

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JANUARY 14, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair; Lois McManus; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Tom Sears, Ann Bowers and David Hoggard.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Ms. Spaeh was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 31, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the October 31, 2012 meeting as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

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

- (a) **Location: 929 Walker Avenue**
Application No. 1598
Applicant: John Stewart
Property Owner: Shi Guan
Date Application Received: 11-16-12 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

The back porch was enclosed using vinyl siding and windows. Some deteriorated tongue-and-groove soffit boards were replaced with plywood. The applicant is proposing to replace the windows with new wood windows, casings and trim to match original windows on the house. The vinyl siding would be replaced with either wood or fiber cement siding to match the original siding. The plywood used to repair the soffits will be replaced with tongue and groove boards to match the original material.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, if the conditions are met then the porch enclosure will be consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions page 75-76 for the following reasons:*

Fact:

The enclosed area is not an original part of the house. It "reads" as an addition.

Fact:

The enclosed area is offset from the main body of the house and is therefore distinguished from the original structure. It does not obscure, destroy, damage or radically change character-defining features of the house. Similar design and materials make the addition compatible with the house.

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.*
6. *Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

In Support:

John Stewart, 6401 Rock Springs Road

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1598 for work at 929 Walker Avenue. The applicant is John Stewart. The description of work is to enclose the back porch and make exterior repairs. Staff recommends that this work can move forward with conditions that the proper cement siding be used as well as window casings and moldings that match the historic detailing, to be submitted to staff for review. The guidelines cited in this case are on page 76, guidelines 1 through 6.

Discussion:

Commissioners commented that the applicant has come up with a good solution for this work.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1598 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 staff comments detailed in the agenda and guidelines 1-6 on page 76 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1598 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. John Stewart for work at 929 Walker Avenue with the following conditions: (1) that the windows be replaced to match the existing windows on the back, (2) the siding be replaced with fiber cement, (3) that the roofline be extended to match the existing width, and (4) that all details be submitted to staff for review, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**(b) Location: 754 Chestnut Street
Application No. 1600
(CONTINUED)**

Ms. Geary stated that the owner has requested that this item be continued until the next meeting.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on January 30, 2013.

Mr. Hoggard updated members on a movement downtown to prevent demolition by neglect. He noted that there is an Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect that covers local historic districts and Guilford County landmarks located inside the city. There is currently no money available to fund the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect. Mr. Hoggard felt that the Historic Preservation Commission should be a proactive voice to push for funding. Members discussed efforts to enforce civil penalties as a solution.

At the next meeting, members plan to move forward with a recommendation to City Council to request funding for the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition.

Mr. Hoggard stated that the Commission should be involved in the process moving forward with War Memorial Stadium. He reported that another consultant has been hired by the City.

Ms. Geary is currently working with a group of staff members and A&T University representatives who have been meeting regularly for eight months to come up with a plan for the stadium. She updated members on work being done including a grant application for a historic structure report.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 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
JANUARY 30, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair; Ann Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; and Tom Sears.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Ms. Spaeh and Ms. McManus were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 5, 2012 MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the December 5, 2012 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 14, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Sears moved approval of the January 14, 2013 minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

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

- a) **Location: 617 North Elm Street**
Application No. 1607
Applicant: First Presbyterian Church
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 1-10-13 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

- New water service in below grade vault covered with a metal door flush with the ground on the North Elm Street side of property.
- New utility yard on North Greene Street side of property to include electrical transformer, gas meter, domestic water meter and back flow preventer.
- New entrance to the Smith Building from Fisher Park Circle.
- Reglazing of bathroom 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 project is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines -- Commercial and/or Institutional (page 9), and Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The Smith Building is a wing of First Presbyterian Church just to the east of the main sanctuary. In order to meet the functional needs of the church, interior spaces are being redesigned and a new entrance is

being proposed for the wall that faces Fisher Park Circle. The proposed entrance uses compatible windows, doors, and details in a manner that maintains the architectural character of the building.

Construction materials will match the existing as closely as possible. The windows proposed for reglazing are in an inconspicuous location on the building.

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 strict in order to meet the objectives of both the property owner and the intent of the guidelines.

Guidelines (page 57):

(1) Retain and preserve the pattern arrangement and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduced 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.

Fact:

The utility yard is needed because today certain equipment items are required to be in exterior locations. Good examples are gas meters and back flow preventers. In this case the utility yard will be screened using existing and new plant materials.

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.

(3) Install mechanical equipment, such as electrical panels or gas meters, at grade level when they are visible from the street, and screen with shrubbery or other landscaping.

(4) Locate new mechanical supply lines, pipes, and ductwork on the interior of the structure. If an interior location is not feasible, place in inconspicuous locations and/or conceal with architectural elements such as downspouts.

(5) Place utility service lines underground where possible, to eliminate overhead lines and poles.

(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:

Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church, 617 North Elm Street
 Jeff Harbinson, 1311 Brookstown Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC
 Randal Romie, 2033 Briar Run Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1607 for property at First Presbyterian Church, 617 North Elm Street. Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church, indicated that the description of work includes new water service in a below grade vault covered with a metal door flush with the ground on the North Elm Street side of property; new utility yard on North Greene Street side of property to include electrical transformer, gas meter, domestic water meter and back flow preventer; new entrance to the Smith Building from Fisher Park Circle; and reglazing of bathroom windows. Staff recommends approval and cites guidelines 1 and 2 on page 9; guideline 1 on page 57; and guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on page 40. Mr. Millisor spoke in favor of the application and gave an overview of some of the improvements on the interior along with impacts on the exterior. Jeff Harbinson, 1311 Brookstown Avenue, Winston Salem, North Carolina, is the architect for the project. He addressed questions about glazing and door material. Randall Romie, 2033 Briar Run Drive, gave an overview of the landscaping and distributed additional materials.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers stated her support of the plan for the new entrance. She felt that the new design would fit in well and had no objections to the new entryway and door. Ms. Cantrell stated that she did not object to the design because this is an institutional use.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1607 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 1 and 2 on page 9; guideline 1 on page 57; and guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on page 40 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1607 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tim Millisor for work at 617 North Elm Street, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

- b) Location: 518 Fifth Avenue**
Application No. 1603
Applicant: Camilla Cornelius
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 1-3-13 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

- Construction of addition at back of house.
- Construction of brick wall.

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, with conditions, the proposed addition and brick wall will be consistent with the Historic District Design Guidelines -- Additions (page 75-76), and Fences, Walls and Site Features (pages 24-26) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The addition will be at the rear of the structure and should not obscure, change or damage any character-defining features of the house. It will be distinguishable from the original structure because of the difference in roof line and wall plane. Materials will be compatible with those of the house.

Note: A Special Exception will be required because the original structure encroaches into the side yard setback.

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

Fact:

If the wall is relocated to outside of the traffic sight obstruction triangles, it will still provide some privacy for a back yard that is very exposed because of its location on a corner lot.

Note: The wall will require a Special Exception since it is 6 feet high within 15 feet of a street-right-of way.

Guidelines (page 26):

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

- (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.)*

In Support:

Stephen Ruzicka, 517 Fifth Avenue
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1603 for property located at 518 Fifth Avenue. The description of work includes the construction of an addition in the back and the construction of a brick wall. The staff recommends in favor of the application with suggestions dealing with the walls. Staff requests that recommended special exceptions be given if there is a positive finding by the Commission. One special exception would be for the 40-inch height restriction and another for the sight obstruction setback restriction. Staff cited guidelines 1 through 6 on page 76 and guideline 5, A, B, and C on page 26. Steve Ruzicka, 517 Fifth Avenue, spoke in favor of the project. Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, was present to represent the Aycock Neighborhood Association. She said that the neighborhood was also in support of the project.

Discussion:

Members felt that the project was well thought out. Mr. Cowhig explained that staff recommends that the fence be moved per the City's sight obstruction rules. The two requested exceptions are not conditions.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1603 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 as detailed and guidelines 1 through 6 on page 76 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. Ms. Cantrell amended her motion and added guidelines 5, A, B, and C on page 26 to the findings of fact.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1603 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Camilla Cornelius for work at 518 Fifth Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the proposed fence be moved so as not to obstruct sight lines, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion for Special Exceptions:

Ms. Cantrell moved to recommend two Special Exceptions to the Board of Adjustments relative to application number 1603 as follows: (1) an exception on the height of the walls and, (2) an exception for the setback of the side yard, as the project meets the intent of the guidelines, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

c) Location: 754 Chestnut Street**Application No. 1600****Applicant: John Mandrano****Property Owner: Same****Date Application Received: 11-29-12 (Continued from the January 14, 2013 meeting)****(DENIED)****Description of Work:**

The landing at the top of the exterior stairs to the second story apartment was expanded without a COA or a Building Permit. The work does not meet the Building Code and it encroaches into the required side yard setback. The property owner submitted a COA application for the landing that was denied on October 31, 2012. The property owner has submitted a new COA application to replace the current landing. The new landing would be smaller and would no longer encroach into the side yard setback.

Note: Under the City's Land Development Ordinance, this property is considered "legally nonconforming" because it is divided into two dwelling units and the property is zoned for single-family use. Structures in this category cannot be expanded. The Zoning Enforcement Officer has determined that the landing cannot be enlarged under this rule.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, and pursuant to the Land Development Ordinance, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, expanding the landing is not consistent with the guidelines which recommend that exterior stairs be in rear or inconspicuous side locations. (*Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirement, page 69-70*).

Fact:

This house was converted from single-family to apartments sometime after WWII. A set of stairs was constructed on the side of the house and a doorway added for a second floor apartment. The stairs and landing were tucked under the roof of the house and connected to the wrap-around front porch, so they

were relatively inconspicuous. Expanding the landing makes the stairs more conspicuous than they were. However, there are safety and practical considerations involved.

Fact:

The applicant is proposing to replace the current landing with one that is considerably smaller and use a railing that is similar in design to historic railings on the house. The landing and railing would be painted white which is typical of exterior stairs in the historic district.

Guidelines (page 70):

1. *Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.*
2. *Construct fire exits, stairs, landing and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and feature. 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.*

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1600 for property located at 754 Chestnut Street. The applicant is John Mandrano. The description of work includes expanding a landing for exterior stairs to a second floor apartment through a modified design. This matter has been before this body and the first COA application was denied leaving the existing stairway in place. The stairway is in violation of the Land Development Ordinance and does not meet current building code. Staff does not recommend in favor of granting the certificate citing guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 70.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1600 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines on page 70 and that staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1600 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Mandrano for work at 754 Chestnut Street, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

d) Location: 822 Spring Garden Street

Application No. 1606

Applicant: Mark Haselsberger

Property Owner: Same

Date Application Received: 1-7-13 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Request for after-the-fact application for existing sign.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the application is not congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines – Signs (page 13)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

A Certificate of Appropriateness and Permit were not obtained for the sign resting against the building. There is another sign on the property that is low to the ground and identifies the business.

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.*

In Support:

Mark Haselsberger, 4905 Robdot Drive, Oak Ridge, North Carolina

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1606 for property located at 822 Spring Garden Street. Mark Haselsberger, applicant, is requesting the installation of a sign that is after-the-fact. The staff recommends against this application citing guidelines 1, 2, and 3 on page 34. Mr. Haselsberger, 4905 Robdot Drive, Oak Ridge, North Carolina, spoke in support of the application. Speaking in opposition to the application was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, who was present to represent the College Hill Neighborhood Association.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell stated that the new owner seems to be making an attempt to improve the property. Rather than denying the application, she felt it might be better to approve the application with conditions to work with staff to replace the sign with one that is more in keeping with the guidelines.

Mr. Burroughs felt that the sign clearly did not meet the guidelines. Comments were made that it might be better to have an entirely new application to address any other signage needs for the property.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1606 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and guidelines 1, 2, and

3 on page 34 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1606 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mark Haselsberger for work at 822 Spring Garden Street, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Ms. Geary reminded members that the reservation deadline to attend the Preservation Greensboro Incorporated Annual Meeting is next Monday, February 4, 2013.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Burroughs requested a meeting with the previous chairman of the Historic Preservation Commission, Mr. Cowhig, and Ms. Geary to discuss progress being made on the historic Heritage Communities.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 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 27, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair; Ann Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; David Hoggard; and Lois McManus.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Mr. Sears and Ms. Spaeh would be late to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 30, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved approval of the January 30, 2013 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

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

- a) **Location: 701 Simpson Street**
Application No. 1610 Amendment to COA 1583
Applicant: David and Diana Tate
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 2-13-13 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Change to approved plans to use fiber cement siding instead of wood to enclose back porch and minor change in design.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The fiber cement siding maintains the overall character of the house. The reason for enclosing the back porch is to create functional interior space, which has been accomplished in a manner that is sensitive to the character of the house and the district.

Guidelines (page 64):

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

In Support:

Ashley Meredith, 26 Leftwich Street
 Rob Goins, RG Builders, P.O. Box 16397, High Point, NC

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1610 for work at 701 Simpson Street. The applicant, Diana Tate, has applied for a change in the approved plans to use fiber cement siding instead of wood to enclose the back porch with a minor change in design. The guideline citation is on page 64, guideline number 7 from the staff's recommendation of approval. Two individuals spoke in support of the application. Ashley Meredith, 26 Leftwich Street, stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association was in support of the application. Rob Goins, contractor with RB Builders, also spoke in favor of the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell commented that the work will be in the rear of the house and therefore, the use of cementitious fiber board is not as detrimental. She was concerned that if a COA was approved with certain parameters, how a better job can be done making sure conditions of a large COA are clearly understood and carried through.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1610 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 guideline 7 on page 64 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1610, an amendment to application number 1583, and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David and Diana Tate for work at 701 Simpson Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

b) Location: College Place

Application No. 1611

Applicant: Jason Combs, Duke Energy

Property Owner: Greensboro College

Date Application Received: 2-7-13 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Three Maple trees were removed along College Place as part of Duke Energy's maintenance of its electrical circuits.

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 removal of the trees is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping (page 23)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

These trees were located directly under electric distribution lines. The trees were inspected by the City's Urban Forester and determined to be in declining health. They were also considered too large for the space between the sidewalk and curb.

Guidelines (page 23):

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

Condition:

That the stumps be removed.

In Support:

Mike Cusimano, City of Greensboro Urban Forester
Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street
Jane Frommann, 1001 West McGee Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1611. Duke Energy has applied to remove the three Maple trees, after the fact, along College Place. The recommendation of the Urban Forester was that these trees were not in good condition and therefore, should be removed. Staff cited guidelines 1 and 5 on page 23. Speaking in opposition to the application was Virginia Haskett, College Hill Neighborhood Association, who indicated that the neighborhood is recommending conditions to the COA, after the fact, to replace the trees and the canopy. In addition, Janet Frommann, 1001 West McGee Street, spoke about larger contextual issues concerning Duke Energy's relationship with the College Hill Neighborhood Association and the COA process.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs stated that he was concerned this was an after-the-fact application. He noted there were previous conversations with Duke Energy about the necessity to communicate with all the stakeholders, namely the College Hill neighborhood. He found the situation troublesome given the context and history that Duke Energy has had with the neighborhood. There should have been more diligence on the part of Duke Energy by checking into the background of the nature of the project. He stated his intention to vote against this application on general principle. Mr. Burroughs felt that the suggestion to replace the trees was good.

Members discussed putting conditions on the application. Counsel Williams advised members that this after-the-fact application should be treated as though it was an application submitted at the time the trees were still present.

Members discussed recourse and available options that would deter utility companies from continuing to do work after-the-fact.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1611 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 noted in the comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: Burroughs.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1611 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jason Combs of Duke Energy for work at College Place on the Greensboro College campus with the following conditions: (1) that three canopy trees be replaced on the opposite side of the street and a smaller specimen tree be planted on the same side of the street, to be selected by City staff; (2) and that the existing stumps be removed; seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: Burroughs.)

Chair Lucas urged Mr. Combs, applicant, to make sure that that Duke Energy does not come back to the Commission with after-the-fact work relative to any trees in the historic districts. He instructed Mr. Combs to contact City staff if he is unclear as to the location of the historic properties so that this situation does not occur again.

**c) Location: 911 West McGee Street
(APPLICATION WITHDRAWN)**

Mr. Cowhig explained that this property is a designated Guilford County landmark and therefore, the application will be heard by the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission.

**d) Location: Corner Yanceyville Street and East Bessemer Avenue
Application No. 1618
Applicant: Stefan-Leih Geary for City of Greensboro
Property Owner: Guilford County Schools
Date Application Received: 2-13-13 (APPROVED)**

Ms. Cantrell asked to be recused from this case as she is a member of the Aycock Neighborhood Association Board and has discussed this matter with others.

Ms. Bowers moved to recuse Ms. Cantrell from this case, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

Description of Work:

Construction of historic district entryway sign.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed sign is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Signs (page 33)* for the following reasons:

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.*

Condition:

That the plans be presented to GDOT and Field Operations for final review and approval prior to construction.

In Support:

Stefan-Leih Geary, City of Greensboro Planning and Community Development
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1618 for property at Yanceyville Avenue and Bessemer Street. The City of Greensboro is requesting permission to construct a historic district sign citing guidelines 1-3 on page 34. Stefan-Leih Geary, City of Greensboro, articulated the application. Also speaking in favor was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, of the Aycock Neighborhood Association.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1618 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, and 3 on page 34 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None. Abstain: Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1618 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Stefan-Leih Geary, City of Greensboro, for work at the corner of Yanceyville Street and Bessemer Avenue, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None. Abstain: Cantrell.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Lucas pointed out that today's agenda contained three after-the-fact COA applications. Commissioners discussed imposing penalties for after-the-fact applications. Members commented that it was difficult for a neighborhood association in a historic district to promote the necessity of a COA when they are being ignored with no consequences. Following discussion, there was a consensus among members to consider the use of penalties for after-the-fact applications. Chair Lucas asked staff to present a report at the next meeting on issues involved with penalties.

Members discussed ways to promote education for property owners and neighborhood associations in historic districts. Chair Lucas suggested that a subcommittee should be formed to look at the education process and who should be involved.

Mr. Cowhig informed members that some communities charge a higher fee for after-the-fact applications. Staff has already prepared a fee schedule and he plans to share the information with members at the next meeting.

Mr. Hoggard suggested that an informational brochure should be triggered through the City when property changes hands in historic districts.

Chair Lucas asked Mr. Burroughs to draft a letter to Duke Energy on behalf of the Commission for review and adoption at the next meeting.

Chair Lucas indicated that members are in receipt of a letter from Sean Patch regarding property located at 518 Fifth Avenue in the Aycock Historic District. Mr. Cowhig provided background information on the property. The owners replaced all of the siding, not just the deteriorated boards. In addition, the owners painted the trim and left the siding unpainted which is unlike any other structure in the neighborhood. Mr. Cowhig stated that the original fabric of the house is no longer present.

There was a discussion about tax credits and Mr. Cowhig felt the property may no longer qualify because the siding was entirely removed. Mr. Cowhig recommended changing the guidelines to require a COA for any significant replacement of materials.

Staff plans to present a draft of revised guidelines to the Commission for their review at an upcoming meeting.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Sean Patch, 112 Cypress Street, stated that the property at 518 Fifth Avenue is clearly in violation of the guidelines because more than 60 percent of the siding was removed without a COA. He requested that the owners be required to apply for a COA, after-the-fact, and that the application be denied because it is not congruous with the guidelines. In addition, Mr. Patch requested that fees be imposed and/or that the property be restored to its original condition. He commented that less than one percent of the home's historic fabric is present as it stands. He also felt that the property is no longer a contributing structure in the neighborhood because its integrity has been adversely affected.

Chair Lucas thanked Mr. Patch for his comments and assured him that the Commission will be addressing this issue over the next several months.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 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 27, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair; Ann Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Thomas Sears, Jill Spaeh; and Lois McManus.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Mr. Hoggard's absence was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 27, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Sears moved approval of the February 27, 2013 minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Sears, Burroughs, Cantrell, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Ms. Bowers joined the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

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

- (a) **Application No. 1630**
Location: 607 Summit Avenue
Applicant: David Hobson
Date Application Received: 2-26-13 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Install utility pole and security light

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The property owner has asked Duke Energy to install a security light in the back of the house to enhance security for residents.

Guidelines:

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

Recommended Condition:

- That a full cutoff fixture be used in order to prevent glare and light trespass onto surrounding properties.

In Support:

Rich Watson; Allstate, Ltd., Manager
 Scott Hobson, Duke Energy

In Opposition:

Elizabeth Glass, Managing owner of adjacent property located at 601-603 Summit Avenue

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1630 for work at 607 Summit Avenue. The description of work is installation of utility pole and security light. The applicant is David Hobson. Staff recommends in favor with a condition that a full cutoff fixture be used in order to prevent glare and light trespass onto surrounding properties. The guideline citations are on page 32, guidelines 1 and 2. Speaking in support was Richard Watson, 607 Summit Avenue, the property owner. Also in support was Scott Hobson, representing Duke Energy. Speaking in opposition with a question was Elizabeth Glass, 601-603 Summit Avenue.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1630 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments regarding the use of a full cutoff fixture are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1630 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Hobson for work at 607 Summit Avenue with the condition that a full cutoff be used, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 608 Joyner Street

Application No. 1621

Applicant: Don Ray

Property Owner: College Place United Methodist Church

Date Application Received: 3-1-13 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Construction of new asphalt parking area.

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

Fact:

The applicant is proposing to pave with asphalt a vacant lot adjacent to the church for parking for church members and those who use the church's programs and services. Several trees would be removed and new trees and shrubbery started to screen the parking lot. The pavement will not have curb and gutters but wheel stops will be installed.

Guidelines:

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

Fact:

Wheel stops will be installed to protect the mature Oak trees at the rear of the property. Some trees will need removal to accommodate the parking plan while other existing trees will be incorporated into the new landscape plan.

Guidelines:

7. *Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing. The Commission may consider alternate locations when properly screened and landscaped.*

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

Condition:

- That the applicant will work with staff on lighting, landscaping and other details of the project.

In Support:

Jason Harvey, 509 Tate Street

Don Ray, Trustee of College Place United Methodist Church

Tom Herron, 707 Walker Avenue

Marlis Wilcox, 911 Spring Garden Street

In Opposition:

James Rouns, 604 Park Avenue

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1621 for work at 608 Joyner Street. The applicant is College Place United Methodist Church to install a new asphalt parking area. Staff is recommending a condition that the applicant works with staff on landscaping, lighting, and other details leading to the technical review process. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines 7, 8, and 10 on page 28 in support of the application. Speaking in support of the application were Jason Harvey, 509 Tate Street, pastor at College Place United Methodist Church; Don Ray, trustee of the church; Tom Herron, 707 Walker Avenue; and Marlis Wilcox, 911 Spring Garden Street. James Rouns, 604 Park Avenue, raised concerns with drainage in moving from gravel to solid paving surface.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs commented that parking appears to be a huge concern for not only the church but the area in general. He felt that due diligence was done to insure the trees would be protected or replaced. Mr. Burroughs expressed his support for the application. Ms. Spaeh commented on the storm water runoff issue and said that codes were very strict in this regard and the technical committee will be looking at the matter very carefully.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1621 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, specifically guidelines 7, 9, and 10 on page 28, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1621 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Don Ray for work at College Place United Methodist Church located at 608 Joyner Street with the condition the applicant works with staff on lighting, landscaping and other details of the project, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(c) Location: 313 S. Tate Street**Application No. 1619****Applicant: Lance Uberseder, Concord Management****Property Owner: Richard Strohmier****Date Application Received: 2-20-13 (DENIED)****Description of Work:**

Installation of satellite dish (after-the-fact).

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review, 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—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (page 38) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The satellite dish has been installed in a prominent location in front of the house. It is clearly visible from the street.

Fact:

FCC regulations prohibit local governments, landlords, or associations from restricting a property owner or lessee's placement of consumer-owned satellite dishes and other types of antenna called "over-the-air reception-devices" on property he or she controls under its OTARD Rules.

However, exceptions apply to properties located within national Register Historic Districts. College Hill is a National Register District and restrictions may be applied as long as they are consistent to all types of communication devices without prohibiting their use.

Guidelines:

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 not appropriate and create the least amount of visible impact on the district.*

There was no one present to speak in support or in opposition to the application.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1619 for work at 313 South Tate Street. The applicant is Lance Uberseder, Concord Management. The description of work is installation of satellite dish (after-the-fact). Staff recommends against granting this application because the installation is not congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines, citing page 40, guidelines 1 and 2.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers commented that this application is after-the-fact and would not have originally been accepted. She does not plan to support the application. Mr. Sears felt that little thought was put into this project for a careful installation.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1619 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 staff comments that the satellite dish has been installed in a prominent location in front of the house and it is clearly visible from the street; FCC regulations prohibit local governments, landlords, or associations from restricting a property owner or lessee's placement of consumer-owned satellite dishes and other types of antenna called "over-the-air reception-devices" on property he or she controls under its OTARD Rules; however, exceptions apply to properties located within national Register Historic Districts; College Hill is a National Register District and restrictions may be applied as long as they are consistent to all types of communication devices without prohibiting their use; are acceptable as finding of fact.

Mr. Burroughs offered a friendly amendment to add guidelines 1 and 2 on page 40 to the finding of fact.

Ms. Spaeh accepted the friendly amendment, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion, as amended. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1619 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lance Uberseder, Concord Management, for work at 313 South Tate Street, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(d) Location: 517 Park Avenue**Application No. 1631****Applicant: John Worsley****Property Owner: Same****Date Application Received: 3-13-13 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)****Description of Work:**

Enclose back porch.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue National Register Historic District. It has been under Minimum Housing Code enforcement. The south chimney has been rebuilt which was a condition of a previous COA application.

Fact:

The applicant is proposing to enclose the back porch to create needed interior space. The siding will be wood lap siding to match what is on the house. An existing historic window will be moved to the new exterior wall.

Guidelines (page 64):

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

Recommended Conditions:

- That the details of the enclosure match those of the house, including window and door casings, drip cap, sills, soffit, fascia, and trim.

Note: The deck meets the criteria for staff level approval.

In Support:

John Worsley, 814 Cypress Street
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1622 for work at 517 Park Avenue. The description of work is to enclose the rear porch. The applicant is John Worsley. Staff recommends in favor with a condition that details of the enclosure match those of the house and the details are to be submitted to staff for review and approval. Staff cited guideline 7 on page 62.

Discussion:

Members discussed the dimensions of the deck in relation to the house.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1631 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 from the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances, and Balconies* (page 62) and the fact that this is a contributing structure, it has been under Minimum Housing code enforcement, the chimney has been rebuilt, the enclosure is being proposed to create needed interior space, along with guidelines on page 64 that state side and rear porches may be enclosed to create sunrooms if the design of the enclosure is compatible, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1631 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Worsley for work at 517 Park Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the details of the enclosure match those of the house, including window and door casings, drip cap, sills, soffit, fascia, and trim, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(e) Location: 808 Olive Street

Application No. 1620

Applicant: Pam Frye

Property Owner: Chaney-Frye Properties

Date Application Received: 2-28-13 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Wood shingle siding was removed exposing original wood clapboard siding; wheelchair ramp was removed and front porch repaired. Non-original windows were replaced with wood windows with muntin pattern similar to original 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 work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guideline--Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes* (page 44) and *Windows and Doors* (page 55) for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. It had been covered with non-original siding and a number of the original windows had been replaced by the former owner. A wheelchair ramp was constructed in front of the house.

Fact:

The new owner removed the wood shingles that had been installed to cover the original siding as an alternative to painting. Deteriorated siding and trim boards were replaced with new wood siding and trim that matches the design and dimensions of the original. The net effect of the work is to restore much of the historic character of the property.

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 details. 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.*
3. *Locate vents or mechanical connections through walls that are not character-defining walls or inconspicuously on rear or sidewalls of the structure where they are not visible from the street.*
4. *It is not appropriate to cover or replace historic materials with substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or plywood panels.*

Fact:

In some areas, non-original wood windows were replaced with new wood windows that generally match the pattern and dimensions of the original windows. No new window openings have been added. These window units are wood simulated divided light.

Guidelines (page 57):

Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary, for technical reasons, locate new window or door opening on secondary elevations, and introduced units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.

In Support:

Don Smith, 308 Parkway
 Pam Frye, 2202 West Market Street
 Dawn Chaney, 2202 West Market Street
 Sandra O'Connor, 2202 West Market Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1620 for work at 808 Olive Street. The applicant is Chaney-Frye Properties and the work includes the removal of wood shingle siding, removal of wheelchair ramp, the replacement of right side and back windows on the structure. Staff recommends in favor of the work that has already been accomplished citing guidelines on pages 44, 55, 56, and guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 47. Speaking in favor was Don Smith, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association; and Pam Frye, Dawn Chaney, and Sandra O'Conner, 2202 West Market Street.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs commended Ms. Frye and Ms. Chaney for their successful renovation that adds to the value of the neighborhood and City. Ms. Cantrell agreed but commented there are still problems with people being unaware of historic districts. Ms. Bowers felt that the work done to the structure looked like what would have originally been approved by the Commission.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1620 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 from the *Historic District Design Guidelines— Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes* (page 44) and *Windows and Doors* (page 55), guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, on page 47 and also guidelines on page 57 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1620 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Chaney-Frye Properties for work at 808 Olive Street with the previously listed conditions and guidelines, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

- (f) Location: North Greene Street from Smith Street to Florence Street**
Application No. 1629
Applicant: David Hobson for Duke Energy
Property Owner: City of Greensboro (public right-of-way)
Date Application Received: 3-13-13 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Replace utility poles in order to upgrade electrical service to First Presbyterian Church.

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), for the following reasons:

Fact:

The taller utility poles and additional cross arms are needed in order to upgrade electrical service. The new poles will replace the old in the same location therefore the project should have minimal impact on the character of the historic district. Alternate routes were explored and the proposed route is the most direct and determined to cause the least impact.

Fact:

The possibility of placing utility lines underground was explored in College Hill during the redevelopment years. At that time, it was considered not feasible due to the extremely high cost.

Guidelines under Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way (page 29):

6. Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at the rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters that are disturbed as part of the installation should be maintained.

In Support:

Scott Hobson, 4600 Dicks Mill Road, McLeansville, North Carolina

Jane Morgan, 10 Pepperwood Circle

In Opposition:

Janet Frommann, 1001 West McGee Street

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1629 for property on North Greene Street from Smith Street to Florence Street. Scott Hobson is the applicant for Duke Energy. The work description is to replace utility poles to create electrical service to First Presbyterian Church. Staff recommends in favor of the application citing guideline 6 on page 20. Speaking in support of the application were Scott Hobson and Jane Morgan, Duke Energy. Speaking in opposition was Janet Frommann, 1001 West McGee Street, who raised a question about communication regarding this matter.

Discussion:

Mr. Sears commented that First Presbyterian Church is working hard to make their facility more functional and more electrical power is required. He felt there was no other choice because underground wiring appears to be cost prohibitive. Mr. Burroughs commented that First Presbyterian Church is doing an outstanding job and although the power structure will be unattractive, it is necessary for their project. Mr. Burroughs pointed out that there are other historic districts throughout the country where the power companies have worked with the district to put cables and wires underground. Members expressed concern that Duke Energy has demonstrated historically that they are unwilling to work with the district in that regard.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1629 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 on page 20 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1629 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Hobson, Duke Energy, for work at North Greene Street from Smith Street to Florence Street, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(g) Location: 607 North Greene Street
Application No. 1627
Applicant: Jason Combs for Duke Energy
Property Owner: Holy Trinity Episcopal Church
Date Application Received: 3-12-13 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove Ashe tree located in front of sanctuary and Oak tree located in front of house at 603 North Greene Street.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

These two trees are in close proximity to electrical distribution lines along North Greene Street. To meet clearances for safe and reliable electrical service these trees must be pruned substantially. The City's Urban Forester, Mike Cusimano, has inspected the trees and feels that they should be removed and replaced with more appropriate trees.

Guidelines under Trees and Landscaping (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:

Jason Combs, 5615 Buckhaven Court
 Cameron Cooke, Holy Trinity Episcopal Church

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1627 for work at 607 North Greene Street. The applicant is Jason Combs for Duke Energy. The description of work is to remove Ashe tree located in front of sanctuary and Oak tree located in front of house at 603 North Greene Street. Staff recommends in favor of this application citing guidelines 1 and 2 on page 23. Speaking in support was Jason Combs, Duke Energy, and Cameron Cooke, Holy Trinity Church.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs stated his concern in voting for a project that might set a precedent that stumps have to always be taken care of by the individual, not Duke Energy. Ms. Bowers felt that it was not right for the individual to be responsible for removal of a stump and resulting wood when the power company takes down a tree that was in their way. Chair Lucas pointed out that the application suggests in this instance the stump and wood will be removed by another party, Holy Trinity Church. He felt that given the circumstances, the urban area, and the constraints involved with the property, there is no other choice for the church but to take down the two trees.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1627 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 that these two trees are in close proximity to electrical distribution lines along North Greene Street; to meet clearances

for safe and reliable electrical service these trees must be pruned substantially; the City's Urban Forester, Mike Cusimano, has inspected the trees and feels that they should be removed and replaced with more appropriate trees; and the guidelines on page 23 under Trees and Landscaping that say to retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district, and 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; are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1627 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jason Combs, Duke Energy, for work at 607 North Greene Street, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell)

(h) Location: 1101 Virginia Street

Application No. 1626

Applicant: Jonathon Billeisen

Property Owner: Same

Date Application Received: 3-11-17 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Remove walkway from street to south side of 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 will not be congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 28-30) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The existing walkway appears to be an original feature of the property, connecting the front porch with the public sidewalk and street. Walkways that connect houses to the public right-of-way are an integral part of the original site design for the property and the historic district.

Facts:

Walkways contribute to the pedestrian character of the historic district and are part of what makes up the neighborhood setting.

Guidelines (page 30):

A paved walkway typically leads directly from the public sidewalk to the front steps of most houses in the Historic District. Maintaining the historic configuration of driveways and walkways is essential to preserving the character of the districts.

1. *Retain historic driveways and walkways, including steps and sidewalks, in their original locations. When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original.*

In Support:

Don Smith, 308 Parkway

Jon Billeisen, 1101 Virginia Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1626 for work at 1101 Virginia Street. The description of work is to remove walkway from street to south side of house. The applicant is Jonathan Billeisen, 1101 Virginia Street. Staff is recommending against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness because the walkway removal is not congruous with the guidelines, citing guideline 1 on page 30. Speaking in favor of the application was Don Smith, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, and Jon Billeisen, the property owner.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell stated her opinion that the front of the house is the address, 1101 Virginia Street. She was in favor of granting the COA because she does not feel the Bessemer Avenue side is the front of the house. Ms. Bowers was in agreement with comments made by Ms. Cantrell. Mr. Cowhig clarified for Mr. Burroughs that the walkway has been there for a long time; however, staff was unsure if it was original. He indicated the walkway would have been present at the time the neighborhood was designated as a historic district. It was suggested that a nonfunctional, unconnected "ghost" walkway be created as a condition to be worked out with staff. The image or memory of a walkway would exist but no concrete would be required. Ms. Spaeh discussed separating the public part of the sidewalk from what is on the private property through a change in scale perhaps using grass and meandering stepping stones.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1626 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 despite staff comments in the finding of fact and guidelines on page 30, the Commission finds these are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1626 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jonathon Billeisen for work at 1101 Virginia Street, with the following condition: (1) that the applicant works with City staff on preserving the public appearance of the walkway in the public right-of-way, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell. Nays: None.)

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Chair Lucas stated that two applicants have come back to the Commission for reconsideration in situations where a Certificate of Appropriateness has been denied. He read from the Commission's Rules of Procedure, Section 8, detailing the process for reconsideration of applications that have been denied. He explained that procedurally, a motion must be made if it is decided by members of the Commission that there is an opportunity for the applicants to present new evidence. Commissioners will hear the new evidence and decide if the application can be reconsidered at the next meeting through a motion.

Chair Lucas asked members if they were inclined to hear new evidence in the matter of application number 1600 from the January 30, 2013 meeting. The applicant is John Mandrano for property located at 754 Chestnut Street.

Ms. Spaeh moved to review additional evidence in application number 1600 for property located at 754 Chestnut Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Spaeh, McManus, Sears, Bowers. Nays: Cantrell, Burroughs, Lucas)

John Mandrano, 411-A East Hendrix Street, was sworn as to his testimony in this matter.

Mr. Mandrano explained circumstances surrounding his absence at the January 30, 2013 meeting. In addition, he explained that the Board of Adjustment recently approved an expansion of the landing to a side offset of two feet and an additional four feet to the back, as requested.

Ms. McManus moved to docket this matter for the April agenda, seconded by Ms. Bowers.

Counsel Williams suggested a friendly amendment regarding the wording of the motion to reflect that this item will be reconsidered at the April 27, 2013 meeting. The friendly amendment was accepted. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion, as amended. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, McManus, Sears, Bowers, Cantrell, Burroughs. Nays: None.)

Chair Lucas stated that the second case for reconsideration is application number 1611 for College Place from the February 27, 2013 meeting. Jason Combs, Duke Energy, is applying for the property owner, Greensboro College.

Ms. Spaeh moved to listen to new evidence in this matter, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, McManus, Sears, Bowers, Cantrell. Nays: Burroughs.)

Jason Combs, Duke Energy, stated that the declining health of the trees presented a hazard. He said that typically for trees removed in the historic district, conditions would not be set to replace a dead, dying, or hazardous tree, along with stump removal. In addition, Mike Cusimano, Urban Forester, identified the trees as being in the City's right-of-way. No one was aware the street had been turned over to the private property owner, Greensboro College.

Mr. Cowhig added that a key person speaking in support of the application as property owner, Robin Daniels, Greensboro College, was called away on an emergency at the last minute and could not attend the February 27, 2013 meeting. He said there was confusion as to who could speak on the application due to Mr. Daniel's absence.

Members commented that the application was approved at the February 27, 2013 meeting; therefore, conditions were likely to be the issue for reconsideration.

Ms. Spaeh moved to reconsider application number 1611 at the April 27, 2013 meeting, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, McManus, Sears, Cantrell. Nays: Burroughs, Bowers.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

A draft of revised guidelines was distributed to members for their review. Mr. Cowhig asked Commissioners to be prepared to discuss the draft at the next meeting.

Mr. Cowhig distributed information about a possible fee schedule for Certificate of Appropriateness applications. He asked members to review the information for discussion at a future meeting. Comments can be emailed to Mr. Cowhig or Ms. Geary.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Ms. Geary stated that a training session will be available on April 10, 2013 in Burlington, North Carolina. She asked interested members to contact her for more information.

Ms. Geary introduced Hanna Cockburn, the new Long Range and Strategic Division Manager for the Planning Department.

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 OFFICE BUILDING
APRIL 24, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair, Anne Bowers, James Burroughs, Christina Cantrell, David Hoggard, and Lois McManus.

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

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Sears and Ms. Spaeh were approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 27, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved approval of the March 27, 2013 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

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

Ms. Bowers joined the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

- a) **Location: 201 South Tate Street**
Application No. 1633
Applicant: Jim Dutton
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-9-13 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

This house is being repaired following a fire in one of the apartments. The single electrical meter has been replaced with individual meters for each apartment unit.

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 meter location is congruous with the guidelines if conditions are met, *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (pages 38-40)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

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

Fact:

There was a fire recently in one of the apartment units. As part of the repair work, the electrical meter has been replaced with individual meters for each unit. Duke Energy requires that the meters be located on the exterior of the structure.

Fact:

Possible locations for the meters have been studied and this location was determined to be the most practical. This location requires minimal alteration to the building. It is visible from Tate Street but not from Rankin Place (this is a corner lot). Screening with lattice would hide it completely from view.

Guidelines (page 64):

1. *Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building.*
3. *Install mechanical equipment, such as electrical panels or gas meters, at grade level when they are visible from the street, and screen with shrubbery or other landscaping.*
4. *Locate new mechanical supply lines, pipes, and ductwork on the interior of the structure. If an interior location is not feasible, place in inconspicuous locations and/or conceal with architectural elements such as downspouts.*
5. *Place utility service lines underground where possible, to eliminate overhead lines and poles.*

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1633 for property at 201 South Tate Street. The applicant is Jim Dutton and the application is to install individual electrical meters for each apartment unit on the right side of the structure. Staff's recommendation is to grant the COA with the condition that a lattice panel or other screen be installed with details submitted to staff. Guidelines 1 through 5 were cited on page 40 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment*.

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff could work with the property owner on a final design for the screen. Members discussed the possibility of lowering the electrical box and allowing vegetation to climb the lattice screening.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1633 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 on page 64 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1633 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jim Dutton for work at 201 South Tate Street with the following condition: (1) that the property owner work with staff to development some kind of screening to hide the mechanical equipment, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

b) Location: 4 Magnolia Court

Application No. 1636

Applicant: Scott Hobson for Duke Energy

Property Owner: Sidney Stern

Date Application Received: 4-10-13 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install 30' utility pole in order to reroute electrical service.

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* (pages 18-20) for the following reasons:

Fact:

Currently, electrical service to 4 Magnolia Court is from the rear of the property. However, the service line crosses the roof of 705 Magnolia Street. The new utility pole will eliminate this potential safety hazard. The pole will be located at the rear of the lot and will not be easily noticeable from the street.

Fact:

Placing the electrical service underground would mean a significant cost for the property owner.

Guidelines for Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way (page 20):

6. *Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at the rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters that are disturbed as part of the installation should be maintained.*

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.*

In Support:

Scott Hobson, 4600 Dicks Mill Road, Duke Energy

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1636 for property at 4 Magnolia Court. The applicant is Scott Hobson for Duke Energy and the description of work is for installation of a 30 foot utility pole in order to reroute electrical service. Mr. Hobson spoke in support of the application.

Discussion:

Members pointed out that the guidelines clearly state that poles can be located at the rear of a lot.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1636 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 guideline 6 on page 20 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1636 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Scott Hobson, Duke Energy, for work at 4 Magnolia Court, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Cantrell.)

Chair Lucas noted that the next two cases are applications for reconsideration by the Commission. All of the evidence presented in the hearings will be new.

- c) **Location: College Place**
Application No. 1611
Applicant: Jason Combs, Duke Energy
Property Owner: Greensboro College
Date Application Received: 2-7-13 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Note:

This is a reconsideration of a COA application that was denied.

Description of Work:

Three Maple trees were removed along College Place as part of Duke Energy's maintenance of its electrical circuits.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness without conditions. In the staff's opinion the removal of the trees is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping (page 23)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

These trees were located directly under electric distribution lines. The trees were inspected by the City's Urban Forester and determined to be in declining health. They were also considered too large for the space between the sidewalk and curb.

Fact:

College Hill Municipal Service District revenue was used to fund landscaping and tree planting along West McGee at College Place. Additional trees are planned for this area as part of the College Hill streetscape improvement program. These measures should more than compensate for the loss of the three maple trees on College Place.

Guidelines (page 23):

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

In Support:

Jason Combs, 5615 Buckhaven Court
 Dave Pokela, Attorney, 1126 West Northwood Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1611 for property at College Place. The applicant is Jason Combs for Duke Energy representing Greensboro College. The description of work is to remove three Maple trees. Staff recommends in favor of the application citing guidelines 1 and 5 of *Historic District Design Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping* on page 23. Speaking in support of the application was Jason Combs, Duke Energy, and Dave Pokela, an attorney with Nexsen Pruet, representing Duke Energy.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs pointed out that Duke Energy is not the stakeholder involved in this matter and he questioned if other stakeholders were being represented in discussions.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1611 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines 1 and 5 on page 23 that state: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district*, and (5) *replace mature trees with similar canopy trees and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape*, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: Burroughs, Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1611 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jason Combs of Duke Energy for work at College Place on the Greensboro College campus without conditions, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: Burroughs, Cantrell.)

- d) Location: 754 Chestnut Street**
Application Number 1600
Applicant: John Mandrano
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 11-20-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Note:

This is a reconsideration of a COA application that was denied.

Description of Work:

The landing at the top of the exterior stairs to the second story apartment was expanded without a COA or a Building Permit. The work does not meet the Building Code and it encroaches into the required side yard setback. The property owner submitted a COA application for the landing that was denied on October 31, 2012. The property owner has submitted a new COA application for a new landing that would be smaller and would no longer encroach into the side yard setback.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the amended application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the expansion is minimal and will enhance safety and therefore meets the intent of the guidelines -- *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements (page 69-70)*, for the following reasons.

Fact:

This house was converted from single-family to apartments sometime after WWII. A set of stairs was constructed on the side of the house and a doorway added for a second floor apartment. The stairs and landing were tucked under the roof of the house and connected to the wrap-around front porch, so they were relatively inconspicuous. The expanded landing makes the stairs more conspicuous than they were before. However, there are safety and practical considerations involved.

Fact:

The applicant is proposing to replace the current landing with one that is considerably smaller and use a railing that is similar in design to historic railings on the house. The landing and railing would be painted white which is typical of exterior stairs in the historic district.

Fact:

The Greensboro Board of Adjustments voted to overturn the City Planning staff interpretation that this property is “legally non-conforming” and as such the landing cannot be expanded.

Guidelines (page 70):

- (1) *Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.*
- (2) *Construct fire exits, stairs, landings and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so that they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.*
- (3) *Design and construct new fire exits, stairs, and landings to be compatible with the scale, materials, details, and finish of the historic structure.*

In Support:

John Mandrano, 411 East Hendrix Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1600 for property located at 724 Chestnut Street. The applicant is John Mandrano and the description is to install a 5' x 9' landing at the top of existing exterior stairs to a second story apartment on the property. Staff recommends approval with details for the handrails submitted to staff for review citing guidelines 1, 2, and 3 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Safety and Code Requirements* on pages 69 and 70. Speaking in favor of the application was the property owner, John Mandrano.

Discussion:

Members commented that if the work meets code and the rails resemble those in the neighborhood, there was no reason not to approve the application.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1600 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, and 3 on page 70 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1600 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Mandrano for work at 754 Chestnut Street with the following condition: (1) that the details for the handrail be presented to City staff for approval, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Cantrell.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Members reviewed a letter drafted by Mr. Burroughs to Duke Energy.

Counsel Williams informed the Commission that a public hearing regarding the Tree Ordinance is scheduled for the May 21, 2013 City Council meeting.

Commissioners expressed concerns that Duke Energy was not following the process set in place by the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines. Members felt that Duke Energy may not have a sense of the needs of the historic districts.

Mr. Burroughs felt that the Historic Preservation Commission's position should be communicated to the City Manager's officer prior to the public hearing on May 21, 2013.

Following discussion, Ms. Cantrell moved to authorize Mr. Burroughs to work with City staff to rework the existing letter but direct it to the City Manager's office, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Bowers, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Cantrell.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Benjamin Briggs, Preservation Greensboro, updated the Commission on the status of 919 Spring Garden Street. He stated that Preservation Greensboro has come to an agreement with the church for the price of the property. In addition, the church has progressed on plans for a parking lot at the rear of the property. Preservation Greensboro hopes to identify an owner who can produce an action plan and a financial plan for the property.

Mr. Briggs informed members that a College Hill tour of ten homes will be held on May 18th -19th, 2013.

Mr. Cowhig stated that a meeting was held with the Long-Range Planning team and there are plans to hold a Tax Credit Workshop. The workshop would raise awareness and promote the use of tax credits in the Greensboro historic districts. Any members interested in serving on a project team for the workshop should contact Mr. Cowhig.

Chair Lucas stated that he has accepted a position to direct the Interiors Program at the University of Kentucky. His last meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission will be May 29, 2013. He indicated that the College Hill district has been notified that they will be without a representative on the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 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
MAY 29, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; David Hoggard; Lois McManus; Jill Spaeh; Thomas Sears; and Linda Lane.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 24, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved approval of the April 24, 2013 minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus. Nays: None.)

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

(a) **Location: 813 Olive Street**
Application No. 1644
Applicant: Dan Huckabee
Property Owner: Kiet Nguyen
Date Application Received: 5-13-13 **(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Construction of addition and other alterations as part of renovation of house.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the proposed addition and alterations will be consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 75-76)*, and *Windows and Doors (page 55-57)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The owner is planning to completely renovate the house. It is a very small house and a small addition is planned in order to make the floor plan more functional and bring the house up to current standards. The addition is designed to be clearly distinguishable from the main body of the house and is under a separate roof. It should not obscure, change or damage any character-defining features of the house. There will be a clear distinction between the roof line and wall plane. Materials will be compatible with those of the house.

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.*
6. *Minimize site disturbances for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

Fact:

A non-original doorway will be removed and a window relocated on the south elevation. This is needed for a more functional floor plan. It is not in a prominent location.

Guidelines (page 57):

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural system, and therefore contributed 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.

Conditions:

- That window and door openings have trim work that matches the existing house: drip cap, sill, casings, etc.
- That new siding match the existing in terms of design and profile and be staggered in order to avoid a "seam".
- That the deck railing be designed to match historic railings, with a flat top rail and bottom rail.

In Support:

Dan Huckabee, 412 Beverly Place

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1644 for work at 813 Olive Street. The applicant is Dan Huckabee and the description of work is construction of addition and other alterations as part of renovation of house. Staff has recommended in favor of this COA application noting guidelines 1-6 on page 76 and guideline 1 on page 57. They are recommending three conditions: (1) That window and door openings have trim work that matches the existing house: drip cap, sill, casings, etc.; (2) That new siding match the existing in terms of design and profile and be staggered in order to avoid a "seam"; and (3) That the deck railing be designed to match historic railings, with a flat top rail and bottom rail.

Speaking in favor was Dan Huckabee, the applicant.

Discussion:

Ms. Spaeh and Mr. Hoggard commented on the roof detailing and felt that a hipped roof would be a better choice. Following discussion, Ms. Geary suggested ways to give a hipped roof appearance. Members commented that the submitted drawing does not appear to be a final drawing. Concerns were expressed for several details on the drawing such as the lack of windows in the kitchen area.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1644 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 through 6 on page 76 and guideline 1 on page 57 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus, Sears, and Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1644 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Dan Huckabee for work at 813 Olive Street with the following conditions: (1) That window and door openings have trim work that matches the existing house: drip cap, sill, casings, etc.; (2) That new siding match the existing in terms of design and profile and be staggered in order to avoid a “seam”; (3) That the deck railing be designed to match historic railings, with a flat top rail and bottom rail; (4) That there be a suggestion of a clipped roof to give the appearance of a hipped roof without making the structure too tall; (5) That smaller windows be used than those in the top floor of the rear elevation; (6) That the revised site elevations be brought to staff for their final approval; and (7) That the roof overhangs be addressed; seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus, Sears, and Lane. Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 614 Fifth Avenue**Application No. 1645****Applicant: Joy Brown****Property Owner: Same****Date Application Received: 5-16-13****(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)****Description of Work:**

Replace non-original windows and door way with new wood double-hung windows. Replace concrete front steps with brick steps. Replace kitchen window with shorter window in order to install kitchen counters. Remove shed at back of house. Screen-in back porch.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff’s opinion, the proposed work is consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 55-57) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The front porch was partially closed in when the house was converted to two housing units with a new entrance door and windows. The house is being renovated and converted back to single-family use. Since they are wood, double-hung windows they will be more compatible with the original windows. The shed at back does not appear to be original and is in poor condition.

Guidelines:

1. *Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building’s significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.*

Recommended Conditions:

- That the design of the brick front steps be similar to steps found in the historic districts.
- That the new windows have wood trim that matches the other windows on the house – drip cap, sill, casings, etc.

In Support:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1645 for work at 614 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Joy Brown and the description of work includes replacement of non-original windows and doorway with new wood double-hung windows; replace concrete front steps with brick steps; replace kitchen window with shorter window in order to install kitchen counters; remove shed at back of house; and screen-in back porch. Staff recommended approval of this application citing guideline 1 on page 57 with conditions that the design of the brick front steps be similar to steps found in the historic districts; that the new windows have wood trim that matches the other windows on the house—drip cap, sill, casings, etc.; and that details be submitted to the staff for review for this application. Speaking in support was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Preservation Committee of the neighborhood association.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs suggested that details in this application be submitted to staff for their review for final approval. Mr. Sears commented that he was pleased to see these houses being changed in such a careful, proactive manner.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1645 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 guideline 1 on page 57 that reads “*Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributed 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*” are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus, Sears, and Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1645 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joy Brown for work at 614 Fifth Avenue with the following conditions: (1) That the design of the brick front steps be similar to steps found in the historic districts; (2) That the new windows have wood trim that matches the other windows on the house –drip cap, sill, casings, etc.; and (3) That a final drawing of all the work being done be presented to staff for their final approval, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus, Sears, and Lane. Nays: None.)

(c) Location: 909 Morehead Avenue**Application No. 1643****Applicant: Ken Baucom****Property Owner: Same****Date Application Received: 5-13-13****(CONTINUED UNTIL JUNE, 2013 MEETING)****Description of Work:**

Replace deteriorated retaining wall. Remove three trees.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff’s opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Feature (page 24-27)* and *Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The existing concrete retaining wall is crumbling and must be repaired or replaced. The applicant is proposing to replace with a modular block wall.

Fact:

The City's Urban Forester has inspected the property and feels the trees should be removed.

Guidelines (page 26):

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

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

Guidelines (page 23):

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

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

3. *Maintain the property's natural topography, and avoid grading that adversely affects drainage and soil stability or could negatively impact existing trees.*

Conditions:

- That the retaining wall follow the slope of the property rather than be "stepped".
- That the trees be inventoried before they are removed.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig noted that the large Oak tree in question is healthy. Mr. Sears suggested that a better alternative would be to run the wall into the bank before reaching the tree and its roots instead of running the wall around the tree. Ms. Cantrell agreed and felt the wall should slope until it reaches the tree, but does not go around it. Mr. Burroughs was also in agreement with the suggestion and expressed his opinion that the other two trees that are thought to be endangering the wall should remain as there is a lack of compelling evidence for their removal and other options remain to be explored. Members questioned the proposed materials to be used. Members agreed that the wall was in poor condition but felt that it could successfully be replaced without removing the trees. It was suggested that the application should be revisited and other alternatives be explored.

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue the application until the June, 2013 Historic Preservation meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Spaeh, Burroughs, Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus, Sears, and Lane. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the Budget Office has proposed fees for Certificates of Appropriateness in the historic districts. The proposed fee schedule is as follows:

- (a) \$34.00 fee for a staff approved COA.
- (b) \$66.00 fee for a COA that must come before the Historic Preservation Commission.
- (c) \$115.00 fee for an after-the-fact application.

Sue Schwartz, Director of Planning and Community Development, recently met with leaders of the neighborhood associations in the historic districts to discuss the proposed fees. An alternative fee structure was suggested at the meeting. The revised proposal included (a) \$25.00 fee for a minor works application, (b) \$66.00 fee for a COA that must come before the Historic Preservation Commission, and (c) \$250.00 fee for an after-the-fact application.

Ms. Cockburn stated that Ms. Schwartz has requested that the Commission discuss the proposed fee structure and provide feedback and recommendations as the City goes into the final budget season. She indicated that internal discussions around fee recovery have focused on the efforts of staff and staff costs. The generation of revenue from the fees will help cover costs to allow the continuation of the program. Ms. Cockburn noted that the proposed after-the-fact application fee is in line with after-the-fact permit requests being charged by the Board of Adjustment.

A public hearing on the budget will be held June 4, 2013 and the final budget will be decided at the June 18, 2013 City Council meeting.

Members provided the following feedback regarding the proposed fee schedule:

- The proposed \$115.00 after-the-fact fee should be raised; \$200.00 was suggested as a good compromise.
- It was felt that the large difference in fees charged between submitting an application and submitting an after-the-fact application was very good.
- A member acknowledged the value of historic districts and stated his opinion that it is the government's responsibility to work in partnership with historic district property owners because they benefit the entire community. He was not supportive of having fees associated with the application process. He encouraged members of the community to communicate their feelings regarding fees at the public hearing.
- Another member felt that having fees would make applicants more serious about the process and he was supportive of attaching fees to applications, particularly the much larger fee for after-the-fact applications. He noted that a homeowner understands what is involved when they choose to move into a historic district. It may cost more to live in a historic district but if projects are done well, property values are enhanced.
- One member commented that after-the-fact applications make it difficult for the neighborhood association boards in historic districts to encourage owners to follow the *Historic District Design Guidelines* when there are offenders.

Members discussed the process for collecting fees and Ms. Geary commented on the amount of staff time involved with an after-the-fact application.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, stated that the College Hill neighborhood has not participated in any preliminary discussions about the fee structure. A representative was present at the meeting but there was no advance notice of the meeting's agenda; therefore, there was no consultation with the association as a whole to discuss the matter. At a neighborhood association meeting held yesterday, strong opposition to the fee structure was voiced. The association believes that if there is going to be any fee structure, it should only be done as part of a planned approach to improve participation in the COA application process.

Raymond Large, 622 North Elm Street, is a member of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He reported that there was mixed response to the fee structure proposal at their recent neighborhood meeting. There was more positive reception to the proposed fee for after-the-fact applications. They remain neutral on the matter at the present time; however, would like to weigh-in on the subject at a later date.

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, stated her opinion that a more welcoming feeling would exist without having an application fee. Two representatives from her neighborhood attended the overall meeting where fees were proposed but she felt that the subject should be taken neighborhood-wide to allow more people to weigh-in on the matter. Although she felt there should be no impediment to submitting a COA application, there should be higher fees for after-the-fact applications.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JUNE 26, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Lee Lucas, Chair; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Anne Bowers; and Linda Lane.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 29, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved approval of the May 29, 2013 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell, Bowers, Lane. Nays: None.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Ms. McManus, Mr. Sears, and Mr. Hoggard could not be present at the meeting.

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

**(a) Location: 909 Morehead Avenue
Application No. 1643
(CONTINUED UNTIL JULY, 2013 MEETING)**

The description of work is to remove trees and replace the deteriorated retaining wall. This case is continued from the May 29, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Cowhig indicated that a meeting was held with the applicant at the property to discuss alternatives for removing the trees. The applicant has requested a continuance to consider the alternatives.

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue application number 1643 until the July, 2013 meeting at the request of the applicant, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell, Bowers, Lane. Nays: None.)

**(b) Location: 509 Park Avenue
Application No. 1657
Applicant: James B. Rounds
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 6-12-13
(APPROVED)**

Description of Work:

Construction of addition and other alterations as part of renovation 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 consistent with the *Historic*

District Design Guidelines: Additions (page 75-76), Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64-66) and Roofs (page 52-54) for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a small house and the proposed changes are needed to make the floor plan more functional and the house more livable. The back porch enclosure is needed to enlarge the kitchen area. Matching materials will be used. The addition is designed to be clearly distinguishable from the main body of the house, and it should not obscure, change or damage any character-defining features of the house.

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.*
6. *Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

Facts:

The proposed repairs to the front porch will maintain the design and materials of the original front porch. The proposed front porch railing is characteristic of the Craftsman style and this is a craftsman bungalow.

Guidelines (page 64):

1. *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.*
2. *Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*
3. *If a deteriorated porch must be removed or is completely missing, replace it either with a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design that is appropriate for the structure in terms of materials, roof form, detailing, scale, size and ornamentation.*
4. *It is not appropriate to add elements or details to porches to create a false historical appearance.*
7. *Because of their character-defining role, it is not appropriate to enclose front porches. Side and rear porches may be enclosed to create sunrooms if the design of the enclosure is compatible with the architecture of the structure, and does not result in a loss of historic fabric or architectural details.*

Fact:

The dormer will be enlarged in a manner that maintains the materials and details of dormers on the house.

Guidelines:

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

In Support:

James Rounds, 1505 Garner Avenue
Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1657 for work at 509 Park Avenue. The applicant is James Rounds and the description of work includes construction of addition and other alterations as part of renovation of house. Staff recommends in favor of this Certificate of Application citing guidelines 1 through 6 on page 76, guidelines 1 through 4 and guideline 7 on page 64, and guideline 1 on page 53. Speaking in support was James Rounds, the owner, and Mindy Zachary, representing the neighborhood association.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers commented that this project seems to have been carefully thought out.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1657 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, facts on the worksheet, and guidelines 1 through 6 on page 76, guidelines 1 through 4 and guideline 7 on page 64, and guideline 1 on page 53 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell, Bowers, and Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1657 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to James Rounds for work at 509 Park Avenue, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell, Bowers, and Lane. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Chair Lucas distributed information on the Lowenstein Legacy Modernism House Tour and Symposium to be held in October, 2013.

Chair Lucas announced that this will be his last Historic Preservation Commission meeting before moving. Members and staff thanked him for his work with the Commission.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig reminded members that the Historic Tax Credit workshops for residential and commercial properties will be held June 27, 2013 at the Greensboro Historical Museum and June 28, 2013 at Holy Trinity Church.

Ms. Cockburn reported that the City's budget was approved at last night's City Council meeting. The proposed fees discussed at the last meeting were approved as part of the budget. The fee structure will include \$25 for minor works, \$50 for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Commission, and \$250 for an after-the-fact application. The fee structure will go into effect July 1, 2013. There will be a period of outreach and education to inform the historic communities about the fees.

SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR:

James Rounds, 1505 Garner Avenue, commented on the revised guidelines. He discussed the continuing problem with painting. He pointed out differences between opaque stains and paint, commenting that opaque stains for not peel. In addition, he was concerned that the new guidelines

encourage neighbors to get together to eliminate alley right-of-ways. Mr. Rounds also expressed concern about the streetscape and the issue of who takes care of stone walls. He felt that since the stone walls are on City property, the City should be responsible for repairs and not the private homeowners.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JULY 31, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Acting Chair; Christina Cantrell; Thomas Sears; Lois McManus; and Linda Lane.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 26, 2013 MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the June 26, 2013 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that absence of Mr. Burroughs was excused.

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

- (a) **Location: 909 Morehead Avenue
Application No. 1643
(CONTINUED UNTIL AUGUST, 2013 MEETING)**

Description of Work:

Remove trees and replace deteriorated retaining wall. This application was continued from the May 29, 2013 and June 26, 2013 meetings.

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has requested another continuance until the August, 2013 meeting. He is in process of gathering additional information for his presentation to the Commission.

Ms. Cantrell moved to continue the case until the August, 2013 meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

- (b) **Location: 211 North Park Drive
Application No. 1662
Applicant: Andrea Crouse and David Myers
Property Owner: Michael Parker
Date Application Received: 6-18-13
(DENIED)**

Description of Work:

Install moveable bike shelter.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Facts:

For the purposes of the Historic District Guidelines, bike shelters would fall into the category of miscellaneous items under the section on *Fences, Walls and Site Features*. It does not require a building permit because of its small size. It is described as moveable and temporary. The proposed location for the bike shelter is on the side of the house. And the guidelines recommend that miscellaneous items be located in areas such as rear yards, where they are not visible from the street.

Guidelines (page 26):

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

In Support:

Andrea Crouse, 211 North Park Drive
David Myers, 211 North Park Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1662 for work at 211 North Park Drive. The applicants are Andrea Crouse and David Myers. The description of work is to install a movable bike shelter. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that bike shelters are a new application for the historic district and might need to be added to the guidelines. Staff is opposed to building the shelter as presented because it is not congruous with district guidelines, citing guideline 1 in *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 24-27). Speaking in favor of the application was Andrea Crouse, 211 North Park Drive, who proposed moving the shelter back in the winter as opposed to having it on the side of the house during the spring, summer, and fall where it is convenient. The proposed shelter is to be enclosed on one side. David Myers, 211 North Park Drive, described the shed using cedar shake and said the structure would be hidden by plantings.

Discussion:

Members noted that the proposed structure is not allowed in side yards in the historic district. In addition, a structure large enough to cover the bicycles would be too large to successfully conceal with plantings. They felt the back yard would be a better location for the structure.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1662 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, facts on the worksheet, and guidelines on page 24 and 26 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1662 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Andrea Crouse and David Myers for work at 211 North Park Drive, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 1013 N. Elm Street**
Application No. 1665
Applicant: B. E. Enterprises
Property Owner: Dolly Madison Homeowner's Association
Date Application Received: 6-18-13
(GRANTED)

Description of Work:

Replace deteriorated balconies.

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 project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 24-27), for the following reasons:

Facts:

The balconies are a prominent feature of this 1920s apartment building. The original steel railings have decorative features that contribute to the character of the building. However, they do not meet current building code specifications. If the balconies are replaced the railings must meet the current code. The replacement railings would be constructed of steel, they would be 3" taller than the original railings and pickets would be spaced closer than on the original railings.

Guidelines (page 76):

1. *Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticos, balconies, pergolas, terraces and entrances.*
2. *Preserve and maintain historic materials and features of historic porches such as tongue-and-groove flooring, beaded board ceiling boards, trim, railings, lattice, entablatures, columns, steps, balustrades, brackets, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative trim. If a porch element or detail is deteriorated and requires replacement, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in material, size, scale, texture and detail. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*
3. *If a deteriorated porch must be removed or is completely missing, replace it either with a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design that is appropriate for the structure in terms of materials, roof form, detailing, scale, size and ornamentation.*

Condition:

- That the decorative design and detailing of the new railings match the original as closely as possible and that a drawing be provided to staff for review prior to construction.

In Favor:

Vernon Powell, 103 Elmwood Terrace
 Alan Berger, 4914 Gladwyn Drive, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1665 for work at 1013 North Elm Street. The description of work is replacement of deteriorated balconies. Speaking in support was Vernon Powell, 103 Elmwood Terrace, who was in favor of the improvements. However, he asked that people not park in his parking lot. Also in support was Alan Berger, 4914 Gladwyn Drive, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Mr. Berger, the contractor, indicated that the scrolls would be reused when the railings were redone. The same format would be followed and the railings would look the same except they would be three inches taller and the spread would be reduced to meet code requirements. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, remarked that the building is a contender for historic tax credits.

Discussion:

Mr. Sears stated that he was impressed with the engineering component and if done correctly, the project would be an asset to the building and to Greensboro. He encouraged owners to look into the availability of historic tax credits.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1665 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 on page 76 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1665 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Dolly Madison Home Owners Association for work at 1013 North Elm Street with the intention to make the balcony replacement aesthetic and to work toward potential historic preservation approval, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

- (d) Location: 614 Fifth Avenue
Application No. 1672
Applicant: Joy Brown
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-18-13
(GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

- Remove existing 15-lite front door and reinstall at back entry at new screen porch. Install new wood and glass front door of design shown in guidelines.
- Remove existing window over tub in guest bathroom and replace with new solid PVC window of same size and configuration. New window will have frosted glass.
- Remove all exterior siding. Install new exterior sheathing and house wrap. Install new Hardie Artisan siding with identical exposure and detailing as the original.
- Install two skylights over kitchen on right side of house near the back.

- Remove two trees close to foundation on left side of house. Remove two trees on right side of house. Remove Mulberry tree overhanging right rear corner of the 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 consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55-57)*, *Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23)*, *Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44-47)*, and *Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38-40)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This house is being totally renovated. The exterior siding is in unusually poor condition in part because of the abrasive measures used to prepare the surface for re-painting at some point. At the very least some sections of siding need to be replaced. The proposed replacement material is more similar in design to the original wood siding than traditional fiber cement siding. But it will not have the intrinsic quality of natural wood.

Guidelines (page 47):

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.

Fact:

The location of the window proposed for replacement is near the back of the house and not in a prominent location. The window pattern is one-over-one. The proposed replacement is a solid PVC window that matches the design and dimensions of the original. The proposed new front door is taken from the Guidelines Manual as an appropriate style for a bungalow.

Guidelines (page 57):

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

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

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

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

Fact:

The Mulberry tree and the two trees that were removed are too close to the house and should be removed to avoid structural damage. The other trees are so covered in vines that it is difficult to determine their condition.

Guidelines (page 21):

1. Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.
2. When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.
3. Maintain the property's natural topography, and avoid grading that adversely affects drainage and soil stability or could negatively impact existing trees.
4. Retain historic landscape materials such as brick or slate pavers. Crushed stone, "pea" gravel, or brick chips are examples of inappropriate materials for ground cover.
5. Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.

Fact:

The location of the skylights is above the kitchen which is at the right rear of the house. This is a fairly inconspicuous location. This is a front facing gable roof so there is no "rear elevation". Skylights fall into the same category as solar panels.

Guidelines (page 38):

1. Solar Panels are best located on rear elevations.

Recommended Conditions:

- That the new door be salvaged or new wood, simulated divided light (muntins permanently attached to exterior and interior of glass).
- That the skylights be low profile units.
- That the trees be cleared of vines and dead wood removed before a determination is made regarding their condition.
- That a trim board be used to indicate that the front porch was partially enclosed.

In Support:

Joe Bauer, New Age Builders, 625 Fulton Street
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1672 for work at 614 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Joy Brown and the description of work is to replace siding, bathroom window and front door, install skylights, and remove two trees. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that that a COA for work was approved in May, 2013 and the project will turn a duplex into a single-family unit. A door for the front of the house was shown from the list of acceptable designs. The applicant also plans to remove an existing window and replace it with solid PVC window and remove all exterior siding and install new Hardie Artisan siding. Mr. Cowhig commented that the siding was in very poor condition. Two skylights will also be installed over the kitchen on the back side of the house. They plan to remove two trees close to the foundation of the house. It was suggested that underbrush close to the house also be removed along with the Mulberry tree overhanging on the right rear of the property. Speaking in support was Joe Bauer of New Age Builders, 625 Fulton Street, who said that the Hardie Artisan plank was heavier looking siding. He distributed brochures describing the siding and stated that if the Hardie Artisan siding was not acceptable, they would look at cypress lap siding. Mr. Bauer stated that they plan to add transition board between the new front porch and the back

side of the house and they will retain the shakes over the top part of the front portion of the house. He said they may not use the old door because it was not in very good condition. A sample of the vinyl window was shown to Commissioners. In addition, skylights will be going into the kitchen to provide additional light. Mr. Bauer said it may be possible to retain the two Ash trees; however, the Mulberry tree was in very bad condition.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell felt that wood was a preferable material instead of Hardie board. Mr. Sears pointed out that in his experience; new-growth cypress boards are not as durable as other materials. He pointed out that modern wood does not hold up as well as old-growth wood. Ms. Geary stated that each application is unique and she explained why staff was willing to allow deviations from the guidelines in this instance. It was pointed out that the Commission has allowed the use of products similar to the proposed Hardie Artisan material in additions, not for existing houses, in the past.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1672 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 on pages 47, 57, 22, and 38 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: Cantrell.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1672 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joy Brown for work at 614 Fifth Avenue with the following conditions: (1) the new door be salvaged or new wood, simulated divided light (muntins permanently attached to exterior and interior of glass), (2) skylights be low profile units, (3) that the trees be cleared of vines and dead wood removed before a determination is made regarding their condition, and (4) that trim boards be used to indicate that the front porch was partially enclosed.

Mr. Cowhig clarified that staff's recommendation was for the use of wood siding. He remarked that this project would qualify for tax credit only if wood was used as the State requires that like materials be used in replacements. Mr. Bauer stated that the applicant plans to apply for historic tax credits.

Ms. Lane amended her motion and moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1672 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joy Brown for work at 614 Fifth Avenue with the following conditions: (1) the new door be salvaged or new wood, simulated divided light (muntins permanently attached to exterior and interior of glass; (2) skylights be low profile units; (3) that the trees be cleared of vines and dead wood removed before a determination is made regarding their condition; (4) that trim boards be used to indicate that the front porch was partially enclosed; and (5) that wood siding be used as the material of choice, not Hardie Artisan siding; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Lane. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig announced that a representative from the College Hill historic district is in process of being appointed to the Commission to fill the seat vacated by Patrick Lee Lucas. Staff is working to fill the remaining vacancies.

Ms. Geary informed members that the City has been awarded a grant to have a historic structure report made on the War Memorial Stadium.

Mr. Cowhig updated the Commission on the house in College Hill that burned and where a COA was issued to demolish it. The neighborhood is currently working with the City to find a way to save the house, possibly using municipal funds to acquire the property and prepare it for marketing to sell.

Ms. Cockburn reported that the recent commercial and residential historic tax credit workshops were well-attended. She felt that good projects would come out of the workshops and was hopeful that enough interest was generated to encourage individuals to help push the State Legislature to renew the credits when they expire next year.

Mr. Cowhig and Ms. Geary are working closely with the College Hill and Aycock Neighborhood Associations and their municipal service district projects. Both neighborhoods are preparing to have tree inventories done. Staff hopes that the inventories will help address the issue of Duke Energy's tree trimming activities. Neighborhoods will be able to identify where the lines are located and perform proactive pruning.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 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
AUGUST 28, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Acting Chair; Christina Cantrell; Thomas Sears; James Burroughs; David Hoggard; Lois McManus; and David Arneke.

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

REQUESTS FROM STAFF FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the property owner of 602 Fifth Avenue has requested a continuance for application number 1679.

Mr. Cowhig introduced the Commission's newest member, David Arneke, representing the College Hill historic district.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JULY 31, 2013 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved approval of the July 31, 2013 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, McManus, Burroughs, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that absence of Ms. Lane was excused.

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

- (a) **Location: 104 Fisher Park Circle**
Application number 1662
Applicant: Carl Nilsson
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-5-13
(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Install satellite dish.

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 location of the satellite dish is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (pages 38-40)*, for the following reasons:

Facts:

A satellite dish was installed in the front yard without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The homeowner submitted an application “after-the-fact”. The dish is located in the middle of the yard and is highly visible from the street.

Guidelines (page 40):

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:

Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street
Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1662 for work at 104 Fisher Park Circle. This is an after-the-fact application for installing a satellite dish. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that the satellite was installed after-the fact in the front yard by a new homeowner. He brought forth that there is a law in respect to telecommunications. Mr. Cowhig noted guideline 2 under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment*. Members questioned what would happen if the request was denied and staff indicated that the applicant could go to court or to the Board of Adjustments. Ms. Cantrell observed that an alternate location could be found and Mr. Cowhig mentioned that screening was a possibility. There was no one speaking in support of the application. Speaking in opposition was Sally Atwood, 802 Simpson Street, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She recommended against the application. Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street, was also opposed to the installation and offered the idea that satellite dishes can also be attached to roofs, on the side of houses, and on the chimney.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs noted that there was no one present to support the application or provide alternate locations for the satellite.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1662 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments, and Guideline 2 (page 40) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1662 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carl Nilsson for work at 104 Fisher Park Circle, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke. Nays: None.)

**(b) Location: 602 Fifth Avenue
Application No. 1679
(CONTINUED UNTIL SEPTEMBER, 2013 MEETING)**

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue application 1679 until the September, 2013 meeting. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, Burroughs, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig distributed an update of the College Hill Municipal Service District Plan to members. He explained that the Plan guides spending of special tax district funds. The original Plan called for streetscape improvements, landscaping, and other projects. College Hill would like to make an addition to the list of uses of their funds so they can restart their redevelopment effort on a very limited scale. The College Hill district has pledged \$25,000 of their Municipal Service District (MSD) funds toward saving a house in the neighborhood that is slated for demolition. Mr. Cowhig asked the Commission to consider recommending the plan update to City Council for final approval at their September 17, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Cowhig clarified for members that the City would acquire the property to be demolished and he described options for redevelopment of properties using the funds.

Mr. Arneke stated that the College Hill district is seeking authority to use MSD funds for the same purpose as the original redevelopment program had which was to remove the most blighted properties and, as in this case, save the most significant structures.

Ms. Cockburn explained that the College Hill district is presently restarting their strategic planning process for the neighborhood to conduct a neighborhood plan. One of the things being discussed along with the MSD update is using criteria to establish a list of properties that could be brought back to single-family use, should they become available, in the interest of creating stability in the neighborhood.

Property owners in the College Hill district will receive notice of a public hearing and will have an opportunity to review and comment on the MSD update. City Council has final action in the matter.

Mr. Hoggard moved to support the College Hill Municipal Service District Plan update, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke. Nays: None. Abstain: Burroughs.)

Mr. Cowhig asked members to consider holding a special meeting involving property at 619 South Mendenhall Street. The COA application was received today; however, a 48-hour notice is required before the case can be heard. Following discussion, a tentative date of Wednesday, September 4, 2013 was suggested for the special meeting.

Mr. Burroughs moved to hold a special meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation on Wednesday, September 4, 2013; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, Sears, Hoggard, Burroughs, McManus, Arneke. Nays: None.)

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street, stated that the Fisher Park historic neighborhood has an official greeter in each of their four quadrants to inform new homeowners that they are in, or out, of the historic district. Homeowners in the historic district are provided with a copy of guidelines to help them understand the implications of after-the-fact applications.

Mr. Cowhig stated that letters were sent out regarding the implementation of fees in the historic districts. The after-the-fact fee of \$250 will go into effect October 1, 2013 but the other fees will not go into effect until at least after the first of the year so there can be additional discussions.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Acting Chair Bowers announced that this will be the last meeting for Mr. Sears as a Historic Preservation Commissioner. Members thanked Mr. Sears for his many years of service to the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 4, 2013
SPECIAL MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christina Cantrell, Acting Chair; James Burroughs; David Hoggard; Lois McManus; David Arneke; and Linda Lane.

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

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

- (a) **Location: 619 South Mendenhall Street**
Application number 1682
Applicant: Karan (Jai) Singh
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-28-13
(CONTINUED UNTIL SEPTEMBER 25, 2013 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Construct third floor addition to house; expand house at back; add front porch railing; construct patio.

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—Additions (pages 38-40)* and *Roofs (pages 53-54)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The third story addition was constructed because the homeowners wanted to convert the attic to a bedroom. Because there was not enough head room to meet code they decided to remove the roof and construct a third story. They are also planning to expand the house at the back where there is currently a one-story kitchen wing.

Facts:

Removing the original roof and chimney and adding a third story obscures and radically changes character-defining features of the house. The original roof with its overhanging eaves, crown molding, returns and brick chimney is a key element of the Colonial Revival style of the house. The addition also changes the height, shape, form and massing of the house. The house becomes significantly taller which compromises the integrity of the original structure.

Guidelines (page 76):

1. In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.

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

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.*
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.*

In Support:

Jai Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street
 Krystal Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street
 James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street
 Keith Thurmond, 2 Asia Road, Mocksville, North Carolina

Summary:

Acting Chair Cantrell stated that this is application number 1682 for work at 619 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Jai Singh and the request is to construct a third floor addition to the house and expand the house at the back. Staff recommends against this application because it does not fit with the design guidelines in the historic district. Speaking in favor of the application was Jai Singh who purchased the property at 619 South Mendenhall but currently lives in Winston Salem, North Carolina. He indicated that although he was familiar with the neighborhood, he did not realize that a COA was required for this construction. He did go through building permits and it was not indicated to him that a COA was required before he started third floor construction. Also speaking in favor was Krystal Singh who provided the timing of the permits requested from the City of Greensboro. She indicated that they were not told a COA was required and a considerable amount of money has already been spent on the project. Speaking in favor was James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall, of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He felt that proceeding with the application was preferable to not continuing with the application and leaving an eyesore that would perhaps result in more rental property. The final person speaking in favor of the application was Keith Thurmond, a contractor, who provided drawings for the Singh's COA application.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs noted that although there may be issues with the current notification process in historic districts, the matter at hand to consider is the application itself and how it aligns with the guidelines. He agreed with staff that the project as presented was not congruent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. Ms. McManus expressed concern about stopping and restarting the project and felt that the City made a mistake. Acting Chair Cantrell commented that the third story addition appears to completely change the character of the house and she questioned what options were available to mitigate the change. Mr. Hoggard was not in support of the current application because it is not congruous with any of the guidelines. He suggested putting the roof back on and just raising the roof two feet which would change the look of the house. Mr. Arneke agreed with Mr. Hoggard that the application was not congruous with the guidelines. He noted that there are

three-story houses in the neighborhood but this proposed third story addition would be very out of scale. Mr. Burroughs was amenable to granting a continuance in this case to allow the applicants to present new ideas and illustrations to the Commission at the next meeting. Ms. Lane commented that the change in pitch was very egregious and felt that heightening the roof could be accomplished without changing the pitch. Counsel Williams clarified details for a continuation until the September, 2013 meeting.

Motion:

Mr. Arneke moved to continue application number 1682 and have staff work with the applicants to amend the application in response to points raised by staff comments, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Burroughs, Arneke, Hoggard, Lane, McManus. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 25, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Chair; Christina Cantrell; James Burroughs; David Hoggard; Lois McManus; David Arneke; and Linda Lane.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, and Hannah Cockburn; Department of Planning and Community Development. Also present were Tom Carruthers and James Dickens, City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 28, 2013 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the August 28, 2013 regular meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2013 SPECIAL MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved approval of the September 4, 2013 special meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

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

- (a) **Location: 602 Fifth Avenue**
Application number 1679
Applicant: Suzanne Gray, Agent
Property Owner: Blade Properties LLC
Date Application Received: 8-13-13
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

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

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue National Register Historic District. It is a good example of the Queen Anne style. The original two-over-two windows are a defining feature of the late-Victorian architectural period.

Fact:

Some of the original windows were replaced with vinyl windows without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The owner is proposing to replace the vinyl windows with SDL windows that match the muntin arrangement of the original windows.

Guidelines (page 57):

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

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

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

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

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

In Support:

Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue
Nathan Duggins, 100 North Greene Street

Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1679 for work at 602 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Suzanne Gray, Agent, for Blade Properties LLC. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that staff recommended in favor of granting this COA. The description of work is for the replacement of vinyl windows with new wood SDL windows. Staff cited guidelines on page 57. Staff confirmed that the sash and only vinyl windows were being replaced. This application corrects a longtime violation. Original windows were two-over-two, late-Victorian, turn of the century. The vinyl windows are being replaced with SDL wood windows with the original pattern. Speaking in support of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, who said that the neighborhood association voted in favor of the application. Also in favor of the application was Nathan Duggins, 100 North Greene Street. He wanted to be reassured that the application was replacing only the vinyl windows and he felt there might have been a mistake on the application relative to the number of windows being replaced.

Discussion:

Ms. Geary said that she has seen a sample of the proposed window and recommended that a condition be put on the application that the window be SDL with a shadow bar. Mr. Hoggard questioned if the windows would go back to sash only or sash within another box. Ms. Geary suggested that the matter could be addressed by placing a condition on the application. She also commented that there will be a phased replacement of the windows over time.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1679 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 2 and 3 (page 57) A and B, and 1-6 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1679 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Suzanne Gray, agent for Blade Properties, for work at 602 Fifth Avenue with the following conditions: (1) that the replacement of windows are only for vinyl windows with new wood SDL windows and a shadow bar, and (2) that the frame and sash be replaced to match the original windows, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (b) Location: 619 South Mendenhall Street**
Application number 1682
Applicant: Karan (Jai) Singh
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-28-13
(CONTINUED UNTIL OCTOBER, 2013 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Construct third floor addition to house; expand house at back; add front porch railing; construct patio.

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—Additions (pages 38-40)* and *Roofs (pages 53-54)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

Removing the original roof and chimney, adding a third story, and expanding the house at the back will compromise the historic structure. The original height, form and massing of the house will be altered significantly. The chimney, which is usually a defining feature of historic structures, has been removed. The enlargement at the back will not be distinguishable from the original structure. The net effect will be the loss of the home's historic integrity.

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

Guidelines (page 53):

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

In Support:

Dan Huckabee, 410 Beverly Place
 James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street
 Jai Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street
 Crystal Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1682 for work at 619 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Jai Singh and the description of work is to add a third floor addition, enlarge house at rear, add front porch railing, and construct a patio. Based on the information, staff recommended against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 38-40)* and *Roofs (pages 53-54)*. The background was continued from a special meeting held on September 4, 2013. Work has been going on with a permit from City inspectors. After the September 4, 2013 meeting, the Commission was willing to look at a new proposal relating to the addition. The applicant provided scale drawings for the Commission to review and the roof pitch was changed back to the original roof pitch per some of the instructions. The incongruity is due to expanding the house at the back and compromising the historic structure. The house will be altered significantly. The chimney, a defining feature, has been removed. The enlargement in the back of the house will not be distinguishable from the original structure and the net effect will be the loss of the home's historic character. Staff cited guidelines 1-6 on page 76 along with guidelines 1 and 4 on page 53. In addition, staff noted that this is a nonconforming structure and would have to go before the Board of Adjustment for a variance. It was also clarified that this case must be judged as an individual case and not in comparison with other applications. Speaking in favor of the application was Dan Huckabee, 410 Beverly Place, who was the designer of the addition. He commented that the homeowners had pulled a permit and had done all the proper things without ever being notified that they were in a historic district. Neither the building inspector nor the realtor mentioned this. In response to Mr. Huckabee, the Commission commented that they had specified not doing the third floor but only a second floor roof addition. James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, stated that the neighborhood association was in support of the application. The neighborhood was concerned about what would happen if the construction was not completed. Mr. Keith shared some personal comments. Jai Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street, homeowner, said they had slipped through the cracks. He felt they had done what the Commission had asked. He pointed out that are eight rentals, four family homes, and one foreclosed house in the neighborhood. He was willing to add a chimney and reuse windows. Mr. Singh felt they were improving the neighborhood. There was a lengthy discussion. David Hoggard suggested again raising the roof to meet code for the third story, just being in the attic, and clarified where the third story idea came from. There was more lengthy discussion. Crystal Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street, said that a great deal of money had been put into the application and she felt there was a possibility they wouldn't be able to continue if they did not have the Commission's COA. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Referring to minutes from the September 4, 2013 special meeting, members reiterated that they had requested the applicant to bring back drawings with the elimination of the third floor addition and an extension of the height of the roofline to accommodate the bedroom. Mr. Burroughs asked the applicants if they were amenable to a continuance. Jai Singh responded in the affirmative. Mr. Huckabee indicated that he understood that what he was being asked to bring back at the next meeting did not include a third floor addition.

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue this case, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (c) **Location: 114 South Mendenhall Street (in the public right-of-way)**
Application number 1688
Applicant: Leo Ballard, AT&T
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 9-11-13
(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replacement of metal telecommunications cabinet on utility pole with larger metal cabinet.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the new cabinet is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public right-of-Way (page 20)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The new cabinet is part of AT&T upgrades to their telecommunications system to provide high speed broadband and television services.

Fact:

The new cabinet is significantly larger than the one it replaced. It is so large that it interferes with views of the historic structures along South Mendenhall Street; in particular the view of the Troy Bumpass Inn, one of the oldest and most significant homes in Greensboro. It undermines ongoing efforts to improve the quality of the streetscape in College Hill.

Fact:

It is not known whether or not there are alternatives to a very large cabinet in such a prominent location in the Historic District.

Guidelines (page 20):

6. Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters, that are disturbed as part of the installation, should be maintained.

Recommended Condition:

- If there are no alternative locations for the cabinet, consider moving it higher on the utility pole and paint a dark green color to match the traffic signal control boxes.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street
 Larry Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street
 Bill Berkley, 701 Morehead Street
 Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1688 for work in the public right-of-way at 114 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Leo Ballard with AT&T. The property owner is the

City of Greensboro. This is an after-the-fact application. City staff recommends against granting a COA for this application citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public right-of-Way (page 20)* for the following reasons: (1) the new cabinet is part of AT&T upgrades to their telecommunications system to provide high speed broadband and television services; (2) the new cabinet is significantly larger than the one it replaced. It is so large that it interferes with views of the historic structures along South Mendenhall Street; in particular the view of the Troy Bumpass Inn, one of the oldest and most significant homes in Greensboro. It undermines ongoing efforts to improve the quality of the streetscape in College Hill; and (3) it is not known whether or not there are alternatives to a very large cabinet in such a prominent location in the Historic District. They also cited guideline 6 on page 20 as follows: *Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters, that are disturbed as part of the installation, should be maintained.* Staff recommended that if there are no alternative locations for the cabinet consider moving it higher on the utility pole and paint a dark green color to match the traffic signal control boxes. There was no one speaking in support of the application. Speaking in opposition was James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, who said the neighborhood association voted to deny the application. He pointed out that AT&T could not provide broadband service in the neighborhood from that particular box. They have to come from outside to provide the service. He noted the picture in the application was not the box that was used and also cited incidences where other cities have had the same issues with AT&T and their large boxes. Larry Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street, pointed out that the replacement box is much larger and he distributed pictures of the new box. He said the box blocked traffic and could attract graffiti. Bill Berkeley, 701 Morehead Street, owns nearby landmark properties. He pointed out that ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) issues of not being able to pass the box in a wheelchair. Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street, also pointed out that the new box is very large. The old box was not particularly hazardous to one's health; however, the new box was quite large and in the way of traffic as well. There was no one speaking in rebuttal.

Discussion:

Members commented that the work is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. Ms. Cantrell was not supportive of placing the box higher on the pole and painting it green. She felt an alternate location should be secured for the large box. Commissioners noted that the applicant was not present to respond to questions.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1688 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that Guideline 6 (page 20) that reads as follows: *Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters, that are disturbed as part of the installation, should be maintained,* along with staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1688 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Leo Ballard, agent for AT&T, for work 114 South Mendenhall Street, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (d) **Location: 1003 North Eugene Street**
Application number 1690
Applicant: Jane Nickles
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-11-13
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of garage according to attached site plan and elevation drawings. Concrete driveway and parking area to be removed and replaced with brick paver multi-purpose area (turn-around and patio). Siding and trim to be fiber cement.

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 replacement windows are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garage* (page 35-36) for the following reasons:

Facts:

1003 North Eugene Street is a "contributing structure" in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. 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 along with double-hung windows.

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 structure 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 Conditions:

- That the window casings be wider to match window casings on historic garages in the neighborhood.
- That consideration be given to replacing the roof as shown with a smaller hip roof that covers only two bays and covering the parking space with a pergola type (open decorative rafters), eliminating the brackets and maintaining a consistent overhang.

In Support:

Don Smith, 308 Parkway
Jane Nickles, 1003 North Eugene Street
Tricia Dowling, 1001 North Eugene Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application 1690 for work at 1003 North Eugene Street. The applicant is Jane Nickles. The description of work is for construction of a garage. The concrete driveway and parking area are to be removed and replaced with brick paver multi-purpose area (turn-around and patio), with siding and trim to be fiber cement. Staff reviewed the plans with a past Design Review architect who suggested that the building might be a little large and felt that the

carport area should be turned into a pergola along with removing the brackets. This alteration could be handled at staff level if the application is approved. Staff noted that the applicant was planning to use salvaged wood and salvaged windows if possible. Mr. Cowhig cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garage* (page 35-36), numbers 2, 3, and 4. Staff recommends in favor of granting a COA with the following conditions: (1) that the window casings be wider to match window casings on historic garages in the neighborhood, and (2) that consideration be given to replacing the roof as shown with a smaller hip roof that covers only two bays and covering the parking space with a pergola type (open decorative raters), and eliminating the brackets and maintaining a consistent overhang. Speaking in support of the application was Don Smith, 308 Parkway, who is president of the neighborhood association. He stated that the neighborhood unanimously supports the application. Also in support was Jane Nickles, 1003 North Eugene Street, the applicant. She was open to any suggestions that staff might make and expressed flexibility in making changes. Speaking in support with questions was Tricia Dowling who resides at 1001 North Eugene. She is a neighbor who shares a property line with the applicant. She asked questions about construction of the driveway, the bricks, and the building site. It was recommended that she speak with the homeowner and the landscape architect to get more details. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Members discussed guidelines for concrete driveways. Ms. Nickels, the applicant, stated that she was not doing anything to the existing driveway. The brick pavers would be on her side of the property line. Ms. Lane was in agreement with earlier comments that the overall footprint of the roof line was too large. She was supportive of the proposed open pergola or structure to make it wider and possibly reshape the geometry of the hip roof to be in keeping with the main structure. Mr. Hoggard urged the applicant to consider using a garage door that was consistent with design elements in the neighborhood. He agreed that the brackets should be removed.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1690 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 2, 3, and 4, (page 36) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1690 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jane Nickles for work at 1003 North Eugene Street with the following conditions: (1) that the applicant work with City staff to ameliorate the size of the overall roof with suggestions that have been provided, possibly a pergola; (2) that the exterior casing of the windows is appropriate to the neighborhood; and (3) that the brackets be eliminated and a consistent overhang with the overall roof be maintained.

Mr. Burroughs made a friendly amendment to add a condition (4) that staff should have final approval of the design elements, specifically the garage door features. Ms. Lane accepted the friendly amendment, and Ms. McManus seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (e) Location: 806 Cypress Street**
Application number 1692
Applicant: Sandra Browning
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-11-13
(APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove Yoshino Cherry tree.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Facts:

This tree appears to be healthy and not causing problems for any structures. The Yoshino Cherry was introduced into the United States in 1912 so it is not likely they were part of the early neighborhood environment. They are flowering trees and do not grow high enough to become part of the neighborhood tree canopy. In this case the tree is shading out the lawn and competing with the nearby Crape Myrtles. Its removal should have little effect on the Historic District tree canopy. It was planted by the homeowner who would like to remove it and restore the lawn. There are numerous shade trees in the back yard that contribute to the neighborhood green canopy.

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:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1692 for work at 802 Cypress Street. The applicant is Sandra Browning and the description of work is to remove a Yoshino Cherry tree. Staff is in favor of recommending removal of the tree stating that the tree was introduced into the country in 1912 and was not part of the original neighborhood. The homeowner planted the tree and in this case it is shading the lawn and competing with nearby Crape Myrtle trees. Mike Cowhig noted that removing the tree will benefit the Crape Myrtles. He cited guidelines 1 and 2 on page 23. Speaking in support of the application was Mindy Zachary, 604 Summit Avenue, representing the Aycock neighborhood. The neighborhood approved the application.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1692 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 2 and 3, (page 23) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1690 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sandra Browning for work at 806 Cypress, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Members discussed forming a subcommittee that would be tasked with investigating the process in which people are notified regarding HPC concerns.

Mr. Burroughs moved to form such a subcommittee that would include James Burroughs; James Keith; David Hoggard; Linda Lane; Mike Cowhig, staff liaison; with Mr. Burroughs serving as Chairman; seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig reported that he recently met with Stefan-Leigh Geary, Hanna Cockburn, and Sue Schwartz to discuss the issues of education and awareness. He discussed several approaches that would promote awareness and public relations in the community. Members suggested exploring the idea of using an electronic trigger through the Water Resources Department when residents apply for new service in a historic district. It was also suggested to have staff start attending the Board of Realtor's monthly meeting and also to use mail-outs on a more regular basis.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
OCTOBER 30, 2013**

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 25, 2013 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Hoggard moved approval of the September 25, 2013 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke, Lane. Nays: None. Abstain: Adams.) Ms. Adams is a new member and was not present at the September 25, 2013 meeting.

Ms. Bowers joined the meeting at 4:09 p.m.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

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

- (a) **Location: 619 South Mendenhall Street**
Application Number: 1682
Applicant: Karan (Jai) Singh
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-28-13
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS and SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)

Description of Work:

Construct third floor addition and enlarge the house at back; add front porch railing; construct patio.

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, while the proposed work is not congruous with the letter of the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 38-40)*, and *Roofs (pages 53-54)*, it does meet the spirit of the guidelines for the following reasons:

Facts:

The original roof and chimney were removed inadvertently as part of a project to add a third story and livable attic space. If the additions and renovations were constructed according to the homeowners' original plans, the house would have been drastically changed and out of character with the Historic District. The revised plans are significantly more sympathetic with the character of the house and the Historic District than the previous plans. The roof pitch and exterior detailing will match the original roof. The third story has been eliminated reducing the overall height. Exterior materials will match the original materials. The original gable end window will be reused.

Facts:

The house will be enlarged at the rear but the additional square footage is of a size and scale that should not overwhelm the original house.

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

Guidelines (page 53):

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

Note:

Because the house is within 15' of the Lilly Street right-of-way, the house is considered nonconforming. Any expansion of the house will require a Special Exception approved by the Board of Adjustment. The Special Exception must first be recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission as meeting the Historic District Guidelines.

Recommended Conditions:

- That the chimneys be rebuilt if feasible.
- That details including new windows, steps, railings and site improvements like the patio be submitted for staff approval.
- That dormers may be acceptable for the south elevation to meet code requirements. A revised elevation drawing will be brought back to the Commission for approval.

In Support:

Tom Wright, Attorney, 301 North Elm Street
 Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street
 Dan Huckabee, 410 Beverly Place
 Jai Singh, 619 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Cantrell stated that this is an after-the-fact situation where building has already started and there are difficulties coming to consensus on what is within the Historic Design Guidelines, what meets building codes, and also what meets the needs of the Singh family. Tom Wright, Attorney, spoke in favor of the application. The College Hill Neighborhood Association spoke in favor of the COA because they were supportive of having an owner-occupied house in the neighborhood. Also speaking in favor was Dan Huckabee, designer; and the homeowner, Jay Singh. Staff is in favor of constructing the addition that is a heightened roof attic addition, but not a third floor. Today the

Commission found out that the building code requires more windows than the design presented at this meeting. Therefore, the design presented today would not meet the building code.

Counsel Williams summarized that the Commission is trying to decide on an issue in which the information is incomplete.

Acting Chair Cantrell stated that they are looking at a design, whether or not the Commission can approve it, which does not meet building code.

It was questioned if the application could be approved because it does not meet building code. Members discussed approval of the application with the addition of conditions.

Mr. Cowhig stated that in staff's recommended conditions, they felt a reasonable approach would be to meet building code through the construction of dormers.

Discussion:

Mr. Hoggard asked if the Commission could approve the design with a condition that building code be met through the use of dormers to be approved by staff. Counsel Williams confirmed that approval can be delegated to staff by the Commission. If staff is comfortable, the Commission can approve the application with conditions and let staff approve how the conditions should look. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff was comfortable designing and approving the dormers; however, in listening to testimony he was unsure if the applicants want the dormers.

Acting Chair Cantrell asked Commissioners if they were amenable to Mr. Wright's earlier request that the plans rejected at last month's meeting be reconsidered. Members indicated that they would vote to disapprove the request. A complete third story addition would not be approved by the Commission. Mr. Hoggard pointed out that this has been the consensus throughout all three meetings.

Acting Chair Cantrell summarized that the design, as presented at today's meeting, does not meet building code but could meet code if conditions were placed on the application.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1682 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 are acceptable as findings of fact along with the following guidelines: *Additions-- (Page 76) 1. In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly; 2. Distinguish additions from original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material; 3. Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed; 4. Limit the size and scale of additions, so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised; 5. Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate; 6. Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees; and Roofs--(Page 53) 1. Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhand, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks; 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.* Ms. McManus seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1682 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the applicant, Karan (Jai) Singh for work 619 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) That the chimneys be rebuilt if feasible; (2) That details including new windows, steps, railings and site improvement like the patio be submitted for staff approval; and (3) If dormers are the solution for the building code requirements, that revised elevation drawings be brought back to staff for approval, seconded by Mr. Hoggard.

Members discussed the first condition regarding the feasibility of rebuilding the chimney. Staff noted that they would like the chimney rebuilt only if it could be built out of matching brick. Counsel Williams asked staff to clarify if the chimney was to be functioning or cosmetic in nature as it may not be possible to rebuild a working chimney. Mr. Cowhig felt that the chimney could be non-working and pointed out that a chimney would help blend the structure in with the surrounding neighborhood because almost all the houses on the street have chimneys. Mr. Hoggard disputed the condition noting that it would not be functional or feasible and would only be aesthetic at this point. He suggested dropping the condition because so much of the house design is changing. Mr. Arneke was in support of amending the motion and dropping the first condition.

Mr. Arneke amended his motion and moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1682 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the applicant, Karan (Jai) Singh for work 619 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) That details including new windows, steps, railings and site improvement like the patio be submitted for staff approval, and (2) If dormers are the solution for building code requirements, that revised elevation drawings be brought back to staff for approval, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion for a Special Exception:

Mr. Arneke moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment that a Special Exception be approved for the proximity of the structure to Lilly Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 114 South Mendenhall Street (in the public right-of-way)**
Application Number 1708
Applicant: Jason A. Franza, AT&T
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 10-4-13
(CONTINUED UNTIL DECEMBER 4, 2013 MEETING)

Mr. Cowhig stated that a request has been submitted for the reconsideration of a denied Certificate of Appropriateness based on new information being provided. The Commission can vote to accept the request for reconsideration and hear it as a new application. Representatives from AT&T are present to make the case for the new information.

Mr. Arneke pointed out that there is no new information that relates to historic guidelines in the letter accompanying the application. Mr. Cowhig commented that there was no one present at the last meeting to represent AT&T and unanswered questions from the last meeting could be addressed if the application was heard.

Following discussion, Mr. Hoggard moved to let the applicant present new information, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Lane, Adams. Nays: Arneke.)

Jason Franza, 100 South Eugene Street, representing AT&T, requested that the item be reopened. He stated there was no new information but offered to answer any questions.

Responding to questions, Mr. Franza indicated that there is no other suitable place to locate the box that would not infringe on regulations. However, the box can be raised 10 feet on the pole to sit exactly where the old box was located. In addition, the box can be painted green. The box cannot be placed on top of the pole or in the grassy area between the sidewalk and the street. The subject box is the smallest size available. He stated that the box could possibly be moved onto the Bumpass Troy Inn property if an easement was granted by the owners. Mr. Franza stated that not only would it be an expensive process but it would be impossible to maintain service to the College Hill neighborhood if the box was relocated.

Ms. Bowers moved to reconsider the application, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Description of Work:

Replacement of metal telecommunications cabinet on utility pole with larger metal cabinet.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the new cabinet is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public right-of-Way (page 20)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The new cabinet is part of AT&T upgrades to their telecommunications system to provide high speed broadband and television services.

Fact:

The new cabinet is significantly larger than the one it replaced. It is so large that it interferes with views of the historic structures along South Mendenhall Street; in particular the view of the Troy Bumpass Inn, one of the oldest and most significant homes in Greensboro. It undermines ongoing efforts to improve the quality of the streetscape in College Hill.

Guidelines (page 20):

6. Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters, that are disturbed as part of the installation, should be maintained.

Recommended Condition:

- If there are no alternative locations for the cabinet, consider moving it higher on the utility pole and paint a dark green color to match the traffic signal control boxes.

In Support:

Jason Franza, AT&T, 100 South Eugene Street

In Opposition:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

Bill Berkley, 701 Morehead Street

Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street

Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street, suggested the possibility that the box could be placed in the rear of her property at the Troy Bumpass Inn. In addition, Bill Berkley, 701 Morehead Street, asked that consideration be given to placing the box at the corner of West Market and South Mendenhall Street next to the traffic control box. Mr. Franza said that he was willing to explore placing the box at other locations. He reiterated that site selection is bound by transmission capability.

Members felt more information was needed to make a decision. They were supportive of a continuation for the applicant to gather more specific information on other possible site locations for the box.

Mr. Franza agreed to continue the application until the next meeting on December 4, 2013.

Mr. Hoggard moved to continue the application until the next meeting to find a more suitable location, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

(c) Location: 518 Fifth Avenue
Application Number 1707
Applicant: Camilla Cornelius
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 10-15-13
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replace existing wood siding with new wood siding that matches the design and dimensions of the existing siding.

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 Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44-47)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This property has been completely renovated. For the most part original exterior materials have been repaired and retained. However, the owners chose to replace all of the original siding with matching wood siding. The original trim work, including corner boards, window and door casings, soffit, fascia, crown molding, etc. has been retained. The new wood siding was left unpainted. There is no historical precedent in the district for unpainted wood siding.

Guidelines (page 47):

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, patten, and detail. The appropriateness of substitute materials is reviewed based on the size, shape, texture, patten, and detail as compared to the original material and, when available, past performance of the material in documented cases.

In Support:

Stephen Ruzicka, 517 Fifth Avenue
 Linda Foscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue

Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Cantrell stated that this is application number 1707 for work at 518 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Camilla Cornelius of the same address. The description of work is to replace the existing wood siding with new wood siding that matches the design and dimensions of the existing siding. Staff comments recommended against granting this COA because the proposed work is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes* (page 44-47). The property has been completely renovated and the original wood siding was replaced with matching wood siding. The original trim work has been retained. The wood siding was left unpainted and stained. There is no historical precedent in the district for unpainted wood siding. Speaking in favor was Stephen Ruzicka, 517 Fifth Avenue, who is the property owner. He said that their original intention was to replace only the boards that needed to be but during the renovation he realized that almost everything needed to be replaced. Also speaking in support was Linda Foscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue, President of the Aycock Neighborhood Association Board. The Board is in favor of this application.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers felt that the house looked good. Members noted that a future owner could paint the siding if desired and it would not require a COA. In addition, the original fabric was damaged by mold that could not be cleaned away. Mr. Hoggard indicated he was in favor of the application.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1707 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 -- Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes* (page 44-47) and that staff comments and guidelines on page 47 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1707 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Camilla Cornelius for work at 518 Fifth Avenue, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

**(d) Location: 224 South Park Drive
Application Number 1699
Applicant: Steve J. Rubin
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-30-13
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Mr. Hoggard asked to be recused from this case due to a conflict of interest.

Ms. McManus moved to recuse Mr. Hoggard from this item, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Description of Work:

Replace wood handrails at front porch and steps with brick cheek walls; replace porch and balcony railings with new wood railing; face front steps with blue stone.

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 will be

consistent with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 64-66) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The existing railings are deteriorated and need to be replaced. The front steps are not original. Cheek walls as proposed are a commonly found feature in the historic districts and would be in keeping with the house and the historic district. Blue stone is another material that is used commonly. The proposed front porch and balcony railing design is found in the historic district on houses of this vintage. An alternative might be the railing design on the house at 115 North Park Drive.

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 details. It is not appropriate to replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.*
3. *If a deteriorated porch must be removed or is completely missing, replace it either with a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design that is appropriate for the structure in terms of materials, roof form, detailing, scale, size, and ornamentation.*
4. *It is not appropriate to add elements or details to porches to create a false historical appearance.*

Recommended Conditions:

- That a construction detail or sketch of the porch and balcony railing be provided for staff approval prior to the beginning of construction.
- That wrought iron or aluminum railings be installed to meet Building Code safety requirements for the steps.

In Support:

Steve Rubin, 224 South Park Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Acting Chair Cantrell stated that this is application number 1699 for work at 224 South Park Street. The applicant is Steve Rubin of the same address. The description of work is to replace wood handrails at front porch and steps with brick cheek walls; replace porch and balcony railings with new wood railing; and face front steps with blue stone. Examples of ideas that Mr. Rubin would like to consider were presented to members. Staff recommends in favor of granting this COA with conditions. Cheek walls are generally allowed in this neighborhood and are frequently approved at staff level. Existing railings are in deterioration and not original to the house and neither are the front steps. To support this application staff cited *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 64-66), guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4. Speaking in support of the application was the property owner, Steve Rubin. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers felt that the application should be approved with the railing design to be approved at staff level. The Commission asked staff to do more research on an appropriate railing design to see if the cutout design might work in this house. Mr. Cowhig indicated that staff will consult with the

State Historic Preservation office in addition to looking at documentary publications about porch railings.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1699 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that the following guidelines under *Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 64-66): 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 replace deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps;* 3. *If a deteriorated porch must be removed or is completely missing, replace it either with a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design that is appropriate for the structure in terms of materials, roof form, detailing, scale, size, and ornamentation;* and 4. *It is not appropriate to add elements or details to porches to create a false historical appearance;* and along with staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None. Abstain: Hoggard.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1699 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Steve Rubin for work at 224 South Park Street with the following conditions: (1) That a construction detail or sketch of the porch and balcony railing be provided for staff approval prior to the beginning of construction, and (2) That wrought iron or aluminum railings be installed to meet Building Code safety requirements for the steps, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None. Abstain: Hoggard.)

Mr. Hoggard left the meeting unexcused and therefore, his vote in the following matter will be counted in the affirmative.

- (e) Location: 1003 North Eugene Street**
Application Number 1690
Applicant: Jane Nickles
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-11-13
(SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)

Description of Work:

Construction of garage according to attached site plan and elevation drawings. Concrete driveway and parking area to be removed and replaced with brick paver multi-purpose area (turn-around and patio). Siding and trim to be fiber cement.

Note:

The proposed garage is larger than 50% of the footprint of the house. Therefore, 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.

Following discussion, Ms. McManus moved to recommend a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment for the zoning requirement for the 50 percent rule for the footprint of the house, seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Cantrell, Bowers, Hoggard, McManus, Lane, Adams, Arneke. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff will be scheduling a meeting of the newly formed Education and Public Relations Committee in the very near future.

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 OFFICE BUILDING
DECEMBER 4, 2013**

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 30, 2013 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Cantrell moved approval of the October 30, 2013 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

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

- (a) **Location: 114 South Mendenhall Street (in the public right-of-way)**
Application Number 1708
Applicant: Jason A. Franza, AT&T
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 10-4-13
(CONTINUED UNTIL JANUARY 29, 2014 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Replacement of metal telecommunications cabinet on utility pole with larger metal cabinet.

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 new cabinet is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public right-of-Way (page 20)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The new cabinet is part of AT&T upgrades to their telecommunications system to provide high speed broadband and video services.

Fact:

The new cabinet is significantly larger than the one it replaced. It interferes with the views of historic structures along South Mendenhall Street, and it conflicts with ADA sight obstruction standards.

Guidelines (page 20):

6. *Place cables and wires underground, and locate poles at rear of lots. Add new poles, cables, and related equipment in the public right-of-way only when there is no other feasible way of meeting established safety and code standards. Granite curbs and brick gutters, that are disturbed as part of the installation, should be maintained.*

Recommended Condition:

- Move the cabinet higher on the utility pole and paint a dark green color to match the traffic signal control boxes.

In Support:

Jason Franza, AT&T, 100 South Eugene Street

In Opposition:

Bill Berkley, 701 Morehead Avenue

Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street

Rebuttal:

Jason Franza, AT&T, 100 South Eugene Street

Discussion:

At the last meeting, the Commission continued this case to allow Mr. Franza time to explore other possible ground locations for the cabinet. Mr. Franza and AT&T have worked with neighborhood residents and have investigated alternative locations but have been unable to come up with a workable solution. Mr. Cowhig distributed and read an e-mail from Mr. Franza explaining circumstances that prevent the use of the suggested alternate locations due to ADA and right-of-way requirements. Mr. Cowhig commended Mr. Franza for his effort trying to find a feasible location.

From a guidelines perspective, staff felt that it would be preferable to move the cabinet higher on the utility pole and have it painted a dark green color rather than have it remain in its current location.

Jason Franza, 100 South Eugene Street, stated that several alternative sites were explored and a meeting was held with Mr. and Mrs. Horn, owners of the Troy Bumpass Inn. He confirmed that it was not possible to locate an alternate site for the cabinet. Mr. Franza responded to questions from Commissioners.

Mr. Arneke questioned if the office building property located at the corner of West Market Street and South Mendenhall Street could be used as a possible site for the cabinet.

Bill Berkley, 701 Morehead Avenue, presented two possible locations where the cabinet can be placed on his property located at the corner of South Mendenhall Street and West Market Street. Mr. Berkley stated that he is absolutely opposed to putting the proposed cabinet on the utility pole under any circumstances and he felt that his property would be an excellent location where AT&T trucks could park in his parking lot.

Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street, agreed that she did not like the look of the box placed on the pole.

Speaking in rebuttal, Jason Franza, 100 South Eugene Street, referred to Mr. Berkley's suggestion and stated that AT&T cannot place any facilities off of the right-of-way without deeded property. Ingress and egress to the property would be required in addition to the physical plot. Mr. Berkley was amenable to granting an easement and he agreed to discuss details with Mr. Franza.

Members were supportive of exploring this new option and felt a continuance would be appropriate.

Although he expressed reservations with Mr. Berkley's offer, Mr. Franza was agreeable to a continuation to explore the new option.

Mr. Arneke moved to continue application number 1708 until the next meeting, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

- (b) **Location: 918 Carr Street**
Application Number 1712
Applicant: Carl L. Robbins
Property Owner: Carl L. Robbins Living Trust
Date Application Received: 11-8-13
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Sliding automatic metal fence gate. This is an after-the-fact application.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The black metal gate/fence replaces a wooden gate that had become deteriorated. The new fence and gate is constructed of black aluminum and is similar to existing black metal fencing at the front of the property.

Fact:

The height of the new section is less than 42 inches in height.

Fact:

The mechanical portion of the gate which allows it to slide open and shut via a remote is black metal designed to blend with the fence style of the gate.

Guidelines (page 26):

5. Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, sale, location, and size with the 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.

Recommended Condition:

- That the existing metal fence end at the point in which the new fence/gate begins.

In Support:

Carl Robbins, 918 Carr Street

Opposition:

Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street

Rebuttal in Support:

Carl Robbins, 918 Carr Street

Summary:

Acting Chair Bowers stated that this is application number 1712 for work at 918 Carr Street. The description of work is for a sliding automatic metal fence/gate. This is an after-the-fact application.

The applicant is Carl L. Robbins of 918 Carr Street. Staff recommended in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with a condition. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, felt that the changes were congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines---Fences, Walls, and Site Features (page 24)* because it is a metal gate which meets the guidelines and the height of the new section is less than 42 inches in height. The mechanical portion of the gate allows it to open and shut via a remote control and blends in. Mr. Cowhig cited guideline 5 and 5-A on page 26. The recommended condition was that the existing metal fence end at the point where the new fence/gate begins. He commented that there was very little reference to gates in the guidelines. The gate needs to be low in the front yard and in metal or wood as appropriate for the neighborhood. Speaking in support of the application was Carl Robbins, 918 Carr Street, who said he had difficulty getting his trash containers out and the property next door drained a lot of water into his property rusting out the old fence. He also wanted the new fence as security. Speaking in opposition was Judy Horn, 114 South Mendenhall Street, on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood expressed concern that a COA was not applied for and they were willing to defer to the Commission on a decision. Speaking in rebuttal was Mr. Robbins who did not realize he needed a COA for replacement of the fence. He thought a COA was only required for new work. Ms. Lane asked if he considered replacing all the fencing and Mr. Robbins felt that he could not afford to do that. Ms. Adams confirmed his intentions.

Discussion:

Mr. Arneke was bothered by the way the new gate goes behind the existing fence. He was in support of the recommended condition to remedy the issue but he did not feel the concern was severe enough to deny the COA. Landscaping would also be helpful in the area where the gate and the fence meet. Ms. Cantrell did not feel that an eyesore was created by the two different styles of fencing. Acting Chair Bowers and Ms. Cantrell indicated they were not in favor of the recommended condition.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1712 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 Guideline 5 on page 26 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1712 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carl L. Robbins for work at 918 Carr Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Cantrell, McManus, Arneke, Lane, Adams. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the recent appeal of the Mendenhall Street property to the Board of Adjustment (BOA). A Special Exception was approved by the BOA for the property's encroachment onto Lilly Street. The applicant's appeal of the Commission's decision was continued until the next meeting of the BOA.

The next Historic Preservation Commission meeting is scheduled for January 29, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd