited guidelines 1, 2, and 7 and guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 76. He also commented that this is a work in progress. Speaking in support of the application was Ray Large, 622 North Elm Street, who said the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association had approved the application at their earlier meeting. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Several members stated that they liked the application.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1729 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 based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this COA because in staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances, and Balconies (page 62) and Additions (page 75)* based on guidelines on 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; (7) Because of their character-defining role, it is not appropriate to enclose front porches. Side and rear porches may be enclosed to create sunrooms if the design of the enclosure is compatible with the architecture of the structure, and does not result in a loss of historic fabric or architectural details; and guidelines on 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; are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, McManus, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)*

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1731 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Pam Frye for work at 810 Olive Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, McManus, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers welcomed students from UNC-Greensboro's Historic Preservation Law class who were present in the audience to observe the meeting.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that plans for an in-house training session are underway. More information will be provided as it becomes available.

Responding to questions, Ms. Cockburn advised members that penalties for after-the-fact applications went into effect January 1, 2014. The fee for an after-the-fact application is \$250.00. The remaining fees originally approved in the budget have been placed on hold until further consideration.

Members acknowledged and welcomed City Councilwoman Sharon Hightower who was present in the audience.

Ms. Cockburn stated that there will be a Design Workshop for the Lawndale Corridor from March 19 to March 22, 2014. A series of workshops is planned for the first phase of the corridor that stretches from Cornwallis Drive to Cone Boulevard.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 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 OFFICE BUILDING
MARCH 26, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Cindy Adams; David Hoggard; Lois McManus; and Wayne Smith.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary and Hanna Cockburn; Department of Planning and Community Development.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that there are no approved absences for today's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 26, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the February 26, 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, Arneke, Adams, Smith, McManus. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application No. 1737**
Location: 220 West Fisher Avenue
Applicant: Royce Weisner
Property Owner: Sarah Sockwell
Date Received: 3-12-14
(CONTINUED UNTIL APRIL, 2014 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Construct 4' high metal picket 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 fence is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed fence is a decorative metal style similar to historic fence styles.

Fact:

Because the fence is of an open design, painted a dark color and because the lot slopes away from the house, the fence will not restrict the view of the property and will read as a "low" fence.

Guidelines (page 36):

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

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

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig explained that this application was not approved at the staff level because the guidelines recommend fences of no more than 42 inches in height and this application is for a 48 inch metal picket fence. He referred to *Historic District Design Guidelines--Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 24) and indicated that staff feels the 48-inch height is reasonable because the fence has an open design and will be painted a dark color. In addition, the lot slopes away from the house and the fence will appear lower at the street level and won't restrict the view of the home. Staff is in support of the application.

Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street, is a member of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She stated that the neighborhood is in opposition to the application because insufficient information was supplied on the decorative arches over the gate. In addition, they felt the height would be closer to 54 inches due to the decorative arches and the fact that the fence does not go all the way to the ground.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the 48" height restriction is a requirement of the City. He was also concerned that the gate may swing into the City's right-of-way which may be not allowed in the current zoning.

Members felt that the property owners may not realize there are height restrictions and a possible conflict with the swinging gate. It was suggested that another option might be to put the fence on the top of the hill behind the sidewalk which would eliminate the problem with the swinging gate and it would create the appearance of a taller fence that would provide greater security.

Mr. Smith felt that the application required reconsideration from a design standpoint. Members suggested continuing the application for more information.

Mr. Hoggard moved to continue the application until the April, 2014 meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, McManus, Adams, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 810 Cypress Street
Application No. 1732
Applicant: Bobbie Sonner
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 3-12-13
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Remove Walnut tree located in back 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 project is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The tree was inspected by the City's Urban Forester, Judson Clinton. In his opinion the tree is reasonably healthy and he did not see a good reason to remove it.

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.*

In Support:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1732 for property at 810 Cypress Street. The applicant is Bobbie Sonner and the description of work is to remove a Walnut tree located in the back yard of the property. The tree is dropping walnuts into the swimming pool and it is a poisonous tree. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that the tree is not dead or diseased and in the opinion of the City's Urban Forester, the tree is healthy and there is no reason to remove it. Staff is recommending against removing the tree. However, if the tree is removed a new tree would be needed to replace it. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping (page 21): (1) Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district, and (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.* He also cited the fact that the tree was inspected by the City's Urban Forester who indicated the tree is reasonably healthy and he did not see a good reason to remove it. Speaking in support was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Aycok Neighborhood Board. They were in support of the application although it was not a unanimous vote. They wanted to support the applicant because she has done so much to rehab the house. There was no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith asked staff if there were any guidelines relating to pools on historic properties. Mr. Cowhig stated that pools are among miscellaneous items that should be confined to the rear yard and not be visible from the street. The pool is not a contributing element.

Chair Bowers and Ms. Cantrell felt that the reasons given by the owner were not sufficient to warrant the removal of a healthy tree. A suggestion was offered to creatively trim the tree to help prevent walnuts from falling around the pool.

It was noted that Walnut trees are indigenous to this area and they tend to fall on the ground in the fall.

The property owner, Bobbie Sonner, joined the meeting during the discussion and was sworn as to her testimony in this matter. Ms. Sonner, 810 Cypress Street, explained that the tree is toxic to surrounding trees, including numerous trees that she has planted. The walnuts fall into the pool causing major damage that is expensive to repair. She indicated that the walnuts drop to the ground in the summer while the pool is open. She has also attempted to trim the branches on the tree and indicated that its current size is half of what it originally was.

Mr. Hoggard stated that he supports the application. Due to its toxic nature, nothing can be planted around the tree. Mr. Arneke agreed that the poisonous nature of the tree killing other trees around it merits its removal.

Ms. Cantrell questioned the health of the trees that did not survive near the Walnut tree. She did not feel there was sufficient evidence to consider cause and effect in this matter.

Ms. Sonner said that her neighbor has expressed his preference for the tree to be removed.

Chair Bowers and Ms. Cantrell stated that the application is clearly against the guidelines. They were concerned that a precedent may be set if this application is approved. Mr. Cowhig commented that each application must be considered on its own merits and the setting of precedence should not be a concern as long as the unique facts of the case are tied into the Commission's decision.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1732 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines* even though staff comments are against this application as cited in *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping (page 23): (1) Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district*; however, mitigating this is the fact that the Walnut tree is inhibiting the use of the yard in such a way that the full enjoyment of the yard can contribute to problems with the pool and keeping other plants from growing under it are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hoggard, Arneke, Adams, McManus, Smith. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1732 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bobbie Sonner for work at 810 Cypress Street without conditions, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hoggard, Arneke, Adams, McManus, Smith. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers informed members of the upcoming Westerwood Tour of Homes. Anyone who is interested in serving as a docent during the event should contact Chair Bowers for further information.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the Mendenhall Street property. The Inspector is ready to issue a building permit based on the Commission's earlier decision to approve a partial third story.

Mr. Cowhig stated that a replacement has been appointed for James Burroughs who has resigned from the Commission. Sharon Graeber from District 1 has been approved as the Commission's newest member.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Arneke brought the Commission's attention to property located on Mendenhall Street where there is a retaining wall ready to topple onto the sidewalk. The hill behind the wall was dug out a year but there has been no further progress with the project. He asked staff to look into the matter. Mr. Cowhig stated that he spoke with the owner over a year ago when plans to solve drainage

issues were being discussed. Mr. Cowhig plans to contact the owner again and if there is still no progress, he felt the matter should be handled by Minimum Housing enforcement staff.

Mr. Arneke said that College Hill has two monument signs at entry points into the neighborhood. There is interest in additional signage; however, there is no room for large signs. A suggestion was made that it would be appropriate to mount smaller signs on posts. He stated that the idea was originally proposed in the 1980's but was rejected by the City. He asked staff for their input on the matter.

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff has been collecting pictures of examples of historic district signage from neighborhoods throughout the country. He commented that the College Hill neighborhood has also expressed interest in sign toppers and staff plans to work on a plan for neighborhood signage. Mr. Cowhig plans to meet with Vince Price, with the City's sign department, to see what suggestions he might have for signage that would be appropriate.

Mr. Hoggard noted that property located at 503 Percy Street has inappropriate 2x4 railing tacked onto the porch. He asked staff to look into this matter.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:08 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 30, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Lois Lane; Sharon Graeber; and Wayne Smith.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, and Hanna Cockburn;
Department of Planning and Community Development.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Cindy Adams, David Hoggard, and Lois McManus are excused.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:

Mr. Cowhig announced that application number 1737 for work at 220 West Fisher Avenue has been removed from the agenda. The fence that was proposed would be in the City's site obstruction triangle and cannot be constructed. In addition, there is a request from the property owner for a continuance for application number 1764 for work at 764 Chestnut Street. The applicants are not in town and have asked that the application be heard at the May, 2014 hearing. Members acknowledged the request and agreed to hear the case at the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 26, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the March 26, 2014 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 220 West Fisher Avenue**
Application number 1737
(REMOVED FROM AGENDA)

- (b) **Location: 211 West Bessemer Avenue**
Application number 1742
Applicant: Tracy Lathrop
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 3-26-14
(APPROVED WITH CONDITION AND SPECIAL EXEMPTION RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Smith joined the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Description of Work:
Construction of garage.

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—Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36) for the following reasons:

Note: A Special Exception to the side yard setback is required. It must be recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission and then approved by the Board of Adjustment.

Facts:

The site for the proposed garage is at the end of the driveway where garages are commonly found in the historic districts. Garages sited close to property lines are characteristic of the historic districts. Although it is a 3-bay garage, the left bay is stepped back which reduces the massing of the structure. The design of the garage is similar to other garages and accessory structures in the district and the materials are compatible with the house. The roof pitch and the dormers match the house.

Guidelines (page 37):

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

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

(4) New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.

Recommended Condition:

- That the window and door casings, drip cap, and other trim work matches the house.

In Support:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street
Tracy Lathrop, 211 West Bessemer Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1742 for work at 211 West Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Tracy Lathrop and the work description is to modify a pre-existing garage in order to be able to park cars in the building and stay within the original footprint, plus an extra bay. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that this would require a Special Exception which is equal to a variance for the setback. Normally buildings in historic districts have closed lot lines but staff felt this application was compatible with the guidelines. Three-bay garages do appear in the Fisher Park neighborhood. The building was designed to reflect characteristics of the home. Referring to *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages*, he cited guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 37. He also made note of a letter from Lynn Kernodle, a neighbor. Following questions regarding the size of the building, Mr. Cowhig stated that it has been reviewed by zoning in the past. Members commented that the roof seemed a bit large for the garage and a lower roof line was suggested to be more appropriate. It was determined that the building had been torn down and therefore, it is considered new construction. The work had started but the second story will be removed. The original Certificate of Appropriateness was only for doors. Mr. Cowhig commented that the 12'x12' pitch of the roof was designed to match the house. Speaking in favor of the application was Raymond Large, III who resides at 622 North Elm Street. Mr. Large was speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Board supported the application noting that the latest plan had a lower roof line. He asked the Commission to agree to the Special Exception. Also in support of the application was Tracy Lathrop, 211 West Bessemer Avenue, who felt the appearance of the garage was deceptively large. She was assured by the architect that the original structure matched the roof line and would match other aspects of the home. She

commented on the original building and said that the garage doors were not tall or secure enough and the building would not support the garage doors. Ms. Lathrop noted that parking is not allowed on Bessemer Avenue. Mr. Arneke asked about extending the driveway. The homeowner indicated there would be a gravel drive but that is an application for a later date. It was noted by the homeowner that the second floor will be removed.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith pointed out that the building was built before it was approved and he questioned why there were no plans for a driveway to accompany the garage. Chair Bowers agreed that a driveway needs to be considered; however, it is not part of this particular application. Mr. Smith felt the driveway should have been included in the application. He calculated that the building is already over 600 square feet. He noted that if there is a detached garage less than 600 square, it can be built to the five-foot line. If the building is larger than 600 square feet or attached to the house, then it has to follow the setbacks that the house has to follow. Mr. Cowhig clarified that this application has not been approved by the City and permits have not been issued. However, it has been reviewed through the City's Zoning Enforcement Specialist who looks at the ordinance, square footage, and setback requirements. Staff noted that a Special Exception for the side yard setback requirement was requested by the Zoning Specialist as a result of her review.

Ms. Cantrell expressed concern that the Special Exception should not act as a blanket if there is something else that is a violation or is larger than the square footage generally allowed. Ms. Geary said that the Special Exception could be made in favor of this location because it meets the traditional site pattern for garages in rear locations. She explained that when there have been requests for Special Exceptions, the logic is that if a garage is brought too far forward on the lot then it is removed from being in that traditional site location. She felt that the side or rear did not need to be specified; however, it should be stated that the Commission is in favor of a Special Exception to decrease the setback requirements for the property. She said that if the Commission agreed that this project is designed appropriately and the massing as shown on the site pattern is appropriate, then a Special Exception can be granted to allow the garage to exist as indicated. If there are concerns over the size of the garage and whether or not it meets the 600 square foot criteria that Mr. Smith referred to, then the case probably needs to be continued to another meeting. Ms. Cantrell stated that the original COA was approved followed by an extension. She expressed concern that it should be specified the Commission does not want the garage larger than it already is. Ms. Geary pointed out that the original COA was approved for garage doors and there were no accompanying elevation plans. It was a very easy staff approval project that snowballed into a larger project. The current proposal is tied to a detailed and measured drawing and therefore, if the applicant builds something different from this then they would be in violation.

Staff clarified for Ms. Lane that this application has gone through a cursory review with Zoning.

Mr. Smith commented that it is always possible that inadvertent review mistakes could be made that would lead to the discovery of the garage being too big after it is constructed. The non-conforming piece is adding to the front. The extension of the front is encroaching into the setback, not the piece on the side. The two and a half feet is the non-conforming addition.

Several members stated their opinion that the encroachment is on the side. Ms. Graeber said that the garage was sited in a manner that is traditional for the neighborhood. Therefore, the location of it adjacent to the property line would still comply. Since the project has already been through cursory review with the Zoning Department, the lot is not bigger than it can be for the site.

Mr. Cowhig indicated that Loray Averett, City of Greensboro Zoning Department, reviewed the application and only identified the side yard setbacks as an issue. When the applicant gets permits for this project, the application will go back through the technical review process where any other issues will be detected. He felt the Commission should rely on Ms. Averett's review.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1742 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 37, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1742 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tracy Lithrop for work at 211 West Bessemer Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the window and door casings, drip cap and other trim work match the house, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion for Special Exception:

Ms. Cantrell moved that a Special Exception be granted for application 1742 for work at 211 West Bessemer Avenue to allow the reduced setback for the construction of the garage, seconded by Ms. Graeber.

Mr. Arneke made a friendly amendment that the Special Exception be recommended and not granted.

Ms. Cantrell accepted the friendly amendment and moved to recommend a Special Exception for application 1742 for work at 211 West Bessemer Avenue to allow the reduced setback for the construction of the garage, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

**(c) Location: 764 Chestnut Street
Application Number 1764
(CONTINUED UNTIL MAY, 2014 MEETING)**

**(d) Application Number 1747
Location: 912 North Eugene Street
Applicant: Rachel and Blair Percival
Property Owner: Same
Date Received: 4-16-14
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS AND SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)**

Description of Work:

Construction of addition at the back of house and roof dormer, add windows to gable ends, and close-in window on right side 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 congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75), and Windows and Doors (page 57)* with conditions for the following reasons:

Facts:

The project consists of a first floor addition at the back of the house, adding a dormer on the rear slope of the roof, adding windows in the right and left side gable ends, and closing in a window on the first floor right side of the house.

Facts:

The proposed additions will be small and located at the back of the house. They will be distinguishable from the original structure and will not obscure, damage, or radically change any character-defining features of the house. Materials including siding, windows, doors, foundation, etc. will match the existing. The window changes are not in prominent locations. New windows will match the design of original 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.*

Guidelines (page 64):

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

Recommended Conditions:

- That new windows will be simulated divided light, wood windows with casings, drip cap, trim work, etc. that match the existing windows on the house.
- That the addition be offset slightly in order to stay out of the side yard setback. Otherwise a Special Exception will be required. The exception must be approved by the Board of Adjustment and first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

In Support:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street
Rachel Percival, 912 North Eugene Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1747 for work at 912 North Eugene Street. The description of work is for an addition at the back of the house, add windows to gable ends, and close in window on right side of house. The applicants are Rachel and Blair Percival. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that the application met the guidelines and it was good to see this investment in the neighborhood. He discussed the fact that the addition would encroach 24 inches, plus or minus, into the setbacks and therefore, either a Special Exception or an offset to separate the addition from the original house would be needed. Referring to *Historic District Design Guidelines*, he cited guidelines 1, 2, and 3 under *Additions* and guideline 1 on page 64 under *Windows and Doors*. He suggested that as a condition new windows should be simulated divided light, wood windows with casings, drip cap, trim work, etc. that matches the existing windows on the house; and that the addition be offset slightly in order to stay out of the side yard setback. Otherwise a Special Exception will be required. There were questions about closing the windows and a question about the

appropriateness of a bay window. Speaking in support of the application was Raymond Large, III who resides at 622 North Elm Street. He spoke on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board who approved the application. Also in support was Rachel Percival, 912 North Eugene Street, who commented they are very committed to the neighborhood. She said the extension goes into her yard and not into the adjacent property. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell asked how the addition would be distinguished from the existing structure if the offset is not done as part of the conditions. Mr. Cowhig said that another option would be a trim board to separate the addition from the existing structure. Mr. Smith agreed that a trim board would be a good option. He referred to a drawing of the structure and identified a section of roofing where he wished a better resolution could be found to improve the rear composition. Ms. Percival indicated that they would look into the matter with their architect. Ms. Lane commented that overall, the design is very handsome.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1747 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines* and that all of staff comments and guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 76 under *Additions* along with guideline 1 on page 64 under *Windows and Doors*, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1747 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Blair and Rachel Percival for work at 912 North Eugene Street with the following conditions specified by staff in their comments, with the exception of the offset, as follows: (1) new windows should be simulated divided light, wood windows with casings, drip cap, trim work, etc. that match the existing windows on the house; and (2) that a vertical trim board be used to distinguish the addition on the two sides of the house; seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion for Special Exception:

Mr. Arneke moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment that a Special Exception be approved for the encroachment, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

- (e) **Location: 701 Percy Street**
Application Number 1744
Applicant: Todd Grinstead
Property Owner: Julie Stallings
Date Application Received: 4-3-14
(CONTINUED UNTIL MAY, 2014 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Remove Elm tree.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on an inspection by the City Forester, 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:

Facts:

This is a mature Elm tree that appears to be healthy although it is covered with vines. It is causing a section of the concrete driveway to heave and is pushing on a fence. Limbs overhang the two houses and one limb fell onto the roof during the ice storm this past winter.

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.*

In Support:

Jeff Beaman, 703 Percy Street
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Discussion:

Ms. Lane asked staff for details regarding the recommendation of the City Urban Forester to retain this tree. Mr. Cowhig explained that the Urban Forester feels that trees in older neighborhoods are a very important connection to the past and he looks to retrench trees rather than taking them down. He referred to this tree as a "survivor". Mr. Cowhig indicated his respect for the Urban Forester's opinion yet recognized the practical reasons of the homeowner's request to take the tree down. It was noted that the tree has vines growing on it which is not healthy. The Urban Forester indicated that some limbs should be removed which is consistent with his retrenchment philosophy where tree removal is the last step. Members commented that there is a certain amount of cost associated with maintaining the tree canopy in a historic district. Ms. Geary visited the site and stated her opinion that this is an unfortunate location for the subject tree in a narrow area between the two houses. She felt there was good reason for the consideration of taking out the tree.

Mr. Smith commented that the subject tree is large and it is always worth going to extraordinary efforts to save trees. However, he noted that the neighborhood association was in favor of removing the tree and he questioned the degree to which the association felt the tree affected the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Graeber expressed concern that the roots would eventually encroach on the foundation of the house. The roots have already dislocated the driveway. She asked how much of the tree would have to be pruned to save it. Mr. Beaman said that a tree service has not been contacted yet but he described the location of limbs that would need to be removed.

Responding to a question about the health of tree, staff noted that the Urban Forester referred to the tree as a "survivor" several times but he never used the term "healthy".

Ms. Cantrell stated her preference to prune the tree instead of cutting it down. The tree appears to have been neglected over time and she felt that pruning might bring it back to a healthy state. She commented that it was a shame to remove a tree that was not in the way of a power line.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1735 for work at 701 Percy Street. The applicant is Todd Grinstead and the property owner is Julie Stallings. The description of work is for the removal of an Elm tree. The tree is causing the concrete to heave up, it is pushing on the fence, and limbs overhang the roof. Some of the tree limbs are dead and several limbs fell on the roof during the ice storm. Staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness as the City's Urban Forester has suggested retrenchment. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, cited *Historic District*

Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21), specifically the following guidelines on page 23: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district, and (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.* Speaking in favor of the application was Jeff Beaman, 703 Percy Street, who lives next door to 701 Percy Street. He supports the application and indicated that it is a volunteer tree and was not planted in the location. The tree would have to be pruned and doing so would leave very little of the tree. In addition, roots could possibly go into the foundation of the house. Mr. Beaman indicated that the tree was located in line with the house and on the property line. Also speaking in support of the application was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, who spoke on behalf of the Aycock Neighborhood Association Board. She said that the neighborhood is in support of the application to remove the tree.

Continued Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell stated that she was not in support of the application. Mr. Arneke felt it was uncertain if the tree was healthy or not. Mr. Beaman indicated that an arborist had not been contacted. Mr. Cowhig said that a tree inventory was made of the neighborhood that could yield information on the health of the tree or the applicant could secure an arborist to look at the tree. Mr. Arneke indicated that if the tree was deemed to be unhealthy, he would be in support of the application. Considering the amount of the tree that is dead, it is unclear whether or not the tree is healthy. Members felt that a second opinion would provide more information on the health of the tree. The Commission was in support of continuing this application until the next meeting.

Mr. Arneke moved to continue the application until next month's meeting to have staff get an opinion on the health of the tree.

Mr. Cowhig explained that staff would check the tree inventory and the applicants could provide more documentation from a certified arborist.

Mr. Arneke amended his motion and moved to continue the application until next month and to direct staff to consult the tree inventory to determine what it says about the condition of the tree and allow the applicant to bring any new information about the tree from a certified arborist, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Lane, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers invited members to the Westerwood Tour of Homes to be held on May 17 and 18, 2014. In addition, on Saturday, May 3, 2014 there will be an Architecture and History of Westerwood lecture in the Chapel of First Baptist Church. There will be a patron party on May 15, 2014 at Double Oaks on Mendenhall Street. She instructed interested members to contact Preservation Greensboro for tickets.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Commission members who attended the workshop in Cornelius, North Carolina commented on the event. Mr. Cowhig informed members that by attending the workshop, the training requirement as a certified local government program under the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office rules has been satisfied. Mr. Arneke felt that the workshop was very useful and he found the information pertaining to legalities to be very helpful. Ms. Geary described information she found interesting such as the shift in recognizing post modern changes, specifically the recognition of the mill village on the National Register. Ms. Graeber commented that as a new member, the program was a good introduction to historic preservation commissions.

Ms. Cockburn reported that the tree canopy survey and related workshops have been scheduled for May, 2013. In addition, staff is moving forward with the final draft of the College Hill Neighborhood Plan. The plan will be presented to the neighborhood association and then will go out for other input before it is brought to the Planning Board and then onto City Council for adoption.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:42 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 28, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Sharon Graeber; Wayne Smith; David Hoggard; and Lois McManus.

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 absence of Cindy Adams was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 30, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the April 30, 2014 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke; Graeber, Smith, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Ms. McManus joined the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

(a) **Location: 701 Percy Street
Application Number 1744
Applicant: Todd Grinstead
Property Owner: Julie Stallings
Date Application Received: 4-3-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

Description of Work:

Remove Elm tree.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on an inspection by the City Arborist, 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:

This is a mature Elm tree, 22 inches in diameter according to the tree inventory. Its condition rating is "good" although it is covered with vines. It is causing a section of the concrete driveway to heave somewhat and is pushing on a fence. Limbs overhang the two houses and one limb fell onto the roof during the ice storm this past winter.

Fact:

The City's Arborist believes that steps could be taken to care for the tree (removal of the vines, fertilization, pruning, etc.) short of complete removal.

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.*

In Support:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1744 for work at 701 Percy Street. The description of work is for the removal of an Elm tree. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, reported that based on the opinion of the City Arborist, staff is recommending against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. The tree removal is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and the following guidelines on page 23: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district*, and (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*. Mr. Cowhig located the Elm tree on the tree inventory that indicated this tree is a mature Elm that is 22 inches in diameter and in good condition. The City Arborist felt that steps could be taken to care for the tree. He advised removal of the vines, fertilization, and pruning rather than removing the tree. Mr. Cowhig deferred to the Arborist. This application was continued from the last meeting because the applicant might have wanted to add more information. Ms. Cantrell said that the categories under a healthy tree were “good”, “fair”, “poor”, and “dead”. Speaking in support of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, who was representing the Aycokk neighborhood. She said the neighborhood was in support of the application because it wants to support owners who are trying to be good neighbors in the neighborhood. She observed that the tree is too close to the house and would like to see another tree planted because there are a lot of mature trees in the tree inventory but very few juvenile trees. There was no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell pointed out that the picture being shown to Commissioners was taken in the winter. The Elm tree currently has leaves on its limbs. Mr. Arneke referred to guideline 2 and asked if there are standards for degrees of structural problems. Mr. Cowhig explained that there are no quantifiable standards for structural problems. Ms. Cantrell commented that a structural problem that is encroaching on a crawl space or sewer line certainly needs to be considered more of an issue than a driveway or a fence. Mr. Hoggard said that the roots of the tree generally run to the drip line so it seems the tree is contained and is not butting up against the foundation. Mr. Smith commented that when the property owners were present at the last meeting, they said the tree was an inconvenience to them. He also noted that the neighborhood has indicated its support to remove the tree. He was supportive of removing the tree and felt the tree was in the way. Ms. Cantrell said that she could not justify cutting down a healthy tree. Ms. Graeber felt that the roots may already be pushing up against the foundation of the house. Ms. Graeber pointed out the damage that the tree has already done to the property. She asked members to weigh the impact of damage to a historic structure versus the replacement of a tree. Mr. Smith questioned if an awkwardly placed tree too close to a historic structure was compatible with the appearance of the neighborhood.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1744 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines -- Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and the following guideline on page 23: (2) *When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy*

manner, is acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Graeber, Smith, Arneke, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1744 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Julie Stallings for work at 701 Percy Street with the following condition: (1) that a canopy tree, to remain healthy for a period of two years, is planted in another location on the property; seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Graeber, Smith, Arneke, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell.)

- (b) Location: 919 Spring Garden Street**
Application Number 1730
Applicant: Preservation Greensboro Development Fund
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 2-12-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Chair Bowers and Mr. Hoggard asked to be recused from this matter due to a conflict of interest.

Description of Work:

General renovation of house including removal of fire-damaged addition and kitchen wing at back of house, construction of addition, and replacement of slate roof with asbestos shingles.

Note: A COA was approved for this project on February 26, 2014. A condition of approval was that the question of the slate roof and built-in roof drainage system would be brought back to the Commission. Some members of the Commission expressed concern about the loss of the slate roof.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The house features a slate roof and built-in drainage system. These are original construction features and are indicative of the high quality of the home's construction. As a result of the fire and neglected maintenance the roof is in poor condition today. To repair the slate roof properly, the slate tiles need to be removed and the underlayment, fasteners, flashing, etc. should be replaced. Only 60 percent of the original slate can be salvaged so new slate would be required. The built-in gutters need to be completely relined with new copper or galvanized metal. The metal floor of the balcony also needs to be replaced.

Fact:

A much less costly alternative would be to replace the slate roof with asphalt shingles and external gutters.

Fact:

Grant funding has been secured that would help defray the cost of replacement of the slate roof and gutter system. The project has been certified for the North Carolina Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits. The tax credit application states that the roof and gutter system will be repaired if feasible based on cost. Otherwise the slate roof will be replaced with asphalt shingles and the built-in gutter system will be replaced with external gutters.

Guidelines (page 53):

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

In Support:

Steve Johnson, 1014 Carolina Street
 Jason Harvey, 419 East Radiance Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bower stated that this is application number 1730 for work at 919 Spring Garden Street. The description of work is to replace the slate roof with fiberglass roofing shingles and built-in gutters with external gutters. The applicant is Preservation Greensboro Development Fund. The property owner is the City of Greensboro. The COA was already approved but the request of the slate roof and the built-in wood drainage system was to be brought back to the Commission. The church was planning to demolish this home but it was saved by Preservation Greensboro and the College Hill Association. Staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51)*. One fact is that it is less expensive to replace a slate roof with asphalt shingles and external gutters. It is noted that slate roofs can be sacrificial in historic districts. Grant funding has been secured that would help defray the cost of the replacement of the slate roof and gutter system. The project has been certified for the North Carolina Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit. The tax credit application stated that the roof and gutter system will be repaired if feasible based on cost. Otherwise, the roof will be replaced with asphalt shingles and the built-in gutter system will be replaced with exterior gutters. The Covington Foundation has given a grant of \$12,500 to repair or replace the slate. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines on page 53 as follows: (1) *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks;*(2) *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission tiles" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original;* (3) *Retain historic roofing materials such as asbestos shingles, metal shingles, and standing seam metal roofing. If replacement is necessary due to deterioration, substitute roofing materials such as composition shingles are appropriate. Since historic roofing materials were traditionally dark in color, light colored composition shingles are not appropriate in the Historic Districts;* (4) *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original;* and (5) *Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems.* There was a question about whether the internal gutter is tied into just to the slate or if the internal gutter could be saved with using a shingle roof. There was a conversation about how the guidelines were not clear and Mr. Cowhig reiterated that roofs are considered more sacrificial. This is a particularly nice house because it did have internal gutters and slate which is unusual in some of the houses. Speaking in support of the application was Steve Johnson, 1014 Carolina Street, who is the architect

on the job. He did say that the roofing and gutters are two different issues. They have a cost to repair the gutters and they want to repair the slate using the grant which brings the project into budget. There will be asphalt shingles on the addition. He also noted that tar paper underneath the slate has deteriorated and this is not going to be an extremely long-term solution. Also speaking in support of the application was Jason Harvey, pastor of College Place Methodist Church, of 419 East Radiance Drive. Mr. Cowhig also made one point about clarifying with the Covington Foundation that they are in line with the repair of the slate because they received a proposal for extensive restoration. Ms. Cantrell noted asphalt shingles will be placed over the porch, not over the addition.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke felt that this application was the best that could be hoped for the house. It will be a good solution if the Covington Foundation will help with the cost and the owner is willing to put up some money. If the money is not sufficient, it would be better to go without the slate but save the house rather than to say no to saving the house. Ms. Cantrell commented that although it is not an excellent solution, there is a lot to be said for saving the house even if some of the historic characteristics are destroyed.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1730 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines—Roofs (page 51)* and staff comments as given and the guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 53 and the fact that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards accept the project as it has been presented with preservation of the slate roof being contingent on cost, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Arneke, McManus, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None. Abstain: Bowers, Hoggard.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1730 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro for work at 919 Spring Garden Street with the following condition: (1) that the internal gutter system be preserved, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 5-0-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Arneke, McManus, Graeber, Smith. Nays: None. Abstain: Bowers, Hoggard.)

- (c) **Location: 510 Fifth Avenue**
Application Number 1753
Applicant: Joe Steele
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-14-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Widen and extend concrete driveway to back of house, construct concrete parking area at back of house, and remove four trees.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the City Arborist, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project can be done in a manner that is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28)* and *Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed paved parking area will be constructed at the back of the house. It will begin at the back wall of the house and extend toward the back of the property. It will be a significant amount of pavement for such a small lot. Therefore, it will have more than a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment. Moreover, the City Arborist is concerned that the pavement will come close to a large Willow Oak and could damage the root system. Only one of the trees was rated in poor condition.

Guidelines (page 30):

5. *Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracks (narrow strips), macadam, brick, and crushed stone. Conceal edging materials used for gravel driveways. Keep new driveway aprons and curb cuts to the minimum width possible.*
6. *Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.*

Fact:

Three of the trees proposed for removal appear to be in reasonably good health according the City's Arborist.

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.*

Proposed Conditions:

Reduce the amount of pavement.
Only remove the tree in poor condition.

In Support:

Joe Steele, 1503 17th Street.
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1753 for work at 510 Fifth Avenue. The description of work is to widen and extend the driveway, add a fence on the side yard, construct parking area at the back of the house, construct roof over stoop, and remove four trees. The applicant is Joe Steele. Based on the application, Mike Cowhig recommends in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. Staff feels the project can be done in a manner congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 28)* and *Trees and Landscaping (page 21)*. He commented that this is a non-contributing house. He reviewed the condition of the trees that have been proposed for removal. One tree is "dead" and another tree is "healthy". Of the remaining two trees, one tree is "fair" and the other is rated "good". He cited guidelines on page 30 as follows: (5) *Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracks (narrow strips), macadam, brick, and crushed stone. Conceal edging materials used for gravel driveways. Keep new driveway aprons and curb cuts to the minimum width possible;* and (6) *Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.* Three of the trees proposed for removal appear to be in reasonably good health according to the City Arborist. He also cited guidelines on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the*

historic district; and (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. The proposed conditions are to reduce the amount of pavement and only remove the tree in poor condition. Speaking in support of the application was Joe Steele, 1503 17th Street, who indicated that the house previously had drug dealers in it and he was remodeling the inside. There is a lot a water run-off in the rear. The concrete pad in the rear is the size of a two-car garage. He said that because of the fire hydrants, parking is not allowed on the street. In addition, he calculated the coverage of concrete on the lot and it was within the code. In response to comments from Mr. Smith regarding the water run-off, Mr. Steele said that he plans to level the lot. The driveway is ten feet wide and the owner agreed that it would be possible to narrow the driveway to curve around to the utility building to allow more open green space. He also commented he would prefer to have a fence due to junk in his neighbor's yard. He would like the fence along the entire space at a height of six feet. Mr. Steele stated that the Willow Oak was not coming out. Two other trees are not coming out because they are on his neighbor's property. The two trees he would like to remove are leaning over both his house and the neighbor's house. Ms. Cantrell commented that there is mulch available for the area where grass will not grow. Mr. Steele commented on the side porch and said that he could either build a roof with a wood post or an awning. Speaking in favor of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, who would have preferred to see an alley so as to not have a driveway at all. Since that is not the case, the neighborhood association voted in favor of the application. They were mostly concerned about the height of the fence. She also supported cutting back some of the concrete and suggested that if the trees were to come out, the City Arborist should be the person to recommend the appropriate replacement tree.

Discussion:

Mr. Hoggard felt that the stoop needs to present and should have been there when the house was first built. Chair Bower and Ms. Cantrell were in agreement with Mr. Hoggard regarding the necessity of the stoop. Ms. Cantrell was also in agreement with comments made by Mr. Smith about reducing the amount of concrete because not only is the concrete overwhelming for the lot, there are drainage issues that will make the problem worse. Mr. Hoggard pointed out that if the issue is to be able to park two cars, one car could park in the driveway and another could park on the street. Members noted that it is a luxury in most historic neighborhoods to be able to get two cars in and out of a driveway. Mr. Hoggard commented that he did not have a problem with a six-foot fence at the midpoint of the house and members felt that due to the size of the house, the fence should be space picket at a height of 48" to the midpoint. Since an example of a space picket fence was not available, Mr. Cowhig agreed that the fence could be approved at staff level. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that two trees proposed for removal are located on the neighbor's property. The City Arborist felt that the trees worked best as a pair. Chair Bowers and Ms. Cantrell did not see the need to remove a tree just because grass would not grow underneath.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1753 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as noted and guidelines 1 and 2 on page 20 under *Trees and Landscaping* and guidelines 5 and 6 on page 30 under *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of them motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, McManus, Smith. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1753 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joe Steele for work at 510 Fifth Avenue with the following conditions: (1) that the amount of pavement is reduced to no more than 10' wide for the driveway and to extend the concrete pad beyond the utility shed at the rear, (2) only remove the tree in poor condition, (3) that there be a wooden fence that extends only to the

midpoint of the house at six feet and the standard 48 inches from the midpoint to the front of the property, and (4) that the Willow Oak is not disturbed during construction of the parking pad.

During discussion of the conditions and the impact and location of the concrete in relation to the Willow Oak tree, Mr. Cowhig clarified that the parking pad will be underneath the crown of the Willow Oak tree. To outline the Commission's recommendation on where the concrete should go, a friendly amendment was offered to ask for a revised site plan showing the tree, the crown, and the concrete not going closer than the crown of the tree for review by the City Arborist.

Ms. Cantrell accepted the friendly amendment and moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1753 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joe Steele for work at 510 Fifth Avenue with the following conditions: (1) reduce the amount of pavement and request that a revised site plan be submitted to City staff and the Arborist to insure that the Willow tree is not damaged; (2) to only remove the one tree in poor condition, and (3) extend the six-foot proposed fence only to the midpoint of the house and from the midpoint to the front of the property the fence will be in the standard 48 inch picket to be approved by staff; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of them motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, McManus, Smith. Nays: None.)

**(d) Location: 305 West Bessemer Avenue
Application Number 1751 (CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has requested that this application be continued until the next meeting due to illness.

Ms. Cantrell moved to continue application number 1751 until the next meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, McManus, Smith, Hoggard, Arneke, Graeber. Nays: None.)

**(e) Location: 808 Walker Avenue
Application Number 1755
Applicant: Charles Cranford
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-14-14 (CONTINUED)**

Description of Work:

Remove Oak tree located in back yard.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by City Arborist, Judson Clinton, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed tree removal is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reason:

Fact:

It is the opinion of the City Arborist that there are steps that could be taken to treat the tree short of total removal. These steps include pruning and fertilization. He pointed out that he was not guaranteeing that the tree will not fall, because there is no way to make that guarantee. However, based on his visual inspection from the ground he did not observe conditions that would indicate the tree is hazardous. The College Hill tree inventory rated the tree as in "good" condition.

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.*

In Support:

Greg Baldwin, 808 Walker Avenue

In Opposition:

Janet Frommann, 1001 West McGee Street

Mr. Cowhig stated that Greg Baldwin, property manager of 808 Walker Avenue, asked staff to look at a large Willow Oak tree on the property that had been struck by lightning in the past. The City Arborist did not feel that complete removal of the tree was warranted. He recommended steps to treat the tree including removal of dead or damaged wood and fertilization. The significant tree is located on the property line. The applicant and property owner are still concerned about the safety of the tree and have proceeded with the application and the request to have it completely removed.

Members noted that the tree is not located on the applicant's property. Mr. Arneke asked staff why consideration of an application for work on someone else's property was being presented.

Mr. Cowhig explained that the owner of the adjacent property facing McGee Street was present when staff went to view the tree. She was concerned about the tree and was uncertain what the appropriate action should be. Staff told her that a request to remove the tree would have to be approved by the Commission. There were no stakes to prove the actual location of the property line.

Mr. Arneke suggested that before the application proceeds any further, a determination should be made as to which property the tree is on. Members were in favor of hearing from both property owners to gather information.

Greg Baldwin, property manager of 808 Walker Avenue, spoke in favor of the application. He explained that one-quarter of the tree is on 808 Walker Avenue and three-quarters of the tree is on 1001 West McGee Street. He expressed safety concerns for falling branches for tenants who park at 808 Walker Avenue. He described the hesitancy of two tree companies to work with the tree.

Speaking in opposition was Janet Frohman, 1001 West McGee Street. She indicated that Bill's Tree Service is scheduled to prune the tree on June 4, 2014 and inspect for damage from a lightning strike. She was in favor of a continuance.

Mr. Baldwin was supportive of having Bill's Tree Service inspect and prune the tree. Members discussed continuing the application and said if the applicants are satisfied with the results of the pruning; the application could just expire without coming back to the Commission. It was determined that a subsequent application for tree removal could be made and co-signed by both parties.

Ms. Cantrell moved to continue application number 1755 until the next meeting or until the time that a tree service can identify how much damage there is to the tree, if pruning will take care of the issue, and if the two co-owners are satisfied then there is no need for a continuance; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, Smith, McManus, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (f) **Location: 1004 North Elm Street**
Application Number 1757
Applicant: Brad Walker
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-14-14 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Construction of handicap ramp.

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—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69)* for the following reason:

Fact:

The ramp is needed for a new tenant of the building. It will extend from the side of the wraparound porch to the parking lot behind the building. This location will have the least impact on the historic structure and still meet building code requirements.

Guidelines (page 70):

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

Recommended Condition:

That a site plan and drawing be submitted for staff approval prior to construction.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1757 for work at 1004 North Elm Street. The applicant is Brad Walker and the description of work is for a handicap ramp. Based on information presented in the application staff recommends in favor of granting the COA. Staff cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69)* and indicated that the ramp is needed for a new tenant in the building. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines on page 70 as follows: (1) *Introduce new exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations;* and (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.* The recommended condition is that a site plan and drawing be submitted for staff approval prior to construction. Mr. Cowhig suggested that they need to check to see how close it is going to be to the property line, that it be made of wood, and that it be painted to match the building. The ramp will go around the side of the building to the rear parking lot.

Discussion:

Responding to questions, Mr. Cowhig stated that the stairs would remain and the ramp would go in around the side. Members felt the application should be continued until the applicant can provide more information through a site plan.

Mr. Hoggard moved to continue application number 1757, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, Hoggard, Smith, McManus. Nays: None.)

- (g) **Location: 743 Park Avenue**
Application Number 1760
Applicant: City of Greensboro Neighborhood Development
Property Owner: Katherine Young
Date Application Received: 5-14-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Install fiber cement siding over the existing siding. Existing siding and trim to be left in place. Eaves and rafter tails are to be painted. Windows and doors to be removed, stripped, repaired, reinstalled and painted.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44)* for the following reason:

Fact:

The applicant is proposing to cover original siding with new fiber cement siding, strip and repair the windows and doors, and paint the eaves and exposed rafter tails.

Guidelines (page 30):

4. *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or plywood panels.*

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1760 for work at 743 Park Avenue. The applicant is the City of Greensboro Neighborhood Development and the work description is to install fiber cement siding over the existing siding. The existing siding and trim are to be left in place and eaves and rafters are to be painted. Windows and doors are to be removed, stripped, repaired, reinstalled and painted. Staff recommends against granting this COA. They feel the application is incongruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44)* because the applicant wants to cover original siding with new fiber cement siding. Staff cited guideline 4 on page 30 as follows: (4) *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or plywood panels.* Mr. Cowhig observed that if this had not been a historic neighborhood, the house would have been covered with vinyl. As the house is in a historic neighborhood, the applicant is proposing to cover the siding in fiber cement boards and then paint the soffits and rafters. This is part of the Lead Safe Housing Program. Ms. Geary indicated that the lead has been contained by paint but it was continuing to fail. Several members observed that the moisture from the inside is creating problems. The intention is to keep the lead contained with the fiber cement siding. There was no one speaking in support of the application. Speaking in opposition was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, who was representing the neighborhood. The neighborhood felt this was a painting issue and not a siding issue. They were against covering the siding with fiber cement boards.

Discussion:

Responding to questions, Ms. Geary indicated that a grant was provided through the Lead Safe Housing program to paint the house. The peeling started a year after it was painted and the house

has been prepped and repainted three times due to the peeling. Ms. Cantrell commented that covering the siding does not remediate or improve the situation and despite the frustration resulting from the situation, it is not a good solution. Ms. Geary pointed out that the decision of the Commission regarding this matter will help lead the owners in other directions to pursue remaining options. Mr. Arneke felt that covering the siding with fiber cement was not the right choice for a house in a historic district.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1760 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and staff comments concerning the following guidelines on page 30: (4) *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or plywood panels* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Arneke, McManus, Graeber, Smith, Bowers, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve Application Number 1760 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro Neighborhood Development for work at 743 Park Avenue, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Arneke, McManus, Graeber, Smith, Bowers, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (h) **Location: 114 West Bessemer Avenue**
Application Number 1756
Applicant: Craig E. Vandeventer
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-14-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Mr. Hoggard was recused from this application due to a conflict of interest.

Description of Work:

Remove trees according to attached description and plan.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the City Arborist, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and *Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This property is being completely renovated. The site will be re-landscaped and several trees are proposed for removal.

Fact:

City Arborist, Judson Clinton, inspected the trees proposed for removal. He felt that the Cedar tree in the back yard could possibly be pruned and saved. He did not agree that the Crepe Myrtle in the front yard is the cause of the retaining wall leaning. He said that the leaning is due to the force of the weight of the soil and hydrostatic pressure.

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.*

Guidelines (page 26):

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

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

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

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

(Note: fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line that abuts a street, by City ordinance.)

Recommended Conditions:

That the fences be reviewed to ensure that they do not violate the street setback requirement or the sight obstruction ordinance.

Mr. Hoggard asked to be excused from the meeting due to a previous commitment.

Ms. Cantrell moved to excuse Mr. Hoggard from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Mr. Hoggard left the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

In Support:

Craig Vandeventer, 7 Montford Court
Lynne Gladstone, 112 Bessemer Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1756 for work at 114 West Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Craig Vandeventer and the description of work is for tree removal according to the attached description and plan. Mr. Cowhig described the plan and said that staff is in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Cowhig reviewed the various trees proposed for removal that included a Crepe Myrtle along Bessemer Avenue, a Cedar in between two trees, a dead Cedar in the backyard, and another much damaged Cedar. There were other trees mentioned and clarified later. The City Arborist felt that the Cedar tree in the back yard could possibly be pruned and saved but he did not agree about the Crepe Myrtle in the front yard. He believes that the leaning wall is due to soil and hydrostatic pressure. He observed that the Cedar tree was moved in the front yard between two trees and the Crepe Myrtle is still healthy. The backyard Cedar tree is highly damaged and he suggested pruning. Another Cedar is mostly dead and severely damaged and should be taken out. There was also an invasive tree along the wall that could be taken out. Mr. Cowhig made the observation that people working on the site should have protected trees but that is a subject to keep for the future. He cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and *Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24)*. He showed members pictures of two kinds of fences, a privacy fence for two sides and an open iron rail fence for the other side. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district; and (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.* In addition, he cited guidelines about fences on page 26 as follows: (5) *Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location, and size with original fences and*

walls in the Historic District; (A) Low picket fences of an open design, constructed of wood or metal and finished in white or another color/stain compatible with the building, (B) Install utilitarian fences of woven wire or chain link in rear yards only; (C) Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72" in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard. Fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line. The recommended condition is that the fences be reviewed to ensure that they do not violate the street setback requirement or the sight obstruction ordinance. Speaking in favor of the application was Craig Vandeventer, 7 Montford Court, who said that seven trees were proposed for removal. He disagreed that the Crepe Myrtle was not pushing up against the wall. He reviewed the proposed fences which are privacy fencing for two sides and iron rails on the other side. He will be adding more green space in the backyard by taking out 400 square feet of concrete drive. Also speaking in support was Lynne Gladstone, 112 West Bessemer. She agreed that the two Cedar trees needed to come out. She made an observation about why she thought one of the trees had died due to removing a fuel tank. She would not object to the Crepe Myrtle tree coming out because even though it is healthy, it is pressing against the wall. Even though it represents a change, she was in agreement with the proposed fences being installed. There was no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell stated that she was comfortable with the removal of the damaged and dead trees. However, she was not supportive of removing the healthy Crepe Myrtle trees and the trees at the retaining wall. Chair Bowers agreed that she was supportive of removing the two Cedar trees. Mr. Smith felt the tree beside the retaining wall should be replaced. He stated his opinion that the invasive tree was responsible for pushing in the wall. Ms. Cantrell did not agree that the tree was responsible for damaging the retaining wall. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that the City Arborist felt that the wall was damaged due to the weight of the soil over a hundred years. The action of freezing and thawing over the years has contributed to damaging the unreinforced wall. Mr. Smith commented that regardless of the reason for the damage, the wall does not look good as it is.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1756 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and staff comments along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 23 and guidelines 5, A, B, and C on page 26 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, McManus, Graeber, Smith. Nays: Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application Number 1756 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Craig Vandeventer for work at 114 West Bessemer Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the fences be reviewed to ensure that they do not violate the street setback requirement or the sight obstruction ordinance, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, McManus, Graeber, Smith. Nays: Cantrell.)

A recess was taken from 7:00 p.m. until 7:07 p.m.

Ms. Cantrell left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION FOR CAROLINA CADILLAC COMPANY BUILDING, 304 EAST MARKET STREET:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the Commission has been asked to review the nomination for the Carolina Cadillac Company building to determine if it meets the criteria for listing in the National Register.

He gave an overview of the building and indicated that the interior is still fairly intact. The building was constructed in 1917 as an automotive dealership. He reviewed the Statement of Significance in the Nomination Report and described the architecture of the historic building. The owner has plans to renovate the building. The eligibility of tax credits that come with a National Register property will allow him invest in the renovation of the building and will have an economic impact on the City.

Chair Bowers opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak on the nomination.

Chair Bowers was supportive of the nomination and felt it was a wonderful building that has been preserved very well on the interior. Mr. Smith commented that tax credits would insure that the building will be renovated better than most.

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

Ms. McManus moved to recommend the nomination of the Carolina Cadillac Company building for the National Register, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, McManus, Smith, Arneke, Graeber, Cantrell. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell left the meeting and was not excused and therefore, her vote counted in the affirmative.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

None.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 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
JUNE 25, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Sharon Graeber; Cindy Adams; Linda Lane; and Lois McManus.

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 Wayne Smith were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 30, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Arneke moved approval of the May 28, 2014 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Chair Bowers. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 305 West Bessemer Avenue**
Application Number 1751
Applicant: John Morrissett
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-5-14 -- Continued from May 28, 2014 meeting.
(APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove Magnolia tree located in planting area between sidewalk and street.

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

Fact:

The ice storm in February caused significant damage to trees in Fisher Park including this Magnolia tree. Magnolias have historically lined this part of Bessemer Avenue.

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.*

In Support:

John Morrissett, 305 West Bessemer Avenue.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1751 for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue. The description of work is to remove a Magnolia tree located in the planting area between the sidewalk and street. The applicant is John Morrissett. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, reminded members that this is a continued item. The tree was taken down during a leeway period for homeowners following the ice storm because so many trees were badly damaged. He commented that the tree was bushy and not very treelike. His suggestion is to grant the application citing guidelines on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district, and* (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.* The recommended condition is that the stump be ground out and a new Magnolia tree started in its place. Mr. Cowhig commented that he was not sure a Magnolia was the proper tree for a right-of-way. This is an after-the-fact application but it is borderline due to the moratorium for taking out trees through a Certificate of Appropriateness in historic districts. Speaking in favor was John Morrissett, 305 West Bessemer Avenue. He said the tree is badly damaged and was removed. He spoke with someone about the tree and when he returned, the tree was gone. He asked if it was the responsibility of the homeowner or the City to replant the tree. He did not ask an arborist about the condition of the tree. The tree is located in the public right-of-way and quite often maintenance in the public right-of-way is the responsibility of the homeowner. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1751 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines -- Trees and Landscaping* and that staff comments along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 23 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Lane, Arneke, Graeber, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1751 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Morrissett for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue with the following conditions: (1) That the stump be ground out and, (2) That a decision on replanting an appropriate tree be made in consultation with staff, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Lane, Arneke, Graeber, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 305 West Bessemer Avenue**
Application Number 1767
Applicant: John Morrissett
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-10-14
(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replaced porch columns with brick and floor with pavers.

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 changes are not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The original side porch was constructed with wood columns and a tongue-and-groove floor.

Guidelines (page 23):

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

In Support:

John Morrissett, 305 West Bessemer Avenue.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bower stated that this is application number 1767 for work at 305 Bessemer Avenue. The description of work is to replace porch columns with brick and floor with pavers. Based on the information, staff recommends against granting this COA. In staff's opinion the proposed changes are not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62). In addition, staff cited guidelines on page 23 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 the incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.* Mr. Cowhig stated that guidelines are very clear about porches and balconies and specifically mentioned that tongue and groove boards are an integral part of historic homes. He said the water problem might possibly have resulted from a change in grade when brick pavers were installed creating a drainage problem. He said the best floor for replacement was treated and then kiln-dried lumber which is already seasoned when installed and therefore, it doesn't cup and peel when painted. There were no reasons not to repair the flooring rather than replace. Speaking in support of the application was John Morrissett, 305 West Bessemer, who said the roof would add prominence to the columns. He said there was no leakage into the house. Mr. Morrissett suggested putting up a steel support and then covering it up with wood. Mr. Cowhig said they would have a building inspector go to the property to see what type of repairs would be needed. There was no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell commented that she would like to see the efforts of City staff and the homeowner combined to save the columns. She did not want to see the columns replaced and was in favor of repairing them. Chair Bowers was in agreement with Ms. Cantrell's comments.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1767 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and the guidelines on page 23 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 the incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps;* are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1767 for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Chair Bowers asked Mr. Morrissett to work with City staff to come up with alternative solutions.

- (c) **Location: 808 Walker Avenue**
Application Number 1755
Applicant: Charles Cranford
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-14-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Remove Oak tree located in back yard.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by City Arborist, Judson Clinton, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed tree removal is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reason:

Fact:

It is the opinion of the City Arborist that there are steps that could be taken to treat the tree short of total removal. These steps include pruning and fertilization. He pointed out that he was not guaranteeing that the tree will not fall, because there is no way to make that guarantee. However, based on his visual inspection from the ground he did not observe conditions that would indicate the tree is hazardous. The College Hill tree inventory rated the tree as in "good" condition.

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.*

In Support:

Greg Baldwin, 808 Walker Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1755 for work at 808 Walker Avenue. The owner is Charles Cranford and the description of work is to remove an Oak tree located in the back yard. Based on information contained in the application and review by the City Arborist, staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. The removal of the tree is not congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* because the Arborist feels that reasonable steps could be taken short of removal to save the tree. These steps include removal of damaged portions of tree, fertilization, etc. There is no guarantee the tree will not fall. Also cited were guidelines on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district; and (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.* This has been a continued application because of the question of the tree being on the property line of 1001 McGee Street and 808 Walker Avenue. The owner at 1001 McGee Street withdrew her application. Bill's Tree Service looked at the tree but there is no official report. Speaking in favor of the application was Greg Baldwin, property manager for Charles Cranford. There was a lengthy discussion about whose property the tree was on and that it had been damaged during the storm causing a fear that falling limbs would damage cars and houses in the area. Several tree services have looked at the tree and there has also been a survey by Wilson Surveyors. Some of the branches have been trimmed off. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

During discussion it was noted that although Mr. Baldwin is present as property manager, Mr. Cranford would have to agree to continue the application as he is listed as owner on the application. Mr. Cowhig commented that the application could not be continued another time.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1755 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments in regard to the opinion of the City Arborist that there are reasonable steps that can be taken to save the tree and the guidelines on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district, and (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;* and also the fact brought up in discussion that the tree is on the property line and the owner of the adjoining property has withdrawn her support of her application in support of the project, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1755 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Charles Cranford for work at 808 Walker Avenue, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

(d) **Location: 606 Summit Avenue**
Application Number 1769
Applicant: Jeremy McReynolds
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-3-14 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove side porch and gazebo.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed changes are not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62)* for the following reason:

Fact:

The existing side porch and gazebo were added when the house was renovated in 2003. The porch structure on the south side of the house concealed a wheelchair ramp. Today, the porch is badly deteriorated.

The likely cause of the deterioration is the generally inferior quality of the lumber and the lack of a roof drainage system. Modern plantation pine cannot duplicate the density and resinous, insect and rot resistant characteristics of old-growth pine.

Guidelines (page 23):

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

Recommended Condition:

That a site plan and drawing be submitted for staff approval prior to construction.

In Support:

Jeremy McReynolds, 606 Summit Avenue
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1761 for work at 606 Summit Avenue. The applicant is Jeremy McReynolds and the description of work is to remove the side porch and gazebo. Staff recommended against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. They felt the proposed changes were not congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62)*. They cited guidelines on page 23 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 the incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps. Mr. Cowhig showed pictures of the 1983 conditions where there was no gazebo or wrap-around porch. In the mid-90's the home went into disrepair and was saved in 2003 by one person who was willing to step up. A wheelchair ramp was added at that time in 2003 with an open roof and a gazebo was approved and constructed. Since then the structure has deteriorated greatly. There was a lengthy discussion about removing structures that were not original to the house and whether that really is a condition of removing something that is part of the original construction. Ms. Geary suggested approval with the condition of putting back the wrap-around porch at some point in time. There was further discussion about the conditions of the addition from 2003. Speaking in support of the application was Jeremy McReynolds, 606 Summit Avenue, who would like to remove the deteriorated gazebo and ramp. He showed on the drawing how he plans to cap off the edges on the sides of the porch. Also in support was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit, who was the homeowner in 2003 who purchased and saved the property from demolition. She spoke on behalf of the neighborhood association who voted in favor of the demolition and went on to comment on a lot of the problems that probably came from storm drains being blocked by Yanceyville Street. She showed pictures of basement flooding and mentioned the neighborhood has hired an engineer to look at the water problems. There are no storm drains available for the block running from 600 Summit Avenue to 606 Summit Avenue. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application. Ms. Geary was at the Monday evening neighborhood association meeting and stated that comments made by Ms. Zachary about the alleyway issues actually were not part of the neighborhood's decision. Their decision was based on the fact that the gazebo and ramp were not original and it was in a deteriorated state.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell and Chair Bowers felt that since the deteriorating handicap ramp and gazebo were not original to the house, they had no problem with removing them. Ms. Graeber commented that although the pergola and gazebo were not original construction, the profile of the side of the house where the roof is open helps to keep the roof line going where the existing wrap-around porch had been. They maintained the edge profile of the wrap-around porch. Staff recommended that the owner be given time to restore the wrap-around porch. It had been a wrap-around porch but it was changed to an open configuration with a ramp but the element where the roofline had been was maintained. A previous condition was modified to meet their need. Mr. McReynolds clarified for members that the columns would also be removed. Ms. Geary reiterated her earlier comment that one possibility might be a restoration of the original wrap-around porch. Chair Bowers pointed out it may be a hardship to the owner to restore the porch given the deteriorated condition of the house. Mr. Arneke commented that he would be supportive of adding the wrap-around porch if it was a part of the application, but it is not.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1769 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous, despite staff comments, with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and based on information contained in the application staff recommends against granting this COA and in staff's opinion the proposed changes are not congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies on page 62 for the following reason: (1) The existing side porch and gazebo were added when the house was renovated in 2003. The porch structure on the south side of the house concealed a wheelchair ramp. Today, the porch is badly deteriorated. The likely cause of the deterioration is the generally inferior quality of the lumber and the lack of a roof drainage system. Modern plantation pine cannot duplicate the density and resinous, insect and rot resistant characteristics of old-growth pines; are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by

Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1769 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jeremy McReynolds for work at 606 Summit Avenue, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arneke expressed concern regarding the issue of the storm drainage problems in this block of Summit Avenue. During discussion of the matter, Counsel Jones indicated that the City is in process of looking into this problem again. Mr. Arneke was in support of putting this matter on the agenda of a future meeting for further discussion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Jeff Sovich, City of Greensboro Planning Coordinator, gave a presentation of the College Hill Plan. Development of the Plan began with a neighborhood summit in January, 2009 to introduce the process and engage community residents. Staff analyzed data on conditions and trends in College Hill that was collected as a result of the meeting. Staff developed a draft vision and roles for the neighborhood that was presented at a second neighborhood in April, 2009 where participants discussed preferences, priorities, and a strategy of action steps to accomplish the vision and goals. Using this material, staff developed an initial draft Plan document in November, 2009. At that point, the neighborhood association informed the City of their wish to place the planning process on hold to focus on issues related to the development of the Neumann Machine property, now the Province Apartments. In October, 2013 the neighborhood was ready to resume the planning process with a third neighborhood summit where participants gave their feedback on the draft vision, goals, strategies and actions. A new website was created to help facilitate greater engagement in the planning process; new maps were developed with key aspects of the neighborhood; and trends were updated using the 2010 census and other more recent information. The updated document was presented to the neighborhood at a fourth and final summit on June 16, 2014. The finished document contains six sections: (1) Housing and Historic Character, (2) Private Safety, (3) Communications and Governance, (4) Neighborhood Development, (5) Parking and Traffic, and (6) Quality of Life. The document contains 120 strategies and 150 separate action steps that the neighborhood and City will work together on over the course of the Plan to address issues that have been identified in the neighborhood. Last week, the College Hill Neighborhood Association voted unanimously to adopt the draft College Hill Neighborhood Plan. Mr. Sovich pointed out that College Hill is a designated historic district and much of the Plan deals with historic preservation issues in the neighborhood. These issues relate to improved upkeep of historic properties, better awareness of and compliance with Historic District Guidelines, and marketing coordination to insure that historic properties that become available find buyers who are willing and able to carry out appropriate historic restoration and maintenance. The Plan also contains strategies and actions allowing the neighborhood to work toward developing projects for use of Municipal Service District Funds that are intended to support the historic character of the neighborhood through enhancements of City-owned property within the historic district.

Mr. Sovich distributed an Executive Summary of the College Hill Neighborhood Plan for review by members.

Mr. Arneke was involved in the process and commented that the Plan is immensely more detailed and strategic than what he thought was possible in the beginning. One problem the neighborhood has had over the past 20 years is that single-family owner-occupied residences continue to be lost to rentals. He felt that the document and other things being done by the neighborhood association could lead to a better outcome for the neighborhood. The emphasis on returning College Hill to greater owner occupancy is emphasized throughout the Plan as a priority of the neighborhood. He envisioned the percentage of owner occupied residences could be increased through marketing and working with realtors on the value of historic districts.

Mr. Arneke stated that the neighborhood association is very appreciative of Mr. Sovich's work along with all the insight and effort that have gone into the Plan.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JULY 30, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Sharon Graeber; Cindy Adams; Linda Lane; and Lois McManus.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 25, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the June 25, 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, Lane, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 305 West Bessemer Avenue**
Application Number 1779 -- amendment to 1767
Applicant: John Morrissett
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-15-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replace side porch floor with brick or tile floor; rebuild columns.

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 changes are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The side porch floor is deteriorated and needs to be replaced. A tile floor would be compatible with the architectural style of the house and endure the affects of the weather better than a wood floor.

Fact:

The porch columns are rotted in places but not beyond repair. Because lumber available today is not as dense and stable as old growth wood, it is prone to early failure. Therefore repair is a between restoration option. A new masonry floor would give the columns better support and avoid problems due to sagging of the floor.

Guidelines (page 23):

1. *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.*

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

Recommended Conditions:

(1) That the tile selected for the floor be similar to tile used on other houses in the neighborhood of the same time period.

(2) That the columns be repaired rather than completely replaced. Selectively replace only the deteriorated element with new material to match the original in size, scale, texture and detail.

In Support:

Susan Morrisett, 305 West Bessemer Avenue

In Opposition:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1779, an amendment to application number 1767, for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue. The description of work is to replace the side porch floor with brick or tile floor and to rebuild the columns. It was determined that rebuilding the columns would be a staff level approval. The applicant is John Morrisett of 305 West Bessemer Avenue. Based on information presented in the application, Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff was in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. He felt the porch was deteriorated and tile floor would be compatible with the architectural style of the house. He cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 23. He said the tile floor would be similar tile that would be raised up several inches so it would be identifiable from the existing pavers. Ms. Geary said that the wood was very bouncy and a raised porch would be in the footprint of where the existing porch is. Chair Bowers questioned why this application was being heard again because it was very similar to the original application. Members discussed putting the columns under staff level approval. Ms. Adams commented that it should be a wood porch that could be approved at staff level as well. Speaking in opposition was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association who met on Monday evening. They felt the repairs should be done within the guidelines. Speaking in favor of the application was Susan Morrisett, 305 West Bessemer Avenue, who is the homeowner. She said that the balcony located above the porch to be repaired was sagging and a solid floor might be a better support. The wood floor is the original floor of the house. There was no one else speaking in support of the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Lane commented that the outside elevation view was bothersome. Referring back to the original photograph of the house, she felt that as a result of having lost the porch screening the floorboards were exposed in an unusual manner and seeing the floorboards “floating” is problematic in general. In her opinion, changing the flooring to tile will not be an improvement. She felt the screening should be put back on the porch to give a finishing quality to the floor. The sway issue above can be handled with proper beams and restructuring of the interior. Therefore, a tile floor is not needed in order to support the columns. She felt the original wood material should remain.

Ms. Graeber commented that water problems might become an issue if a wood floor is put back on the porch.

Ms. Morrisett described the three columns on the porch and indicated that the screen was not original to the house. The flooring is 92 years old and is sitting directly on the dirt. Mr. Cowhig commented that when the screening was added a board was placed in between the three separate columns. He felt it would be good if the board was removed during the work.

Ms. Adams questioned the possibility of other alternatives that would be efficient and yet not cost prohibitive.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1779, amendment to application number 1767, 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 and 2 on page 23 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Lane, Arneke, Graeber, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1779 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Morrisett for work at 305 West Bessemer, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Lane, Arneke, Graeber, Adams, McManus. Nays: None.)

Chair Bowers asked Mrs. Morrisett to work with City staff on the repair of the columns and possible flooring alternatives.

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, is with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He explained that he had to leave the meeting early due to a commitment and asked permission to comment on item (f), application number 1778, for work at 905 Magnolia Street. Chair Bowers was amenable to hearing his comments out of order. It was confirmed that the applicant for application number 1778 was present in the audience. Mr. Large proceeded to give his statement for the record.

(b) Location: 544 South Mendenhall Street
Application Number 1778
Applicant: Reverend T. J. Patterson
Property Owner: Bob Scott
Date Application Received: 7-10-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Cover front wall of building below window with wood "brick" siding.

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 changes are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls (page 7)* for the following reason:

Fact:

The façade of this building, which was originally a grocery store, has been altered substantially from its original appearance. More recently the space below the front window was covered with a wood product that resembles bricks.

Guidelines: (page 12)

3. *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, cement boards, or plywood panels. Substitute siding almost always compromises the character of a historic structure, and it can hid water infiltration, insect infestation and other problems that should be corrected as soon as possible.*

Recommended Condition:

(1) That the wood “bricks” be painted white.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1778 for work at 544 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Reverend T. J. Patterson and the property owner is Bob Scott. The description of work is to cover the front wall of the building below the window with wood “brick” siding. Staff recommends in favor of granting the COA with the condition that the wood “bricks” be painted white. He also said that this is a small commercial building, probably a grocery store, from the turn of the century. The building has been significantly altered and is currently a small church. The building has been well taken care of on the inside. Mr. Cowhig met with Reverend Patterson to look at the property. The owner lives out of state and the church was not aware they were in a historic district. Mr. Cowhig did not feel original materials would be covered because the building had been so significantly altered. Staff cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls (page 7)* and guidelines on page 12 as follows: (3) *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, cement boards, or plywood panels.* There was no one present to speak in support of the application. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street, on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood has objections to the faux brick material. She commented the work had been done recently.

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig confirmed that it was the church, not the owner, who replaced the material. They were not advised by the owner that they were in a historic area. Mr. Arneke commented that the material jumps out in an inappropriate way and painting the faux brick may not significantly diminish the effect. Responding to a question from Ms. Adams, Mr. Cowhig said that if this matter had come to staff for approval and given that this is such a altered historic property, he would have recommended a smooth wood surface or a board and batten material. Members questioned the nature of a faux brick made out of wood. Mr. Cowhig said that paneled wood bricks have been used in historic districts in the past, although not very often. Ms. Cantrell expressed concern that the faux brick material might not last for a very long period of time. She felt the material was not appropriate.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1778 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments citing guideline 3 on page 12, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1778 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Reverend T. J. Patterson for work at 544 South Mendenhall Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Chair Bowers asked Mr. Cowhig to get together with the applicant to find an acceptable product.

- (c) **Location: 604 Park Avenue**
Application Number 1782
Applicant: Jim Rounds, Margaret Reed-Lade
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-15-14
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS/SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)

Description of Work:

Construction of accessory building according to attached site plan and elevation drawings.

Note:

A Special Exception to the setback requirement must be approved by the Board of Adjustment. It must first be recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

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 changes are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-36); Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 48-50); and Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 62-66)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed accessory structure is not large and its location is consistent with historic site patterns for garages in the historic district. Compatible construction materials are proposed including lap siding and double-hung windows.

The front porch appears to originally have full length columns to match the property at 606 Park Avenue. The current brick piers with half columns and skirting were added in a 1929 remodel of the property. The brick pier and half columns are more typical of the craftsman style. The owner wishes to restore the property to its original appearance when it was constructed in 1911. The new columns will be wood and designed to match the columns at 606 Park Avenue. The porch skirting will be replaced with new brick to more closely match the original brick on the rest of the foundation.

Guidelines (page 36):

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

Guidelines (page 64):

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

Guidelines (page 50):

(3) *Maintain the integrity of masonry/stone features by re-laying loose bricks or stones and repairing deteriorated mortar joints as necessary. When re-pointing or tuck pointing masonry surfaces, match the dimensions, composition, color, profile, and design of the old mortar joints as closely as possible.*

In Support:

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

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1782 for work at 604 Park Avenue. The applicants are Jim Rounds and Margaret Reed-Lade. The description of work is for construction of an accessory building which will require recommendation of a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment. The homeowner would like to remove the craftsman columns in the front of the house and replaced them with columns, similar to 606 Park Avenue, that are more appropriate to the style of the house. A twin house would be created. Staff was in favor of granting the COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-36); Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 48-50); and Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 62-66)*. Specifically, he referenced guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 36; guideline 4 on page 64; and guideline 3 on page 50. Mr. Cowhig commented that the homeowner had built a similar accessory building and it was previously approved. He also mentioned that a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment was being requested. The craftsman columns were changed in the 1920s. The house was actually built in 1911. They also want to replace the brick under the porch to match the existing brick and generally have the look of the house more appropriate to the true architecture of the home. Speaking in favor of the application was James Rounds, 604 Park Avenue. He said that 604 and 606 Park Avenue were probably built in 1911. There has been little change to 606 Park Avenue giving him clear guidance as to what 604 Park Avenue should look like. He wants to restore the front of the house with new brick that is compatible. He felt the original owners were probably concrete magnates because these are only two houses in the Summit Avenue neighborhood with full width sidewalks. Mr. Rounds would also like to move the original front door back to the front of the house. It now has a 1930s multi-pane glass door. Also speaking in support was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Aycokk Neighborhood Association. They fully supported the application and thought that it was exciting to have a set of twin houses. Ms. Geary commented that there is another set of twin houses right across the street on Park Avenue although they are not easily seen.

Discussion:

It was confirmed for Ms. Cantrell that the original application was submitted although the structure was never built.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1782 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-36); Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 48-50); and Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 62-66)* and along with staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1782 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to James Rounds and Margaret Reed-Lade for work at 604 Park Avenue and also that a Special Exception be prepared to go before the Board of Adjustment for the accessory building, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arneke offered a friendly amendment that plans for the front columns and replacement front door be submitted to staff for approval. Ms. Graeber accepted the amendment and added **condition (1) that the owners submit a column plan and an elevation showing the relocation of the existing back door to the front door, along with the porch floor, to staff for approval.**

- (d) **Location: 704 Spring Garden Street**
Application Number 1771
Applicant: Todd Doerner
Owner: Todd Doerner, John Lalonde
Date Application Received: 7-15-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replace front porch floor.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The porch floor was replaced with deck boards. Historically porch floors were constructed of tongue-and-groove boards.

Guidelines (page 36):

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 details. It is not appropriate to replaced deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*

In Support:

Todd Doerner, 3203 West Market Street

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1771 for work at 704 Spring Garden Street. The applicant is Todd Doerner and the description of work is to replace the front porch floor. Staff recommends against granting this COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (pages 62-66) along with guidelines on page 36 as follows: (1) *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances;* and (2)

Preserve and maintain historic materials. Mr. Cowhig explained that the owners did not think they needed a COA to replace an existing porch because it was already in decking boards. They did not think the work required a COA. He felt this was a difficult case because although the flooring was probably decking board, it is still not an appropriate material for the neighborhood. Mr. Cowhig read the guidelines for change versus replacement and then questioned whether the work was done with a building permit. Speaking in support of the application was Todd Doerner, 3203 West Market Street, who said they were replacing what was already there. They'd owned the house for 12 years and planned to paint the porch gray or white. They did maintain the columns. They understood that if the work was under \$2,000 a permit was not needed. There was a discussion about when a permit was actually needed. Speaking in opposition to the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood did not approach the matter as a question of whether or not it was decking before or after; rather, they felt it was not an appropriate material. They requested denial of the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke felt that guideline 2 dealt with the matter and he read the guideline into the record. He stated that the porch needed to be replaced and it happened to be an inappropriate material. The guidelines state quite clearly that it needs to be replaced not with what was there but with appropriate materials. Ms. Cantrell agreed and felt the guidelines were very clear and replacement should be with historically accurate material. Members noted a conflict in the way another guideline could be interpreted and Ms. Cantrell felt the best resolution would be to call and ask if a COA is needed rather than going forward if there is a conflict or difference in interpretation. Ms. Geary pointed out that the ordinance is triggered when there is a change. If a property owner is replacing what is there, whether or not it is appropriate, it does not trigger the ordinance because they are not making a change. Mr. Cowhig commented that the historic district is all about the architectural details and unless staff is able to review things in advance they cannot know with certainty that the details are going to be maintained. He commented that ordinary maintenance or repair of any exterior architectural feature in a historic district which does not involve a change in design, material, or outer appearance does not require a COA. Several members commented that replacement is not repair. Responding to a question from Ms. Adams, Mr. Cowhig said that the unpainted treated material is a change. Old photographs show the flooring to be painted. If it was painted gray, it would look more consistent with what existed before the work was done. He felt this case was a difficult one and they should look at policy that clearly states when a COA is required in these kinds of situations because this is not the first time this has happened. Mr. Arneke stated that the ordinance can be read that a COA wasn't required because the replacement material was the same as what was previously there. The guidelines state that if the porch element is deteriorated and requires replacement, it has to be done with original materials. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that guidelines are recommendations used to review applications and the ordinance represents rules to work under.

Counsel Jones stated her opinion that the entire replacement is a reconstruction and not just a repair. The entire floor was changed and not just selective boards being repaired.

Mr. Arneke felt that a recommendation should be made to City Council that the ordinance be worded more clearly so that in a situation like this one, it is not a matter of interpretation. He suggested appointing a committee to come up with clearer wording as to when items can be replaced without a COA.

Mr. Doerner confirmed that the material that was on the floor prior to replacement was decking material and he replaced exactly what was already there.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1771 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is

incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (pages 62-66) and that staff comments citing guidelines 1 and 2 on page 36, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Lane. Nays: Bowers, Adams.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1771 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Todd Doerner and John Lalonde for work at 704 Spring Garden Street, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Lane. Nays: Bowers, Adams.)

It was pointed out that because the application was denied, no guidance was given to the applicant regarding appropriate flooring material. Mr. Cowhig was asked to advise the homeowners on appropriate materials that should be used.

- (e) **Location: 301 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1780
Applicant: Lyudmila Dmitriyeva
Owner: 1005 Montpelier Drive
Date Application Received: 7-11-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Repair deteriorated sections of front porch floor.

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 Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 66-62) for the following reason:

Fact:

Sections of the front porch floor were replaced with deck boards. Historically porch floors were constructed of tongue-and-groove boards.

Several column bases have been removed due to deterioration. The new column bases should be constructed in a manner that matches the original column bases.

Guidelines (page 36):

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

In Support:

Lyudmila Dmitriyeva, 1005 Montpelier Drive

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 South Tate Street

Rebuttal in Support:

Lydmila Dmitriyeva, 1005 Montpelier Drive

Summary:

No summary was given.

Discussion:

Members discussed the possibility of continuing the application and having the applicant return with actual photographs or specifications for the products that will be used. Ms. Cantrell commented that it is difficult to approve a COA without photographs or samples of the materials to be used.

Mr. Arneke questioned if the application would even need to come back to the Commission if the product was to be tongue-and-groove and a column base that would be appropriate. Ms. Lane commented that an option would be to approve the application with conditions. Examples of the products to be used could be presented to staff for their approval.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1780 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and staff comments and guidelines 1 and 2 on page 36 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1780 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lyudmila Dmitriyeva for work at 301 South Mendenhall Street with the following condition: **(1) flooring and column details are to be submitted to staff for final approval**, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Graeber, McManus, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Ms. Cantrell offered a friendly amendment to add condition **(2) the flooring must be tongue-and-groove replacement, not decking material.**

Ms. Graeber offered a friendly amendment and pointed out that if you look at photos there are some columns where the banding at the bottom of the column is missing and the columns are starting to come apart; therefore, **(3) details for the column banding should also be required.**

Ms. Lane accepted the amendments and noted that these items constitute the scope of work because only the column bases and patches in the floor are mentioned in the application.

Chair Bowers asked the applicant to contact Mr. Cowhig who will help her with information to come up with the appropriate materials.

- (f) Location: 905 Magnolia Street
Application Number 1783
Applicant: Joyce Freeman
Owner: Eula Wray
Date Application Received: 7-14-14
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Remove Magnolia trees located in front 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:

These are mature Magnolia trees that 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:

Eula Wray, 905 Magnolia Street

Joyce Freeman, 512 Beachland Drive, McLeansville, North Carolina

Eric Fitzgerald, 907 Magnolia Street

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street (comments were given earlier in the meeting)

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1783 for work at 905 Magnolia Street. The applicant is Joyce Freeman, 512 Beachland Drive, McLeansville, North Carolina, and the owner is Eula Wray, 905 Magnolia Street. The description of work is the removal of Magnolia trees located in the front yard. Mr. Cowhig recommended against granting the COA citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)*. These are mature Magnolia trees that contribute to the character of the historic district. Mr. Cowhig referred to guideline 1 on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.* He also said the City arborist said these trees were in good condition. Speaking in support of the application was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The association had a lengthy conversation and supported the application as a special exception. They supported removal of two of the trees while leaving the third tree in place. They also suggested a different tree species to replace the Magnolias. They felt the homeowner may want to contact the City arborist about the proper species that should be planted in lieu of Magnolias. The third Magnolia tree is to remain. Also in support was Eula Wray, 905 Magnolia Street, who would like to take the trees down because they are dangerous. Pods and leaves shed and are slippery. Also in favor of the application was Joyce Freeman, 512 Beachland Drive in McLeansville, North Carolina, who is Ms. Wray's daughter. She is concerned for her mother's safety because she lives alone and she could trip on the leaves and pods that fall off the tree. She was concerned about security issues as well because the house is obscured by the trees. Eric Fitzgerald, 907 Magnolia Street, was also in favor of the application. He is the next door neighbor of Ms. Wray and felt the house would show up better if the Magnolia trees were removed. Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, reinforced the safety perspective and talked about the right tree at the right place. She noted that police guidelines quite often talk about shrubs not going above the window line. Mr. Cowhig also commented that the guidelines do suggest that if trees have to be removed for safety issues, other trees should be planted to take their place. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell indicated that she was opposed to the application. Members reviewed photographs and determined that the crown had not been raised as they noted the denseness of the trees.

Ms. Adams commented that pruning the two trees would resolve safety issues; however, the issue of dropping leaves would still exist. Mr. Arneke disliked the idea of taking out healthy trees but he was inclined to support the application because the trees are causing extensive problems for the homeowner. He felt it was reasonable to remove the two trees if they were replaced with a more appropriate species. Ms. Bowers commented that a condition should be put in the application that the replacement trees should be replanted if they died within the first two years of planting.

Ms. Graeber felt that this was a life safety issue regarding the homeowner's physical safety if she were to fall on the leaves or pods and her safety in the house because it is obscured by the dense trees. She stated that a tree can be replaced over and over but a person cannot be replaced.

Crowning the tree will not resolve the life safety issue. Chair Bowers clarified that approving this application would not set a precedent because all cases are reviewed on their own merit.

Ms. Cantrell pointed out that Raymond Large with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association said that the neighborhood's support was a special exception.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1783 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and that staff comments citing guidelines 1 page 23, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, McManus, Adams, Graeber. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell, Lane.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1783 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joyce Freeman for work at 905 Magnolia Street with the following conditions: **(1) after the trees are removed that each tree be replaced with an more appropriate tree; (2) that the homeowner get approval from staff regarding the appropriate replacement trees; (3) that the trees need to live for two years or be replaced; and (4) that the trees be two inch caliper in size**, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, McManus, Adams, Graeber. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell, Lane.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

- **Informational Presentation on Proposed Landmark Designation for the Cannon Court Apartment Building**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the proposed Landmark Designation for Cannon Court Apartments will go before City Council on August 19, 2014. The apartment building is located in Fisher Park and was built in the 1920s. The application has been recommended by the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission. If approved, the owners are eligible for up to 50 percent reduction in local property taxes. The nomination will be placed on the website and a link will be sent to members.

Mr. Cowhig informed members that demolition is planned for 815 Pearson Street in the Ole Asheboro neighborhood. The house was built around 1880 and needs to be brought up to Minimum

Housing Standard codes. He asked Commissioners to contact staff if they know of an investor who may be interested in restoring the property for sale.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:33 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 27, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Wayne Smith; Sharon Graeber; and Lois McManus.

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 Linda Lane and Cindy Adams were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 30, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the July 30, 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, McManus. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 209 East Hendrix Street**
Application Number 1790
Applicant: David and Jennifer Cox
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-5-14 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install solar panels on east and west sides of roof.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

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

Fact:

The solar panels will be installed on side-facing slopes of the roof. They will be black in color. The pitch of the roof is fairly low with wide overhangs so the solar panels will not be easily visible and the impact on the historic structure and the district should be minimal. There will be no changes to the roof itself.

Guidelines (page 38):

Solar panels are best located on rear elevations.

In Support:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street

Patrick Cavanaugh, 3401 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 101, Raleigh, North Carolina

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1790 for work at 209 East Hendrix Street. The applicants are David and Jennifer Cox who live at 209 East Hendrix Street. The description of the work is to install solar panels on the east and west sides of the roof. Staff recommends in favor citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38)* because the house is a contributing structure and the solar panels will be installed on the side-facing roof. They are black and the pitch of the roof is low with a wide overhang and therefore, they will not be easily seen. The impact on the district and the structure should be minimal. There will be no changes to the roof itself. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, commented that extensive information on the solar panels has been included in packets distributed to members and that during area meetings several years ago, people were very interested in more efficient energy. A similar house was approved on Magnolia Street several years ago. Mr. Cowhig felt the panels would be barely visible from the street because they are black in color and the way they are set up on the hill. Ms. Cantrell also commented that the house is high up on the hill and how the site would have no damage. Speaking in favor of the application was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, who was speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association made their approval of the application. Also in favor of the application was Patrick Cavanaugh, 3401 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 101, in Raleigh, North Carolina, who was present on behalf of the solar panel company. He said that the panels would be in a fixed position and tilted on the back half of the roof. The position is of maximum benefit to the homeowners because there are no trees where the panels will be located. They will be about five feet high on the slant and they weigh about 39 pounds. They are resistant to winds up to 175 miles per hour. They will lower operating costs as much as \$100 per month and will last for several decades. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1790 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 presented at the meeting and guidelines on page 38 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1790 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David and Jennifer Cox for work at 209 East Hendrix Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, McManus. Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 211 West Bessemer Avenue

Application Number 1789

Applicant: Tracy Lathrop

Property Owner: Same

Date Application Received: 8-1-14 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of garage; use existing Grid-Between-Glass (GBG) windows instead of simulated divided light windows.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The design, dimensions, and trim of the proposed windows will be similar to the house and therefore compatible yet recognizable as new construction. The impact of GBG versus simulated divided light sash will be minimal. The garage will still be compatible with the house and the district because of the sensitivity of the overall design.

Guidelines: (page 37)

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

In Support:

Tracy Lathrop, 211 West Bessemer Avenue
Donald Dale, 622 Guilford College Road

In Opposition:

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1789 for work at 211 West Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Tracy Lathrop. The description of work is a request for a variation on the garage to use GBG windows instead of simulated divided light windows. Staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36) and guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 37. Mr. Cowhig commented that the homeowner already had the windows and staff's opinion was to suggest the option of installing grids over the glass. He felt the windows still met guidelines for new construction and were very compatible with the neighborhood. This is not a historic structure and historic windows are not being replaced. Due to the location of the garage, the impact will be minimal. Speaking in support of the application was Tracy Lathrop, 211 West Bessemer, who said the dormers were on the back and cannot be seen from Parkway. She said that windows in the neighborhood had glass over the mullions. She was not interested in adding the grid because it would interfere with opening the windows. Also in support was Donald Dale, 622 Guilford College Road, who works with Kevin Jones, the contractor. He brought a simulated divided light window and a GBG window. He commented that the GBG has shaped mullions and the dimensions were correct. He said that the window could not be open and closed if there were attached mullions. Speaking in opposition was Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, who said that the Neighborhood Association did not approve the application because they felt the GBG windows were not appropriate for the neighborhood. Speaking in rebuttal, Ms. Lathrop disagreed and felt it would be one of the finest garages in Fisher Park.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell stated that she was not fond of Grid-Between-Glass windows for the historic district. Chair Bowers commented that when she walked by the property, the garage cannot be seen from the street and noted that it is not a historic construction. Mr. Smith referred to the guidelines and noted emerging technologies and stated his opinion that allowing solar panels and not GBG windows was problematic. The fact that the windows are already installed and trying to make a case for another way was not really the point. Members noted that this was after-the-fact work and briefly reviewed prior work at the property. Mr. Smith felt that this case was a bad example of how not to work with the historic district. He had no problem with the windows; however, he did have concerns about the way it got to this point.

Ms. Lathrop felt that the correct steps were followed. The contract erred and the entire structure was taken down. She stated that she went through all the prescribed steps. This is a restructure and getting rid of the GBG windows would not be cost effective. She clarified that she already had the GBG windows.

Chair Bowers explained that Mr. Smith's comments were not personal toward the homeowner. During the conversation regarding earlier work at the property, Mr. Smith was objecting to not being able to talk about something that was not on the application. Chair Bowers said that the only question was whether or not she already had the GBG windows.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1789 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments citing guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 37, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, McManus. Nays: Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1789 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tracy Lathrop for work at 207 West Bessemer Avenue with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Smith, Graeber, McManus. Nays: Bowers, Cantrell.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that members are in receipt of the National Register Nomination for Printworks located at 1700 Fairview Street. He provided an overview on the history of Printworks, located across from Revolution Mills. The nomination is based on the building's story in relation to the industrial history of Greensboro, not its architecture. It was the first printing textile mill in the South. Mr. Cowhig was hopeful that the nomination would lead to tax-credit renovation and re-use.

City Council will review the application and consider supporting the nomination at their September 6, 2014 meeting. There will be a period of public comment relative to the application.

Ms. Cantrell left the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Ms. Bowers moved to support the application for the National Registration Nomination of Printworks, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 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 24, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Wayne Smith; Linda Lane; and Cindy Adams.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 27, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the August 27, 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 317 South Tate Street**
Application Number 1794
Applicant: Rick Sandler
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-5-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Place two small triangular concrete pads next to driveway to fill holes made by car tires.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 28-30) for the following reasons:

Fact:

317 South Tate Street is a turn-of-the-century house that has been converted to apartments. A wing was added to the back of the house early in its history for a total of 8 apartment units. Off-street parking was not provided when the house was converted to apartments. The driveway was paved at some point and provides some parking. It is difficult and hazardous to back out of the driveway onto Tate Street. This block of Tate Street is very busy and cars are parked on both sides making it difficult to see oncoming cars when pulling out of the driveway. Cars using the driveway have created ruts and holes next to the driveway. The property owner filled the holes with concrete.

Fact:

A relatively small amount of concrete was added to the existing concrete driveway. The new concrete stays within the width of the existing driveway and is within the width of the driveway apron. The overall effect on the character of the property and the district is minimal.

Guidelines (page 30):

For residential driveways, when needed introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible to existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, and design. Generally double-width driveways and circular driveways are not appropriate.

Construct new driveways and walkways in locations that require minimum alteration to the 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.

Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracts, narrow strips, brick, and crushed stone.

In Support:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1794 for after-the-fact work at 317 South Tate Street. The applicant and property owner is Rick Sandler. The work description is to place two small triangular concrete pads next to a driveway to fill in holes made by car tires. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that this originated from a complaint. Staff investigated and determined that a change was involved and a COA was needed. The application was submitted after-the-fact. He said the building has eight or more units and there is no off-street parking. Mr. Cowhig felt that the concrete really didn't affect the property. He said the work was congruous and referred to *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* as follows: (1) *Guideline 1. Retain historic sidewalks and driveways, including steps and sidewalks,* and (2) *Guideline 2. Select appropriate paving materials for new walkways including concrete, bricks, stone, and others.* He really did not see any other alternatives for this work and felt it was a matter of safety so residents did not have to back out into a busy part of Tate Street. When asked why it was not filled in, Mr. Cowhig indicated that it probably would look better if it was just one long driveway without the points in it. In support of the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who was speaking on behalf of the neighborhood association. The neighborhood felt the matter was a safety issue and although they were not exactly supportive, they could not find any reason to be in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell felt that an extended double driveway would be too overwhelming to the house. Although it does not look great, the current driveway does not look overwhelming. Chair Bowers commented that it is also not permanent so that if the house is ever restored, it would be easy enough to dig out. Ms. Cantrell stated that she had no issue with the pads but she was not supportive of a double driveway. Chair Bowers commented that this is an after-the-fact application. Mr. Cowhig said that the owner explained that he just didn't think this rose to the level of needing a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1794 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 presented at the meeting and guidelines on page 30 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1794 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Rick Sandler for work at 317 South Tate Street with the following condition: (1) that if the property owner is amenable to adding a small strip of concrete they should check with staff for those designs, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 912 Spring Garden Street**
Application Number 1804
Applicant: Ted Kairys
Property Owner: 200 Tate Street, LLC
Date Application Received: 9-9-14 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Create gravel parking area at end of existing driveway.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (pages 28-30) for the following reasons:

Facts:

912 Spring Garden Street is a single-family house built around 1920. A gravel parking area was created at the end of the existing driveway. It is just wide enough to park two cars side-by-side. The gravel is contained by landscape timbers. Because of the uneven terrain it would be difficult to park behind the house.

Guidelines: (page 30)

Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property.

Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.

In Support:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1804, an after-the-fact application for creating a gravel driveway at 912 Spring Garden Street. The applicant is Ted Kairys and the owner is 200 Tate Street, LLC. This is an after-the-fact application for a gravel parking lot behind the house with timber edges to keep the gravel in place. The backyard is too sloped for the parking lot to have gone directly behind the house. It is very small and contained. Mr. Cowhig confirmed that timbers are acceptable in backyards containing a driveway rather than a front yard for landscaping. There was also a discussion about fees not being imposed. He said that staff recommends in favor of granting this COA and cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* on page 30 as follows: *Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property.* He felt this met the sensibility of the guidelines. Also speaking in support of the

application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the neighborhood. She said that their opinion mirrored the staff's opinion and they were not opposed to the application.

Discussion:

Chair Bowers asked again how this owner managed to buy the property and not know that it is located in a historic district. There was a discussion about the after-the-fact policy and Mr. Cowhig stated that they have not been charging after-the-fact fees as the City has a process in place for fining individuals. He explained that the policy for charging a fee for after-the-fact applications was not officially adopted although it was part of the budget when approved. Mr. Cowhig said that there have been situations where the fee has been difficult to enforce. He cited instances when owners genuinely did not realize they were in a historic district and cases where the applicant felt that minor work was involved and a COA wouldn't be necessary. Counsel Jones clarified that the fee for after-the-fact applications was not adopted as part of the Ordinance. Mr. Arneke recalled that the Commission was told the \$250 fee was adopted by the City. Mr. Cowhig indicated staff has never been given instructions regarding the process of charging fees. Chair Bowers felt the matter should be discussed a later time so as to not delay the progress of the meeting.

Chair Bowers stated that as parking lots go, this is not bad and cannot really be seen. She said the question at hand is whether or not the Commission would have approved it had it not been after-the-fact. Mr. Arneke asked about guidelines concerning concealing edging for gravel driveways. Mr. Cowhig felt that ideally, they should be sunk into the ground and members noted that the angle of the ground would not allow that to happen. Members noted that the timber is only on one side of the lot and toward the end while a natural area is located on the other side.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1804 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 the following guidelines on page 30: *Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment,* are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Cantrell. Nays: Smith.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1804 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ted Kairys for work at 912 Spring Garden Street with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Lane, Adams, Cantrell. Nays: Smith.)

- (c) **Location: 200 South Tate Street**
Application Number: 1805
Applicant: Ted Kairys
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-9-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Front porch floor was replaced. The existing tongue-and-groove flooring was replaced with deck boards.

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 Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (pages 60-62) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The tongue-and-groove porch flooring was replaced with deck boards. Historically porch floors were constructed of tongue-and-groove boards.

Guidelines: (page 36)

(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 replaced deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*

In Support:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1805, an after-the-fact application for creating a porch using deck boards rather than the existing tongue-and-groove flooring. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (pages 62-66) and said the fact was that the front porch tongue-and-groove flooring was replaced with deck boards. Historically porch floors were constructed of tongue-and-groove boards. He also cited guidelines on page 36 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, etc.* He recommended against granting this COA. There was no one speaking in support of the application. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the neighborhood association. She said that the neighborhood was in opposition because the decking was inappropriate material.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke commented that this property is not set back very far and is obvious from the street. Ms. Cantrell felt that the work was glaring and highly obvious.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1805 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 the following guidelines on page 36: (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, etc.*, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Lane, Adams, Cantrell. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1805 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ted Kairys for work at 200 South Tate Street, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Lane, Adams, Cantrell. Nays: None.)

- (d) **Location: 1803 Magnolia Court**
Application Number: 1803
(CONTINUED UNTIL OCTOBER 29, 2014 MEETING)

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has requested that this matter be continued. The application will be heard at the October 29, 2014 meeting.

- (e) **Location: 1003 North Eugene Street**
Application Number: 1806
Applicant: Jane Nickles
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-11-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Construction of garage according to attached site plan and elevation drawings. Siding and trim to be fiber cement and foundation will be brick. Roof pitch will match the house.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-36) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The site for the proposed garage is consistent with historic site patterns for garages in the historic district. Hip roofs are a common roof form for garages in the historic district and lap siding is a common exterior construction material for historic garages.

Guidelines: (page 36)

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

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

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

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive, New Age Builders

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1806 for work at 1003 North Eugene Street. The applicant is Jane Nickles. The description of work is construction of garage with a pergola. The siding and trim are to be fiber cement and the foundation will be brick. The roof pitch will match the

house. Staff felt that the siding was consistent and recommended approving his application. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-36), specifically guidelines on page 36 as follows: (2) *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example;* (3) *Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished;* and (4) *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.* Mr. Cowhig noted that the maximum zoning allowance for height will be exceeded by 7 inches. This will have to be appealed to the Zoning Commission and in addition, the house is more than 50% of the footprint of the house. Speaking in support of the application was Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive. Responding to a question regarding the amount of concrete, he said that there was some intent to park under the pergola. He works with New Age Builders as a contractor. He noted that the foundation was no longer 3 feet from the property line but had been moved 5 feet so there was no encroachment into the 3-foot clearance. He also noted that the footprint of the house was the critical factor and not its square footage.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke commented that the house had a nice plan before but it was huge. This plan is smaller and better in that regard.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1806 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program and Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines 2, 3, and 4 on page 36, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Lane, Adams, Cantrell. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1806 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jane Nickles for work at 1003 North Eugene Street with the following condition: (1) that the Special Exemption be requested from the Zoning Commission because the square footage of the garage exceeds 50 percent of the house footprint and exceeds 7 inches of the height, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Lane, Adams, Cantrell. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Bowers updated members on 919 Spring Garden Street. Construction has started on the house and the owners did obtain a grant for the slate roof from the Covington Foundation.

For the record, Chair Bowers thanked Lois McManus for her service to the Commission.

Ms. McManus served for six years on the Commission. Her term expired and her last meeting with the HPC was August 27, 2014.

Chair Bowers thanked the City Council for having Commissioners to dinner last night. She indicated that it was an enjoyable evening.

Chair Bowers noted that the owners of property on West Bessemer Avenue have not yet planted the trees that the Commission required at a previous meeting. Mr. Cowhig stated that the owner has contacted him and is ready to plant the trees. The owner asked staff to give her direction as to the species of tree and planting location. He plans to contact the City Arborist to ask him visit the property and provide the information.

Chair Bowers asked staff for an update on the appeal that was heard by the Board of Adjustment earlier in the week. Counsel Jones informed members that the Board reversed the Commission's

earlier decision in a 7-0 vote. The Board believed that the work was a repair of an existing material that did not require a COA. Counsel Jones plans to distribute the written decision to members when it becomes available.

Mr. Arneke felt that there should be a specific clarification in the guidelines regarding the difference between the repair and replacement of materials.

Ms. Lane commented that the issue of penalties can go a long way in addressing the situation and could help change attitudes. Chair Bowers reiterated her frustration regarding how property owners can be unaware that they are in a historic district when they purchase their house. Ms. Lane pointed out that there is nothing in the closing documents that state a property is located in a historic district. During discussion members felt a major community outreach effort along with realtor education was needed to turn this situation around.

Mr. Cowhig noted that there has been discussion about the need for a major outreach and education campaign. He noted inconsistencies in the guidelines that were made apparent in the recent case appealed to the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Cowhig invited Commission members to participate in the effort to reach out to neighborhood associations to develop a strategy to inform new owners of the historic district.

Mr. Arneke volunteered to work with staff to review the guidelines making sure that there are no conflicts in items that need to be more specific.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

On behalf of the College Hill neighborhood, Mr. Arneke thanked everybody who was involved in saving 919 Spring Garden Street. He noted the phenomenal collaboration between the City, Planning Department, the College Hill neighborhood, and the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

None.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING
OCTOBER 29, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; David Arneke; Wayne Smith; David Hoggard; Sharon Graeber; and Cindy Adams.

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 absence of Linda Lane is excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 24, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the September 24, 2014 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Hoggard, Graeber, Adams. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 916 Walker Avenue**
Application Number 1810
Applicant: Kathy Burton
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-16-14 **(DENIED)**

Description of Work:

Deteriorated siding has been replaced with fiber cement siding in two locations on the house.

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 Design Guidelines—Exterior Wall Materials and Finishes (pages 44-47)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

Areas of deteriorated siding have been replaced with fiber cement siding. While exposure of the replacement matches that of the existing siding, the profile of the new siding does not match the profile of the original siding. Beveled siding is wider at the bottom than the top resulting in a distinctive shadow line. The fiber cement siding is the same thickness at both the top and bottom resulting in a different shadow line. There is also a difference in texture between fiber cement siding and wood siding.

Guidelines (page 47):

1. *Preserve original form, materials, and details of exterior walls. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material or detail with new material to match the historic material in composition, size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail. The appropriateness of substitute materials is reviewed based on the size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail as compared to the original material and, when available, past performance of the material in documented cases.*

In Support:

Kathy Burton, 403 Mayflower Drive
 Brad Dueterman, 403 Mayflower Drive
 Kathleen Black, 917 Walker Avenue

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Rebuttal in Support:

Kathy Burton, 403 Mayflower Drive
 Brad Deuterman, 403 Mayflower Drive

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1810 for work at 916 Walker Avenue. The applicant is Kathy Burton. The description of work is deteriorated siding that has been replaced with fiber cement siding in two locations on the house. This is an after-the-fact application. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that the guidelines are clear about matching materials. Attendees of past neighborhood meetings indicated that they wanted to see matching materials. Hardiplank is fine for additions and new construction but it is not acceptable for replacement within historic areas. He cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Wall Materials and Finishes (pages 44-47)*, specifically guideline 1 on page 47 as follows: *Preserve original form, materials and details of exterior walls. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material or detail with new material to match the historic material in composition, size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail. The appropriateness of substitute material is reviewed based on the size, shape, texture, pattern, and detail as compared to the original material and, when available, past performance of the material in documented cases.* Mr. Cowhig also observed that the original siding had a beveled edge and there is a very subtle difference between the shadow line and the texture of hardy plank versus the wood siding. Speaking in support of the application were Kathy Burton and Brad Deuterman of 403 Mayflower Drive. Ms. Burton addressed one of Mr. Cowhig's earlier comments and said they had previously used either cedar or cypress siding and it had not held up well. They had seen in the neighborhood other instances of Hardiplank being used. She stated that old growth wood is just not available and felt the guidelines were unclear. Mr. Deuterman commented on the old growth wood not being available and also said the backside of the house had a northern exposure with considerable water accumulation even though there are gutters. Mr. Arneke asked how long the scaffolding had been up. Mr. Deuterman said the house was purchased in 2002 and they painted it in 2005. They started painting again this winter but were unable to resume until this fall. In favor of the application was Kathleen Black, 917 Walker Avenue, who lives across. She has lived in the home, built in 1888, for two years. The back side of her house had been replaced with Masonite which was not holding up. She would like to find out if she could use Hardiplank or another similar product on the back of her house. She complimented the owners for their work on the house. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the neighborhood association. The association felt the guidelines were very specific and they indicated this did not fit the exception where you could use Hardiplank. They were not in favor of the application. Speaking in rebuttal in support of the application were Kathy Burton and Brad Deuterman of 403 Mayflower Drive. They felt the guidelines were not clear. They truly felt that there was not any kind of replacement product available for old growth wood with the same quality of the existing hard wood.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell did not think Hardiplank was an appropriate material to match historic materials on the original portion of the house. Ms. Geary commented that this matter is a significant issue in the preservation community. Ms. Cantrell commented that there was room for manufacturers of products like Hardiplank to create materials that more closely mimic true siding but at this time there are none.

Mr. Arneke felt that the guidelines were clear stating that materials should be used that match the historic material in composition, size, shape, and texture. Mr. Hoggard stated that Mr. Deuterma's point was well-made that sidings available today are not what they used to be. Measures must be taken to make current sidings last a little longer. He also felt that the guidelines were very straight forward. The size, composition, and texture of Hardiplank are different. Commissioners commented that this is an after-the-fact application and members must look at this as if the work had not been done. Mr. Smith pointed out that the applicant could salvage wood from the rear of the house, where there is more leniency in using Hardiplank, and place it in the front. In addition, increased layers of Hardiplank would address the issue of smoothness by increasing the thickness. It was noted that salvage siding might be available for use on the house.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1810 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments presented at the meeting and guideline 1 on page 47 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1810 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kathy Burton for work at 916 Walker Avenue, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 110 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number 1819
Applicant: William Burckley
Property Owner: Greensboro Boxwood Associates, Inc.
Date Application Received: 10-18-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Demolition and removal of granite retaining wall in front of property. Granite steps to remain.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends delaying the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 365 days. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* (pages 24-26) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The granite retaining wall is considered a significant site feature. It is identified as a historic resource in the College Hill Historic District National Register nomination.

Guidelines: (page 26)

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

Note: Section 30-4-12.1 G.7. of the Land Development Ordinance: *"An application for a Certificate of Appropriateness authorizing the demolition of the designated building or structure or the destruction of an object may not be denied. However, the effective date of a Certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of approval. The maximum period of delay may be reduced by the Commission where it finds that the delay would cause the owner extreme*

hardship or deprivation of beneficial use of or return from the property. During the delay period the Historic Preservation Commission may negotiate with the owner and with any other parties in an effort to find a means of preserving the building, structure, or object.”

In Support:

Bill Burckley, 110 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1819 for work at 110 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Bill Burckley. The description of work is the demolition and removal of the granite retaining wall in front of the property with granite steps and cheek wall to remain. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that they had excavated behind the wall to relieve the water pressure. This home was rescued by Mr. Burckley, Betty Cone and others and a lot of restoration work on this property has been done. There was a question about using MSD funds to fix the leaning wall. The cost to repair the property is \$16,000 to \$18,000. Mr. Burckley has a quote from a qualified stone mason. Mr. Cowhig commented that delaying the application for 365 days buys time. Zoning has issued a notice for an unsafe wall that needs stabilizing under Minimum Housing codes. He also suggested that the Commission delay the issuance of a COA for 365 days citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* on pages 24-26. The granite is considered a significant site feature and is also part of the College Hill National Historic Register Nomination. He also referenced a special note from the Land Development Ordinance as follows: *An application for a Certificate of Appropriateness authorizing the demolition of a designated building or structure or the destruction of an object may not be denied. However, the effective date of a Certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of approval.* Speaking in support of the application was Bill Burckley, 701 Morehead Avenue. He said the wall had tilted out about four inches which happened within a three to four week period of time. It stopped moving once there was excavation behind the wall. He plans to do a backfill. Mr. Burckley pointed out he and others had saved these buildings in 1986 but they are still currently zoned for offices. He felt the property was a money pit. He wanted to put a concrete retaining wall behind the existing granite wall and then cover it with grass to hide it. The reason they were unable to finish the repair was because someone in the neighborhood complained and the code officers came and said the wall had to be repaired or demolished. He discussed the lack of funds and said he would be interested in using MSD funds if it were to be approved. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the neighborhood association. The association asked the Commission to preserve the wall in any way possible.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1819 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments presented at the meeting and guidelines on page 26 and the Land Development Ordinance Section 30-4-12.1G.7 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1819 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bill Burckley for work at 110

South Mendenhall Street with the following condition: (1) Any demolition for removal of the granite retaining wall in front of the property be delayed for 365 days, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 921 Carr Street**
Application Number: 1815
Applicant: Joseph Hellen
Property Owner: Louis J. Towne
Date Application Received: 9-30-14 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Satellite dish installed on front slope of roof.

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 Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (pages 38-40) for the following reasons:

Facts:

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

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.*

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1815 for work at 921 Carr Street. The applicant is Joseph Hellen. This is an after-the-fact application and the satellite dish has been installed on the front slope of the roof. Staff recommends against granting the COA and cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (pages 38-40). The guidelines on page 40 read as follows: (1) *Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building; and (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.* Mr. Cowhig said that satellite installations require a COA. There is a law that devices cannot be prohibited or restricted except in National Historic Districts, of which College Hill is one. It must be determined if the signal can be received in another location. There was no one speaking in support of the application. In opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the neighborhood association. She said the association felt the location was inappropriate and they rejected the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell felt that they did not look at any other location except the most obvious and easiest one. Usually, satellites can be placed in less conspicuous places.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber 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 incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 40, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1815 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joseph Hellen for work at 921 Carr Street, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (d) Location: 709 Walker Avenue**
Application Number: 1820
Applicant: Otis M. Ball
Property Owner: Millie P. Goodnight
Date Application Received: 10-2-14 (CONTINUED)

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has requested a continuance of this application.

Mr. Hoggard moved to continue item (d) for work at 709 Walker Avenue, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (e) Location: 817 Rankin Place**
Application Number: 1818
Applicant: Paul Peters
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 10-6-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Landscaping and site improvements.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the City Arborist, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way (page 19)* and *Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reasons:

Note: The proposed fence changes can be approved at the staff level.

Facts:

The proposed landscaping plan maintains the character of the property and the historic district. Two oak trees were planted in the front yard when the house was built in 2005. One was removed recently. This is a small front yard. Because Willow Oak trees are so large at maturity, the space is better suited for one tree.

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.*

Facts:

The planting strip between the sidewalk and curb has proven to be a problem area especially in College Hill because of the high volume of foot traffic and on street parking. They are difficult to maintain and grass is either overgrown or non-existent in many locations. Brick pavers combined with planting spaces has proven to be a popular and attractive alternative to the grass strip. It maintains the historic design of a space between sidewalk and curb in a manner that requires very little maintenance. This treatment has been approved previously in College Hill. The same principles would apply to the space between the two driveways.

Guidelines (Page 20):

3. *Maintain the planting strip between the street and sidewalk. It is not appropriate to surface the strip with pavement or other materials. Brick may be considered where a hard surface is needed.*

Recommended Condition:

That the pavers between sidewalk and curb and between the driveways include planting spaces and that appropriate trees, shrubs or other vegetation be started.

Mr. Hoggard moved to excuse Ms. Adams from the meeting, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

In Support:

Paul Peters, 817 Rankin Place
Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1818 for work at 817 Rankin Place. The applicant is Paul Peters. The description of work is landscaping and site improvements. Due to information contained in the application and review by the City Arborist, staff is recommending in favor of the application. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way (page 19)* and *Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* and also cited guidelines on page 23 as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district; and (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.* Mr. Cowhig stated that this house is new construction built in 2005. The homeowner did not realize that landscaping was included in historic district guidelines. One of the Willow Oak trees has been removed. The homeowner noted that Willow Oaks get so large at maturity, having two Willow Oaks in a very small front yard was inappropriate. The Commission mentioned having brick pavers in the strip between the strip and sidewalk and also brick pavers in between the two driveways. Mr. Cowhig suggested that they be allowed to install some vegetation growth between them. There was also a fencing application that will be handled at the staff level. Speaking in support of the application was Paul Peters, 817 Rankin Street, who would like to do the pavers between the street and sidewalk because there is a lot of foot traffic and grass does not grow well in that area. He would like pavers in the area between the driveways because the neighbor next door is not careful about keeping the grass mowed. He also said he would consider adding greenery inside the brick pavers to make it look more lush. He said he regretted removing the tree without asking permission. Ms. Cantrell asked the owner if he was considering replanting another tree to replace the Willow Oak. Mr. Peters indicated that he was not

but intended to replace trees and bushes that were taken out in the last ice storm. Speaking also in support of the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who said the neighborhood association was in support of the application even if they did take out the Willow Oak tree.

Discussion:

Mr. Smith noted that the plan contains a structural screen in the porch area. Mr. Peters indicated that he does not want to follow through with the screen. It was a recommendation from the landscaper. He offered to sign a statement saying that the screen will not be installed. If it is installed at a later date, it can be done with staff approval. Mr. Arneke commented that the easement strips are narrow and the pavers have no effect on the historical character of the neighborhood. Mr. Smith felt the pavers would provide a good contrast.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1818 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 on page 23, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1818 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Paul Peters for work at 817 Rankin Place, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. Ms. Cantrell offered a friendly amendment that conditions be added as follows: (1) That pavers between sidewalk and curb and between the driveways include planting spaces; and (2) That appropriate trees, shrubs or other vegetation be started. Mr. Smith accepted the friendly amendment. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (f) **Location: 714 Summit Avenue**
Application Number: 1821
Applicant: Melody Christy
Property Owner: Perry Jeffries
Date Application Received: 10-13-14 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install new freestanding sign and replace sign on building.

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—Signs* (pages 34) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The proposal is for a relatively small freestanding yard sign constructed of aluminum. The total height is 5 feet. The sign will be located near the public sidewalk in the location of an existing sign. The sign will be externally lighted. The existing sign on the building will be changed with the new wording using individual letters.

Guidelines: (page 36)

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.*

Recommended Conditions:

That if the yard sign is to be illuminated, use hidden ground spotlights.

That the yard sign be increased in height to 6 feet to meet the City's sign ordinance.

In Support:

Aycock Neighborhood Association, as communicated through Ms. Geary

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1821 for work at 714 Summit Avenue. The applicant is Melody Christy and the description of work is to install a new freestanding sign and replace the sign on the building. The building is a non-contributing structure. Staff is in favor of the application with conditions. Staff feels that the project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Signs* (pages 34) citing guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4. The sign is relatively small and freestanding. The height is five feet and it is constructed of aluminum. The recommended conditions are that if the yard sign is to be illuminated, use hidden ground spotlights and that the yard sign be increased in height to 6 feet to meet the City's sign ordinance. The sign ordinance was passed around to members for their review. If the sign is less than six feet, it must be a monument sign. Ms. Geary stated that the Aycock neighborhood had voted in favor of the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell pointed out that Summit Avenue is a very heavily travelled road with four lanes of traffic along with turn lanes. A small sign could be detrimental to traffic on a major thoroughfare.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Graeber moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1821 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program and Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 34, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Graeber moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1821 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Melody Christy for work at 714 Summit Avenue with the following condition: (1) That the yard sign is to be illuminated by use of hidden ground spotlights; and (2) That the sign be increased in height to six feet to meet the City's sign ordinance, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. Mr. Hoggard offered a friendly amendment for the following condition: (3) That either a five or six-foot fence would be accepted. Ms. Graeber accepted the friendly amendment. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (g) **Location: 617 North Elm Street**
Application Number: 1823
Applicant: Tim Millisor
Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church

Date Application Received: 10-414 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install new freestanding informational signs at select locations on the church campus.

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—Signs* (pages 34) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The proposal is for relatively small informational signs constructed of aluminum at various locations around the church campus.

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:

Tim Millisor, 617 North Elm Street, First Presbyterian Church

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1823 for work at First Presbyterian Church. The applicant is Tim Millisor. The description of work is installation of new freestanding informational signs at select locations on the church campus. Staff recommends in favor of granting the COA and felt it was congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Signs* (pages 34) because it is a relatively small information sign constructed of aluminum at various locations around the church campus. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 34. He said the signs will be made of aluminum and will be no larger than necessary. Speaking in support of the application was Tim Millisor, 617 North Elm Street, who works for First Presbyterian Church. He indicated that the two sided three-foot sign would be located at the welcome center and the other two-foot signs would be along Greene Street near the entrances to different buildings at the church. There was no one else speaking in support and there was no one to speak in opposition of the request.

Discussion:

Members felt that the Church had done a nice job with the proposed signage.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1823 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program and Manual Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines on page 34 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; (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; seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1823 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to First Presbyterian Church for work at 617 North Elm Street and surrounding areas with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Arneke stated that Edgar Street in the College Hill neighborhood has been maintained by the City for decades. The street has City signage and the City has put street lights in and at one point planned to pave it. He said that staff can find no records to verify that Edgar Street is owned by the City. He asked Counsel Jones to research and determine whether or not the City actually owns Edgar Street. Counsel Jones commented that it is possible the original developer retained the street. In addition, it is possible that the City maintains the street without ownership. She plans to look into matter.

Mr. Arneke followed up on a discussion held at the last meeting regarding after-the-fact COA applications and whether or not there is a \$250 fee for after-the fact applications. He has been informed that City Council did approve the \$250 fee but staff has been unable to work out a process for assessing the fees in a way that is considered legally sustainable. The College Hill Neighborhood Association is requesting that the City Attorney's Office look into the situation to determine how the fee can legally be established. Counsel Jones stated her intention to look into the situation.

Mr. Cowhig commented that when the City passed its budget two years ago, they included fees for COAs that come before the Commission that included the \$250 fee for an after-the-fact application. There was a reaction in the neighborhood that led to conversations with City Council members. The result was that the fees were tabled.

Counsel Jones stated that there is a concern that the after-the-fact application fee is a penalty and not a fee. Therefore, it must established that there is an actual relationship between the fee that is charged for the application and staff's time.

Ms. Geary commented that there is already a violation process in place through the City's zoning enforcement.

Members commented that half of the applications are after-the-fact applications. There should be a way to inform people of requirements in the Historic District so as to not penalize those people who follow the rules.

Ms. Cockburn stated that staff is sensitive to the fact that there have been large numbers of after-the-fact applications. They are moving forward with an educational campaign in conjunction with the historic neighborhoods.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church, updated members on ongoing renovations occurring at the church. He explained that exterior scaffolding has been put up recently to address water problems. It

was determined that water was coming in around each major turret around the perimeter of the sanctuary. They engaged the services of an engineering company to develop a solution to the water problem. He advised members that a COA will be coming to the Commission in the future for major renovations to the outside of the structure.

The church consulted with Masonry Preservation Services and petrographic analysis of the stone was performed and core samples were taken. They discovered that the stone material was cast concrete from 1928. It was determined that water could penetrate the material in several ways. He discussed findings that included failed mortar joints, cracking in the concrete stone where it meets the metal flashing, cracking within the stone itself, degradation of cementitious paste, and a series of structural problems.

He described the detailed process to repair the roof and gutter system. The cost for the repair was estimated at eight million dollars with a completion date of 24 months. He indicated that the church was unable to provide the funds at that time; however, a solution had to be found to seal off the leaking water. The current plan that has been put in place has sealed off the perimeter to stop water intrusion. They have tuck pointed all the stone turrets, replaced the mortar to seal the joints, sikalastic material has been put around the stone turrets where the copper flashing meets the stone, a concrete sealant has been applied to the coping stone, and pins were installed in the horizontal cracks in the coping stones. The deteriorated crockets were removed from the turrets and concrete sealant was applied. In addition, the entire balustrade was removed. Mr. Millisor stated that 10 to 20 percent of the removed material has been preserved and stored for future construction. Their goal is that in 10 to 15 years enough money can be raised to fully restore the exterior sanctuary. The scaffolding should be removed in two weeks and water testing has proven that the issue has been dealt with as best as possible for now.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:43 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 3, 2014**

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

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.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

Mr. Cowhig clarified that this is a combined meeting for November and December, 2014 due to the holidays. The meeting packets were sent out early and Item D, Application 1831, was not in the packet. The item has been properly advertised and is on the agenda.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 29, 2014 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the October 29, 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Smith, Lane, Graeber, Adams. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arneke joined the meeting at 4:09 p.m.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 709 Walker Avenue
Application Number 1820
Applicant: Otis M. Ball
Property Owner: Millie P. Goodnight
Date Application Received: 10-2-14 (Continued from October 29, 2014 meeting)
(GRANTED WITH CONDITION)**

Description of Work:

Wheelchair 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 (COA). In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (pages 69-70)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The wheelchair ramp is needed for the homeowner who has a disability. The ramp is located at the front porch and extends to the public sidewalk. This is likely the only feasible location for the ramp

that would meet slope requirements. The ramp can be removed without damaging the structure and did not require any changes to the structure when it was built.

Guidelines (page 70):

1. *Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous 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 Conditions:

That the ramp be painted.

In Support:

Otis Ball, 709 Walker Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1820 for 709 Walker Avenue. The applicant is Otis Ball and the owner is Millie Goodnight. This was continued from the October 29, 2014 meeting and the work description is for a wheelchair ramp at the front porch. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA with conditions. Staff felt the ramp was a need of the homeowner who has had surgery. The ramp is located at the front porch and extends to sidewalk. This seems to be the only feasible location for the ramp due to the slope at the back of the house. The ramp can be removed without damaging the structure and it will not require any changes to the structure when built. Staff cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 47. The recommended condition was that the ramp should be painted. This is an after-the-fact application. The ramp was built for the homeowner by a contractor. Mr. Cowhig said that if this application had come to him before, they might have recommended a different rail style. He commented that this project needed a building permit. Speaking in support of the application was Otis Ball, 709 Walker Avenue, who stated that Ms. Goodnight had a back operation and was confined to a wheelchair and will be home in about three weeks. He checked with the Department of Transportation and asked if the ramp would be agreeable. They felt that it did not encroach too much on the sidewalk and noted it was a temporary structure. Mr. Ball spoke with the Permit Department who informed him a COA was needed in order to get a permit. The ramp is a wood structure and was built about two months ago. He said the ramp is temporary and apologized for not knowing realizing a COA was required.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell was pleased that the Permit Department informed the applicant a COA was required. Mr. Ball confirmed for Mr. Smith that the ramp is for temporary use until the homeowner is walking again. The Department of Transportation felt that the structure could be easily removed as it is not attached to the house. Mr. Smith suggested that a condition be put on the application that the ramp is not to be in place for longer than a year. If it was to remain a permanent structure more attention should be given to the ramp and the rails should be addressed. He felt that 36 inch guardrails would look better than 42 inch rails.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1820 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 presented at the meeting and guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 70 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1820 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Millie Goodnight for work at 709 Walker Avenue, with the following condition: (1) that the ramp be dismantled after a period of 18 months and if the homeowner requires a ramp after that time, they should revise the railings of the ramp to be accordance with Historic Design Guidelines, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 301 East Hendrix Street**
Application Number 1828
Applicant: Jesse Arnett, New Age Builders
Property Owner: Marianne Gingher
Date Application Received: 11-14-14
(GRANTED WITH NO 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. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The location of the proposed addition is at the back of the house where it will not affect character-defining features of the house. It is a small addition. The roof is designed to match the bungalow style roof of the house. Because of its form it will be distinguishable as an addition.

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:

Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1828 for work at 301 East Hendrix Street. The applicant is Jesse Arnett with New Age Builders. The owner is Marianne Gingher and the description of work is for an addition to be constructed at the back of the house. Staff recommended in favor of granting this COA citing guidelines 1, 2, and 3 for *Additions* on page 76. Mr. Cowhig said this location for the addition at the back of the house would not affect the character defining features of the house. It is a

very small addition, the roof is matching the bungalow style of the house, and the form of the extension will make it distinguishable as an addition. He felt this approval could have been made at staff level; however, this is a corner lot making it necessary for the Commission's review. There was a question about how the addition was distinguished from the rest of the house by form along with a comment on the closeness of the door to the new construction. Speaking in favor of the application was Jesse Arnett, 3024 Stratford Drive, with New Age Builders. He commented that they contemplated putting a roof over the door but there was an issue with the budget. He commented on the shape, rafter, tails, and other items. Ms. Cantrell asked about painting the brick versus not painting the brick. There were no other speakers.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1828 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 presented at the meeting and guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 76 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1828 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jesse Arnett and New Age Builders for work at 301 East Hendrix Street, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Lane. Nays: None.)

- (c) Location: 547 South Mendenhall Street (University General Store)**
Application Number: 1829
Applicant: Chris Martin
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 11-20-14
(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

New signs have been installed.

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—Commercial and/or Institutional and Signs* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This building originally housed a horse drawn steam pumper and was known as the West End Hose Company. Today it is being used as a neighborhood grocery store. It is a good example of an adaptive reuse of a historic building. There are three internally lighted signs with metal cabinets.

Guidelines: (page 37)

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.*
- 5 *Billboards (outdoor advertising signs) and other tall freestanding signs, portable signs, flashing or lighted message signs, plastic signs, and signs with internally illuminated letters are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*
- 7 *Signage should be compatible with the original use of a building.*
 - A. *It is not historically appropriate to install signs directly on facades or porch roofs of residential buildings and those buildings originally intended for residential use. The installation of a freestanding sign is most appropriate, as it is less likely to detract from the architecture of the building.*
 - B. *Place signs for historic commercial buildings in locations originally intended for signage, such as at top of the storefront or on windows, doors, or awnings.*
 - C. *Signage for new commercial buildings should reflect similar placement to that of historic commercial buildings in the neighborhood.*

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.*

Recommended Conditions:

That consideration be given to replacing the existing security and floodlights on the building to a full cutoff fixture to reduce glare and light trespass.

In Support:

Chris Martin, 547 South Mendenhall Street
James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1829 for work at 547 South Mendenhall Street, the former General Store. The applicant is Chris Martin and the description of work is that new signs have been installed as well as new front door and filling in the concrete per Mr. Cowhig. Staff's recommendation is to grant the COA with conditions. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7A, 7B, and 7C on page 37. He said that the building was originally a horse drawn steam pumper station known as the West End Hose Company. It is now a neighborhood grocery store and a good example of adaptive reuse of a historic building. There are three internally lit signs that are against the guidelines. He commented on guidelines discussing applicability to commercial and institutional properties on page 9. He said that the functional needs of the commercial or institutional property owner must be considered and the architecture of the building should be valued and preserved in its own right. The condition suggested by staff was that consideration be given to replacing the existing security and floodlights on the building to a full cutoff fixture to reduce glare and light trespass. Members asked if signs have to be internally lit since there are gooseneck light fixtures overhead.

The current owners are not new owners and this is an after-the-fact application. Speaking in support of the application was Chris Martin, 547 South Mendenhall Street, who said they had started to rebrand the building working inside and became carried away with the outside. They put vinyl screen print over the existing sign boxes and added new doors for more security which are more open doors to replace old fiberglass doors with chicken wire. They discussed exterior lighting and why so much exterior lighting is needed. Mr. Cowhig noted there is no COA required for security lighting. There was no one else to speak in support of the application and there was no one to speak in opposition.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke stated that the only thing bothersome about this is the internal illumination of the signs. If this problem can be remedied, he will support the application. He agreed with Mr. Cowhig that it would be good if there was a better way to implement the security lighting. Chair Bowers felt that there should be ample lighting for security in the evening. Mr. Arneke pointed out that this area is one that the neighborhood association and City have targeted for more streetlights. Ms. Cantrell noted that the security lights need to be pointed toward areas where people stand and congregate. Mr. Smith felt that the sidewalk infill has created a better condition. He believed that blinders could be purchased for the lighting that fit over the lens to direct the light straight down. He felt the sign should be changed and should not be internally lit. Ms. Cantrell pointed out that the sign was not intended to be internally illuminated. Mr. Martin reviewed all of the changes and upgrades recently made to the structure. James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall, arrived late to the meeting and asked to speak in support of the application. Mr. Keith was sworn as to his testimony in this matter. He was present on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association who met last night to discuss this application. They were supportive and very impressed with the efforts made by the owners. The only negative comment at the meeting was that they wished it had gone through the correct process.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1829 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, 5, and 7A, B, and C on page 37 along with guidelines 1 and 2 on page 9 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Lane. Nays: Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1829 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Chris Martin for work at 547 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) that the internally illuminated signs be converted to exterior illumination only, and (2) that consideration be given to replacing existing security and floodlights on the building to a full cutoff fixture to reduce glare and light trespass, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Graeber, Lane. Nays: Cantrell.)

- (e) Location: Various locations throughout the College Hill neighborhood**
Application Number: 1831
Applicant: Kym Smith for the City of Greensboro
Property Owner: N/A
(GRANTED)

Description of Work:

Install Sanibel street light fixture on existing wood poles in locations where the decorative street lighting is not sufficient.

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—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way (page 20)* and *Trees and Landscaping (page 21)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The application is based on the City's assessment of lighting throughout the neighborhood. Light levels in certain areas, especially along Spring Garden where there is a high volume of pedestrian activity, are inadequate. Standard street lights were proposed for these areas. As an alternative the City is proposing to use the Sanibel light fixture which is more in keeping with the character of the historic district.

Guidelines (page 20):

7. *Introduce street lighting of a human scale that is consistent with the design and the illumination level of special street lighting in the Historic Districts.*

In Support:

James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1831 for work at various locations throughout the College Hill neighborhood. The applicant is Kym Smith for the City of Greensboro. The description of work is for the installation of Sanibel streetlight fixtures on existing wood poles at locations where the decorative street lighting is not sufficient. Staff recommends in favor of granting this application. Mr. Cowhig indicated it had taken quite a while getting to this point working with the neighborhood to come up with the pole mounted Sanibel light fixture. He noted it is a very contained light. The fixture is for areas where there is inadequate lighting, particularly on Spring Garden Street. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way*, guideline number 7 on page 20. Speaking in support of the application was James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, representing the College Hill neighborhood. He said they were in favor of the application and that Duke Energy had been very cooperative working with everyone. He felt there might be an additional place where a pole should be added for lighting.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke stated that this project has received great support from the neighborhood. There are a lot of places in College Hill that need more lighting, particularly along Spring Garden Street between Mendenhall Street and Tate Street.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1831 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 7 on page 20 under *Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way*, are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1831 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro for

work at the College Hill neighborhood, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Arneke, Smith, Graeber, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Chair Bowers encouraged members to go by Well Spring to vote on Preservation Greensboro's Victorian Christmas tree. Twelve Christmas trees from local non-profit organizations are on display.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the Education and Outreach Committee that was recently formed. The committee is comprised of Commission members along with representatives from the historic districts. Their goal is to develop a strategy in conjunction with the neighborhoods that will include some action steps to raise awareness. They have discussed activities such as producing brochures that can be mailed to real estate agents and the building inspection office for distribution to residents of historic neighborhoods. They have also proposed sending mailings out at certain intervals to people in the historic districts. Other suggestions include regular conversations in historic districts with Commissioners. An action step that was proposed was to troubleshoot the building inspection and Certificate of Appropriateness interface as a step toward further improvement in the process. He felt the committee could make a big difference in reducing after-the-fact applications.

Mr. Cowhig stated that the Historic Preservation Commission is one of the few boards where training is a requirement. Staff proposed holding an in-house training session with HPC staff and Counsel Jones. He noted that other boards and commissions have expressed interest in participating in the session and it has developed into a regional training event. Ms. Geary is working on details of the event that will be a Commissioner's training session held in Greensboro for Historic Preservation Commissions in the central part of the state. Ms. Geary indicated that the event will be held in February, 2015 and she asked members for their feedback regarding their preference for a half-day or full-day session along with their preferred day of the week.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, stated that the neighborhood is excited to be working with the Planning Department. He noted that the last College Hill Neighborhood Association meeting had a better turnout than had been seen in years. In addition, he said that Duke Energy's participation has been surprising and they have worked well with the neighborhood. He expressed his appreciation to the Planning Department for their efforts.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd