

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JANUARY 25, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Anne Bowers; James Burroughs;
Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; and Jill Spaeh.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community
Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the
Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the January 25, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Mr. Lucas, Mr. Sears, and Mr. Macy were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 7, 2011 MEETING:

Ms. McManus moved to accept the minutes from the December 7, 2011 meeting as written, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 708 Simpson Street**
Application No. 1490
Applicant: Thomas Wear
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 1-11-12 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Alterations to foundation walls at side and back of house as part of basement renovation.

Note: Plans showing the changes to the garage are informational. This part of the project can be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Bowers joined the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 55) and *Additions* (page 75) for the following reasons:

Fact:

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

Fact:

The rear elevation was altered in 2005 with a second story addition.

Fact:

The proposed work is primarily interior renovation work. The exterior changes are mainly at the back of the house; principle elevations will remain virtually unchanged. Existing original basement windows will be reused and new windows and doors will be wood, simulated divided light windows (exterior muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass) that match the design of original windows and doors on the house.

Guidelines (page 57):

1. *Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principle 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.*

Fact:

Brick and other materials used to wall in an area at the back of the house for additional interior space and rework the back steps will match the existing materials of the house as closely as possible. The new entrance at the patio uses a design that is similar to original entrances found in the historic district.

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.*

In Support:

Thomas Wear, 708 Simpson Street
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1490 for work at 708 Simpson Street. The applicant is Thomas Wear and the description of work is for alterations to foundation walls at side and back of house as part of basement renovation. Mike Cowhig, City staff, said the City recommends in favor of this project citing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 55) and *Additions* (page 76). Also speaking in support was the owner, Thomas Wear, 708 Simpson Street, and Robert Kantlehner of 306 Parkway. Mr. Kantlehner stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association also supported this application.

Discussion:

Chair Wharton pointed out that he asked that this application come before the Commission because the description of work changed the foundational footprint of the house. He felt the change was substantial and the matter should be heard by the Commission instead of having approval at the staff level. Chair Wharton and Ms. Bowers saw no problems with the application and expressed their support of the application.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1490 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission find that the proposed project is

congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments referencing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (guideline 1 on page 55) and *Additions* (guideline 1 on page 76) which state: (guideline 1 on page 55) *Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principle 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;* and (guideline 1 on page 76) *In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly;* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1490 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Thomas Wear for work at 708 Simpson Street based on the above guidelines, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street
Application No. 1418
Description of work: Install street lights on existing poles
(CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig reported that very little progress was being made between the neighborhood and the City on this item.

Mr. Burroughs pointed out that this application has been continued for several months. He felt that the application should not be continued again without the approval of the Commission and that members should have the option to deny or accept the application. Mr. Cowhig clarified that it is up to the Commission whether or not an application is continued.

Commissioners discussed the lack of progress being made in this case. Chair Wharton stated he was in support of continuing the application to allow the neighborhood to continue to encourage Duke Energy Company to make lighting accommodations for the neighborhood. It was suggested that one way to push Duke Energy toward making accommodations with good period-style lighting would be a letter from the Commission.

Ms. Bowers moved that the Commission work with Ms. Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation, and draft a letter to Mr. Davis Montgomery, Duke Energy Company, asking for help to resolve this issue in a way that is best for the historic district, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Chair Wharton plans to draft the letter and send it to Mr. Montgomery.

Ms. Spaeh moved to continue this application, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spaeh, Cantrell, Bowers, McManus. Nays: Burroughs.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Members are in receipt of a draft of the Heritage Community Program. Chair Wharton stated that a committee meeting was held last week to work on procedural issues involved with the program. He discussed details of the program as distributed.

Mr. Burroughs made the following points relative to the draft: (1) a mechanism is needed to address what happens if an application for designation is denied by the Commission; (2) the process after a designation is approved needs to be concretely identified; (3) there needs to be a mechanism to allow the community to purchase signage through the City to insure uniform signage and competitive pricing; and (4) identify a formalized process for recognition.

Members discussed the uniformity of signage, possibly using the Seal of the City of Greensboro on the signage, and it was suggested that a Greensboro Heritage Community logo could be created. In addition, there was a discussion on determining significance for designation and the process involved with the denial of an application.

Mr. Burroughs indicated that another meeting of the subcommittee was needed to work out further details of the program. Mr. Cowhig felt that feedback from department heads and other City staff would be helpful.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that trees on North Park Drive that were part of a reforestation program were accidentally cut down by Duke Energy Company. Staff is working on a policy with Duke Energy to insure the incident does not happen again.

Mr. Cowhig reported that the owners of the Dunleith property on Chestnut Street have proposed a private cemetery on the site. They have met with the City and have received positive feedback from the neighborhood.

Mr. Cowhig stated that Preservation Greensboro Development Fund and other individuals are still working on a solution to avoid the scheduled demolition of 311 Leftwich Street.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 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 29, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Anne Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; Paul Macy; Tom Sears; Patrick Lucas; and Jill Spaeh.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the February 29, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 25, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the January 25, 2012 meeting as written, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

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

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 902 North Elm Street**
 Application No. 1491
 Applicant: Carol Pearce
 Property Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 1-17-12
 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of fence (after-the-fact)
Replace dentil molding

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the fencing with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features* (page 24) for the following reasons listed below. The staff recommends a continuance of the request to replace the dentil molding on the house. More time is needed to research available products.

Fact:

The fence was constructed to solve the problem of trespassing. The fence is a common stockade type of privacy fence, 6' high. As constructed the fence is not consistent with historic fencing found in the neighborhood. Privacy fences generally do not terminate at the front corner of the house.

Fact:

Privacy fences are acceptable under the guidelines for rear yard use. But this fence comes farther forward on the property than what is generally recommended for privacy fences.

Another option that would be consistent with the guidelines is to move the privacy fence back to the rear corner of the house, or to the midpoint of the house, since the privacy fence does serve to screen the parking area at the back of the property.

Guidelines (page 26):

5. *Introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location and size with original fences and walls within the historic district.*

C. Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only and that do not exceed 72" in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard. (Note: fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line that abuts a street, by City Ordinance.)

Recommended Conditions:

That the section of fence in the side yard be replaced with a 4' high wooden, spaced picket fence.

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.*

In Support:

Carol Pearce, 1005 Dover Road
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that these are application numbers 1491 and 1495 (application numbers 1491 and 1495 were combined into application 1491) for work at 902 North Elm Street. The applicant is Carol Pearce and the description of work is for construction of fence (after-the-fact) and replacement of dentil molding. Mike Cowhig, City staff, said that the City recommended in favor of the application with the condition that the fence either be replaced with a 4' spaced picket fence or moved back to the halfway point of the house. Speaking in support was Carol Pearce, 1005 Dover Road, who is the property owner. She stated her willingness to replace the privacy fence with a picket fence and move it to the halfway point to the back of the house. She was also willing to repair and keep the dentil molding. Also in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association is in favor of moving the fence to the halfway point of the house and replacing it with a picket fence. They also recommended repairing the dentil molding and the thatching or possibly using a composite replacement material. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs pointed out that the applicant was amenable to the changes and the Association was in agreement with the majority of the items.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1495 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 referencing *Guidelines 5* and *5C* on page 26 and also *Guideline 5A* on page 26 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. Mr. Burroughs amended his motion to reflect application number 1491 (which also includes application 1495), seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 9-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1491 (which also includes application number 1495) and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carol Pearce for work at 902 North Elm Street with the following conditions: (1) that the fence be relocated to the midpoint of the house, (2) that the fence not be higher than 48", (3) that the fence be a spaced picket fence, and (4) that the fence be white in color to match the consistency of the house.

Ms. Pearce, 1005 Dover Road, clarified that she was amenable to the Association's request to move the fence to the halfway point of the house. The fence is 42" high in front of the house and if moved back to the midway point, it can be 48" high. She stated her desire to graduate a privacy fence on the side. She would also like to leave the fence a natural finish. Members referenced the guidelines and discussed the option of staining the fence along with the configuration of the fence.

Mr. Burroughs amended his motion and moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1491 (which also includes application number 1495) and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carol Pearce for work at 902 North Elm Street with the owner's agreement to move the fence to the midpoint of the house; that the fence would be a picket fence; that the fence would be graded properly over a proper distance so that the height at the end of the graduation would be her desired height to give her the privacy that she requested; that the fence be either stained or painted, at the interval recommended by the manufacturer, to be compatible with the current color of the house; seconded by Ms. Spaeh. Mr. Burroughs amended his motion that the fence be specifically graduated as per the exact dimensions specified. The Commission voted unanimously 9-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) Location: 811 Cypress Street (Aycock Middle School)**
Application No. 1500
Applicant: Christian Franklin
Property Owner: Guilford County Schools
Date Application Received: 2-15-12
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Improvements to baseball field.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the fencing with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed

project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Commercial and/or Institutional* (page 9) for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a volunteer project to make improvements to this middle school baseball field. The proposal would enhance the quality of the playing field for students and others who use the field and make it more functional.

Fact:

These improvements will upgrade the playing field and make it more enjoyable for students and others who use the facility.

Fact:

Dugouts are common features of baseball fields and their design and placement is dictated by accepted standards for materials, design, location, etc. They are small structures and should have little or no affect on the character of the historic district.

Guidelines (page 26):

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

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

In Support:

Christian Franklin, 705 Percy Street
Linda Foscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1500 for work at 811 Cypress Street, Aycock Middle School. The applicants are Christian Franklin and Guilford County Schools. The nature of work is improvements to the baseball field, building of dugouts, and putting down sand rock. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff supports the project and it is congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines. Speaking in support was Christian Franklin, 705 Percy Street, who is an Eagle Scout planning to do the work for his project. Also in support was Linda Foscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. The Association is in support of the project. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig pointed out that there are no guidelines specific to a baseball field or a school area such as this; therefore, he used guidelines for commercial and institutional properties that can be found on page 9.

Mr. Cowhig recommended a condition directing staff to work with the applicant on the construction. Any significant change in the application would be brought back to the Commission for review.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1500 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Commercial and/or Institutional* (page 9), per the assistance of staff, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 9-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Lucas commented that *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features, (Guideline 1 on page 26)*, regarding playground equipment was a key guideline that might be helpful. He felt it would be better to include a specific guideline to address the work. Counsel Williams reviewed the suggestion and commented that playground equipment was commercial equipment, and he felt either or both guidelines would be acceptable to include because this was a judgment call and different from a situational issue such as windows. A baseball field was already present, whereas if a new field was being created the guideline regarding playground equipment would be more appropriate.

Members discussed the applicability of the newly introduced guideline.

Mr. Tom Franklin, 705 Percy Street, explained that sand rock would be used for the walkway; they plan to replace the existing insufficient benches that are present; and dirt and worn grass will be replaced with sand rock.

Ms. Spaeh moved to amend her motion to include *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features, Guideline 1*, on page 26, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 9-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1500 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Christian Franklin, with the approval of Guilford County Schools, for work at 811 Cypress Street in Greensboro, North Carolina with condition that the applicant works with City staff during design and construction for appropriateness, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 9-0 in favor of the motion.

- (c) Location: 204 West Bessemer Avenue**
Application No. 1499
Applicant: Dwight Wyland
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 2-13-12
(DENIED)

Description of Work:

Remove 15 original windows and replace with new wood windows that match the original windows.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the fencing with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 57).

Fact:

This house is a contributing structure in the historic district. The windows are a significant feature of the house.

Fact:

This house was moved from North Elm Street in 2006 after the property was purchased by First Presbyterian Church. It was carefully restored on its new site on West Bessemer Avenue. Some of the windows may have been damaged during the move and there was subsequent renovation work. Some are wracked (twisted out of square) and don't operate properly. The windows were likely scraped, primed, and painted after the house was moved. Storm windows were not installed during the renovation and today the windows are showing the harsh effects of weather, i.e., peeling paint and weathered wood.

Fact:

The windows proposed for removal appear to be original to the house. They do have condition issues as described above. However, they do not appear to be beyond repair. If the window sash was repaired and storm windows were added they would last indefinitely and increase the energy efficiency of the house. Wood replacement windows will have the same problem of being exposed to the weather. There are storm window products available today that are much less obtrusive than the triple-track aluminum storms that are so common.

Fact:

The proposed replacement windows are wood Simulated Divided Light (SDL) windows that match the design, dimensions, and muntin pattern of the original windows. They are double-paned, insulated glass windows with the muntins permanently attached to the exterior and interior of the glass with a shadow bar. SDL windows are commonly approved for new construction and additions. They have been approved in some instances in the historic districts.

Guidelines (page 26):

1. *Because of their strong link to and indication of the architecture and style of a building, original windows and doors should be maintained, repaired when necessary, and preserved as one of the defining elements of a historic structure. Studies have shown that repair of original windows is typically less expensive than replacement, and the proper installation of storm windows and doors ensures energy efficiency.*

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 windows 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*

Ms. Bowers moved to excuse Ms. Spaeh from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Cantrell, McManus, Burroughs, Macy, Sears, Bowers, Lucas. Nays: None.) Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

In Support:

Dwight Wyland, 204 West Bessemer
 Silvio Mossa, 1702 Forest Valley Road
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1499 for work at 204 West Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Dwight Wyland and the description of work is for the replacement of windows. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that the house had been moved from Elm Street and in the move some of the windows appeared to have been damaged. They were showing the effects of weathering from not having storm windows. In his opinion, they seemed repairable but not in as good a condition as they appear. The application was to replace the windows with wood double-paned windows with permanently attached muntins. The City recommended against the application. Speaking in support was Dwight Wyland, 204 West Bessemer Avenue. He has investigated the cost of both repair and replacement of the windows and he was altering his proposal to replace only the lower story of windows in the front, the four windows on the front, and five on the side. Also speaking in support was Silvio Mossa, 1702 Forest Valley Road, contractor. He noted the exterior of the windows have been damaged and were loose in their frames. The proposal is to replace sashes only. Mr. Mossa provided a sample of the window type for members to view. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said the Association was in support of repairing everything that can be repaired and only replacing what cannot be repaired.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell commented that a lot of the new products coming out are good for new construction; however, she felt that repairing these windows was better than replacing them. Ms. Bowers agreed that the replacement product looked very good but there is nothing in the guidelines that agrees with replacement. Mr. Burroughs was also in agreement that replacing the windows was not congruous with the guidelines. It was noted that storm windows for the house can be approved at staff level. Mr. Sears noted the dilemma that although storm windows extend the life of windows, they destroy the shadow lines and historic structure of a house.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1499 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— Windows and Doors* (page 57), that states:

1. *Because of their strong link to and indication of the architecture and style of a building, original windows and doors should be maintained, repaired when necessary, and preserved as one of the defining elements of a historic structure. Studies have shown that repair of original windows is typically less expensive than replacement, and the proper installation of storm windows and doors ensures energy efficiency.*

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 windows 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*

The aforementioned guidelines and comments by staff are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Cowhig pointed out in *Guideline 3* references to true divided light wood windows are intended to mean the same thing as simulated divided light with the muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the sash.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1499 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Dwight Wyland for work at 204 West Bessemer Avenue in Greensboro, North, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton updated members on the College Hill lighting project. Kym Smith, City of Greensboro, indicated that the company manufacturing the light poles, not Duke Energy, was the holdup toward progress in this matter. The manufacturing company has not yet completed a mock-

up of the light poles as requested by Duke Energy. Ms. Geary commented that Davis Montgomery, Duke Energy, and Ms. Smith plan to meet in March and hopefully a solution can be reached to move the project along. The application for a COA has been withdrawn until the City is ready to proceed.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Responding to a question from Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Cowhig stated that a report on the Heritage Community proposal has been forwarded to Sue Swartz, Director of Planning and Community Development, who plans to schedule a meeting with the Interim City Manager.

Mr. Cowhig reviewed details of a recent meeting with the College Hill neighborhood regarding the continuation of the Municipal Service District Program.

Ms. Geary reviewed projects underway in the Aycock historic district. The projects include installation of decorative sign toppers, landscaping along Summit and Murrow Boulevards near the onramp, historic renovation of the wall, and a neighborhood gateway sign made possible through the Neighborhood Small Projects Program grant.

SPEAKERS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, referred to Item (a), 902 North Elm Street, under Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness. The Association's original concern was with the applicant's requested 4' fence being too far forward and therefore, not meeting the guidelines. He stated that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association would be supportive of leaving the 40" picket fence, bringing it around, and transitioning up. He asked the Commission if it would be possible for staff to work with the applicant on this as it would meet the guidelines and the applicant would not need new posts.

Mr. Macy moved to allow a 42" spaced picket fence along the front in its current position to turn the corner toward the back and remain at 42" until the midpoint of the house at which point it would transition upward to a 6' fence as previously specified, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Counsel Williams pointed out that the applicant can work with staff to do either of these two options.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Sears informed the Commission that a presentation on the interior transformation of his house in Old Salem will be given at the Greensboro Historical Museum on April 3, 2012 at 7:30 p.m.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 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
MARCH 28, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chairman; Anne Bowers; Tom Sears; Christina Cantrell; Patrick Lucas; James Burroughs; Paul Macy; and Jill Spaeh.

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

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the March 28, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

Ms. Cantrell stated that she had a conflict of interest with application number 1505 for work at 706 Fifth Avenue.

Mr. Lucas moved to recuse Ms. Cantrell from application number 1505, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Lucas, Burroughs, Macy, and Spaeh. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 29, 2012 MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Spaeh moved to approve the February 29, 2012 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a) **Location: 706 Fifth Avenue**
 Application No. 1505
 Applicant: Christina and Robert Cantrell
 Property Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 3-5-12
 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Construction of addition at back of house.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

This house is classified as "contributing" in the Summit Avenue National Register nomination.

Fact:

The addition is needed in order to make an existing bathroom more functional and add light and ventilation. It will be located at the rear of the house and will not alter character-defining features of the house. Wood siding, trim and windows will match the existing. Coated concrete block will be used for the foundation.

Guidelines under Additions (page 76):

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

In Support:

Christina Cantrell, 706 Fifth Avenue
 Steve Johnson, 491 Hiatts Drive
 Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1505 for work at 706 Fifth Avenue. The applicants are Christina and Robert Cantrell and the description of work is to construct an addition at the back of the house for a bathroom to go six feet beyond the current exterior wall with a concrete block foundation. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that staff recommended in favor of the COA. He referenced *Historic District Design Guidelines--Additions (page 76)* and cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Speaking in support was Christina Cantrell, the applicant, who resides at 706 Fifth Avenue. She noted the current enclosure was recent. Also speaking in support was Steve Johnson, architect, of 491 Hiatts Drive. He noted that the concrete block for the foundation would help distinguish it from the older structure. The plan was to remove the brick pier to avoid problems in settling with the new foundation. The siding would

be wooden. The wooden windows would match the existing siding. Also speaking in support was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association. She noted the Association was in favor of the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Lucas commented that the triple window configuration returned the porch-like qualities of the addition and he felt the scheme was an improvement. Mr. Macy suggested letting staff give final approval for the triple window configuration. Ms. Spaeh was in agreement.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1505 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 enumerated on the staff report including guidelines 1 through 6 under *Historic District Design Guidelines--Additions* (page 76) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1505 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Christina and Robert Cantrell for work at 706 Fifth Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the details for the crawl space, roof vents, and final window configuration be submitted to staff for approval, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- b) Location: 710 Magnolia Street**
Application No. 1498
Applicant: Sonya Lowe and James Jeffries
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 2-6-12
(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Replace existing retaining wall and steps.

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

Facts:

The existing wall along the front of the property is not an original site feature. The wall is constructed of landscape timbers which are considered an incompatible material for retaining walls that are in a prominent location like this one. The proposed material is an engineered concrete block that is stacked in an interlocking fashion. It has many of the characteristics of historic retaining walls-individual masonry units stacked vertically and topped with a capstone. It will be of similar height, width and design of historic walls. Joints will not be mortared however.

The proposed new steps will be constructed of granite which is a material that is commonly used for steps in the historic districts.

Guideline 4 (page 26):

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

In Support:

Jim Jeffries, 710 Magnolia Street
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway
Sonya Lowe, 710 Magnolia Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1498 for work at 710 Magnolia Street. The applicants are Sonya Lowe and James Jeffries. The work is to replace an existing retaining wall and steps. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that based on the information contained in the application staff recommends in favor of granting a COA for this project. He noted that the current retaining wall is made of landscape timbers which is not in compliance with the guidelines. The proposal is to replace the wall with concrete engineered block which had once before been approved by the Commission. Speaking in support was Jim Jeffries, 710 Magnolia Street, who noted this is part of a larger landscaping project. He preferred block without mortar because of ease of maintenance. He indicated the steps would be granite slab, darker than the ones shown in the photograph. Also in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the Association supported the application except they would like the steps to remain. Also speaking in support was Sonya Lowe, 710 Magnolia Street, who noted the current steps are not centered and this was esthetically not pleasing from the curb. Mr. Jeffries noted the new steps would likely flair. There was no one speaking in opposition to this application.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers had no problem with the retaining wall being done with the blocks; however, she could not picture granite steps going up beside the blocks. She felt it would make the blocks appear more artificial. She stated her opinion that the concrete steps should remain as they are and proceed with the retaining wall as applied for. Mr. Lucas pointed out that this case was instructive in discussing "original" versus "historic" materials. He felt the Commission should be more concerned with whether or not the material was historic. He agreed with Ms. Bowers regarding the steps. In addition, he felt that the contemporary engineered concrete block material was in keeping with the spirit of the neighborhood. He did not feel there was an issue with the block because it has been approved by the Commission in the past. The contemporary material makes it obvious that this is new material and not historic material. Mr. Burroughs stated that he was in agreement with Ms. Bowers and Mr. Lucas regarding the steps and he has no objection to the retaining wall. Chair Wharton commented that the steps predate the historic district and are typical of the neighborhood as well. Mr. Burroughs felt that the steps were a contributing structure and therefore, should be preserved by the Commission. Mr. Sears pointed out that the steps appeared to be in good condition. He expressed concern that the color of the engineered stone would clash with the color of the granite. Mr. Macy stated his opinion that the steps did not add to the structure or the neighborhood.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1498 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 enumerated on the staff report including guideline 4 of the *Historic District Guidelines, Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 24), are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers.

Mr. Burroughs amended his motion to add that the building of the wall is congruous but removing the steps is not congruous, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Cantrell, Lucas, Burroughs, Spaeh. Nays: Macy.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1498 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sonya Lowe and James Jeffries for work at 710 Magnolia Street with the following condition: (1) that the steps be retained. Mr. Burroughs accepted a friendly amendment by Mr. Lucas to add a second condition to the motion as follows: (2) that the color of the engineered concrete block and the configuration and detail of the retaining wall be submitted to staff for approval, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Cantrell, Lucas, Burroughs, Spaeh. Nays: Macy.)

Mr. Burroughs moved to excuse Mr. Macy, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Cantrell, Lucas, Burroughs, and Spaeh. Nays: None.) Mr. Macy left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

- c) Location: 215 North Park Drive
Application No. 1503
Applicant: Gregory Grieve
Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 2-23-12
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Construct decorative metal/sculpture gate over the front walkway.

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

Facts:

The proposed gate is located at the entrance to the property from the public sidewalk. Since gates are typically associated with fences, the guidelines for fences apply in this case. The design of the gate suggests the Arts and Crafts movement which was popular during the period of significance for Fisher Park. Metals, including steel are considered compatible materials for fencing and gates in the historic district.

Guideline 5 (page 26):

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

In Support:

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1503 for work at 215 North Park Drive. The applicant is Gregory Grieve and the description of work is the construction of a decorative metal sculpture/gate over the front walkway. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff recommends in favor of this application for a COA. Staff feels the application is congruous with the *Historic District Guidelines, Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 24). Speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, from the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association.

Discussion:

There was a discussion among members as to the structure's purpose as a piece of art or that of a gateway or arbor. A range of comments and opinions were stated including that the structure was present for aesthetic value as outdoor artwork; that the piece had no function other than "to be" and therefore, should be considered art; a functioning gate can be opened or closed and this structure is not a barrier to entry and therefore its intention is primarily aesthetic and does not require a COA; there are fences on the street but no other gates; and arbors are not defining characteristics in Fisher Park. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that the applicant identified the structure as being a "sculptured gate" designed and built by an artist.

Ms. Geary stated that she originally reviewed this case and distinguished what could be approved at staff level and what fell outside the parameters of staff and needed to come before the Commission. She felt that the structure was more than "just" art because it delineates the front walk and also because of its size, scale and relationship to the pedestrian location near the sidewalk. She felt the structure changed the pedestrian's experience as they walked along the streetscape. She had no objection to the design of the structure; however, the scale and location makes it rise to a higher level than just a piece of artwork. Members commented that the structure does relate to the neighborhood setting and to the sidewalk in a certain way. In addition, it does provide a frame that is a portal which is one definition for a gate even without moving parts.

Mr. Burroughs agreed with Ms. Geary's comments that the piece is not "just" art. He felt her comments were important to note for future circumstances when the Commission was faced with distinguishing between a functional structure and a purely artistic structure. Ms. Cantrell agreed and commented that the Commission should not be in a position to approve or disapprove art and if the piece is not functional and is truly a piece of art then it does not require a COA.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1503 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 enumerated on the staff report including guideline 1 under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, Site Features* (page 24) are acceptable as findings of fact,

seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted 6-1 favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Cantrell, Lucas, Spaeh. Nays: Burroughs.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1503 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Gregory Grieve for work at 215 North Park Drive, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission 6-1 favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Cantrell, Lucas, Spaeh. Nays: Burroughs.)

The Commission took a brief break at 5:55 p.m. and resumed at 6:00 p.m.

- d) **Location: 705 Magnolia Street**
 Application No. 1512
 Applicant: Aaron Randall
 Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 3-14-12
 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Construction of driveway apron and driveway.

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 not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines--Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 28), for the following reasons:

Facts:

The homeowner currently has no off-street parking. He is proposing to construct a driveway apron and a short driveway using parallel brick runners.

Facts:

A driveway using brick runners will have much less of an impact on the setting of the historic district than a concrete driveway. However, if the runners stop in before the front wall of the house then the effect will be a parked vehicle interrupting the view of the house.

Guidelines (page 30):

3. *When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials, and design. Generally, double width driveways and circular driveways are not appropriate.*
4. *Construct new driveways and walkways in locations that require a minimum of alteration to historic site features such as landscaping, retaining walls, curbs, and sidewalks. Usually driveways should lead directly to the rear of buildings, and walkways should lead directly to the front steps of the house.*

Recommended Condition:

- That the driveway extend at least past the front wall of the house and preferably closer to the rear of the house.

Ms. Cantrell moved to excuse Mr. Burroughs, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Cantrell, Lucas, and Spaeh. Nays: None.) Mr. Burroughs left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

In Support:

Aaron Randall, 705 Magnolia Street
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1512 for work at 705 Magnolia Street. The applicant is Aaron Randall and the description of work is construction of a driveway apron and driveway. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that based on information contained in the application staff recommends in favor of granting this COA with conditions. Staff feels the application is congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines--Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas*. The recommended condition was that the driveway extend at least past the front wall of the house and preferably closer to the rear of the house. Speaking in support of the application was the applicant, Aaron Randall, of 705 Magnolia Street who noted that the railroad ties to be used were already there and the project could be easily removed. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said that the Association was in support of the COA but wanted the driveway to go past the front of the house.

Discussion:

Members questioned the accurateness of the drawing presented by the applicant. Ms. Cantrell questioned if there was enough room on the driveway to prevent the vehicle from obstructing the sidewalk. Mr. Sears felt there should be measurements indicated on the drawing to aid members in their decision and to insure Code was being met. Chair Wharton pointed out that it was not clear in the photograph if there was room for the car and the air conditioner. Ms. Spaeh felt that a site plan drawn to scale with dimensions and setbacks noted were needed to determine if a vehicle fit the space. Members agreed that a site plan, with the location of the air conditioner, was needed to make a decision on this case. Ms. Randall indicated that she was amenable to continue this case and return with a site plan with accurate measurements. In addition, the applicant was asked to return with neighborhood rules regarding setbacks along with the length of the vehicle.

Mr. Lucas moved to continue this case, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton stated that a subcommittee will be formed to review the issue of windows. Following a discussion, he listed topics to be explored under the issue of windows including the following: (1) historical significance of original windows, (2) historical and tax consequences of removal of original materials, (3) environmental cost of repair versus replacement, (4) energy costs, and (5) price comparison.

The subcommittee will include Mr. Sears, Mr. Lucas, Ms. Spaeh, and Mr. Macy. Mr. Lucas will serve as Chairman of the subcommittee.

Chair Wharton stated that a Vice-Chairman was needed for the Historic Preservation Commission.

Ms. Cantrell moved to nominate Ms. Bowers as Vice-Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously by acclamation.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Mr. John Redman, Triad Home Energy Solutions, and Mr. Matthew Petit, Environmental Windows, were present to address the Commission on the topic of windows. Mr. Redman stated that Triad Home Energy Solutions partnered with Environmental Windows to address window issues in historic districts through the use of energy efficient interior storm windows. Mr. Petit provided a sample of an interior storm window and described the advantages of this application. Mr. Redman commented that an interior storm window is a third to a fourth of the cost of a replacement window. In addition, he pointed out that historic homes are among the most energy inefficient home in their inventory.

Mr. Redman said that they are currently targeting historic districts in the Triad to promote energy efficiency awareness through educational workshops and free energy audits. He asked members to consider ways that they might team up to promote energy efficiency awareness in the City of Greensboro.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:29 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 25, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; James Burroughs; Lois McManus; Paul Macy; and Tom Sears;

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the April 25, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

Mr. Cowhig reported that there are adjustments to the agenda for today's meeting. The applicant has requested a continuance of Item 3 (b) for work at 705 Magnolia Street. In addition, he stated that work at 719 North Eugene Street, Item 3 (d), can be approved at staff level.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary stated that the absences of Ms. Cantrell, Ms. Spaeh, Ms. Bowers, and Mr. Lucas were approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 28, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the March 28, 2012 meeting as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

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

- (a) **Location: 910 Walker Avenue**
 Application No. 1523
 Applicant: Clara Kelly
 Property Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 3-5-12
 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)
 (APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION)

Description of Work:

Construction of addition at back of house.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 76)* for the following reasons listed below.

Fact:

This house is classified as “contributing” in the College Hill National Register nomination.

Fact:

The proposed addition is needed in order to make the house more functional and better meet the needs of the homeowner. It will be a small addition, located at the back of the house. It will not affect character-defining features. Wood siding, trim and windows will match the existing.

Fact:

A Special Exception to the zoning regulations is required because the house encroaches into the yard setback. See Section 30-4-4.2 (B) 2 of the city's Development Ordinance:

“All street setback (except as provided in subsection 1) above), interior setback, building coverage, and height requirements shall comply with applicable zoning regulations unless a special exception is approved by the Board of Adjustment. The special exception shall be granted only if it complies with the intent of the architectural and historic guidelines of the historic district and if first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.”

Like many houses in historic districts, it was built before zoning regulations were established. It is considered legally non-conforming. The Special Exception provision of the historic district ordinance was designed to address situations like this.

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:

Ms. Clara Kelly, 910 Walker Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1523 for work at 910 Walker Avenue. The applicant is Ms. Clara Kelly. The description of work is to construct an addition at the rear of the house. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that based on information contained in the application and the guidelines staff is in support of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. Speaking in support was Ms. Clara Kelly, 910 Walker Avenue. There was no one in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1523 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 referencing *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 76)*, guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1523 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ms. Clara Kelly for work at 910 Walker Avenue with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion for Special Exception:

Ms. McManus moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment that a special setback exception be granted since this complies with Historic District Guidelines because the addition will encroach into the yard's setback, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) Location: 705 Magnolia Street
Application No. 1512
(CONTINUED)**

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue this application upon the request of the applicant, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

- (c) Location: 719 North Church Street
Application No. 1520
Applicant: Elizabeth Benton, City of Greensboro
Property Owner: Andy and Kathleen Clark
Date Application Received: 3-18-12
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

General rehabilitation of house including replacement of windows and doors.

Note: The only work items in this application that require Commission approval are the replacement of windows and doors.

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—Windows and Doors (pages 55-63)* with conditions for the following reasons:

Fact:

According to the Fisher Park National Register Nomination, this is a non-contributing structure built circa 1955. It is a simple vernacular house, representative of homes that were being built during the post war housing boom. The windows are not beyond repair but they are not in good condition either. Likely mass produced, they are not of the same craftsmanship as windows on most houses

in the historic district. They operate by friction fitting using aluminum jamb liners rather than weights and pulleys.

Fact:

Based on a file photo taken around 1982, at least some of the existing windows are replacements. The triple window on the front façade replaced a “picture” window, which were a common feature of houses from the 1950s.

Fact:

Only the sash will be replaced, not the entire window unit. Wood simulated divided-light (SDL), insulated glass replacement sash will be used. Wood muntins are glued to the exterior and interior with a shadow bar between the glass. Dimensions of rails, mullions, etc. will match the dimensions of the original windows and doors. The replacement doors will be solid wood doors to match the Colonial style of the existing doors.

Fact:

The existing front door is likely not original. The front door would probably not have been a paneled door but rather a smooth veneered surface with light(s) at the top of a style typical of the period.

Guidelines:

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 windows 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*

Conditions:

- That consideration be given to the possibility of restoring the look of the original “picture” window.
- That the front door be of a style that is more representative of the period.
- That the replacement window sash use “putty glazed” type muntins to match the look of the original muntins as closely as possible.

In Support:

Ms. Elizabeth Benton, City of Greensboro
Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Mr. Wharton stated that this is application number 1520 for work at 719 Church Street. The applicant is Ms. Elizabeth Benton, City of Greensboro. The description of work is general rehabilitation of house including replacement of windows and doors. Based on information contained in the application, Mr. Cowhig recommended in favor of granting this COA with conditions. In staff's opinion the proposed application is congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors*. Speaking in support was Ms. Elizabeth Benton, City of Greensboro. She noted that the replacement of any double hung windows would be with wood simulated divided light windows. She did not wish to repair the windows because of the danger of lead poisoning. She also indicated she was willing to install a new "picture" window to replace the original window and wooden doors to match the original style of the house. Also speaking in support was Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association supported this application but had reservations regarding setting a precedent for the replacement of wood windows.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs stated his fundamental problem with viewing non-contributing structures in historic districts differently than contributing structures as they are non-contributing and contributing for a reason. He felt his charge as a Commissioner was to uphold the guidelines when it came to preserving the historic character of a house or neighborhood. He felt a non-contributing structure should be analyzed with the same diligence as a contributing structure.

Ms. Benton cannot get results she needs unless windows are replaced. It was noted that she was working under Federal guidelines with Federal money. She does not do repair work on historic homes and there are very few homes in the historic district that qualify for her program.

Chair Wharton referred to and read a special section in the guidelines for non-contributing structures on page 68. It was pointed out that there are some instances where products for new construction can be appropriate for non-contributing structures.

Ms. Geary pointed out that staff has already negotiated with Ms. Benton behind the scene to bring the best outcome possible in this situation to the Commission. By not replacing with a steel door and vinyl windows, the Commission is in a sense, preserving the property.

Mr. Burroughs stated his concern with setting a precedent in this matter.

Mr. Cowhig said that each application should be looked at on a case-by-case basis. This application represents an opportunity to restore a blighted house.

Mr. Macy pointed out that the guidelines on pages 67-68 speak to the architectural integrity and character of the building which he felt the materials would maintain.

Members discussed previous reasoning by the Commission in granting approval of materials in a similar situation.

Ms. Benton is willing to do as much as possible to restore the original look of the house.

Following the discussion, Mr. Burroughs said that since renovation and improvement of the house would not be possible without the window replacement and knowing the diligence that goes on relative to these projects, he would be in favor of the application.

Mr. Sears commented that a “picture” window was much more appropriate for the period of the house. Members discussed conditions to be attached to the application.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1520 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 – Changes to Non-Contributing Structures* and the following guidelines on page 67 for example, *non-contributing structures should follow the guidelines under Neighborhood Settings to preserve and contribute to the character of the neighborhood. For projects pertaining to the building itself the guidelines under Changes to the Building Exterior should be used following the guidelines below with direction in their level of interpretation. For example, of approved products that may be acceptable for repairs on non-contributing structures, refer to the New Construction Materials Checklist in the appendix inserts. Under Windows, simulated divided light wood windows (wood muntins on both interior and exterior with a space between muntin and glass to allow for a natural profile). In addition, Guideline 1 on page 68, every effort should be made to maintain architectural integrity of non-contributing structures; replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to insure they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering wood trim with vinyl on a brick building is not recommended.* These are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1520 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ms. Elizabeth Benton and East LLC for work at 719 North Church Street whereas the intent is to restore the architectural integrity of the house to the period it was built with the following conditions: (1) to retain the muntin pattern of the windows, (2) to install a “picture” window appropriate for the period, (3) to install a door also appropriate to the period, and (4) that staff will determine the appropriateness to the period, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

- (d) Location: 1009 North Eugene Street
Application No. 1524
(TO BE APPROVED AT STAFF LEVEL)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that work at 1009 North Eugene Street can be approved at staff level.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton stated that City Council recently reprieved one of the City’s National Register properties, World War Memorial Stadium, from a plan to demolish most of the stadium. The City will be doing a second engineering review of the structure to determine if it can be repaired.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Benjamin Briggs will be present next month to update the Commission on 919 Spring Garden Street.

A meeting has been scheduled with the contractor making repairs on the doors to the houses on Charter Street and Park Street.

SPEAKERS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Responding to a question from Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Cowhig said that the Warnersville Neighborhood report has been sent to Ms. Sue Schwartz. He will ask Mr. Russ Clegg who is on the management team for an update.

Mr. Burroughs asked staff to resume emailing staff-level approval updates to Commissioners.

ADJOURN:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
MAY 30, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Anne Bowers; James Burroughs;
Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; Paul Macy; Patrick Lee Lucas;
and Tom Sears.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community
Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the
Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the May 30, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no
Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no
Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 25, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the April 25, 2012 meeting as written, seconded
by Ms. McManus. Following discussion, Mr. Burroughs rescinded his motion to accept the minutes
pending clarification of the minutes at the next meeting.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: Historic Districts**
Application No. 1535
Applicant: Water Resources Department
Property Owner: City of Greensboro (public right-of-way)
Date Application Received: 5-16-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replacement of water lines and addition of fire hydrants.

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:

This project is needed for better water service and to improve fire safety.

Fact:

Repair or replacement of underground utilities does not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.
However, additional hydrants are being installed to improve fire safety. Since this constitutes a

change, a COA is required. Otherwise no changes are being made to the design or materials of streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters.

Fact:

Fire hydrants in the historic districts are most commonly found in the space between the sidewalk and the curb. In the case of the new hydrant at 107 Cypress Street there is no space between the sidewalk and curb. The new hydrant was placed behind the sidewalk.

Guidelines under Additions (page 20):

1. *Maintain historic street patterns, widths, and construction materials.*
2. *Maintain historic paving materials for roads and sidewalks, as well as granite curbing. When they are disturbed for underground utility construction or other work, repair pavement, brick, gutters, and granite curbs with matching materials.*

In Support:

Mr. Robbie Bald, 1705 Westridge Road

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1535 for work in the Aycock Historic District. The applicant is the Water Resources Department of the City of Greensboro. The description of work is the replacement of water lines and addition of fire hydrants. Mr. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that there was nothing specific in the guidelines relative to fire hydrants but he noted that they are placed in grass strips or the curb line sometimes on the other side of the sidewalk. City staff recommends in favor of the COA. Speaking in support of this application was Mr. Robbie Bald, 1705 Westridge Road, representing the City of Greensboro. He said the current hydrants are 80 years old and inadequate. They are upsizing water lines in the district from four to six inches. Old hydrants are not spaced according to current standards. They never put hydrants in the sidewalk and their standard operating procedure is to replace brick gutters and granite curbs. He anticipated four to five additional hydrants for the Aycock district.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers felt that fire hydrants were a life safety issue and installation should not be an issue. Ms. Cantrell stated that the guidelines do not indicate parameters for fire hydrants and conditions should be attached. Chair Wharton said that hydrants were original to the historic district and were part of the landscape in the period of significance. He felt the hydrants appeared historically appropriate in their design.

Mr. Burroughs felt that the question at hand was not the placement or style of fire hydrant but perhaps the installation of new hydrants and what that would do to the footprint of the historic area. He would prefer that applications come before the Commission relative to this matter rather than having a blanket policy. Ms. Cantrell felt that there should at least be a policy insuring that any historically significant material that would be disturbed during the installation of a hydrant be put back as it was.

Mr. Sears pointed out that hydrants can be placed anywhere in the right-of-way; however, the matter is different when placed on personal property and should be looked at before approval is given.

Chair Wharton asked members for their feedback on staff-issued COAs for historic districts with any disturbed historically significant material replaced to its original state. Ms. Cantrell was supportive of

the idea. Mr. Burroughs stated his opinion that it would be appropriate to have staff-level approval for each instance of work.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1535 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--- Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 20)* and staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1535 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness for work in each historic district with the following conditions: (1) that subsequent historic district addition of fire hydrants is handled at staff approval level, and (2) any other historic district needs to have a separate COA, and (3) the other guidelines listed on page 20 under *Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way*, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Location: 674 Chestnut Street**
Application No. 1525
Applicants: Jonathon J. Wallace
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-13-12
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of privacy fence.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines---Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 26)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The fence is constructed of 6' tall boards without spaces. This type of fence is commonly used for privacy or landscape screening purposes. For purposes of the historic district guidelines, it is considered a utilitarian fence more suited for back yards, in contrast to the more decorative spaced picket fences.

Fact:

The fence appears to violate the zoning ordinance with respect to fence height: fences cannot be higher than 4' within 15 feet of a street (usually defined as the front property line).

Guidelines under Additions (page 76):

5. 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:

Mr. Jonathon Wallace, 674 Chestnut Street
 Ms. Jane Brown, 672 Chestnut Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1525. The applicant is Jonathan Wallace and the address is 674 Chestnut Street. The description of work is privacy fence. This is an after-the-fact application. Mr. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that the fence as installed is not only in violation of historic district guidelines but also of City zoning code. In staff's opinion, the project is not congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines---Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 26)*. Speaking in support was Mr. Jonathan Wallace, the applicant, who resides at 674 Chestnut Street. He explained that he received inaccurate advice about whether a COA was needed and whether or not the fence's installation was legal. Also speaking in support was Ms. Jane Brown of 672 Chestnut Street.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs felt that the Commission should stipulate that the owner either remove that portion of the fence or bring it down to the appropriate height to the midpoint of the house. It was noted that an open face fence is appropriate and the Commission has the authority to specify that style of fencing at least to the halfway point of the house or from whatever point the fence steps down in the front yard. Therefore, the portion in the front yard could be an open picket fence. Ms. Bowers had no objection to the fence being enclosed in the backyard. Members discussed conditions to be attached to the COA and the point on the fence where tapering begins.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1525 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the existing fence is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and that staff comments enumerated on the staff comment sheet and the guidelines listed on page 26 dealing with *Fences, Walls and Site Features* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1525 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Jonathon J. Wallace for work at 674 Chestnut Street with the following conditions: (1) that the fence at the midpoint of the house be no higher than 48", (2) that the fence can be tapered anywhere between 42" and 48" from the current front of the fence to the midpoint of the house, and (3) that the fence begins to step down at the midpoint of the house and is 42" in height and of an open picket design from the front corner of the porch to the sidewalk end of the fence, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Wallace asked the Commission how long he had to complete the work. Members felt that 60 days was a reasonable time period to have the work completed.

Mr. Lucas left the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Chair Wharton stated that the Commission would take a 10-minute recess. When they resumed, Mr. Burroughs moved to excuse Mr. Lucas from the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- (c) Location: 311 Leftwich Street
Application No. 1532
Applicant: Ben and Lynn Berryhill
Property Owner: Same
(CONTINUED UNTIL NEXT MEETING)**

At the request of Chair Wharton, Counsel Williams explained the legal background of this case. In January of 2011 the Commission granted a COA for demolition but delayed it for 365 days. The delay period ended in January of 2012 and the City still has not demolished the house. Counsel Williams questioned whether or not the Commission can give a COA on this property due to the fact there is an Order of Demolition on the house which has expired. He asked the Commission to grant a continuation of the case for 30 days to allow him to determine if a Stop Work Order has been issued on this case.

Mr. Cowhig described additional violations and reported that the matter was turned over to Zoning Enforcement as a violation of historic district rules, a matter totally separate from Minimum Housing regulations.

Chair Wharton felt that the application did not contain enough details for the Commission to evaluate it in its current form.

Ms. McManus moved to continue the case, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- (d) Location: 549 South Mendenhall Street
Application No. 1533
(CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that this application is for a business called the University Business Store in the College Hill district. Staff has been working with a group of College Hill residents to plan their municipal service district projects. A signage violation was noted at this business. The sign company that the business contracted with failed to obtain a permit. They have shown a willingness to work with the Commission and have asked for a continuance. The Commission discussed the make-up of a group to work with the business to guide them on the design of their sign. It was decided that the best solution would be to get the Design Review Committee up and running to help with the signage. Staff plans to ask Ms. Elizabeth Link, landscape architect, to join the committee in a design capacity.

Ms. Bowers moved to continue this case until the next meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Wharton updated members on War Memorial Stadium. A recent walkthrough by an engineer from NC A&T University determined that more of the stadium will be able to be preserved than in the Parks and Recreation plan. The full report is still pending.

Staff reported that no further progress has been made on the Warnersville Heritage Communities plan. Chair Wharton plans to send an e-mail encouraging further action toward the process.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig reported plans to resume sending out a list of issued COAs to the historic district representative and the neighborhood association.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business 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
JUNE 27, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Anne Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; Paul Macy; Patrick Lee Lucas; and Tom Sears.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the June 27, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

Chair Wharton noted one adjustment moving item 3 (b), 815 West Market Street, to the beginning of the agenda. Members indicated their support of the change in agenda.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 30, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the May 30, 2012 meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Ms. Bowers joined the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application No. 1550**
Location: 815 West Market Street
Applicant: Robin Daniel, Vice President for Operations
Property Owner: Greensboro College
Date Received: 6-13-12 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install speed tables at crosswalks along College Place. Install warning sign. Relocate planters to southern section of College Place.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines-Introduction* (page 9) and *Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* (page 20) for the following reasons:

Facts:

College Place was closed from West McGee Street to West Market Street in 2003 by action of the Greensboro City Council. Planters were placed on the northern section of College Place to prevent through traffic.

Facts:

The proposed work includes cutting out asphalt and laying brick pavers at pedestrian crossings, installing a warning sign, and relocating the existing planters from the northern section to the southern section of College Place. These changes should have minimal impact on the character of the campus and the historic district.

Guidelines (page 9):

When interpreting the Historic District Design Guidelines for their application 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.*

Guidelines (page 20):

1. *Maintain historic street patterns, widths, and construction materials.*

2. *Maintain historic paving materials for roads and sidewalks as well as granite curbing. When they are disturbed for underground utility construction or other work, repair pavement, brick gutters, and granite curbs with matching materials.*

In Support:

Robin Daniel, Greensboro College, 815 West Market Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1550 for work at 815 West Market Street. The applicant is Robin Daniel, Greensboro College, 815 West Market Street. The description of work is to install speed tables at crosswalks along College Place, install warning sign, and relocate planters to southern section of College Place. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, recommended in favor of granting this COA. He cited guideline (1) on page 9 and guidelines (1) and (2) on page 20. Also speaking in support was Robin Daniel of Greensboro College. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers commented that the change appears to be a positive thing.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1550 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 enumerated on the staff comment sheet and guideline (1) on page 9 along with guidelines (1) and (2) on page 20 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1550 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greensboro College for

work at 815 West Market Street, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Location: 549 South Mendenhall Street**
Application No. 1533
Applicant: Chris Martin
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-17-12 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Modifications to existing signs.

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 application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Commercial and/or Institutional and Signs* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a commercial property in the historic district. Constructed around 1892, the building housed the West End Hose Company which featured a horse drawn steam pumper. Because of its association with the history of fire fighting in Greensboro it is a particularly significant building. Today it is being used as a neighborhood grocery store. This is a good example of an adaptive reuse of a historic building which is essential for its preservation.

Fact:

The existing primary signs are interior lights. The applicant is proposing to apply a face to the existing signs with "cut out" letters. This will reduce the effect of the interior lighting significantly and make the signs more in keeping with the historic character of the building and the neighborhood.

Guidelines (page 37):

1. *Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts.*
2. *New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street.*
3. *Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights.*
7. *Signage should be compatible with the original use of a building.*
 - A. *It is not historically appropriate to install signs directly on facades or porch roofs of residential buildings and those buildings originally intended for residential use. The installation of a freestanding sign is most appropriate, as it is less likely to detract from the architecture of the building.*
 - B. *Place signs for historic commercial buildings in a location originally intended for signage, such as at the top of the storefront or on windows, doors, or awnings.*
 - C. *Signage for new commercial buildings should reflect similar placement to that of historic commercial buildings in the neighborhood.*

Guidelines (page 9):

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

- 1) *The functional needs of the commercial or institutional property owner must be considered. The property owner should be allowed to use the property in the manner needed, as long as it maintains the character of the Historic District.*

In Support:

Chris Martin, 1334 West Friendly Avenue
Cindy Shepherd, 608 Morehead Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Discussion:

During discussion members asked Mr. Martin to clarify details in his proposal to change the existing signs that have interior lights. In addition, suggestions were offered for lighting that would be compatible with the guidelines such as installing a long bar with illumination. It was felt that more documentation was needed for Commissioners to evaluate the application. Chair Wharton asked the applicant if he was interested in continuing the application and returning with more research on a metal sign with other forms of lighting. He asked Mr. Martin to provide a drawing and identify elements of the application such as color and texture. The applicant indicated he was willing to continue the application and return with a detailed plan.

Mr. Lucas moved to continue the application until the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (c) **Location: Fulton Street near West McGee Street**
Application No. 1549
Applicant: Eddie King for Duke Energy
Property Owner: City of Greensboro (public-right-of-way)
Date Application Received: 6-14-12 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Install utility pole as part of upgrades to electrical facilities.

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 proposed new utility pole is needed in order to upgrade electrical service in the neighborhood. It is proposed for the east side of Fulton Street in order to avoid substantial pruning of a Walnut tree on the west side of the street.

Fact:

A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required to repair or replace utility poles and wires. A COA is required for the installation of new utility poles and wires.

Fact:

The possibility of placing existing utility lines along streets in College Hill underground in order to start new street trees was explored during the years that College Hill was a redevelopment area. Because of the high cost estimates the idea was abandoned.

Guidelines under Additions (page 76):

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.

Discussion:

Mr. Lucas described a scenario where a wire could be run across the street to where an existing crossing is already in place to avoid introducing two new diagonal wires. A Duke Energy representative was not present to speak on the matter. Following discussion, it was suggested that the application should be continued to get more information from Duke Energy.

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue the application with a request for fuller documentation and explanation from Duke Energy, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (d) **Location: 311 Leftwich Street**
Application No. 1532
Applicant: Ben and Lynn Berryhill
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-15-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Double-hung windows have been replaced with new wood windows; HVAC compressor has been installed in a "crow's nest" construction at back of house; the back porch or "mud room" has been enclosed with wood shingle siding; a handicap ramp and a front porch railing is proposed for the front porch; a deck is proposed for the back of the house; landscaping of the property.

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 not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 26), Utilities and Mechanical Equipment, Trees and Landscaping, and Safety and Code Requirements* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The windows have been replaced with new wood, double-hung windows that are similar in design to 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.*

Fact:

The crow's nest for the compressor is at the back of the house and not easily visible from the street.

Guidelines (page 40):

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

Fact:

The front porch is the most practical location for the handicap ramp.

Guidelines (page 70):

4. *Introduce reversible features to assist persons with disabilities so that the original design of the entrance or porch is not diminished and historic materials or features are not damaged.*

Fact:

The “mud room” is enclosed in a manner that indicates the location of the porch and is on a rear elevation. The application also proposes to add railings to the front porch.

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.*

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

Fact:

The deck will be located at the rear of the house.

Guidelines (page 42):

1. *Locate decks at the rear of the structure, or in a location not readily visible from the street. Decks that are visible from the street should be screened with shrubbery or other landscaping materials.*

2. *Decks should be of wood construction, and of dimensions that do not monopolize the rear elevation or significantly detract from the architecture of the building.*

3. *It is not appropriate to install decks that require the removal of historic materials, or otherwise damage or obscure architectural features. Design and construct decks so that they may be removed in the future without damage to the historic structure.*

Recommended Conditions:

- That the replacement windows be simulated divided light with muntins that match the original muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the top sash.
- That the height and design of the porch railings be appropriate for the architectural style of the building.
- That, if feasible, the HVAC compressor be moved to the ground.
- That consideration be given to reducing the size of the deck.

In Support:

Ben Berryhill, 6600 Dustin Road, Climax, NC

Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1532 for work at 311 Leftwich Street. The description of work is replacement of windows, placement of HVAC in a “crow’s nest”, building a

handicap ramp and a front porch railing, landscaping, and building a new deck at the rear of the house. The applicants are Ben and Lynne Berryhill. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro staff, recommended in favor of granting this COA with conditions citing guidelines (2) and (3) on page 57; guideline (6) on page 40; guideline (4) on page 70; guidelines (7) and (4) on page 64; and guidelines (1), (2), and (3) on page 42. He recommended the following conditions: 1) that the replacement windows be simulated divided light with muntins that match the original muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the top sash, 2) that the height and design of the porch railings be appropriate for the architectural style of the building, 3) that, if feasible, the HVAC compressor be moved to the ground, and 4) that consideration be given to reducing the size of the deck. Speaking in support of the application was Ben Berryhill of 6600 Dustin Road in Climax, NC. Also speaking in support was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. She took no position on this application.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers pointed out that the “crow’s nest” does not appear to have ruined the structure of the building; there is a high danger of vandalism; and the structure is removable in the future.

Ms. Geary stated that Ms. Cantrell was present at the Aycock Neighborhood Association meeting when matters on this agenda were discussed and therefore, Ms. Cantrell has been advised to recuse herself from this COA application.

Mr. Lucas moved to recuse Ms. Cantrell from this item, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Commission members were instructed not to consider comments previously made by Ms. Cantrell relative to this item

Mr. Sears commented on the size of the deck and said that he felt the deck should not be the same width as the original structure. Counsel Williams advised that members can state the maximum size of deck they would approve and leave the final design up to staff as the deck is located at the rear of the house. Members felt that 14'x20' was an ample size for the deck. Mr. Sears suggested that the size of the deck be such that the nearby tree would be saved. As requested by Counsel Williams, Chair Wharton advised Mr. Berryhill as to procedures for doing landscape work.

Mr. Lucas noted that just as the “crow’s nest” is not congruous with the guidelines, the windows are also incongruous with guidelines. The historic windows were removed from this house and replaced with new windows. Counsel Williams reminded the group that the house is currently under a Minimum Housing Order. This case came before the Historic Preservation Commission last year and a motion to delay demolition for 365 days was granted. He advised the group to indicate in their motion that to save what is left of this house; accommodations are being made which would normally not be done due to the special circumstance.

Finding of Fact:

In light of the extreme circumstances of the demolition order on this property, Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1532 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the removal of the original windows and the placement of a “crow’s nest” for the compressor on the second floor on the rear of the structure is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* on page 57, guidelines numbers (2) and (3) and guideline (6) on page 40; however, we find that the front porch amendments, the enclosure of the mud room, and the construction of the deck to be congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* as cited on page 70, guideline (4); page 42, guideline numbers (1), (2), and (3); and staff comments contained in the very detailed staff report are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell was recused from this item and did not vote.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1532 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ben and Lynne Berryhill for work at 311 Leftwich Street with the following conditions: (1) that the replacement windows be simulated divided light with muntins that match the original muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the top sash, (2) that the height and design of the porch railings be appropriate for the architectural style of the building, (3) that, if feasible, the HVAC compressor be moved to the ground, (4) that the property owner request a variance that the horizontal members of the front porch railing system if possible align no higher than the brick cap of the piers and details, materials, and configuration be submitted to staff for approval, (5) that the deck be reduced in scale to a maximum dimension of 14' in depth and 22' in width, that the base be of open construction, that the deck be aligned with the northeast rear corner of the structure, and that the deck details, materials, and configuration be submitted to staff for approval, (6) that the property owner retains both dogwood trees at the rear of the structure, and (7) that the details, materials, and configuration of the handicapped ramp be submitted to staff for approval, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell was recused from this item and did not vote.

The meeting adjourned for a ten-minute break and resumed at 6:25 p.m.

- (e) **Location: 717 Percy Street**
Application No. 1546
Applicant: Brian Heagney
Property Owner: Donald G. Strickland
Date Application Received: 6-8-12 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Replace metal porch railing with wood railing. Some of the new railing will be salvaged material and some will be constructed to match.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The existing metal railing is not original to the house. The proposed wood railing is similar to railings found on other craftsman houses in the historic district.

Guidelines (page 64):

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, step, 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 railing for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.

In Support:

Brian Heagney, 717 Percy Street
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Mr. Lucas moved to recuse Ms. Cantrell from all discussions of the Aycock Neighborhood district, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.)

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1546 for work at 717 Percy Street. The applicant is Brian Heagney. The description of work is to replace metal porch railings with wood railing with some salvaged material. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that staff recommends in favor of granting this COA. Staff feels the project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. Speaking in support was the applicant, Brian Heagney, of 717 Percy Street. Also in support was Linda Fusco of 721 Fifth Avenue. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

None.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1546 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 enumerated on the staff comment sheet and guideline (2) on page 64 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell was recused in this matter and did not vote.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 15546 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Brian Heagney for work at 717 Percy Street with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell was recused in this matter and did not vote.

- (f) **Application No. 1548**
 Location: 695 Percy Street
 Applicant: Leonard T. Ebright
 Property Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 6-13-12 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of accessory structures and fence: widen driveway; add parking strips; add gravel at back of lot.

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-Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 28), *Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 35) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The proposed accessory structures will be located in the rear portion of the property and will be behind an existing fence. One is of an open design while the other will be enclosed with a door and

window(s). They will be constructed of wood. They must be at least 3 feet from the property line to meet the zoning setback requirement. No trees are proposed to be removed.

Guidelines (page 36):

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

Facts:

The driveway appears to be a shared driveway. The proposal is to widen only a small portion of the driveway and add concrete parking strips. This should not have an appreciable impact on the character of the property.

Guidelines (page 30):

3. *When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials, and design. Generally, double width driveways and circular driveways are not appropriate.*
4. *Construct new driveways and walkways in locations that require a minimum of alteration to historic site features such as landscaping, retaining walls, curbs, and sidewalks. Usually driveways should lead directly to the rear of buildings, and walkways should lead directly to the front steps of the house.*
5. *Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracks (narrow strips), macadam, brick, and crushed stone. Conceal edging materials used for gravel driveways. Keep new driveway aprons and curb cuts to the minimum width possible.*

In Support:

Leonard Ebright, 695 Percy Street
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue
Ben Berryhill, 6600 Dustin Road, Climax, NC

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1548 for work at 695 Percy Street. The applicant is Leonard T. Ebright. The description of work is for construction of accessory structures and fence; widen driveway; add parking strips; add gravel at back of lot. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff is in support of this application. Speaking in support was Leonard Ebright, 695 Percy Street, and Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood association is in support of the application with the provision that the shed reflects the architecture as in the drawing presented to Commissioners. Also speaking in support was Ben Berryhill, 6600 Dustin Road, Climax, NC. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers felt that the proposed work in the application seemed to be reasonable.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1548 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is

congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Historic District Design Guidelines-Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* on page 28; *Accessory Structures and Garages* on page 35; guidelines (2), (3), and (4) on page 36; and guidelines (3), (4), and (5) on page 30 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell was recused in this matter and did not vote.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1548 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Leonard Ebright for work at 695 Percy Street with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Macy, Bowers. Nays: None.) Ms. Cantrell was recused in this matter and did not vote.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Mr. Lucas moved to approve the April 25, 2012 minutes, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Chair Wharton stated that the Windows Subcommittee has produced an informational document for members to review. Mr. Lucas distributed and gave an overview of the draft document entitled *Windows in Historic Buildings*. He asked members to review the document for feedback and discussion at a future meeting.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig reported that staff recently met with Redevelopment staff and Preservation Greensboro Development Fund regarding 919 Spring Garden Street. Preservation Greensboro would like to purchase the property and sell it in a fashion similar to 910 Magnolia Street. They plan to present their plan to the Redevelopment Commission in July, 2012.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JULY 25, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; and Tom Sears.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the July 25, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

Mr. Cowhig stated that Duke Energy has requested that item 3(b), for work at Fulton Street near West McGee Street, be moved to the beginning of the agenda. Members were supportive of the request.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Ms. Spaeh, Ms. Bowers, Mr. Macy, and Mr. Lucas were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 27, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the June 27, 2012 meeting as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, McManus, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.)

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (b) **Application No. 1549**
Location: Fulton Street near West McGee Street
Applicant: Eddie King for Duke Energy
Property Owner: City of Greensboro (public right-of-way)
Date Received: 6-14-12 (CONTINUED UNTIL AUGUST, 2012 MEETING)

Description of Work:

Install utility pole as part of upgrades to electrical facilities.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 20)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed new utility pole is needed in order to upgrade electrical service in the neighborhood. It is proposed for the east side of Fulton Street in order to avoid substantial pruning of a Walnut tree on the west side of the street.

Fact:

A COA is not required to repair or replace utility poles and wires. A COA is required for the installation of new utility poles and wires.

Fact:

The possibility of placing existing utility lines along streets in College Hill underground in order to start new street trees was explored during the years that College Hill was a redevelopment area. Because of the high cost estimates the idea was abandoned.

Guidelines under Additions (page 76):

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:

Mr. Donnie Dimsdale, 161 O'Bryant Road, Reidsville, North Carolina

In Opposition:

Ms. Kate Gaston, 924 Carr Street

Discussion:

Chair Wharton pointed out that this application was continued in order to explore the possibility of crossing the wires on the street at a different point. Mr. Dimsdale, Duke Energy, gave an overview of their proposed plan and responded to questions from Commission members. Ms. Gaston, College Hill Neighborhood Association, stated that the neighborhood is in process of discussing streetscapes in the community. In addition, the neighborhood association has not had an opportunity to meet with Duke Energy. She asked the Commission to continue this application so that the association can meet with Duke Energy to discuss this plan along with future plans for the neighborhood. Mr. Dimsdale agreed to continue the application for 30 days to meet with the neighborhood and address their concerns.

Ms. McManus moved to continue the application, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, McManus, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.)

- (a) **Location: 549 South Mendenhall Street**
Application No. 1533
Applicant: Chris Martin
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-17-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Modifications to existing signs.

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 application is congruous

with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Commercial and/or Institutional and Signs* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a commercial property in the historic district. Constructed around 1892, the building housed the West End Hose Company which featured a horse drawn steam pumper. Because of its association with the history of fire fighting in Greensboro it is a particularly significant building. Today it is being used as a neighborhood grocery store. This is a good example of an adaptive reuse of a historic building which is essential for its preservation.

Fact:

The existing primary signs are interior lights. The applicant is proposing to apply a face to the existing signs with "cut out" letters. This will reduce the effect of the interior lighting significantly and make the signs more in keeping with the historic character of the building and the neighborhood.

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.*
7. *Signage should be compatible with the original use of a building.*
 - A. *It is not historically appropriate to install signs directly on facades or porch roofs of residential buildings and those buildings originally intended for residential use. The installation of a freestanding sign is most appropriate, as it is less likely to detract from the architecture of the building.*
 - B. *Place signs for historic commercial buildings in a location originally intended for signage, such as at the top of the storefront or on windows, doors, or awnings.*
 - C. *Signage for new commercial buildings should reflect similar placement to that of historic commercial buildings in the neighborhood.*

Guidelines (page 9):

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

- 1) *The functional needs of the commercial or institutional property owner must be considered. The property owner should be allowed to use the property in the manner needed, as long as it maintains the character of the Historic District.*

In Support:

Mr. Chris Martin, 1334 West Friendly Avenue
Ms. Kate Gaston, 924 Carr Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1533 for work at 549 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Chris Martin and the description of work is for modifications to the existing design. This application was continued from the last meeting. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that staff felt the application was congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* citing guidelines (1), (2), (3), and (7) A, B, and C on page 34 and guideline (1) on page 9. Speaking in support was applicant Chris Martin of 1334 West Friendly Avenue. He has modified

the application so that both signs in question will have a metal face painted red with white letters to be illuminated from above with gooseneck lights similar to those used in the building across the street. Also speaking in support was Kate Gaston of 924 Gaston Street. She said that the Neighborhood Association voted unanimously in favor of the motion. There was no one in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Members felt that the new signage described by the applicant represented an improvement in appearance. In addition, the group felt that the unused doorway and ice machine would be more historically compatible if they were painted a color closer to the color of the building.

Chair Wharton felt that when making a motion for this application, the metal signs with gooseneck lights should be referenced as a condition as they were not in the original application. The original application was to have illuminated letters.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1533 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments along with guidelines (1), (2), (3), and (7) A, B, and C on page 34 and guideline (1) on page 9 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, McManus, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1533 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Chris Martin for work at 549 South Mendenhall Street with the following condition: (1) that the sign presented today, which describes a 3x9 cabinet with aluminum face painted with premium vinyl graphics illuminated with four gooseneck lights for the front of the building as well as the 3x8 cabinet with an aluminum face painted with premium vinyl graphics on the side of the building with two gooseneck lights, be specifically noted as what is approved in the COA; seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, McManus, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Chair Wharton reported that the new interim director for Parks and Recreation, Mr. Chris Wilson, noted in a memo that he is working with the Aycock Neighborhood Association to explore a comprehensive renovation plan for War Memorial Stadium and the Farmers Market. He is also looking into the use of preservation tax credits for the projects.

The Commission agreed that a liaison from the Commission should be appointed to work with the Aycock Neighborhood Association. Ms. Cantrell and Ms. McManus will coordinate to serve as liaison to the association.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Burroughs announced that the third annual Warnersville Heritage and Music Festival will be held on August 25, 2012 from 2:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Preservation Greensboro plans to hold their annual conference in Asheville, North Carolina from September 19 to September 21, 2012. Details of the agenda will be forthcoming.

Mr. Cowhig distributed copies of the Prevention of Demolition by Neglect Ordinance from Greensboro and Raleigh, North Carolina. Mr. Cowhig felt that Greensboro's Ordinance and process should be revisited and he asked members to compare the two texts to determine if a revision in terms of levying fines is needed. He reviewed several houses under Minimum Housing Code enforcement that illustrate the need to take a further look at the Prevention for Demolition by Neglect Ordinance.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 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
AUGUST 29, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; Paul Macy; Patrick Lee Lucas; Jill Spaeh; and Tom Sears.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the August 29, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 25, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Sears moved to accept the minutes from the July 25, 2012 meeting as amended, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a. **Location: Fulton Street near West McGee Street**
 Application No.1549
 Applicant: Eddie King for Duke Energy
 Property Owner: City of Greensboro
 Date Application Received: 6-14-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install utility pole as part of upgrades to electrical facilities.

Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). In the staff's opinion the proposed 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 proposed new utility pole is needed in order to upgrade electrical service in the neighborhood. It is proposed for the east side of Fulton Street in order to avoid substantial pruning of a Walnut tree on the west side of the street.

Fact:

A COA is not required to repair or replace utility poles and wires. A COA is required for the installation of new utility poles and wires.

Fact:

The possibility of placing existing utility lines along streets in College Hill underground in order to start new street trees was explored during the years that College Hill was a redevelopment area. Because of the high cost estimates the idea was abandoned.

Guideline (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.

In Support:

Mr. Don Dimsdale, 161 O'Bryant Road, Reidsville, NC

In Opposition:

Mr. Joe Wheby, 405 Fulton Street

Ms. Janet Froman, 1001 West McGee Street

Rebuttal:

Mr. Don Dimsdale, 161 O'Bryant Road, Reidsville, NC

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1549 for work at Fulton Street near West McGee Street. The applicant is Eddie King for Duke Energy Company. The property owner is the City of Greensboro and the work is to install utility poles as part of an upgrade for electrical facilities. Speaking in support was Don Dimsdale, 161 O'Bryant Road, Reidsville, NC, who explained the need for this project in terms of providing adequate power. He said that this option causes the least loss to the tree canopy. Adam McClure, 2005 Creekmore Court, asked a question about the placement of the pole. Speaking in opposition was Joe Wheby, 405 Fulton Street, who showed a photograph indicating incomplete work done on a previous pole installation. The photograph showed sidewalks destroyed and piles of dirty gravel. He objected to the project on the basis of quality of work. Also speaking in opposition was Janet Froman, 1001 West McGee Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She noted that the neighborhood association had not been able to find a satisfactory meeting time with Duke Energy and therefore, did not have enough information about the pole and the effect on the streetscape. Speaking in rebuttal was Don Dimsdale who noted that replacement poles would be 40 foot wooden poles with crossbars added to handle the increased number of wires. Jane Morgan, 10 Pepperwood Circle, is also with Duke Energy. She explained the problems with arranging a meeting with the College Hill Neighborhood Association. Duke Energy is still willing to meet with the association. Staff recommended in favor of this COA.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs felt that guideline 5 on page 40 was also applicable to this application and should be added. Ms. Cantrell commented that the addition of more wires detracted from the historic nature of the streetscape and agreed that utility companies often do not leave the area the same way they found it. It was noted that burying the power lines was very expensive. Mr. Burroughs expressed concern with the lack of communication between the neighborhood and Duke Energy. Members discussed the possibility of adding a condition to the COA to insure repair of the sidewalk in a timely manner.

Chair Wharton asked Ms. Morgan if Duke Energy would consider continuing this application until the next meeting to allow them to meet with the neighborhood. She expressed concern with a continuation. She said that continuing the application would delay a resolution to the voltage concerns that are an issue in the neighborhood; therefore, continuation was not an option.

Mr. Sears stated his opinion that the scenario provided by Duke Energy was the least invasive process for the overall good of the community. He was in support of approving the COA with conditions.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1549 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guideline 5 on page 40 and guidelines on page 20 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 1549 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Duke Energy for work at 901 West McGee Street with the following conditions: (1) that the sidewalks are repaired after installation of the new poles, and (2) that the obsolete poles are removed in a timely manner.

Chair Wharton asked Mr. Dimsdale, Duke Energy Company, to comment on a timeframe for the completion of this project. Mr. Dimsdale stated that it would take 60 days from the time the project started until it was finished.

Ms. Cantrell restated the second condition to read (2) that a timely manner would be 60 days from the time the work actually begins, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- b. Location: 754 Chestnut Street
Application No. 1562
Applicant: John Mandrano
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 7-19-12
(CONTINUED UNTIL SEPTEMBER, 2012 MEETING)**

Mr. Lucas joined the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

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. (It is not known if the landing encroaches into the side yard setback requirement or if the work meets the Building Code).

Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The expanded landing makes the stairs more noticeable and the property less in keeping with the historic character of the district. The guidelines recommend that exterior stairs be designed to be as inconspicuous as possible.

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.*

Discussion:

There was a discussion on the merits of continuing this case to determine if the project can be allowed by Zoning Code set-backs and the Building Code.

Mr. John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix Street, stated his approval to continue this case as the property owner.

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue this case until the next meeting, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- c. Location: 739 Park Avenue**
Application No. 1566
Applicant: Carolyn Velez
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 7-31-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Cover front porch soffit and header, wall under porch roof, gable vent, rake board, windows and doors with PVC products designed to match historic materials. Install seamless aluminum gutters and downspouts. All work to be performed according to Lead Safe Work Practices.

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 Design Guidelines—Non-Contributing (page 10), Changes to Non-Contributing Structures (page 67), Exterior Walls, Materials and Finishes (page 44)*, for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a non-contributing structure based on the Summit Avenue Historic District National Register nomination. It was likely built shortly after World War II. At some point the original German siding was covered with asbestos shingles with the exception of wall area under the porch roof. Some of the windows have been replaced with vinyl windows.

Guidelines (page 10):

The original architecture and style of the building should be evaluated for merit, and when architectural quality is noted, changes should strive to respect the character and features of the original structure. When making changes to the buildings themselves, guidelines in this document pertaining to "Exterior Changes" should be followed. However, considerable flexibility is warranted when making changes to non-contributing buildings. Decisions that make practical and aesthetic

sense that may be contrary to specific guidelines are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the guidelines.

Guidelines (page 68):

1. Every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure that they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering of wood trim with vinyl on a brick building is not recommended.

In Support:

Matt Ford, 3834 Angus Road, Whitsett, North Carolina
 Carolyn Velez, 739 Park Avenue
 Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1566 for work at 739 Park Avenue. The applicant is Carolyn Velez. The description of work is to cover front porch soffit and header, wall under porch roof, gable vent, rake board, windows and doors with PVC products designed to match historic materials. In addition, install seamless aluminum gutters and downspouts. All work to be performed according to Lead Safe Work Practices. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that based upon information in the application, staff recommends against granting a COA. It is not congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Non-Contributing (page 10)*, *Changes to Non-Contributing Structures (page 67)*, and *Exterior Walls, Materials and Finishes (page 44)*. Speaking in support of the application was applicant, Carolyn Velez, of 739 Park Avenue. She noted that the paint on her house is lead based. She was concerned for the children next door. Also speaking in support was Matt Ford, 3834 Angus Road, Whitsett, North Carolina, who indicated that the cost of removing lead paint would be in excess of \$20,000. Also speaking in support was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, of the Charles B. Haycock Neighborhood Association. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Macy felt that the guideline on page 10 contradicted staff's conclusion to some extent. Mr. Cowhig acknowledged that the guidelines were open to interpretation and he explained how staff arrived at their conclusion. In response to a question from Mr. Macy, Mr. Cowhig said that there is a section in the guidelines that states the Commission can consider cost when evaluating an application. Mr. Burroughs was in agreement with Mr. Macy. He felt it was important to note the health risk to neighboring children along with the high cost for abatement when considering this project. Ms. Cantrell noted that this house is not a contributing structure in the historic district. Members discussed wording in the Finding of Facts that reflects the Commission's interpretation of the guidelines due to the circumstances that include the dangers of lead and the house being a noncontributing structure. Mr. Lucas suggested that an alternative material such as hardy board be considered. Mr. Sears stated that he preferred hardy board material over vinyl; however, he felt the thickness of hardy board would be an issue. Chair Wharton stated that the application is for vinyl material and that is what should be approved or denied by the Commission.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1566 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 contained in the staff report and guidelines on page 10 and page 68 are acceptable as

findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Lucas, McManus, Sears, Cantrell, Speah. Nays: Macy.)

Members discussed the use of hardy board versus vinyl.

Motion:

Despite the fact that this is not congruous with the guidelines, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1566 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carolyn Velez for work at 739 Park Avenue for the following reasons: (1) the structure is noncontributing, (2) vinyl is going to be the least disturbing procedure, (3) the house poses a lead hazard, (4) encapsulation is preferred to protect original materials which could be under the encapsulation that could be restored, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 6-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burroughs, Macy, McManus, Sears, Cantrell. Nays: Lucas, Spaeh.)

Co-Chair Wharton called for a recess at 5:36 p.m. The meeting resumed at 5:45 p.m.

- d. Location: 602 Fifth Avenue
Application No. 1568
Applicant: Emerson Property Group, Suzanne Gray, Agent
Property Owner: Blade Properties 1
Date Application Received: 7-31-12 (WITHDRAWN)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has withdrawn their application.

- e. Location: 810 Cypress Street
Application No. 1572
Applicant: Barbara Sonner
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-15-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Replace wrought iron porch supports with tapered wood columns.
Install wood railing on front porch to match design of porch railings on similar historic houses.
Replace front walkway with salvaged brick following same design. (Staff approval).

Recommendation:

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

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue National Register Historic District. It appears that the original front porch columns have been replaced with metal supports. Based on similar historic houses in the neighborhood the original columns were likely tapered wood half-columns. If it had a railing it would have been similar to the proposed railing which is similar to houses of the same style and period found in the neighborhood.

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.

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

Recommended Conditions:

- That prior to construction, details of the proposed columns and railing be provided to staff for approval.

In Support:

Barbara Sonner, 810 Cypress Street
Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1572 for work at 810 Cypress Street. The applicant is Barbara Sonner and the description is to replace wrought iron porch supports with tapered wood columns, install wood railing on front porch to match design of porch railings on similar historic houses, and replace front walkway with salvaged brick following same design. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, recommended in favor of granting a COA. He said it was congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 62)* and also guidelines 1 and 2 on page 64 with the recommended condition that prior to construction, details of the proposed columns and railing be provided to staff for approval. Also speaking in support was the owner, Barbara Sonner, 810 Cypress Street. Also in support was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association. The association supports this application. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Responding to a question from Mr. Sears about the condition of the sidewalk, Ms. Geary stated that she recalled that it was broken up. The repair of the sidewalk can be done with staff approval.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1572 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; the fact that this is a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue National Register Historic District; it appears that the original front porch columns have been replaced with metal supports; based on similar historic houses in the neighborhood the original columns were likely tapered wood half-columns; if it had a railing it would have been similar to the proposed railing which is similar to houses of the same style and period found in the neighborhood; and guidelines 1, 2, and 4 on page 64 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1572 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Barbara Sonner for work at 810 Cypress Street with the following condition: (1) that prior construction details for proposed

columns be provided to staff for approval, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (f) **Location: 720 Percy Street**
Application No. 1571
Applicant: John Mandrano
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-15-12 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Removal of chimney stack near back of roof.

Recommendation:

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

Fact:

This is a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue National Register Historic District. There are two chimneys—one a fireplace chimney near the front of the house, the second appears to be an original chimney that likely vented a boiler and a cook stove. While the chimney is original and appears to be in good condition, and contributes in some measure to the overall historic character of the house, it is not "essential" to the character of the house.

Guidelines (page 50):

1. Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps. Decorative grilles and vents, water tables, lattice panels, access doors, and steps are character-defining features of foundations that should be preserved as well.

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

In Support:

John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix Street

In Opposition:

Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue

Rebuttal:

John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix Street

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1571 for work at 720 Percy Street. The applicant is John Mandrano and the description of work is for the removal of chimney stack near back of roof. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro Department of Planning and Community Development said that staff is in favor of granting this COA. The work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)*, and also cited guidelines numbers 1 and 6 on page 50. Speaking in support was John Mandrano of 321 East Hendrix Street. He explained that the chimney was causing some leaking into his house and was

not suitable for kitchen renovation he wants to do. Speaking in opposition was Linda Fusco, 321 East Hendrix Street, representing the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association. She said the association unanimously did not support this application on the basis of the fact the Historic Preservation Commission had denied the demolition of chimneys in two other cases. Speaking in rebuttal was John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix Street, who said he did not know if those denied cases were similar to his and he noted that the guidelines called for flexibility in the modern use of structures.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs stated that he was not in favor of granting this application for the following reasons: (1) He believes the chimney does contribute to the character of the house and that it tells a particular story; the characterization of the house is non-essential and is an arbitrary distinction in this case, and (2) There is no compelling evidence that the chimney will impede plans for the owner's renovation of the kitchen and it is not necessarily the Commission's responsibility to insure the placement of a chimney is optimal for an interior kitchen renovation. He stated that he based his interpretation on guideline 6 on page 50. Mr. Macy stated his opinion that he does not think the chimney is essential as it is located toward the back of the house and doesn't add character to the structure. Chair Wharton felt that since the chimney was once used as a cook stove, it tells a story about the house. He added that the chimney contains some architectural detail and contributes to the character of the house. Ms. Cantrell pointed out that there is currently not a plan for kitchen renovation and therefore, it is not clear if the chimney will interfere with the owner's plans. Ms. Spaeh pointed out that there are methods to reinforce the chimney from underneath that would take it out of the core space.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1571 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the guidelines on page 50, numbers 1 and 6; in fact, the original chimney contributes to the overall historic character of the house; are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, McManus, Cantrell, Burroughs, Spaeh, Lucas. Nays: Macy.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1571 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Mandrano for work at 720 Percy Street, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, McManus, Cantrell, Burroughs, Spaeh, Lucas. Nays: Macy.)

- g. Location: 677 Chestnut Street**
Application No. 1573
Applicant: Demetri Dascalakis
Property Lindley Heights, Inc.
Date Application Received: 8-15-12 (APPROVED IN CONCEPT WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Development of cemetery on vacant tract.

Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 18), Trees and Landscaping (page 21), Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 28) and New Construction (page 77)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This is a proposal to develop the property on the west side of Chestnut Street, commonly known as Dunleith, for a cemetery. The property would be cleared of existing vegetation with the exception of two large Southern Magnolia trees. Existing trees are mostly volunteers covered in Kudzu and other vines--Locust and other tree varieties on the site are generally not indicative of a late nineteenth century neighborhood. Landscaping would be installed along the north, west and east sides and a fence along the front of the property.

Guidelines (page 23):

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
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.*
6. *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work. Refer to the Tree Protection Guide in the appendix on this document for specific precautions and requirements.*

Facts:

The proposed fence will require a Special Exception because the portion along Chestnut Street is higher than what is permitted under the zoning ordinance. This section of the fence is designed to serve a ceremonial function and define the entrance to the cemetery. It is a decorative fence that is reminiscent of entrances to historic cemeteries.

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.*
2. *Trash receptacle and dumpster areas must be adequately screened from view of the public right of-way and adjoining residences with shrubs and/or fencing.*
3. *Retain fences and walls that contribute to the historic character of the property and the district where possible. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in dimension, proportion, material, texture, and detail.*
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 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.)

Guidelines (page 29):

3. *When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials, and design. Generally, double width driveways and circular driveways are not appropriate.*

4. *Construct new driveways and walkways in locations that require a minimum of alteration to historic site features such as landscaping, retaining walls, curbs, and sidewalks. Usually driveways should lead directly to the rear of buildings, and walkways should lead directly to the front steps of the house.*

5. *Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracks (narrow strips), macadam, brick, and crushed stone. Conceal edging materials used for gravel driveways. Keep new driveway aprons and curb cuts to the minimum width possible.*

6. *Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.*

Guidelines (page 78):

Landscaping: Landscaping can be the key to a successful construction project. This is especially true in the Historic Districts where vegetation is well established. Heavy landscaping is essential if new buildings are to blend in with their surroundings. The site plan for new construction projects should identify existing trees, walls, walks, or other features, which could be incorporated into the landscape design, and every effort should be made to save existing trees, shrubbery, and hedges. Those that can be saved should be protected with some type of barricade during construction. The landscape plan for new buildings should include new shade trees, especially along street frontages.

Recommended Conditions:

- That construction details be submitted to the Commission for approval prior to construction for the driveway, fence and gate.
- That the landscape plan be reviewed to see if there is an opportunity for some taller canopy trees, especially along the street, and shrubbery that might be more reflective of the character of a historic cemetery.
- That consideration be given to incorporating the stone pillars that are on the property into the project.
- That a tree protection plan be submitted.

Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

In Support:

Demetri Dascalakis, 1850 North Elm Street
 Robert Erskine, 3406-A West Wendover Avenue
 Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue
 John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1573 for work at 677 Chestnut Street. The applicant is Demetri Dascalakis and the description is for the development of a cemetery on a vacant tract. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff recommends in favor of granting a COA. It is not incongruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 18)*, *Trees and Landscaping (page 21)*, *Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 28)* and *New Construction (page 77)*. He cited guidelines number 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 23; guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 26; guidelines 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 29; and guidelines for landscaping on page 78. He recommended the following conditions: (1) that the construction details be submitted to the Commission for approval prior to construction for the driveway, fence, and gate, (2) that the landscape plan be reviewed to see if there is an opportunity for some taller canopy trees, (3) that consideration be given to incorporating the stone pillars that are on the property left from the ruins of the Dunleith mansion, and (4) that a tree plan be submitted. Speaking in support was Demetri Dascalakis, 1850 North Elm Street, who summarized the history of the property and outlined the regulatory processes that are involved in this plan. Also speaking in support was project architect, Robert Erskine, of 3606-A West Wendover Avenue. He described the architectural concepts involved based on the historical use of the property. Also speaking in support was Linda Fusco, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association. She indicated that the association gave full support to the project. Also speaking in support was John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix, who is the owner of many properties on Chestnut and Hendrix Street. He stated his support and felt it would be beneficial to his property values. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Members discussed the fact that this is an application in concept only. If approved in concept, all details, other than what can be approved at staff level, must come back to the Commission. Chair Wharton felt that conditions should be put into the motion. Details of the scale of fencing and other design features are not available in the plan at this point. Counsel Williams stated that nothing has been determined in terms of specifics in the plan other than the shape of the layout. Mr. Cowhig informed members that a preliminary landscape plan has been submitted along with a plant list. There was a discussion among members as to the differences between this conceptual application and previous applications that have also had a site plan.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1573 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and the staff comments in the staff report along with guidelines in paragraph 3 on page 3; page 23, guidelines 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6; page 26, guideline 5; page 29, guidelines 3, 4, 5, and 6; page 78, the paragraph starting with the word "landscape"; are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, McManus, Cantrell, Burroughs, Lucas, Macy, Spaeh. Nays: None.) Ms. Spaeh left the meeting unexcused; therefore, her vote counts in the affirmative.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1573 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness for the concept of this design to Demetri Dascalakis, Lindley Heights, Inc., for work at 677 Chestnut Street with the conditions enumerated in the staff report amending the first condition to read: (1) that construction details be submitted to the Commission for approval prior to construction for any elements in the plan as well as any detailed planning plan and lighting plan, along with conditions (2), (3), and (4) as listed by staff, and (5) that design for the details of all headstones and other stones in the cemetery be

covered by a design standards document to be submitted to finish it, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, McManus, Cantrell, Burroughs, Lucas, Macy, Spaeh. Nays: None.) Ms. Spaeh left the meeting unexcused; therefore, her vote counts in the affirmative.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Chair Wharton thanked members of the Windows Subcommittee for their work. The subcommittee will present their report to the Commission at a later date.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Burroughs stated that he will be presenting the Heritage Community proposal at the next City Council meeting scheduled for September 18, 2012.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that a discussion of Ordinance to Prevent Demolition-by-Neglect will take place at the next Commission meeting.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 26, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Chair; Ann Bowers; Lois McManus; Patrick Lucas; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; and Paul Macy.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

WELCOME:

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the September 26, 2012 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Chair Wharton confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets, no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda, and no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 29, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Lucas moved to accept the minutes from the August 29, 2012 meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Macy and Ms. Cantrell joined the meeting a 4:10 p.m.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

**(a) Location: 754 Chestnut Street
Application No. 1562
(CONTINUED UNTIL OCTOBER, 2012 MEETING)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting and has requested a continuance.

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue application number 1562, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**(b) Location: 602 Fifth Avenue
Application No. 1568
(CONTINUED UNTIL OCTOBER, 2012 MEETING)**

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

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue application number 1568, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

(c) Location: 807 Magnolia Street
Application No. 1580
Applicant: Kurt Lauenstein
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-30-12
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)

Mr. Cowhig explained that the applicant could not be present at the meeting; however, he would like the application to be heard. A representative from the company that would install solar panels on the roof is present to give information on the product to be used. Procedurally, the representative cannot present on behalf of the property owner, but they can respond to technical questions about the application.

Description of Work:

Install solar panels on south slope of roof.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

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

Fact:

The solar panels will be installed on a side-facing slope of the roof for maximum energy efficiency. They will be of dark color and flush mounted. The pitch of the roof is fairly low and the overhangs are wide making it difficult to see the surface of the roof. Therefore the solar panels will not be easily noticeable.

Guidelines (page 38):

Solar Panels are best located on rear elevations.

In Support:

Mr. Greg Olenar, 4523 Fairport Court, High Point, North Carolina
 Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1580 for work at 807 Magnolia Street. The applicant is Mr. Kurt Lauenstein and the description of work is installation of solar panels on south slope of roof. Mr. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff reviewed the application and recommended in favor of granting it. He felt it was congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38)* where it states that solar panels are best located on rear elevations. Also in support was Mr. Greg Olenar of 4523 Fairport Court in High Point, North Carolina. He noted that the panels to be installed will be black on black,

monocrystalline, and flush-mounted. Also speaking was Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said that the neighborhood was unanimously in favor of the COA.

Discussion:

Mr. Macy inquired about the color of roof. Mr. Olenar replied that although he did not know the exact color, it was a light colored asphalt shingle roof. Ms. Bowers stated that she did not object to the installation of solar panels on this roof. Ms. Cantrell likened the panels to storm doors or storm windows that help the heating and cooling inside the house. Mr. Burroughs was concerned that the process should be reversible for future homeowners. Staff indicated that the neighbor in direct view of the proposed panel installation has not responded with an objection.

Mr. Lucas stated that interpreting this installation as mechanical equipment would allow for qualification under guidelines on page 38. Mr. Macy asked if any trees would be removed during the installation. Mr. Olenar did not anticipate that any trees would be removed in the process.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1580 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 contained in the staff report, specifically the guidelines on page 38, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, McManus, Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell. Nays: Macy.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1580 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Kurt Lauenstein for work at 807 Magnolia Street, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, McManus, Lucas, Burroughs, Cantrell. Nays: Macy.)

(d) Location: 701 Simpson Street
Application No. 1576
Applicant: David and Diana Tate
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-11-12
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Enclose back porch; screen in side porch; construct portico to replace original portico; replace missing balustrade on side porch roof.

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 Fisher Park National Register Historic District.

Fact:

Based on documentary photographs the original front portico was removed along with the balustrade on the side porch roof. The applicants would like to reconstruct the front portico to match the original as closely as possible.

Guidelines (page 64):

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.

5. The addition of new entrances, porches, pergolas, balconies and other entryway features to primary elevations should be studied in depth and based on architectural precedence for the style and design of the building.

Fact:

The proposed balustrade on the side porch roof is based on documentary photographs.

Guidelines (page 64):

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

Fact:

The proposed screening of the side porch involves removing original columns.

Guidelines (page 64):

6. Screening a porch may be appropriate when it is installed and designed in a way that does not alter or detract from the details of the original porch, and uses compatible materials to the original structure. For example, porches may be screened if the framing is recessed, the screening placed behind columns or balustrades, and the framing can be removed in the future without damaging historic elements of the porch.

Fact:

The reason for enclosing the back porch is to create functional interior space. It is not practical to enclose the porch as a sunroom because of its small size.

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 State Historic Preservation Office be consulted on the design details of the proposed front portico so that it will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and qualify for the NC historic rehab tax credits.
- That the side porch columns be retained and the framing for the screening be recessed. And that the screening be installed in the traditional manner rather than a kit with screen inserts and metal framing.
- That a constructional detail be provide for the balustrade.

In Support:

Ms. Diane Tate, 701 Simpson Street
 Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1576 for work at 701 Simpson Street. The applicants are David and Diana Tate and the description of work is to enclose back porch, screen in side porch, construct portico to replace original portico, and replace missing balustrade on side porch roof. Mr. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff supported this application citing guideline numbers 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 54 and guideline 7 on page 74. Staff recommended two conditions: (1) that the State Historic Preservation Office be consulted on the design details of the proposed front portico, and (2) that the side porch columns be retained and the framing for the screening be recessed. Speaking in support of the application was Ms. Diana Tate, the homeowner, of 701 Simpson Street. She said she did not have any problems with the suggested conditions. Also speaking in support was Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said that the association unanimously supported this application with the exception of the removal of the columns on the side porch. They desired that the materials on the side porch match those on the original house.

Discussion:

Mr. Macy asked if the owners were planning to remove the vinyl siding. Mr. Cowhig indicated that the owners were not planning to remove the siding but if they chose to, the project would be eligible for a tax credit.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1576 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 contained in the staff report, specifically guidelines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on page 64, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1576 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to David and Diana Tate for work at 701 Simpson Street, with the following conditions: (1) that the State Historic Preservation Office be consulted on the design details of the proposed front portico so that it will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and qualify for the NC historic rehab tax credits; and (2) that the side porch columns be retained and the framing for the screening be recessed, and that the screening be installed in the traditional manner rather than a kit with screen inserts and metal framing, with these construction details be submitted to the staff; (3) and that a construction detail be provided for the balustrade, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

(e) Location: West Fisher Avenue between N. Elm and N. Eugene Streets

Application No. 1587

Applicant: Ted Partrick, City Engineer

Property Owner: City of Greensboro

Date Application Received: 9-12-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of Phase II of the Downtown Greenway along West Fisher Avenue.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Neighborhood Setting: Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* (page 18) for the following reasons:

Facts:

Fisher Avenue was once a two-way street from Church Street to Wharton Street. In the mid-twentieth century it became part of the City's thoroughfare system. It linked Murrow Boulevard with Battleground Avenue and was part of a planned loop around the downtown. The loop was never completed and right-of-way acquired for the southern section is being used for the Downtown Greenway.

The Downtown Greenway will result in the narrowing of the roadway of Fisher Avenue to two lanes, the addition of protected parking spaces and reduce the crossing distances at intersections by extending the curb with bulb-outs, a traffic calming measure. The result should be a safer and more pedestrian friendly street. In a sense, the Greenway will restore some of the neighborhood feel Fisher Avenue had before it was widened and became part of the thoroughfare system.

Features that will help relate the greenway to the historic district are the granite curbing, pavers, grass strip, landscaping and street trees. Any loss in historic character resulting from changes to Fisher Avenue should be far outweighed by the benefits to the neighborhood environment that will accrue from this project.

Guidelines (pages 18-20):

Streets, sidewalks, parks, and other public spaces are important parts of the neighborhood setting. The public right-of-way has evolved and changed over time, but much of the early twentieth century appearance and character remains in the Historic Districts. Most streets retain their original granite curbs and brick gutters, with a grass strip separating the street from the sidewalk. Neighborhood streets are usually two lanes wide and somewhat narrow compared with current standards. Mature shade trees along many streets provide a green canopy. On some streets, standard streetlights have been replaced by decorative lighting fixtures of a more human scale, adding to the pedestrian character of the districts. Future changes should maintain this character.

1. *Maintain historic street patterns, widths, and construction materials.*
2. *Maintain historic paving materials for roads and sidewalks, as well as granite curbing. When they are disturbed for underground utility construction or other work, repair pavement, brick gutters, and granite curbs with matching materials.*
3. *Maintain granite curbs and brick gutters. Expose and restore these features when they have been covered.*
4. *Maintain the planting strip between the street and sidewalk. It is not appropriate to surface the strip with pavement or other materials. Brick may be considered where a hard surface is needed.*
7. *Introduce street lighting of a human scale that is consistent with the design and the illumination level of special street lighting in the Historic Districts.*

Recommended Conditions:

- That consideration be given to planting trees along Fisher Avenue similar to the street trees along South Greene Street as a way of helping to restore the high canopy that has been in serious decline in the historic district.
- That any new lighting along Fisher Avenue be of the dark sky compliant type to avoid glare from streetlights.

In Support:

Mr. Ted Partrick, 300 Washington Street
 Mr. John McLendon, 2 Magnolia Court
 Ms. Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street
 Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1587 for work at West Fisher Avenue between North Elm and North Eugene Streets. The applicant is Ted Partrick, City Engineer, and the description of work is for the construction of Phase II of the Downtown Greenway along West Fisher Avenue. Mr. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff recommends in favor of this COA. He cited guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 on pages 18 through 20 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. He recommended the following conditions: (1) that consideration be given to planting trees along Fisher Avenue similar to the street trees along South Greene Street as a way of helping to restore the high canopy that has been in serious decline in the historic district, and (2) that any new lighting along Fisher Avenue be of the dark sky compliant type to avoid glare from streetlights. Also in support was Mr. Ted Partrick, 300 Washington Street, who is a City Engineer. He explained the scope of the project. Also speaking was Ms. Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street, who is Project Manager for the Greenway. Also speaking in support was Mr. John McLendon, 2 Magnolia Court, who is the Co-Chair of the Technical Committee. Finally, also in support was Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The association unanimously approved the application with no conditions. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Burroughs commented that this public/private partnership has proven to be a real benefit for the City of Greensboro and he was very pleased with the work that has been done. He stated his opinion that continued work with the Greenway will help to attract people to Greensboro which is necessary for the City to maintain its competitive edge. He stated his support for the COA. Following a discussion, members felt that it was appropriate to have staff level approval for the landscaping component.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1587 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* enumerated on pages 18-20, guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7; are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1587 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro for work at West Fisher Avenue between North Elm and North Eugene Streets with the following conditions: (1) that any landscape work be approved at least at the staff level by the Greensboro Historic Preservation staff, and (2) that consideration be given to appropriate trees along the Fisher Avenue area, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- (f) **Location: 903 N. Eugene Street**
Application No. 1588
Applicant: Andrew Spainhour
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 9-12-12
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install backflow preventer required by code for the installation of irrigation systems.

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—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (page 38) for the following reasons:

Fact:

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

Fact:

The backflow preventer is required by the City for installation of irrigation systems. It is a pipe device that must be ground and it is usually covered by a metal cabinet. It must be located within 25' of the meter at the street.

Guidelines (page 40):

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.

Recommended Condition:

- That the visual impact of the backflow preventer be softened with landscaping.

In Support:

Mr. Andrew Spainhour, 903 North Eugene Street
 Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1588 for work at 903 North Eugene Street. The applicant is Andrew Spainhour and the description of work is to install a backflow preventer required by code for the installation of irrigation systems. Mr. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated the City staff recommended in favor of granting the COA with the condition that the visual

impact of the backflow preventer be softened with landscaping. Speaking in support was the Mr. Andrew Spainhour, the applicant, who lives at 903 North Eugene Street. He indicated that he was not pleased with the fake rock currently in place. Also speaking in support was Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The association voted unanimously in favor of the application.

Discussion:

Chair Wharton commented that this is an issue that will need to be addressed in the next revision of the guidelines. He felt that softening the backflow preventer with landscaping is the best solution at hand. Ms. Bowers indicated that she liked the way the applicant balanced the landscaping on both sides of the backflow preventer. Ms. Cantrell stated that green coverings have more potential to successfully cover the backflow preventer than the fake rock.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1588 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 on the worksheet and guideline 3 on page 40, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Macy. 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 1588 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Andrew Spainhour for work at 903 North Eugene Street with the following condition: (1) that the shrubbery he has proposed that is not part of the application be installed, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Co-Chair Wharton directed staff that in the future, the Commission would like to see bushes in applications of this sort, not fake rocks.

The Commission recessed at 5:50 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION OF SUNSET HILLS REGISTER NOMINATION:

Ms. Geary gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Sunset Hills National Register nomination. Her overview included resources in the area, a brief history of the area, architectural styles in the neighborhood, and the procedure for designation.

Ms. McManus moved to recommend the nomination of Sunset Hills to the National Register, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Burroughs was informed by Mr. Cowhig that the Heritage Community Proposal presentation will be heard by City Council on October 16, 2012.

The Windows Subcommittee gave an overview of their report, as distributed to members. The subcommittee members are Mr. Lucas, Mr. Macy, Mr. Sears, and Ms. Spaeh. Mr. Lucas presented the report entitled *Windows in Historic Buildings*.

Mr. Lucas cited five recommendations pertaining to windows in historic buildings as follows:
 (1) Sponsor yearly seminars on window inspection and repair. (Co-sponsored by PGI or ASG/PGI

as well as historic neighborhoods.)

- (2) Place this information online and in print for easy access by property owners.
- (3) Consider a You-Tube video of someone actually working on windows.
- (4) Complete the case study of the Greensboro Historical Museum windows to provide tangible evidence with costs associated.
- (5) Consider some of the language developed in this report as the guidelines document moves forward.

Mr. Lucas moved to adopt the document, seconded by Mr. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Lucas moved to adopt all the recommendations, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

There was a discussion about creating a video illustrating window repair in a step-by-step format that can be used by homeowners. Members noted the promotional value of having such a video available. Mr. Cowhig plans to talk to Channel 13 staff for their input.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Members held a discussion on the City's Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect. Mr. Cowhig reviewed the way the City of Raleigh handles blighted properties in historic neighborhoods and members discussed next steps that could be taken in Greensboro to enforce the Ordinance. Among the measures discussed was the levying of fines. Staff indicated that they plan to confer with Minimum Housing staff and Ms. Schwartz with Planning and Community Development regarding the matter.

Mr. Lucas moved to direct staff to research a more efficient use of the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect through administrative process or an Ordinance amendment and use of civil penalties, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 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
OCTOBER 31, 2012**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

Ms. Spaeh moved to nominate Mr. Lucas as Chairman of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2012 MEETING:

Mr. Burroughs moved to accept the minutes from the September 26, 2012 meeting as written, seconded by Chair Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

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

- (a) **Location: 754 Chestnut Street**
Application No. 1595 (Amendment to #1562)
Applicant: John Mandrano
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-19-12 (DENIED)

Note: The zoning enforcement officer has determined that this property is legally non-conforming because it is a multi-family use in a single-family zone. Structures in this category cannot be expanded. The property owner has the right to appeal this interpretation to the Board of Adjustment. The Historic Preservation Commission does not have a role in this process.

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 has submitted an amended application proposing to reduce the size of the landing and make structural changes to meet the Building Code. It will still encroach 3' into the 5' side yard setback. The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to the setback requirement under Section 30-4-4.2 (B) 2 of the City's Development Ordinance:

"All street setback (except as provided in subsection 1 above), interior setback, building coverage, and height requirements shall comply with applicable zoning regulations unless a

special exception is approved by the Board of Adjustment. The special exception shall be granted only if it complies with the intent of the architectural and historic guidelines of the historic district and is first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.”

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the amended application and discussions with the applicant about safety and practical issues, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff’s opinion, if the conditions are met the expanded landing will be congruous with the *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 materials and design of the railing for the expanded landing are much different than the original porch railings on the historic structure. Beveled pickets are nailed to the bottom band and the top rail, a 2x4 turned on its side. It is a design commonly used for deck construction. The historic porch railing is constructed of top and bottom rails with square balusters with flat tops using a traditional design. Therefore the railing is not compatible with the historic structure.

Fact:

The following steps could be taken to minimize the impact of the expanded landing on the historic character of the structure and the district:

- (1) Reduce the size of the landing.
- (2) Replace the railing on the landing and the stairs with a railing that is closer in design and materials to the original porch railing.
- (3) Paint the landing and railings white.

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.*

Recommended Conditions:

- That the landing be reduced in size so that it does not encroach into the side yard setback.
- That the railing for the stairs and landing be re-designed to be closer in design and materials to the original porch railing and that a construction detail be provided for staff approval.
- Paint the landing and railings white.
- That a Building Permit be obtained.

In Support:

John Mandrano, 321 East Hendrix Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1595 for work at 754 Chestnut Street. The applicant is John Mandrano. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, reviewed the merits of the application noting that the zoning enforcement officer indicated that this was a legally nonconforming use for the property. This means that the property cannot be expanded but an appeal can be made to the Board of Adjustment in this instance. This application does not meet the building code and if the application is approved, conditions have been recommended as noted in the staff report. The purpose of expanding the landing was for safety for two reasons in terms of access for furnishings and for accommodating egress for the window near the door on the second floor of the building. Mr. Mandrano suggested that the application would include 6' by 6' columns with posts set approximately 3' inside the property line which would require a special exception within the historic district to the Board of Adjustment.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell commented that the landing became much more conspicuous when it was expanded especially with the deck design on the top as opposed to the porch style underneath. She was not comfortable approving the application because doing so would put a stamp of approval on the application for the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Burroughs stated that he did not think the project was congruous with the guidelines. Ms. Spaeh asked about options if the application was denied. Mr. Cowhig replied that the building inspector indicated that the stairway could be put back to its original state but a building permit would be required. The original landing was well within the required set-back distance; however, the expanded landing encroached into the side yard set-back. Mr. Sears stated that he was comfortable with expanding the landing for egress in terms of safety. He pointed out that it would not extend past the drip line of the overhang and therefore, would have no impact on appearance from the front of the property. Mr. Cowhig discussed the procedural process if the application was denied. The applicant could submit a new application or appeal to the Board of Adjustment. Members felt the application should be denied.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1562, which is an amendment to application 1595, 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 the guidelines on page 70 as well as staff comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1562, which is an amendment to application 1595, and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. John Mandrano for work at 754 Chestnut Street, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 602 Fifth Avenue

Application No. 1568

Applicant: Emerson Property Group, Suzanne Gray, Agent

Property Owner: Blade Properties

Date Application Received: 7-31-12 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replacement of some original windows with vinyl replacement windows, after-the-fact.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the replacement windows are not 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. Original windows are an essential part of the historic character of the house.

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:

Suzanne Gray, 4420 Forest Walk Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1563 for property at 602 Fifth Avenue. The description of work is replacement of some original windows with vinyl replacement windows, after-the-fact. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that there has been significant work with the property manager and City staff for options including Architectural Salvage of Greensboro or replacement with wood windows. The property manager is Suzanne Gray, 4420 Forest Walk Drive. She stated that she was willing to work to get to an appropriate window scenario for the building; however, she expressed concerns about cost.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell felt that the application was in opposition to guideline recommendations. She expressed support for phased window replacement. Members discussed denying the application and having phased window replacement as part of a second application.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1568 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 listed in the summary and guidelines listed on pages 55 through 61 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1568 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Emerson Property Group and Suzanne Gray acting as the agent for work at 602 Fifth Avenue, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

(c) Location: 912 Olive Street**Application No. 1590****Applicant: Eric and Anna Phillips****Property Owner: same****Date Application Received: 10-5-12 (CONTINUED)****Description of Work:**

Construction of masonry privacy wall according to attached site plan and description.
Construction of wood picket fence, patio and accessory structure.

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 privacy wall, fence, patio and outbuilding will be congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls, and Site Features (pages 24-27) and Garages and Accessory Structures (pages 35-37)*, for the following reasons:

Facts:

This house is a "contributing" structure in the Fisher Park Historic District. It is located at the edge of the district where land uses change from residential to institutional. There are some rundown apartment houses directly across the street from the back yard. The property is located on the corner of a busy thoroughfare, and the back yard is exposed to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. A masonry wall would provide much needed privacy. A 7' wall would give a level of privacy that would make this property much more livable than it is today and at the same time add a site feature that is traditionally found in historic areas of American cities.

Fact:

Wood, spaced picket fences are consistent with the guidelines for fences.

Guidelines (page 70):

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

- A. Low picket fences of an open design, constructed of wood or metal and finished in white or another color/stain compatible with the building, and low walls and hedges are appropriate for front and rear yard use. Front yard fences and walls should usually not exceed 42" in height.*
- B. Install utilitarian fences of woven wire or chain link in rear yards only. Where they are visible from the street, screen with climbing vines, ivy or shrubbery. (If chain-link fencing is needed, coated chain-link is preferable to raw aluminum.)*
- C. Introduce privacy fences or privacy walls in rear yards only that must not exceed 72" in height. The midpoint of the house marks the division between the rear and front yard. (Note: fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line that abuts a street, by City ordinance.)*

Facts:

The proposed accessory structure is small and is sited at the rear of the property. The applicant is proposing to use a design and materials that are consistent with the guidelines for accessory structures.

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

Recommended Conditions:

- That a final design for the wall to be submitted to staff for approval prior to construction
- That shrubbery and/or flowers be planted in front of the wall and a detail be provided to staff for approval prior to construction
- That the proposed accessory structure have the following features:
 - a. Roof with wide overhangs and exposed rafters.
 - b. Siding be either lap or board-and-batten.
 - c. Siding material be either wood, or fiber cement.

Mr. Cowhig explained why staff recommends continuing this application. The applicant has agreed to a continuance.

Ms. Spaeh moved to continue application number 1590, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Spaeh. Nays: None.)

Mr. Burroughs moved to excuse Ms. Spaeh from meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.)

Mr. Hoggard joined the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

(d) Application No. 1591**Location: 800 Simpson Street****Applicant: Frank Kuester****Owner: Same****Date Application Received: 10-15-12 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)****Description of Work:**

Construction of garage according to attached plan and description. Extend driveway. Remove non-original stairs at left side of house.

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

Facts:

800 Simpson Street is a "contributing structure" in Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The site for the proposed garage is the site of an original garage. It is a simple design with a pitched roof with a generous overhang and two bays. Lap siding is a common exterior construction material for historic garages.

Guidelines under Accessory Structures and Garages:

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

Recommended Condition:

- That the window casings be wider to match window casings on historic frame garages in the neighborhood.

In Support:

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this is application number 1591 for work at 800 Simpson Street to construct a garage, extend a driveway, and remove non-original stairs at the left side of the house. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that this application was congruous with the guidelines. Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, was present to represent the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He pointed out several concerns raised by the neighborhood including whether or not the windows were true divided light and consideration for protecting a large tree located near the construction site.

Discussion:

Members referred to the attached plan and commented that the proposed garage looked nice.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1591 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 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1591 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Frank Keuster for work at 800 Simpson Street with the condition that the windows match guideline requirements and that the recommended care be given to trees on the property, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

(e) Location: 910 Magnolia Street**Application No. 1595 (Amendment to COA 1478)****Applicant: Tracy Pratt****Property Owner: same****Date Application Received: 10-15-12 (APPROVED)****Description of Work:**

Remove basement windows on north side of house and brick in openings.

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—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys* (pages 48-50) for the following reasons:

Fact:

This house is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park Historic District. It is currently undergoing major renovations.

Fact:

The basement windows on the north side of the house are partially below grade and water enters the building through these openings. The sills are completely rotted. There is not enough room for window wells because of the driveway location.

Fact:

Recessing the infill brick will indicate the former location of the basement windows.

Guidelines (page 50):

1. Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps. Decorative grilles and vents, water tables, lattice panels, access doors, and steps are character-defining features of foundations that should be preserved as well.

In Support:

Tracy Pratt, 108 Woodbourne Avenue
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Lucas stated that this application is for work at 910 Magnolia Street. The description of work is to remove basement windows on north side of house and brick in openings. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that this project is a major renovation and that this is an amended application to allow water to be redirected from the basement of the house. Mr. Tracy Pratt, 108 Woodbourne Avenue, is the owner. He spoke to the issues and said that this was an alternative that had been worked out with staff. Mr. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, was present to represent the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He spoke in support of the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Cantrell pointed out the importance of the recess to indicate that a window was previously there. Mr. Sears commended the applicant for his work on the property. He was also in favor of the recess and suggested it be $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1 inch in depth.

Mr. Hoggard indicated a conflict of interest with this application and asked to be recused from the vote.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1595, which is an amendment to application number 1478, 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 staff comments summarized in the packet and the guidelines on page 50 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.) Mr. Hoggard was recused from the vote.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1595, an amendment to application 1478, and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mr. Tracy Pratt for work at 910 Magnolia seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lucas, McManus, Burroughs, Cantrell, Sears. Nays: None.) Mr. Hoggard was recused from the vote.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the Heritage Community program. Ms. Sue Schwartz, Director of Planning and Community Development, has asked staff for a proposed process with more detail.

A meeting was recently held to discuss Prevention of Demolition by Neglect. Staff will present an update for members at the next meeting.

Mr. Cowhig reported that Mr. Rich Ducker, Institute of Government, will be present on December 13, 2012 to provide training for Boards and Commissions. He urged members to attend the event.

Ms. Cantrell distributed brochures that her historic neighborhood incorporates into welcome packets for new owners.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Ms. Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, resides in the College Hill historic district. She raised questions as to what happens to a COA as time goes by. She pointed out two concerns that were raised at the College Hill Neighborhood Association meeting. She referenced the 2005 COA regarding the closing of College Place from West Market Street to McGee Street and the impact of the recent closing of a small portion just south of O'Dell Street to the entrance of a Greensboro College parking lot. The apparent use of this area is to park school buses. The school buses impact the neighborhood and detract from the pedestrian friendly vista that was intended in the original COA. Ms. Haskett also described a situation involving the removal of vines from a fence between College Place and the Greensboro College gym. The vines provided screening from the playing field. The overgrown vines were cut down and did not grow back. A banner has been hanging on the fence for two years and has become a semi-permanent installation. She felt that the current use of the fence was not part of the original intention. Ms. Haskett questioned the "staying power" of plans proposed in COA applications.

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff will research the issues and work with the College Hill neighborhood. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
DECEMBER 5, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anne Bowers, Thomas Sears, Jill Spaeh, Christina Cantrell

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development. Also in attendance was Mike Williams, Attorney for the Commission.

Mr. Cowhig announced that a quorum of members was not present; therefore, no business can be conducted.

Mr. Cowhig stated that next scheduled meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission is January 30, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd