

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
JANUARY 12, 2011  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Thomas Sears; and Jill Spaeh.

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

**GUIDELINES UPDATE PROJECT:**

Mr. Cowhig distributed comment sheets from the three listening meetings held in November, 2010. He discussed issues in each of the three historic districts and asked Commission members for their response.

**1. College Hill Historic District**

- Enforcement: Of guidelines and all issues effecting neighborhood/concerns regarding 300 block South Tate St.
- Fund Ordinance to Prevent Demolition.
- Opt out of historic district.
- Lead paint issues.
- Balance Historic District and City regulations.
- Interest in sustainable alternative products, green building using recycled materials.
- Requested information on State Tax Credits—Make Guidelines more informational.
- Resource list-where to find materials?
- Make owners of rental properties aware of rehab tax credits in historic district.
- Identify at-risk properties to see what can be done.
- City support--College Hill is not finished from a Planning standpoint.
- Identify properties in terms of RUCO status.
- Work with University Roundtable to discuss neighborhood issues related to UNC-G and Greensboro College.
- Impacts of street closures at UNC-G and Greensboro College.
- Resume neighborhood planning.
- Future traffic concerns.

Mr. Cowhig commented that while not all of these issues are directly related to the Historic District program, they are issues that the Planning and Community Development Department can address by being proactive. He explained that enforcement officers are now being cross-trained geographically to do minimum housing standards enforcement as well as zoning enforcement. Staff plans to work with the enforcement officers to make sure historic districts receive adequate coverage.

**2. Aycock Historic District**

- Make homeowners aware they are buying in a historic district.
- Concern with demolition-by-neglect.
- Interest in partnerships--Builder's Association, Preservation Greensboro, Habitat for Humanity in an awareness role.

- Could civil penalties result in City ownership?
- How to find contractors sensitive to historic properties--create a contractors list.
- Property owners--report offenders.
- After-the-fact fines--all neighborhoods want to see a penalty for after-the-fact violations.
- Status of Summit Avenue medians.
- Murrow Boulevard—add decorative pedestrian elements.
- Allow for renewable energy technology in Historic District program.
- Front yard gardens—historically appropriate.
- Paint colors are temporary—grow on you.
- Alternative roofing materials—savings vs. historic appropriateness.
- Alleyway discussion—incorporate into guidelines.
- Power lines.
- Education citywide on proper pruning techniques for trees and shrubs.
- Clotheslines should be OK.
- College Hill trash cans—enforcement of time limits.
- Problem of restoration projects that never end and yard debris associates with it.
- Yard art that is old and decaying.
- City initiated enforcement instead.

Vice-Chair Wharton felt the issue of more accommodating alternative roofing should be revisited in the discussion of Guideline revision. In addition, consider the possibility of connecting power lines to alley rights-of way. He suggested that the Outreach Committee should let real estate companies know what is in the Guidelines.

Mr. Cowhig pointed out that it might be possible to work with Local Ordinance Enforcement to see what could be done in regard to problems with restoration projects that never end and the associated yard debris.

### 3. Fisher Park

- More information about storm windows in Guidelines—products that are available and have been used.
- Neighborhood Association as a source of information about materials and services—put in Guidelines.
- Include Resource Guide on website.
- COA fees?
  - a) General \$15-\$25 - small fee makes applicants take process more seriously
  - b) Staff level \$15
  - c) Full commission \$25
  - d) After-the-fact \$250
  - e) Repeat offender \$500
- Require COA for all substantial exterior repairs.
- Provide guidelines to all new owners.
- Improve communication between building permit department and historic zoning enforcement.
- Every contractor doing work in district must get COA, must sign COA.
- Fees—fund Ordinance to Prevent Demolition-by-Neglect.
- \$500 demolition fee for principle, contributing structure.
- Fines for demolition-by-neglect?
- Alternative materials—look carefully.
- Clarify in guidelines the tax credit consequences of replacing windows.
- Emphasize/illustrate value of reparability of original windows

- Include information about weatherization and window repair
- Fiberglass columns, composite porch flooring—if identical in appearance
- Not replacing original porch floor
- Explain tax credit consequences
- Storm windows--preferred to replacement windows—profile should match historic storm profile
- Bathroom/tub windows—allow flexibility, vinyl?
- Solar panels/solar shingles
- Asphalt driveways—don't mind them
- Permeable block driveway?

Vice-Chair Wharton made a recommendation that staff explore the possibility of putting the guidelines online in HTML format with links to supplemental material. Mr. Cowhig felt the publication is an effective marketing tool and should not be eliminated. He was in support of having both versions, electronic with links and published. Ms. Spaeh suggested having the printed version in the libraries of real estate companies.

Vice-Chair Wharton suggested the possibility of contractor training and certification that is renewable or revocable.

### **SLIDE PRESENTATION TO ILLUSTRATE GUIDELINE ISSUES:**

Mr. Cowhig presented slides that illustrate guideline issues and he asked for member feedback to aid in the revision process.

#### Safety and Code Items

- Consider temporary wheelchair ramps.

Members commented that if the ramp required a building permit, it should require a COA. It was felt that “temporary” needed to be defined. The allowance needs to be dealt with on an emergency basis. It was suggested that if the ramp is up for a period of six months, a COA is required.

#### Alternative Materials

- Consider fiberglass porch columns, composite flooring, and vinyl siding.

Vice-Chair Wharton suggested the following language for guideline revision: “Allow when identical to original in dimension and appearance and superior in performance compared to a modern wood material when original materials are missing or beyond repair as determined by the Commission” for fiberglass columns and composite flooring. It was suggested that staff check with state and national historic groups regarding tax credits. Members noted the superiority of old growth wood to new growth wood.

Mr. Cowhig and members felt it was unlikely approval would ever be given to cover original wood siding with vinyl because the identifying element in historic districts is wood.

#### Lead Paint

Guidelines should include helpful information to encourage lead safe working practices along with new EPA rules for contractor certification.

#### Roof

- Consider the use of energy efficient roof shingles and allowing light-colored shingles.

Roof color can affect cooling costs.

#### Solar Panels

- Make allowances for renewable energy sources on a case-by-case basis.

Fences

- Consider 48" high fencing.  
48" is a standard height and will confine pets.

Resources List

Work with Preservation Greensboro.  
(Refer to Historic District Resource Book in guidelines)

Storm Windows

Members discussed the use of Vel-Va-lume storm windows. The storm windows don't protrude and have a lower profile.

Porches

- Allow screening of front porches as long as framing is handled properly and screening can be removed without doing damage. Non-permanent screening resources should be included in the Resource List.

Siding

Clarify when a COA is required. Replace only deteriorated siding versus entire siding.

Vice-Chair Wharton suggested the creation of a separate informational "Historic District Idea and Resource" book available on the website.

Windows

Guidelines are not clear regarding window replacement; provide more educational material regarding replacement; add as determined by staff or Commission. Make it more difficult to replace windows; visit the site.

Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Trees and Landscaping

- Consider requiring a COA for pruning when a tree service is involved to insure they follow industry standards for tree pruning. Include a long-term guarantee for life of tree for replacement.

Satellite Dish and Mechanical Equipment

- Consider imposing fines for after-the-fact satellite dishes with notation of possible credit implications.

Demolition-by-Neglect

Members discussed current issues of demolition-by-neglect.

Mr. Cowhig stated that the guideline revision discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission  
MC/sm-jd



The house appears to be in reasonably good structural condition although there are numerous housing code deficiencies. It would make a good candidate for restoration and continued use as a single-family dwelling.

**Guidelines (page 73):**

*The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored. During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions:*

- *Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition? Could another site serve the purpose just as well?*
- *Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs?*
- *Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building?*
- *As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?*
- *Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance?*
- *Is the structure of national, state or local significance?*

*If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted:*

- *Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site.*
- *Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.*

*If the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days, it should be cleared of debris, reseeded and maintained in a manner consistent with other properties in the Historic District.*

**Proposed Condition:**

- That the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 60 days of demolition and the property be maintained on a regular basis.
- That City of Greensboro staff and/or preservation and architectural professionals be given the opportunity to document the structure prior to demolition.
- That any trees or mature shrubbery be protected during the demolition and a plan to that effect be submitted prior to demolition.

**In Support:**

None.

**In Opposition:**

Benjamin Berryhill, 6600 Dustin Road, Climax, North Carolina

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1380 for 311 Leftwich Street. The applicant is Wanda Hovander, Local Ordinance Enforcement, with the City of Greensboro. The

description of work is for demolition of the house. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that the house is classified as a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue National Historic District. Removal of the house will do harm to the overall quality of the historic district. He noted the house appears to be in good structural condition although there are numerous housing code deficiencies. It would make a good candidate for restoration if continued to be used as a single-family dwelling. Wanda Hovander, City of Greensboro, noted the house had been before the Minimum Standards Housing Commission many times and had been given many continuances. The property was eventually ordered to demolish or repair within 90 days and the 90-day period has expired. Mr. Cowhig recommended that the demolition be delayed for 365 days. Speaking in opposition to the application was Mr. Benjamin Berryhill of 6600 Dustin Road in Climax, North Carolina. He indicated engineering reports were recently completed and he was interested in addressing work on the house; however, he has health and other problems that have prevented him from doing so.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1380 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-Demolition (page 73)* are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1380 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro for work at 311 Leftwich Street with the following conditions: (1) that demolition be delayed 365 days. Mr. Macy made a friendly amendment to move that the effective date of the Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed for 365 days. Ms. Bowers agreed with the friendly amendment and also added that in the event the house is demolished, the proposed conditions are: (1) that the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 60 days of demolition and the property be maintained on a regular basis, (2) that City of Greensboro staff and/or preservation and architectural professionals be given the opportunity to document the structure prior to demolition, and (3) that any trees or mature shrubbery be protected during the demolition and a plan to that effect be submitted prior to demolition, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- b) Location: 517 Park Avenue  
Application No. 1381  
Applicant: John Worsley  
Property Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 11-29-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace metal shingle roof with asphalt shingles. Rebuild chimney that fell.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, and field inspection, 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, Masonry and Stone* and *Roofs* for the following reasons:

**Facts:**

The house had two matching brick chimneys with corbelling at the top. Both are prominent features and they help define 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.*

**Facts:**

It is not clear when the metal roofing shingles were removed or covered over. While the metal shingles are a historic roofing material and preserving them is desirable, they are not essential to the historic character of the house. Roofing shingles have a finite life span and periodically must be replaced.

**Guidelines (Page 53):**

*3. Retain historic roofing materials such as asbestos shingles, metal shingles, and standing seam metal roofing. If replacement is necessary due to deterioration, substitute roofing materials such as composition shingles are appropriate. Since historic roofing materials were traditionally dark in color, light colored composition shingles are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*

**In Support:**

John Worsley, 814 Cypress Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1391 for work at 517 Park Avenue. The applicant is John Worsley and the description of work is to replace a metal shingle roof on the back of asphalt shingles and to rebuild a chimney that fell. Mike Cowhig noted that the house had two matching brick chimneys with corbelling at the top. Both are prominent features and they define the character of the house. It was unclear when the metal roofing shingles were removed or covered over. The metal shingles are historic roofing materials and preserving them is desirable; however, they are not essential to the historic character of the house. Staff recommends support of this application with conditions. Speaking in support was John Worsley, 814 Cypress Street, who noted the asphalt roof had been installed by a previous owner as shown in the photograph he provided for members. He proposed putting a green shingled roof to replace the metal roofing in the rear of the house and also proposed to put in a false non-functioning chimney possibly not of brick materials.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Sears noted that a non-brick chimney cannot be put in the historic district. Ms. Bowers suggested rebuilding the chimney using the old original bricks. She had no objections to the applicant's proposal for shingles. Ms. Burns felt it was important to have staff involved to insure the house is rebuilt to the actual representation of what it was. Vice-Chair Wharton stated the corbelling of the chimneys is a very significant feature and should be reproduced. Mr. Macy stated that the



chimney was not visible from the street. Ms. Spaeh commented on the symmetry of the chimneys and felt a fake chimney was not appropriate; however, a non-functioning chimney would be fine if it matched the corbelling of the other chimney. Mr. Macy felt that the chimneys were not a character defining feature of the house.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1381 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project, to replace with asphalt shingles and rebuild the chimney that fell, is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with the fact that there were two matching brick chimneys and based on *Guideline 1* (page 50) *to 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 and Guideline 6* (page 50), *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, and Guideline 7, to construct new or replacement chimneys of historically appropriate materials such as brick or stone. It is not appropriate to use substitute materials that simulate brick or stone* are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burns, McManus, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Coleman. Nays: Macy)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1381 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the John Worsley for work at 517 Park Avenue with the following conditions: (1) ideally use original brick if available or as close to match as possible as is typical in all historic preservation areas, (2) match in design, shape, and size, and (3) get staff approval on design, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burns, McManus, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Coleman. Nays: Macy)

**c) Location: 203 S. Tate Street (Winburn Court Apartments)**

**Application No. 1383**

**Applicant: Wrenn Zealy Properties**

**Property Owner: Bynum Hunter**

**Date Application Received: 12-21-10**

**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Bollards were installed (without a COA) to create a turning radius for City garbage trucks to access the dumpster at the back of the parking lot.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff does not recommend in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the bollards are not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 28) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The bollards were installed so City garbage trucks can safely access a dumpster that serves the Winburn Court Apartments.

**Fact:**

The bollards are constructed of a post sunk in the ground which is covered with a plastic sleeve. The sleeves are painted yellow so the truck drivers can see them when it is dark. Plastic is a materials that is generally regarded as not in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood.

**Fact:**

Edgar Street is an unpaved City street that is used by City garbage trucks and residents accessing off street parking areas. It also functions as a pedestrian way for the neighborhood.

**Guidelines (page 18): Neighborhood Setting/Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way**

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. Future changes should maintain this character.

**In Support:**

Alexander Wrenn, 3706 Sagamore Drive

**In Opposition:**

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street

**Rebuttal:**

Alexander Wrenn, 3706 Sagamore Drive

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1383 for work at 203 South Tate Street. The applicant is Wrenn Zealy Properties, agent for the owners. The description of work is an after-the-fact application to install bollards at entrance to parking lot behind building to create a turning radius for City garbage trucks. Mr. Cowhig said that when the apartments built the parking area, parking was not an issue. The bollards were installed to protect the garbage trucks. He noted that according to the guidelines, plastic is not considered an appropriate material. The bollards are in what is technically a City street, but it functions as an alley. Commissioner Burns noted that the bollards are visible from Rankin Place. In support was Mr. Alexander Wrenn of 3706 Sagamore Drive. He indicated that an employee of the City of Greensboro, James Staver, requested the bollards. Mr. Wrenn assumed that it was permissible. They chose PVC piping because it can be replaced if damaged. Speaking in opposition was Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She said that the neighborhood's objection was that the bollards were very eye catching. They would prefer the bollards were less visible. The color was more bothersome to the neighborhood than the material. The neighborhood would prefer the bollards to be dark green with reflector strips. Speaking in rebuttal was Mr. Wrenn who indicated that painting the bollards dark green, or some other color, with reflector strips would be fine.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Burns pointed out that this is an after-the-fact application but she felt sympathetic to the property owner because he assumed the bollards were permissible and did not require a COA. She was supportive of a green material, to blend in with the environment, along with a reflective strip. Ms. Coleman questioned if there was a City requirement regarding the use of yellow on the bollards. Mr. Cowhig said that he has a call in to the Solid Waste department awaiting a response. Ms. Burns felt that green was a much more appropriate color and if the color yellow was a requirement, a new application should be submitted. Mr. Wrenn stated that to his knowledge, the City did not require the color yellow on the bollards.

Ms. Burns moved to excuse Ms. Spaeh from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1383 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 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1383 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Wrenn Zealy Properties for work at 203 Tate Street with the following condition: (1) that the bollards be painted a dark green with reflector strips for visibility for garbage trucks, seconded by Ms. McManus. Ms. Burns amended her motion and added a second condition: (2) the color and reflector strips should be approved by staff, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**d) Location: 614-620 North Elm Street  
Application No. 1377 (CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has asked for a continuance.

Mr. Macy moved to continue application number 1377 for work at 614-620 North Elm Street, seconded by Ms Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**e) Application No. 1387  
Location: 711 Simpson Street  
Applicant: Gary and Marion Hosey  
Property Owner: same  
Date Received: 1-12-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of single-family residence and garage.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a new house and garage. In the staff's opinion the proposed plans meet the Guidelines for New Construction on page 80 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines*, for the following reasons:.

**Facts:**

The proposed residence will be set back from the street approximately the same distance as the homes on either side. It will be oriented towards the street and it will generally maintain the established spacing of homes along the street. The garage is sited in a typical location for garages.

**Guideline #1:**

*Site new buildings so that the setback, spacing and orientation to the street are consistent with historic buildings within the district.*

**Fact:**

*The height and width of the proposed home will be similar to homes in general in the historic district. The same is true for the garage.*

**Guideline #2**

*New construction should have a similar height and width of existing buildings within a block or street.*

**Fact:**

The roof form is hipped with a front-facing hipped dormer and a shed dormer on one side. The roof overhang is wide and the roof pitch is relatively steep. There are numerous examples of hipped roofs of similar pitch with dormers and wide overhangs in the neighborhood. The exception would be the unusual extensions of the dormers. The garage roof form and pitch are typical of early garages.

**Guideline #3:**

*Relate the roof form, pitch, and overhang of new construction buildings to historic roofs within the district within the district*

**Fact:**

Openings in the proposed structure are similar in proportion (height to width), size, spacing and detailing as other homes in the neighborhood. Windows are double-hung sash windows similar to windows throughout the neighborhood. Window trim (sill, drip cap, brick mold) is similar to masonry homes in the neighborhood. The front door is a Craftsman style door. Other doors are French doors, a style found commonly in the neighborhood. The garage will have two individual bays typical of early garages.

**Guideline #4:**

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

**Fact:**

The focal point of the house is a central terrace with a pergola. This detail provides a human scale and a welcoming feel to the home which is characteristic of historic homes in the neighborhood. A porch or other outside leisure area located on the street side of the house encourages interaction with neighbors and contributes to a sense of security ("eyes on the street"). Pergolas were a fairly common feature of early twentieth century homes in Greensboro. There are numerous examples of terraces in Fisher Park.

**Guideline #5:**

*Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings.*

**Fact:**

Exterior construction materials include stone foundation, brick veneer walls, wood trim and asphalt shingles. These materials are found commonly in the historic districts. The garage will have brick veneer walls.

*Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic buildings in the districts including brick, wood, stucco, and stone. Materials such as steel, cast stone, fiber cement, and concrete are appropriate for new construction if they are used in a manner compatible with construction techniques and finishes used for historic buildings in the district. It is not appropriate to substitute vinyl or aluminum siding in place of traditional materials typical of the district.*

**Fact:**

A special construction technique will be employed for the garage to protect the large Willow Oak tree in the back yard.

6. Incorporate existing large trees and historic landscape features, such as retaining walls and gardens, into the proposed site plan. During construction protect trees and site features to be retained by temporary fencing, and do not disturb or contaminate the soil or store construction materials within the root zone of trees to be saved.

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That windows be either wood or wood clad, simulated divided light windows with muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass or that windows without muntins be used.
- That the walkway be curved to join the public sidewalk in the middle of the property.

**In Support:**

Marion Hosey, 711 Simpson Street  
 Gary Hosey, 711 Simpson Street  
 Steve Johnson, 491 Hyatts Drive  
 Joe Thompson, 106 North Eugene Street  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1387 for work at 711 Simpson Street. The applicants are Gary and Marion Hosey and the description of work is for construction of new house and garage. Mike Cowhig stated that the City supports this application with enthusiasm. The setbacks, spacing, orientation, and roof forms are all congruous with the guidelines. Staff recommends clad windows and also that the sidewalk be curved away from the driveway to meet the City sidewalk. Speaking in support was Marion Hosey of 711 Simpson Street. She noted that they had submitted all elevations, landscape plan, architectural details, and materials as requested. Also in support was Gary Hosey of 711 Simpson Street. He presented the Commission with three possible clad wood windows, one fiberglass and two aluminum samples. He noted that the cost of fiberglass was 80% less than aluminum, the cost of vinyl was 10-15% less than fiberglass, and the cost of aluminum would be 23% more than vinyl. He requested that they be allowed to install grid between glass windows (GBG). Also speaking in support was Steve Johnson of 491 Hyatts Drive. He noted that fiberglass doors are a superior product and that they are not solid. He passed around sample color and design of a possible fiberglass door which would be hollow, not solid. He also recommended simulated divided lights as being architecturally preferable on the principle elevation of the property. He also noted that the rear double French doors should be fiberglass. Also in support was Joe Thompson of 106 North Eugene Street. He has been a contractor for 35 years. Even though he said he was slow to embrace change, he spoke in favor of cementitious fiberboard fiberglass columns and doors and asked for freedom on the muntin pattern as the project develops. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood felt this was a fantastic project. Their only issue was that they preferred simulated true divided light windows around the perimeter of the building or possibly windows with permanently attached exterior muntins.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Bowers stated that she was in agreement with most aspects but she felt the windows needed to be simulated divided light at the least. Vice-Chair Wharton said that he did not recall ever granting a COA for GBG windows. Ms. Bowers and Ms. Burns felt that GBG windows should not be used on any part of the house. Ms. Burns and Mr. Sears were in favor of a curved sidewalk. Ms. Coleman thanked the applicants for being prepared in their presentation.



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:**

Bob Benson, 2826 County Claire Road  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1386. The applicant is Kathryn Bellenkes for work at 822 North Elm Street. The description of work is to install aluminum letters on a building façade and replacing a sign post with a new aluminum sign. Mike Cowhig indicated that staff is in support of this application without conditions. The sign has met zoning requirements. Speaking in support of the application was Bob Benson of 2826 County Claire Road. He stated that the sign on the sidewalk is replacing the existing sign. The other sign on the façade will let the public know their business is on the second floor. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association supports the application but they felt the lettering on the building was larger than it needed to be.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Burns felt that the sign was in keeping with the architecture.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1386 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments from *Signs, Commercial and/or Institutional, Guidelines 1, 2, 3, (page 34)* and *Guideline 1 (page 9)* are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1386 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kathryn Bellenkes for work at 822 North Elm Street seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Ms. Coleman moved to excuse Mr. Macy from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Mr. Macy left the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

**g) Location: 105 East Bessemer Avenue**  
**Application No. 1379**  
**Applicant: Mahlon E. Honeycutt**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 11-29-10**

**(CONTINUED)**

This is a request for reconsideration. A COA was approved to allow Mr. Honeycutt to replace (in phases) the windows in this apartment building with wood, simulated divided light windows. After completing Phase I, Mr. Honeycutt would like to propose an alternative plan based on new information.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff does not recommend in favor of the new plan. In the staff's opinion the proposal is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 55) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The property is considered a contributing in the National Register Historic District.

**Fact:**

Some of the original windows were replaced with vinyl windows. A COA was issued to replace 13 windows with simulated divided light wood windows.

**Guidelines (page 58):**

*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:*
  - a. *Kind and texture of materials*
  - b. *Architectural and historical compatibility*
  - c. *Comparison to original window profile*
  - d. *Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building*
  - e. *Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards*
  - f. *Material performance and durability.*

**In Support:**

Mahlon Honeycutt, 6 Dunkirk Place

**In Opposition:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1379 for work at 105 East Bessemer. The applicant is Mahlon Honeycutt of 6 Dunkirk Place. The original COA was for window replacement and staff does not recommend in favor of the reconsideration. Mr. Honeycutt said that his desire is to replace the remaining original front windows and two side windows (wooden 6 over 6 windows on the house) with clad 6 over 6 windows to give uniformity. In addition, he asked for consideration to replace one wooden bathroom window on the side elevation with a vinyl window. Speaking in opposition was Robert Kantlehner, representing Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, who stated the neighborhood was in favor of the original issued COA. Mr. Honeycutt said that Fisher Park had supported the original plan.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Burns stated that for uniformity, she would like to see the original windows retained. Members commented that there was much confusion regarding the proposal and a suggestion was made to continue to application until the next meeting. Staff offered to prepare a diagram of the façade to aid members at the next meeting and also to go inside the building to look at the windows. Mr. Honeycutt agreed to continue the application.



Ms. McManus moved to continue the application, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that a conversation needs to occur regarding the replacement of vacancies on the Commission.

Mr. Cowhig reported on a guidelines issue regarding sidewalks that recently came up. A homeowner expressed concern over distinctive scoring patterns on the sidewalk being replaced with a standard sidewalk. There was concern that historic district detail is lost when this happens. Members felt that ADA should take precedence in this matter.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:09 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 23, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Anne Bowers; Cynthia Hatfield; and Paul Macy.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development; Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

**WELCOME:**

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the February 23, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Vice-Chairman 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 Ms. Spaeh, Ms. McManus, and Mr. Sears were excused.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

- a)      **Location: 614-620 N. Elm Street**  
          **Application No. 1377 (continued)**  
          **Applicant: Tim Millisor**  
          **Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church**  
          **Date Application Received: 11-23-10**                      **(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of new parking area, fencing and landscaping.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**Fact:**

The applicant is proposing to create a gravel parking area on the vacant lot where a house was removed. The new parking area would be accessed by the existing driveway for the adjacent parking lot. The existing driveway entrance and steps would be removed.

**Guidelines:**

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

**Fact:**

An 8' privacy fence is proposed for the rear of the lot in order to provide privacy for the adjacent residences on Magnolia Court and Magnolia Street. An open picket fence is proposed for the north side of the property along a walkway between N. Elm Street and Magnolia Court. Wheel stops will be installed to protect the mature Oak trees at the rear of the property.

**Guidelines:**

7. *Design new parking areas to minimize their effect upon the neighborhood environment. Locate them to the rear of buildings, and screen them from view with landscaping and/or fencing. The Commission may consider alternate locations when properly screened and landscaped.*  
 9. *Divide large expanses of pavement into smaller components with planting areas. Incorporate existing large trees and shrubs into the landscaping for new parking areas when possible.*

**In Support:**

Tim Millisor, 617 North Elm Street  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1377 for work at 614-620 North Elm Street. The applicant is Tim Millisor of First Presbyterian Church. The description of work is the construction of a new parking area, fencing and landscaping. City staff, Mike Cowhig, stated that based on information contained in the application and consultation with the City Urban Forester staff recommends in favor of this application. He stated the application was congruous with the guidelines. Speaking in support of the application was Tim Millisor of 617 North Elm Street, First Presbyterian Church. He noted that the project had tree protection, as requested by the neighborhood association, wheel stops, construction of privacy fence, removal of volunteer trees to protect an old wall on the property, removal of fence and ivy on the north side of property replaced with new metal fence and plantings, landscaping on the front of the property, repair of sidewalk and granite curbing, and removal of nonfunctional brick steps. Also speaking in support of the project was Robert Kantlehner of 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park neighborhood association. He stated that the neighborhood supported the project.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Bowers stated that the plan represented a great improvement and she had no objections. Ms. Hatfield was also in support of the plan. Vice-Chair Wharton agreed this was a good plan and thanked First Presbyterian Church for continuing to work on the difficult project.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1377 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 (page 28)* are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1377 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to First Presbyterian Church, for work at 614-620 North Elm Street, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**b) Location: 105 East Bessemer Avenue  
 Application No. 1379 (continued)  
 Applicant: Mahlon E. Honeycutt  
 Property Owner: Same  
 Date Application Received: 11-29-10**

**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

This is a request for reconsideration. A COA was approved to allow Mr. Honeycutt to replace (in phases) the vinyl replacements as well as other original windows with wood, simulated divided light windows. After completing phase I, Mr. Honeycutt would like to propose an alternative plan based on new information.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against the new plan. In the staff's opinion the proposal is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 55) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The property is considered a contributing in the National Register Historic District.

**Fact:**

Some of the original windows were replaced with vinyl windows. A COA was issued to replace 13 windows with simulated divided light wood windows.

**Guidelines (page-58)**

*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:*
  - a. *Kind and texture of materials*
  - b. *Architectural and historical compatibility*
  - c. *Comparison to original window profile*
  - d. *Level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building*
  - e. *Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards*
  - f. *Material performance and durability.*

**In Support:**

Mahlon Honeycutt, 6 Dunkirk Place

**In Opposition:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**Rebuttal:**

Mahlon Honeycutt, 6 Dunkirk Place

Ms. Hatfield moved to reconsider Mr. Honeycutt's application, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bowers, Hatfield, Macy, Burns. Nays: Wharton.)

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1379 (continued) for work at 105 East Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Mahlon Honeycutt and the description is replacement of vinyl replacement windows. Speaking in support of the application was Mahlon Honeycutt of 6 Dunkirk Place who said he would like to spend money on this project to get the most good out of it. He would like to leave the vinyl windows in place, especially the bathroom vinyl windows. Speaking in opposition was Robert Kantlehner of 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park neighborhood association. He said the neighborhood opposed leaving the vinyl as it would set a precedent. He also spoke on his own behalf and said he understood the problems with vinyl in the bathroom and suggested an interior treatment to protect the windows. In rebuttal, Mr. Mahlon Honeycutt of 6 Dunkirk Place said that he had previously spoken with the Fisher Park neighborhood association in 2009 and they said they would not oppose leaving the vinyl windows in place.

**Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated his support for leaving the vinyl windows in the bathroom because putting wood windows in a bathroom would be counterproductive. He was not in support of removing the original wood windows from the front because the guidelines say do not remove original materials and this is a contributing structure. He was in favor of amending the motion with a condition leaving bathroom windows in place while replacing the rest of the vinyl replacement windows as the original plan dictated. Ms. Burns felt that until there was a better solution, the vinyl windows should remain in the bathroom for functionality; however, she could not support having the vinyl stay on the remaining windows. Ms. Geary pointed out that an original wood window remains in one of the bathrooms and members agreed that it should remain until it deteriorated. Ms. Bowers felt that the vinyl windows could be left in the bathrooms but the other windows should go back to the original plan.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1379 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 58, A & B)) with are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Hatfield. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1379 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mahlon Honeycutt for work at 105 East Bessemer Avenue with the following conditions: (1) that the three current vinyl bathroom windows remain, (2) that the one original wood bathroom window be maintained in its current wood form, and (3) that the previous replacement plan be carried out with regards to replacing the remaining non-bathroom vinyl windows with simulated divided light wood windows, seconded by Ms. Hatfield. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Responding to questions raised by Mr. Macy, Vice-Chair Wharton addressed notification of property owners when demolition is involved. Mr. Macy suggested that the City consider providing proof of notification by return mail in future cases of demolition. Counsel Williams gave a brief overview of the case's history and the minimum housing process. Mr. Cowhig advised the Group of his procedure for notification and the case's history of service. Commissioners agreed that when there is an application for demolition of a property, the owner should be notified by return service to insure that the rights of property owners are observed.

Vice-Chair Wharton announced that Ms. Burns will no longer be serving on the Commission. He thanked her for service to the Commission.

There was a discussion among Commissioners regarding vacancies and appointments. Mr. Cowhig reviewed the process for nominations and the specific qualifications and background requirements to serve on the Commission. Vice-Chair Wharton and Mr. Cowhig plan to meet to develop a data base to facilitate the process of filling seats on the Commission.

Commissioners took a brief break at 6:05 p.m. and resumed at 6:15 p.m.

### **ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the listening meetings recently held in each of the three historic districts. He gave a presentation on some of the key issues mentioned during the meetings including the following:

- Consistent enforcement
- After-the-fact fines
- Reasonable fees are okay
- Value of retaining original materials: siding, porch flooring, and windows
- Fund Ordinance to Prevent Demolition-by-Neglect
- Alternate materials: fiberglass columns and composite flooring
- Information on products
- Information on solar energy option
- Asphalt is okay
- Permanent pave
- Resource guide
- Clotheslines are okay
- Front-yard gardens are okay
- Alley information

Ms. Hatfield left the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Mr. Macy left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Additional research into what is state-of-the-art in historic preservation in other communities and the National Trust resulted in the following ideas:

- Weave sustainability into guidelines
- Promote value of energy efficiency into qualities of old houses and buildings
- Educate about quality of original construction material versus replacement
- Guideline style should be clear, more concise, encouraging, more educational, and relevant
- Stress maintenance as preservation technique
- Emphasize durability of historic material
- Encourage “whole building” approaches to renovation

Mr. Cowhig reviewed a proposal for COA fee structure.

- (1) Minor works, repairs with no change in materials ---no charge
- (2) Minor works, repairs with alteration --- \$25 fee
- (3) Major works --- \$125 fee
- (4) New Construction and additions greater than 25% of existing floor plan --- \$250 fee

- (5) Demolition of contributing structure --- \$500 fee
- (6) After-the-fact application for major work --- \$175 fee

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff will return with specific, substantive, recommended changes for review by the Commission before a draft is drawn up.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:29 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  
MARCH 30, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Thomas Sears; Anne Bowers; Cynthia Hatfield; Lois McManus; Paul Macy; Jill Spaeh; and James Burroughs.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning and Community Development; Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

**WELCOME:**

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the March 30, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Vice-Chairman 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 Ms. Burns and Ms. Coleman have resigned from the Commission.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 23, 2011 MEETING:**

Mr. Sears moved to approve the minutes from the February 23, 2011 meeting as approved, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- a)      **Location: 817 Rankin Place**  
          **Application No. 1391**  
          **Applicant: Felix Semper**  
          **Property Owner: Same**  
          **Date Application Received: 2-24-11      (CONTINUED UNTIL APRIL, 2011 MEETING)**

**Description of Work:**

Two windows were added to the rear wall of the garage for light for an artist's studio, without a COA.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends against the application as constructed. However, the staff could support the application if certain conditions could be met. In the staff's opinion the changes are not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction* (page 77) for the following reasons:

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

Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 4:20 p.m.



**Fact:**

This is not a contributing structure in the National Register Historic District. The house and garage were built in 2005. Detailed plans were approved by the commission that specified the garage windows would match the house.

**Fact:**

The garage is located at the back of the lot and the windows were added to the back wall. This wall is not visible from the street or from surrounding residential properties. It can only be seen from a parking lot located behind the property. The new windows do not affect the character of the property as viewed from the street.

**Fact:**

One double hung window in a six-over-six muntin pattern and one 20 light fixed window were installed on the rear elevation. The 6 over 6 pattern on the double hung window clashes with the three-over-one pattern of the existing double hung windows. Also the muntins are attached to the interior of the glass while the existing windows have muntins attached to the exterior. The window casings are wide like other windows on the structure.

**Fact:**

The purpose of the windows is to provide light for an artist's studio which is an acceptable use of the structure. Originally the homeowner proposed closing in the garage bays on the front and adding windows. However, this approach would not have met the zoning ordinance.

**Fact:**

If the interior muntins could be removed the new windows would not clash with the existing window muntin pattern and would maintain the design quality of the structure.

**Guidelines (page 80):**

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

**In Support:**

Felix Semper, 817 Rankin Place  
Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Avenue

**In Opposition:**

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

**Rebuttal:**

Felix Semper, 817 Rankin Place

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1391 for work at 817 Rankin Place. The applicant is Felix Semper and the description of work is an after-the-fact application to install windows in the rear wall of the garage. Speaking for the City of Greensboro was Mike Cowhig who recommended against approving the COA. He noted that the windows on the rear wall would not be visible from the street. This is new construction and not a contributing structure. The original COA noted that the windows on the structure should match the house. These do not match the muntin patterns on the windows on the house. Speaking in support was Felix Semper of 817 Rankin Place. He noted the property backs up to an empty lot and the windows can't be seen except from a small path nearby. The windows are high quality wood windows. Also in support was Cindy Sheppard of 608 Morehead Avenue in the College Hill neighborhood. She completely supports the application and feels that the windows can't be seen and shouldn't be restricted. Speaking in opposition was

Julie Davenport of 812 Rankin Place representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She said the Association opposes the application. The windows don't match the guidelines or the other windows on the house. She said the windows can be seen from outside the property under certain circumstances. Speaking in rebuttal, Mr. Semper noted the windows were only visible from a very small path near the house.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Macy stated that he visited the property and did not feel the windows were visible from any public access.

Ms. Bowers stated that the windows still go against the guidelines and the style is different from other windows.

Ms. Hatfield said that although the house was very nice and well kept, the light patterns of the windows should match. She would have been in support of almost any kind of windows as long as the patterns matched. This is clearly not in keeping with the guidelines even though it is not visible from the street.

Ms. Spaeh felt it was commendable that the applicant was reusing windows. She suggested that a way to adapt the muntins would be to apply faux painting outside of the glass.

Vice-Chair Wharton reminded members of the Commission's principle to treat an after-the-fact application as if no work had been done. He felt the only way to be fair was to follow the guidelines and he quoted Guideline 4 on page 80.

Mr. Sears commented that the quality of the construction was impressive. He stated that exposed mullions were extremely important in historic areas and reiterated that the Commission is held to the guidelines.

Board members agreed that this application posed a dilemma. Ms. McManus suggested continuing the case until next month to allow the applicant to discuss possible solutions with the neighborhood. The applicant agreed to continue the case.

Ms. Hatfield moved to continue the application until the next meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- b) Location: East Side Fulton Street South of Spring Garden Street  
Application No. 1397  
Applicant: Chuck Osborne, Engineer  
Property Owner: City of Greensboro  
Date Application Received: 3-15-11  
(RECOMMENDED TO BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT IN FAVOR OF GRANTING A  
VARIANCE)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace failing and inadequate storm sewer line located under the sidewalk along Fulton Street. Three trees, a privet hedge, and a fence must be removed to complete the work. The fence and hedgerow will be replaced with a new fence and/or hedgerow. A Special Exception will be required for a fence that is taller than 4 feet.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of the project with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design*

*Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way and Trees and Landscaping* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

Normally, underground utility work such as replacing a storm sewer line would not require a Certificate of Appropriateness. In this case the work will result in changes above ground, i. e., removal of trees and a fence and hedgerow, therefore a COA is required. The sidewalk and granite curbing will be put back to match the pre-existing appearance.

**Fact:**

This utility work is essential to prevent flooding in the area and is of an urgent nature because of increased runoff associated with the adjacent development. Alternatives to this location for the line were studied but found to not be feasible because of the presence of other underground utilities.

**Guidelines (page 20):**

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.

**Fact:**

Three trees will be removed for the project. A fence and hedgerow will also be removed.

**Guidelines (page 21):**

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

**Recommended Conditions**

That the trees be replaced with similar species but in a more appropriate location, with the property owner's approval. Choose new locations for trees and plant materials that will not interfere with utility lines, block walkways and sidewalks, or obstruct the vision of motorists.

That the fence be replaced with a similar wood privacy fence of a height to provide privacy equal to the existing fence and hedgerow, with the approval of the property owner.

**In Support:**

Chuck Osborne, City of Greensboro Water Resources Department

**In Opposition:**

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place  
 Martha Carter, 715 Morehead Place  
 Cindy Sheppard, 6087 Morehead Street

**Discussion:**

Counsel Williams said that this was brought before the Historic Preservation Commission not for approval but to provide information. Under the Ordinance the Commission cannot prevent the City from doing ordinary maintenance on streets and sidewalks. There are procedures that the City has

to go through with residents affected by maintenance such as paying property owners for their loss of trees and inconvenience. He stated that the only issue that required a vote was the use of having a fence taller than 4 feet.

Mr. Sears asked Counsel Williams if this was an example of imminent domain. He replied in the affirmative citing that it was for the good of the community.

Mr. Burroughs asked Mr. Osborne if the maintenance could be done in a place other than Ms. Carter's property. He replied that he looked at the design of the relocation on the west side of Fulton Street; however, there is an existing 4-inch existing gas main under the sidewalk. The expense to relocate the gas main made relocation prohibitive. In addition, Mr. Osborne stated that the City plans to replace the granite as it currently is.

Vice-Chair Wharton summarized that the only thing the Commission can vote on in this matter is a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment for the property owner to get a variance in respect to the height of the fence that is going to be removed.

Ms. McManus moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment in favor of granting a variance to allow a 6' or 7' fence, depending on the will of the property owner, at 715 Morehead Place, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Counsel Williams reminded the Commission that this is a recommendation as the Board of Adjustment is the only authority with the power to grant a variance in this matter.

Mr. Macy moved to make the following recommendations to the City on how to handle the projects: (1) that the granite curb and guttering be replaced on both sides of Fulton Street, (2) that the curb cut on Fulton Street be in conformance with the wish of the property owner, (3) that trees and shrubs be replaced by the City on the recommendation of the City's Urban Forester, (4) that the fence at 715 Morehead be treated with care by the City, (5) that the magnolia tree be replaced if it does not survive within two years, and (6) that the City be as sensitive as possible in historic districts, seconded by Mr. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Counsel Williams pointed out that there is a negotiation going on between the City and the property owner regarding these matters. Responding to a question from Ms. Hatfield, Counsel Williams clarified that the City did not make an application for a COA. The City made a request for a variance on behalf of the property owner. There was no need for an application for a COA.

#### **ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Vice-Chair Wharton updated members on appointments to the Commission. He has been in contact with Councilman Zach Matheny who entered two candidates into the database, Christina Cantrell and Patrick Lee Lucas. Vice-Chair Wharton requested that the two candidates be put forward for appointment to the Commission. He announced that Giselle Wells will be joining the Commission as well. A new Chair and Vice-Chair will be elected when new members have been appointed to the Commission.

The Commission thanked Vice-Chair Wharton and Ms. Hatfield for their many years of committed and knowledgeable service.

#### **ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

- **Consideration of Historic District Program Fees**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the City is currently going through an intense review process on fees. Staff conducted research on fees in other cities. They are proposing the following fee schedule:

Repairs (No change in materials or design)	\$ 0
Minor Works, Staff (Minor alterations, storage buildings, fences, etc.)	\$ 20
Minor Works, Commission	\$ 50
Major Alternations and additions, new construction, parking lots, etc.	\$ 75
Demolition of contributing structure	\$500
After-the-fact COA applications, staff	\$ 40
After-the-fact COA applications, Commission	\$150

The fee proposal is in the Budget office and is being analyzed. Mr. Cowhig asked for feedback from Commission members.

Ms. Hatfield felt the fees were reasonable. She was in favor of the high fee for demolition of a contributing structure. She cited the example of an old shed in disrepair that might be an exception due to the risk factor.

Mr. Sears felt that willful neglect leading to demolition is different and should have a higher fee than \$500. He felt that after-the-fact COA fees were very much needed.

Vice-Chair Wharton pointed out that comments at the neighborhood meetings were in favor of higher after-the-fact fees. The fee might discourage after-the-fact applications. Members discussed intentional after-the-fact applications versus those that might have been an honest mistake.

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, was present to represent the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He stated that the Association discussed the fee structure at their meeting. The Association was in favor of the demolition and after-the-fact fees; however, they questioned whether charging a fee for going through the process would be a deterrent.

Ms. Spaeh agreed with the Association and felt that charging fees for repairs and minor works might be seen as being penalized for going through the process in the right order.

Vice-Chair Wharton suggested charging \$20 for a standard COA of either type.

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, was present to represent the College Hill Neighborhood. She indicated that the College Hill Neighborhood Association agreed with the Fisher Park Neighborhood that there should be no fees for following the process and doing the right thing. Her personal opinion was that after-the-fact application penalties should be even higher.

Mr. Cowhig will forward comments made by the Commission to the Budget Office.

**SPEAKERS FROM AUDIENCE:**

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, stated that the College Hill Neighborhood Association would like to make the Commission aware that developers of the dormitory project have rented a single family residence at 808 Spring Garden Street for their "social house". The property owners have been sent a Notice of Violation for the inappropriate use of property as well as the signage that has been placed on the property. Additional signage has been placed on the property since the notice was sent out. In addition, the granite curbing has been destroyed on Spring Garden Street. Other issues include the fence on Oakland Avenue and the destroyed median on Spring Garden Street. The Noise Ordinance is not being respected and work is done on the property seven days a week. There is also the issue of water run-off causing flooding in yards of neighbors with mud; the

streetlight on Fulton has not been replaced; and there is construction traffic in the neighborhood during all hours. Ms. Davenport asked the Commission for any assistance they could give in this matter.

**ADJOURN:**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission  
MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
APRIL 27, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Paul Macy; Ann Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Tom Sears; and Jill Spaeh.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Department of Planning and Development.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that the absence of Ms. McManus was excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 30, 2011 MEETING:**

Mr. Burroughs moved to approve the March 30, 2011 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**PRESENTATION ON WARNERSVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD:**

Mr. Burroughs introduced James Griffin, 1306 Bilbro Street, who is president of the Warnersville Historical and Beautification Society. Their goal is to preserve, protect and promote the legacy of the historic Warnersville community by educating the public on the role the community has played in the City's history. Mr. Griffin gave a presentation on the rich history and significance of Warnersville, one of the first planned African-American communities in Greensboro. He also stated that the Warnersville Historical and Beautification Society is seeking to gain historical recognition for the community.

Mr. Burroughs moved to direct staff to study the possibility of giving historical recognition to one of the structures in Warnersville as a landmark in the community, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that designating an existing neighborhood as a landmark has not been done in the past; however, he was in favor of exploring the possibility.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- a)      **Location: 817 Rankin Place**  
          **Application No. 1391**  
          **Applicant: Felix Semper**  
          **Property Owner: Same**  
          **Date Application Received: 2-24-11**                      **(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work:**

Two windows were added to the rear wall of the garage for light for an artist's studio, without a COA.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the changes are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction* (page 77) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is not a contributing structure in the National Register Historic District. The house and garage were built in 2005. Detailed plans were approved by the commission that specified the garage windows would match the house.

**Fact:**

The garage is located at the back of the lot and the windows were added to the back wall. This wall is not visible from the street or from surrounding residential properties. Therefore the new windows do not affect the character of the property as viewed from the street.

**Fact:**

One double hung wood window in a six-over-six muntin pattern and one 20 light fixed wood window were installed on the rear elevation. The window casings and trimwork match the original windows of the garage. The grid patterns of the double hung window do not match other windows on the garage but are of a design commonly seen in the historic districts. The new windows are the grid between glass style windows (GBL). Simulated Divided Light (SDL) windows with interior and exterior applied grids are recommended for new construction. After meeting with City of Greensboro Rehab staff and the property owner it was proposed that wood muntins could be constructed and applied to the windows making them an SDL style window.

**Guidelines (page 80):**

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

Condition:

- That wood interior and exterior muntins be permanently attached to the windows to match the existing pattern on the new windows.

**In Support:**

None.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1391 for work at 817 Rankin Place. The description of work is to install windows in garage. The applicant is Felix Semper. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that this is a new house and the garage windows are not visible from the street. The applicant agreed to attach permanent wood muntins to the interior and exterior of the windows.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Sears felt that the interior and exterior grid patterns should exactly match the grid pattern between the panes.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1391 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as



expressed by Mr. Cowhig are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1391 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Felix Semper for work at 817 Rankin Place with the following condition: (1) that wood interior and exterior muntins be permanently attached to the windows to match the existing pattern on the new windows, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- b) Location: 704 Magnolia Street**  
**Application No. 1398**  
**Applicant: James Smothers**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 3-25-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace existing privacy screens with privacy fencing; remove Cedar trees.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends in favor of this application. In the staff's opinion this project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The location of the privacy fence is at the rear of a very deep lot, and far from any public street. It will provide privacy screening from a parking lot for an apartment complex. The fact that the privacy fence will be 7' high in some portions instead of 6' high should not be easily discernible. Privacy fences in residential zoning districts are allowed to be 7'.

**Fact:**

The proposed wood privacy fence is of a design that is commonly found in the historic district and recommended in the guidelines.

**Fact:**

The City's Urban Forester feels that the Cedar trees are in decline and removal is reasonable.

**Guidelines:**

2. *If desired, introduce new fences and walls compatible in material, design, scale, location and size with original fences and walls within the historic district.*
5. *If desired, install privacy fences constructed of vertical wood boards in rear yards. Privacy fences should not exceed 72" in height nor extend past the midpoint of the building. (Note: fences may not be higher than 48" within fifteen feet of a property line that abuts a street, according to City Code.)*

**In Support:**

James Smothers, 704 Magnolia Street  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1398 for work at 704 Magnolia Street. The applicant is James Smothers and the description of work is for the construction of a privacy

fence and removal of Cedar trees. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that the existing privacy fence is at least seven feet tall and the Urban Forester noted that the Cedar trees are already dead or in decline. Staff is in favor of this application. Speaking in support was James Smothers of 704 Magnolia Street. He said some of the fencing was originally a living fence but the material never grew properly. In addition, he indicated that most of the Cedar trees were dead and he would like to replace them with a species that would provide screening. Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, was present to represent the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He stated that the neighborhood supported the application.

**Discussion:**

Members discussed the height of the fence and agreed with the tree replacement.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1398 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and *Historic District Guidelines -- Fences*, guidelines 2 and 3, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1398 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to James Smothers for work at 704 Magnolia Street with the following condition: (1) that the diseased Cedar trees be replaced with the appropriate trees, (2) and that the City Urban Forester be consulted for the selection, seconded by Mr. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- c) Location: 600 North Church Street  
Application No. 1403  
Applicant: Susan Lindsay  
Property Owner: Timothy DeVane  
Date Application Received: 4-13-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Install fencing.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion this project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The proposed project is to construct fencing for a new school at this location. The fencing in the front and side of the structure will be wood picket of a design found in the guidelines. The fencing at the back of the property will be chain link.

**Fact:**

The height of the fencing will be 48" which is needed for safety for the children that will be attending the school.

**Guidelines (page 26):**

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

*A. Low picket fences of an open design, constructed of wood or metal and finished in white or*

another color/stain compatible with the building, and low walls and hedges are appropriate for front and rear yard use. Front yard fences and walls should usually not exceed 42" in height.

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

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

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

Conditions:

- That chain link sections of fencing be green vinyl coated.
- That it is understood that an agreement may be needed to allow the construction of a fence in the railroad R-O-W.
- Approval of the COA is contingent upon that agreement being secured.

**In Support:**

Susan Lindsey, 600 North Church Street  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1403 for work at 600 North Church Street. The applicant is Susan Lindsay and the description of work is fence installation. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that the occupancy of this property is being changed to a primary school. The applicant is asking for a 48" picket fence on the front which is 4" higher than recommended in the guidelines. Staff is in favor of granting this application. Speaking in support was Susan Lindsay of 600 North Church Street. She said that the fenced area would be an outdoor classroom and they were willing to do picket fencing on the church and Leftwich Street sides of the rear yard. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, who was representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood supports the application and would like the picket fence on the two aforementioned sides. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1403 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and *Historic District Guidelines -- Fences, Walls and Site Features*, guideline 5 A, B, and C (page 26), are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. 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 1403 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Susan Lindsey for work at 600 North Church Street with the following condition: (1) that the chain link sections of fencing be of green vinyl coating, and (2) that the church and Leftwich Street sides be picket fence, seconded by Mr. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

d) **Location: 717 Percy Street**  
**Application No. 1405**  
**Applicant: Brian Heagney**  
**Property Owner: Donald G. Strickland**  
**Date Application Received: 4-13-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construct screened porch addition at rear 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 75) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

A relatively small screened porch will be constructed at the rear of the house incorporating an existing deck. The porch will not be visible from the street. The porch roof will be lower than the main roof on the house.

**Fact:**

The primary material for the screened porch will be wood. Roof shingles will match the house. It will be easily distinguishable as an addition and not an original part of the house.

**Fact:**

The proposed addition will not affect any character-defining features of the house or affect any trees or require any ground disturbance.

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

Condition:

- That consideration be given to installing flashing for the screened porch roof behind the wood shingle siding.

**In Support:**

Brian Heagney, 717 Percy Street  
 Todd Warren, 1043 Aycock Street  
 Linda Fuscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1405 for work at 717 Percy Street. The description is for construction of screened porch at back of home. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that staff recommends in favor of this application. Staff indicated that the primary material of the porch will be wood and the roof shingles will match the house. The porch will be easily distinguishable as an addition. They recommend consideration be given to installing flashing for the screen porch behind the wood shingle on the second story. Speaking in support was Brian Heagney, 717 Percy Street, who noted the depth would be extended on the kitchen side and the rear staircase would be removed. Also in support was Todd Warren of 1043 Aycock Street. It was clarified that 3-tab architectural shingle would be used. The 3-tab shingle is in line with code for the slope of the roof. In addition, the applicant is willing to put flashing under the shingle. Speaking in support was Linda Fuscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. She indicated the neighborhood was in support of the application.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Sears felt it was important that the side wall be set back inside the corner board for aesthetic and technical reasons.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Macy moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1405 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and *Historic District Guidelines -- Additions*, guidelines 1 through 6 (page 76), are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Macy moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1405 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Brian Heagney for work at 717 Percy Street with the following condition: (1) that the roof flashing be placed under the shingles, and (2) that the side wall be set back at least to the inside edge of the corner board, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- e) **Location: 515 Fifth Avenue**  
**Application No. 1404**  
**Applicant: Jeffrey W. Shinn**  
**Property Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 4-13-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Remove crown molding at back of house to install gutters.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines— Additions* (page 75) and *Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys* (page 48) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

Deterioration is occurring at the rear of the house that appears to be the result of roof drainage problems. This house was likely built without gutters which was fairly typical for the period. Over the years a number of additions and alterations have been made to the back of the house

resulting in water splashing against the house. Moisture infiltration at exposed joints in trimwork and siding is causing paint failure and wood decay.

**Fact:**

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing crown molding at the cornice (or eaves) of the house and replace with rain gutters to carry water away from the building. (The crown molding is part of the cornice whose original purpose was to close the intersection of walls and roof and to carry water away from the building.)

**Fact:**

Ogee (or K-Style) seamless gutters require removal of the crown molding. Half round gutters can be installed without removal of the crown molding but may be more expensive.

**Fact:**

The chimney that is proposed for removal does not appear to be an original chimney. It was likely added when the heating system was converted to steam and a coal-fired boiler was installed. It is not in a prominent location and is not a character-defining feature of the house. At some point the masonry of this chimney was parged rather than repointed which has resulted in deterioration.

**Guidelines (page 50):**

1. *Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundation 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.*
4. *Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry/stone is not appropriate, because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry/stone feature, and can accelerate deterioration. Previously painted surfaces may remain painted.*
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.*

**Guidelines (page 76):**

1. *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks.*
4. *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*
5. *Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters.*

**Condition:**

- That consideration be given to installing half round gutters on the original section of the house. (Half round gutters can be attached by a strap to the roof deck rather than attached to a gutter board and may not require removal of the crown molding.)

Vice-Chair Wharton suggested that the application be continued until the applicant was present. Ms. Spaeh moved to continue the application. There was no second to the motion. Members discussed approving the application with conditions and the public hearing continued.

**In Support:**

None.

**In Opposition:**

Linda Fuscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1404 for work at 515 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Jeffrey Shinn and the description is to remove crown molding to install gutters and removal of chimney. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that the house has experienced rainwater damage due to the lack of gutters. In addition, the chimney was added later and is not original to the house. The chimney was not maintained properly and was not considered architecturally significant. Staff recommends in favor of this application. No one was present to speak in support of the application. Speaking in opposition to the application was Linda Fuscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the Aycock Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood objected to the removal of the crown moldings. They did not discuss the chimney.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Sears read from page 51 and cited that architectural features such as crown moldings should not be damaged or removed. Members were in agreement that the crown molding should not be removed.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1404 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Historic District Guidelines, page 51, the paragraph where exposed downspouts and gutters are to be replaced and installed, *install them so that no architectural features or features like crown moldings are damaged or removed, gutters and downspouts should be painted or finished in baked enamel unless they are made of copper half-round style gutters are most desirable when used whereas not to destroy crown molding*, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1404 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jeffrey W. Shinn for work at 515 Fifth Avenue with the following condition: (1) that the previously quoted requirements from page 51 be followed, and (2) that the crown molding not be removed in any area, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Vice-Chair Wharton updated members on progress being made with City Council to find replacements for open Commission seats.

Members discussed an article in the newspaper regarding the possible closing or sale of War Memorial Auditorium due to budget cuts.

**ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

Mr. Cowhig updated the Commission on the guideline revision process. Staff plans to have a working draft of revisions for members at the next meeting and hopes to be able to hold a public hearing on the guidelines at the June 29, 2011 meeting. A summary of the most controversial changes will be distributed to members. Staff's goal is to have a more user-friendly set of guidelines for applicants and Commission members that focus on maintenance and repair.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd



**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
MAY 25, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Lois McManus; Ann Bowers; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; and Tom Sears.

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

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

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

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- a)     **Location: 101 North Park Drive**  
          **Application No. 1407**  
          **Applicant: James A. Mallard**  
          **Property Owner: Williamsburg on the Park Homeowners Association**  
          **(CONTINUED)**

**Description of Work:**

Changes to security lighting.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, 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--Lighting (page 31-32), for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

An existing security light at the back of the property was replaced in an effort to address security concerns. The replacement light was a cobra-head fixture with a drop lens. This type of fixture and lens tends to shine horizontally and produces glare and light trespass onto surrounding properties. (Since the application was submitted, that fixture has been replaced with a flat lens fixture that does not shine horizontally and therefore does not emit as much glare and light trespass.) A security light was also installed on a wood pole at the garbage can enclosure. (The height of that light has also been reduced to reduce light trespass.)

**Guidelines:**

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

**Recommended Conditions:**

That consideration be given to reducing the height of the security light if necessary as long as adequate security lighting is provided.

**In Support:**

Lynn Wooten, 101-B North Park  
James Mallard, 101-K North Park

**In Opposition:**

Roger Seel, 803 Magnolia Street

**Rebuttal:**

Lynn Wooten, 101-B North Park Drive

Vice-Chair Wharton asked Mr. Wooten if he would be willing to continue the application to allow time for the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association to work with Duke Power and neighbors to arrive at a solution that is mutually agreeable. Mr. Wooten agreed to a continuance.

Ms. McManus moved to continue the application until the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion

- b) Location: 800 Block Spring Garden Street  
Application No. 1408  
Applicant: Edwards Communities, LLC  
Property Owner: City of Greensboro  
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Changes to median.

**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-Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way (page 18-20), for the following reasons:

**Facts:**

The existing planted median along this section of paring on Spring Garden Street originally had an opening for vehicular access at Jackson Street. This provided for left hand turns into the industrial area from the east. Now that Jackson Street south of Spring Garden has been closed for the Province student housing development, this access is no longer needed. It is being removed for traffic and pedestrian safety and will eliminate the possibility of U-turns. It will become part of the planted median thereby increasing the green space along Spring Garden Street.

**Guidelines:**

- Maintain historic street patterns, widths, and construction materials.
- 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.

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That Willow Oak trees be started that maintain the existing tree spacing along the median.
- That consideration be given to providing walkways across the median where needed.

**In Support:**

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place  
Ronald Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue

**In Opposition:**

Phillip Wyne, 408 Jackson Street

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1408 for work on the 800 block of Spring Garden Street. The applicant is Edwards Communities, LLC and the description of work is for changes to the median to fill in a broken median in the 600 block of Spring Garden Street. The owner of the property is the City of Greensboro. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that the median was originally built in 2005, partially from MSD funds from the neighborhood, and the turning point was eliminated at the recommendation of GDOT's Technical Review Committee. The application did not come to the Commission due to an oversight due to the unusual historic district boundary on the other side of the street. Speaking in support was Julie Davenport of 821 Rankin Place, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She said the neighborhood supports changes to the median but would like additional landscaping, specifically trees matching the species, spacing, and size of the existing trees; grass to match the existing grass; and they would like to have the irrigation system reconnected between the two parts that have been joined. They also felt a traffic light would need to be added eventually at the east end of the median. Also speaking in support was Ronald Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue, president of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He noted that the irrigation system for this median had been broken in a hit and run accident and also that the electrical infrastructure that controls the irrigation had been removed by the developer. In addition, the existing median has been damaged by the construction process and should be repaired by the developer. Speaking in opposition was Phillip Wyne of 408 Jackson Street. He owns a rental property at 408 Jackson Street and he noted that the turning point poses a hazard for his tenants at that address.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Sears expressed concern that there are not adequate pedestrian access crossing points to reduce hazards.

Members discussed the scope of their authority in this matter where public safety is involved and conditions that could be placed on the application. Vice-Chair Wharton clarified that the Commission does not have the authority to require the City to fix the irrigation system and connect it; however, they could approve an application from the Neighborhood Association that reflects a proposal between the neighborhood, City, and developer regarding placement of the utility box, electrical infrastructure, and crosswalk. As it is now, the Commission could approve, or not, the median and put conditions on trees and landscaping. The Commission could not rule on pedestrian matters and irrigation unless the Neighborhood Association came up with specific locations for those things.

Mr. Walters indicated that GDOT plans to attend the Neighborhood Association's June 27, 2011 meeting and details could be worked out at that time. Members discussed continuing the application but Vice-Chair Wharton noted that a continuance could not be granted beyond a month without the approval of Edwards Communities, LLC, who is not present.

Vice-Chair Wharton pointed out that the Commission could vote on the application as it is and attach conditions regarding landscaping. The City or Edwards Communities, LLC could come back with further proposals regarding the irrigation and pedestrian access.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1408 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments and Historic District Guidelines -- Streets, Sidewalks, and Public Right-of-Way, (page 18-20), guidelines 1 and 2, and also Historic District Guidelines--Trees and Landscaping on page 21 (as the preservation of the tree canopy is of special concern to the Historic Preservation Commission) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1408 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Edwards Communities, LLC for work at the 800 block of Spring Garden Street with the following conditions: (1) that the trees be planted in the new section to match the species, spacing, and size, to the extent of the recommendations of the City Urban Forester, to those trees already existing; (2) that the type of grass planted matches the grass already existing; (3) that the medians be restored to their original condition at the completion of the project; and (4) that the irrigation system be functional throughout (before the project is finished); seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

- c) Location: 515 Fifth Avenue  
Application No. 1415 (APPLICATION NOT CONSIDERED)**

**Description of Work:**

Request for consideration.

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that the applicant was not present to make their request and therefore, the application could not be considered.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Vice-Chair Wharton commended Preservation Greensboro, Inc. and individuals who volunteered to organize the first Historic House Tour. Commission members involved with the Historic House Tour included Ms. Cantrell, Ms. Bowers, and Ms. McManus.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Mr. Sears updated the Commission on new lead abatement rules and the effects on restoration. A discussion followed regarding the enforcement of lead regulations.

**ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

Ms. Geary updated members on the recent request for historical recognition of the Warnersville neighborhood. She stated that most of the neighborhood was destroyed through urban renewal. With the exception of Union Cemetery, already designated, and J.C. Price School, owned by

Greensboro College, the Historic Preservation Commission has nothing remaining in the neighborhood to designate.

Ms. Geary advised the neighborhood to pursue grants for the funding of historical markers along the Greenway.

Vice-Chair Wharton quoted Section 30-9-5.4a of the Ordinance and discussed the possibility of designating the Warnersville area as a historic landmark in the City of Greensboro. Ms. Geary indicated that she will check with the Institute of Government regarding the intent of the Ordinance. Mr. Burroughs reiterated that the main significance to getting landmark area designation is to promote and preserve knowledge of the historical area.

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff is still in the guidelines update process. A rough draft of revisions was distributed to members for their feedback. He described his vision to answer questions in the guidelines through the incorporation of illustrations and examples.

Mr. Cowhig also informed members that a consultant will be hired shortly for the National Register nomination for the Sunset Hills neighborhood.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm:jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
JUNE 29, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chair; Anne Bowers; Jill Spaeh; Paul Macy; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell, and Patrick Lucas.

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

**WELCOME:**

Vice-Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the June 29, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Vice-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.

Vice-Chair Wharton introduced the Commission's newest member, Mr. Patrick Lucas.

Vice-Chair Wharton announced that he had to leave the meeting early at 5:30 p.m. He asked Ms. Bowers to conduct the meeting in his absence and requested that Items from the Commission Chair be moved up on the agenda.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that there were no excused absences.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 27, 2011 AND MAY 25, 2011 MEETINGS:**

Mr. Burroughs moved to approve the meeting minutes from April 27, 2011 and May 25, 2011 as written, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:**

• **Update on Meeting Regarding Warnersville Historical and Beautification Society**

Vice-Chair Wharton informed members that interested parties recently met to discuss ways that the Historic Preservation Commission could recognize the significance of the Warnersville Community. The Group agreed that areas in the Warnersville Community should be recognized; however, a process for doing so should be established. The process would clarify what is being approved and could be applied to other communities who want similar recognition. The Group came up with a preliminary idea that the recognition might be called a Heritage Community. It was suggested that an official subcommittee should be formed to identify criteria for the Commission to use to identify a Heritage Community. The criteria would then be brought to the Commission for approval.

Vice-Chair Wharton asked members to approve the appointment of the following individuals to serve on the subcommittee to develop criteria for submission at the next Historic Preservation Meeting: Les Eger, Stefan-Leih Geary, James Griffin, Mike Cowhig, Benjamin Briggs, and Vice-Chair David Wharton. Commission members indicated that they were in favor of the appointments.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- (a) **Application No. 1409**  
**101 North Park Drive**  
**Applicant: James Mallard**  
**Owner: Williamsburg on the Park Homeowners Association**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work:**

Changes to security lighting.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, 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-Lighting* (pages 31-32), for the following reasons:

**Facts:**

An existing security light at the back of the property was replaced in an effort to address security concerns. The replacement light was a cobra-head fixture with a drop lens. This type of fixture and lens tends to shine horizontally and produces glare and light trespass onto surrounding properties. (Since the application was submitted, that fixture has been replaced with a flat lens fixture that does not shine horizontally and therefore does not emit as much glare and light trespass.)

**Guidelines:**

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

**Recommended Condition:**

That consideration be given to reducing the height of the security light if necessary as long as adequate security lighting is provided.

**In Support:**

Lynn Wooten, 101-B North Park Drive  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1409 for work at 101 North Park Drive. The applicant is James Mallard and the description of work is a change to security lighting. Stefan-Leih Geary, City staff, said that staff was in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that consideration be given to reducing the height of the security light if necessary as long as adequate security lighting is provided. She cited guidelines 1 and 2 under *Historic District Design Guidelines-Lighting* (pages 31-32). Speaking in support was Lynn Wooten, 101-B North Park Avenue, who noted that the light had been moved downward by 5 feet. In addition, wattage was reduced from 150 watts to 50 watts. Duke Power, on another light, added an extender and lowered the light. Also in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He stated that the neighborhood supports the application with the changes that had been made. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Bowers felt that the applicant met the Commission's criteria as stated at a previous meeting. The neighbors were also in agreement and therefore, she felt the Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. Other members stated their agreement.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1409 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— Lighting* (pages 31-32) that state: 1) Select lighting fixtures and poles that are compatible in scale, design, and materials with the individual property and the neighborhood; and 2) Carefully locate low level or directional lighting that does not invade surrounding properties, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1409 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to James Mallard for work at 101 North Park Drive with the recommended condition that consideration be given to reducing the height of the security light if necessary as long as adequate security lighting is provided, seconded by Mr. McCullough. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**(b) Application No. 1421****Location: 202 South Park Drive****Applicant: Robert Payne and Sandy Hurt****Owner: same****(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)****(APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION)****Description of Work:**

Replace existing garage with new garage.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines-Trees and Landscaping* (page 23), *Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36) and *Demolition* (page 73) for the following reasons:

**Facts:**

202 South Park Drive is listed on the Fisher Park National Register nomination as having been constructed in 1916. The existing garage appears to be original and constructed at a similar time. It is a hipped roof one story building with exposed rafters. However, it is in a deteriorated state and no longer meets the property owner's needs.

**Guidelines under Demolition:**

- Is there a well developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition?
- As a last resort, could the building be move to another location?
- Is the structure of national, state or local significance?

**Facts:**

The original garage is approximately 10' x 20'. The proposed garage will be only slightly larger at 12' 3" x 24' and will be in a similar location. The new garage will be constructed of cementitious lap



siding with brackets to match the house, a brick foundation and architectural roof shingles. Salvaged historic wood true divided light windows will be used. It will be 1 ½ stories tall.

**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.

**Facts:**

A Silver Maple tree and a Sycamore tree currently stand within inches of the walls of the original garage. The Sycamore tree has grown into the sidewall of the building, is in decline and has lost several large limbs. While the silver maple tree is healthy, the tree species in general is not desirable due to the fact that it is a weaker species and limbs break easily. Additionally, the tree removals allow the new garage to be constructed in a traditional siting pattern for historic driveways and garages. There are significant shade trees on the property in addition to these trees.

**Guidelines under Trees and Landscaping:**

- 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.

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That the applicants work with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association and other interested parties to investigate the possibility of moving or salvaging the existing garage.
- That a new tree with species, size and location to be determined by the City's Urban Forester, be planted on the property and that if it does not survive for 2 years that it be replaced to match.

**Note:** A special exception from the Board of Adjustment is required to site the garage less than 10' from the property line. An exception of 8 feet and 9 feet will be required.

**In Support:**

Sandy Hurt, 202 South Park Drive  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1421 for work at 202 South Park Drive. The applicants are Sandy Hurt and Robert Payne and the description of work is to replace existing garage with new garage and to remove two trees. Stefan-Leih Geary, City staff, said that staff recommends in favor of this application with conditions. Staff feels it is congruous with *Historic District Guidelines for Trees and Landscaping* (page 23), *Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36), and *Demolition* (page 73). Guidelines 2, 3, and 4 were cited under *Accessory Structures and Garages*. Ms. Geary noted that the existing garage is not listed on the National Register but more than likely, was overlooked in the original survey. Staff recommended that the property owner look for ways to move the building if someone else wanted it. She also noted that the City Urban

Forester recommended the Sycamore tree be removed as it is declining and the Silver Maple tree is healthy but is not a recommended species because of its traditional weakness. Ms. Geary also cited guidelines 5 and 6 under *Trees and Landscaping*. Staff recommended the following conditions: (1) That the applicants work with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association and other interested parties to investigate the possibility of moving or salvaging the existing garage, and (2) That a new tree with species, size and location to be determined by the City's Urban Forester, be planted on the property and that if it does not survive for 2 years that it be replaced to match. She also noted that the Commission would need to recommend a special exception to the Board of Adjustment for an exception of 8' and 9' on setbacks for the structure. Speaking in support was Sandy Hurt, the applicant, who resides at 202 South Park Drive. She noted that the garage would be similar in design to the house, they will replace one of the trees, and they have consulted with the neighbors. Also in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said that the Association supported the application with the noted conditions. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Bowers asked the applicant to address the possibility of moving or salvaging the garage. Ms. Hurt, the homeowner, replied that plans are to salvage the garage if possible but she does not believe the structure would survive a move as it is in an extremely dilapidated condition. She expressed willingness to cooperate if the garage could be moved. Ms. Spaeh suggested using a local service, ARC Company, that hauls away and recycles debris. Ms. Bowers felt the applicant did a good job covering all the bases in the application. Members discussed the use of cementitious fiberboard.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1421 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—Trees and Landscaping* (page 23) guidelines 5 and 6; *Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36), guidelines 2, 3, and 4; and guidelines under *Demolition* (page 73)) are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1421 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sandy Hurt and Robert Payne, for work at 202 South Park Drive with the following conditions: (1) they will make an effort to salvage or move the existing garage, (2) they will plant a new tree upon removing the Silver Maple and Sycamore trees in their yard that should survive for two years, (3) they will donate a tree to the park in honor of the Sycamore tree, and (4) and that they use smooth-finish cementitious fiberboard, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Lucas moved to recommend a special exception from the Board of Adjustment for a variance of 8' and 9' respectively on the siting of the structure, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Macy asked if justification was needed for the recommendation. Vice-Chair Wharton responded that traditional justification is the historic siting of the building. Members discussed wording for a friendly amendment to the motion.

Vice-Chair Wharton offered a friendly amendment adding to the motion "to allow traditional siting patterns of accessory structures to preserve traditional neighborhood character". Mr. Lucas and Ms. Spaeh accepted the friendly amendment and the Commission voted again on the amended motion.

The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the amended motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Spaeh, Macy, Burroughs, Lucas. Nays: Cantrell.)

Ms. Cantrell expressed her concern that although the current neighbors are in support of the additional height, future neighbors during the lifespan of the house may not find the height desirable.

- (c) **Application No. 1418**  
**Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Kym Smith for the City of Greensboro**  
**Owner: n/a**  
**(CONTINUED)**

**Description of Work:**

Install street lights on existing poles.

**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:

**Facts:**

The application proposes to install 4 light fixtures on existing wooden poles along the 800 and 900 blocks of Spring Garden Street to increase safety and visibility for pedestrians. This is part of an overall analysis of street lighting by the City of Greensboro in the College Hill neighborhood and as part of providing access to the greenway from Spring Garden Street.

**Facts:**

In order to provide adequate lighting a mixture of fixtures are often used in historic districts to supplement lighting provided by decorative fixtures.

**Facts:**

Two fixtures will be located at the intersection of South Mendenhall and Spring Garden Street in a predominantly commercial area of the neighborhood. A third will be located near 912 Spring Garden Street and the fourth fixture located near the intersection of Tate Street and Spring Garden Street, also in a commercial area of the neighborhood.

**Facts:**

The goal of the additional lighting is to cast light on the sidewalk for pedestrians in areas along Spring Garden Street that have been identified as poorly lit. There are two lens styles with different lighting patterns. The Cobra drop lens provides a light path that best meets the needs of the project. However, the Cobra flat lens is usually the desirable alternative to the drop lens style because the globe is not visible.

**Guidelines under Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way:**

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 a pedestrian scale decorative street light at location 3 be investigated and installed if feasible.

**In Support:**

Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation, 300 West Washington Street

**In Opposition:**

Raleigh Bailey, 914 Spring Garden Street

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Street

Ms. Spaeh moved to excuse Vice-Chair Wharton, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Vice-Chair Wharton left the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

**Summary:**

Ms. Bowers stated that this is application number 1418 for work at the 800 and 900 blocks of Spring Garden Street. The applicant is Kym Smith for the City of Greensboro. The description of work is to install street lights on existing poles. Stefan-Leih Geary, City of Greensboro, presented the facts for *Historic District Design Guidelines-Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* (page 20). The application proposes to install four light fixtures on existing wooden poles along the 800 and 900 blocks of Spring Garden Street to increase safety and visibility for pedestrians. This is part of an overall analysis of street lighting by the City of Greensboro in the College Hill neighborhood and as part of providing access to the Greenway from Spring Garden Street. The facts are that two fixtures will be located at the intersection of South Mendenhall and Spring Garden Street, a third would be around 912 Spring Garden Street, and the fourth would be at Tate Street and Spring Garden Street. The type of lens that has been recommended was a cobra drop lens. Traditionally the neighborhood first had cobra flat lens. Ms. Geary cited *Historic District Design Guidelines-Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way*, guideline 7. She also commented that one of the conditions recommended was that a pedestrian scale decorative street light at location 3 be investigated and installed if feasible. Commissioners were given maps indicating the location of the fixtures. Speaking in support of the application was Kym Smith, City of Greensboro, who said the neighborhood had asked for an evaluation. They felt by using the existing poles, flat or drop was fine with them. Cobra lights are used for both streets and sidewalks. To do decorative lights, holes would have to be dug for underground lines. Decorative lights are not particularly good for safety, but decorative lights would be considered at location 3. She indicated that 100 watt high pressure bulbs would be used. Speaking in opposition was Raleigh Bailey of 914 Spring Garden Street. He has lived in the neighborhood for many years and had a personal concern because he felt there would be a lot of light would be shining into his house. He also commented that the neighborhood had been fine in this respect for many years and this would be a step backwards. Also in opposition was Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, representing the neighborhood association. The association did not support the application and she cited guideline on pages 31 and 32 under the lighting section. She felt the new fixtures should match the existing decorative fixtures and commented this was a step backwards. In addition, MSD funds would not be available for streetlights. Mr. Macy asked if this had been discussed with the neighborhood. The whole neighborhood is lit in a residential manner. Ms. Davenport also cited guidelines 18 and 19. Comments were made that the application was not complete. Also in opposition to the application was Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Street, who is president of the neighborhood association. He spoke as a private citizen and said the neighborhood association had not been approached. He also discussed refraction of the light fixtures. Kym Smith, City of Greensboro, spoke in rebuttal and said the lighting had been by request. Decorative lighting is available but it is difficult to get the line underground. The cost of putting up decorative lighting is \$7,000 per fixture and Duke Power cannot install refracting lens and diverters. She recommended Cobra flat lens.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Burroughs commented that there was hardly any information in the Certificate of Appropriateness application. He felt that residents of the neighborhood should have had access to

the maps distributed to Commissioners. He cited guideline 7 on page 20 and guideline 4 on page 32 and stated his interpretation that the non-decorative Duke Power lights do not fit the guidelines. He was not in support of the application. Ms. Geary explained that staff cited the guidelines for *Public Right-of Way* instead of the residential lighting section as street lighting issues are different. Ms. Cantrell commented that she was in agreement with Mr. Burroughs.

Mr. Cowhig agreed that the application does not have the detail that is needed. He gave background on lighting in the College Hill neighborhood and stated that the level of lighting produced has always been an issue. Staff felt adding standard Duke Power security lighting to augment the decorative lighting was an important issue for discussion.

Mr. Burroughs felt that additional discussion of the matter was needed.

Mr. Burroughs moved (1) to continue application number 1418 to allow an opportunity for Greensboro Department of Transportation (GDOT) to speak with the neighborhood association, (2) to annotate a lighting pattern directly on the map, (3) to explore a decorative fixture alternative, and (4) to have a legal opinion as to the purview of the Commission in this matter, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Ms. Geary pointed out the important distinction that street lights are being discussed, not Duke Energy security lights.

Mr. Burroughs recommended that access to all pictures and other supportive documents submitted by GDOT be made available in whatever notice is sent out regarding the continuation of this application. Ms. Bowers added that GDOT should meet with the neighborhood representatives prior to the next meeting.

- (d) Application No. 1426**  
**Location: 303 and 305 South Mendenhall Street**  
**Applicant: Dan Curry and James Keith**  
**Owner: same**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace existing garage with new garage.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee 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 30), *Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 26), *Patios and Decks* (page 42) and *Demolition* (page 73) for the following reasons:

**Facts:**

303 South Mendenhall Street is a contributing structure in the College Hill National Register Historic District. The accessory structure is listed as contributing. The garage is a front gable one story building with exposed rafters. It is in a deteriorated state and no longer meets the property owner's needs.

**Guidelines under Demolition:**

- Is there a well developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition?
- As a last resort, could the building be move to another location?
- Is the structure of national, state or local significance?

**Facts:**

The current driveway is shared by the owners of 303 and 305 S. Mendenhall. The narrow strip driveway will remain the same with the addition of Belgard concrete pavers in portions of the center strip. The existing parking area will be repaved with the same paver materials and include a walkway. The parking area will be expanded to include two new areas each paved with the Belgard material. The parking is at the exterior of both properties and is not easily visible from the street. The Belgard paver material is not a stamped concrete material but individual pavers that provide an appearance similar to brick and stone.

**Guidelines under Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas:**

- 1) Retain historic driveways and walkways, including steps and sidewalks, in their original locations. When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original.
- 2) Select appropriate paving materials for new walkways, including concrete, brick, and stone. Simulations of natural materials such as stamped concrete are not appropriate.
- 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.
- 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.

**Facts:**

The existing fencing will be extended in two locations. The first will be expanded on the side of the property at 303 S. Mendenhall and is a white picket fence design not taller than 42" in height. The second area is a privacy fence that will be installed to close the gap that is left after the accessory structure is removed. Both fences are of wood and a design that meets the guidelines. The new fence portions will match the existing.

**Guidelines under Fences, Walls and Site features:**

- 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.
  - 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.

**Facts:**

The deck at 303 S. Mendenhall will be expanded to provide a walkway connection to the existing side porch. It will be constructed of wood decking materials with a railing to match the existing deck rail. This portion of the deck will come past the midpoint of the house but it will not be easily visible from the street due to the historic side porch and the picket fence. The deck walkway will not be permanently attached to the historic building or side porch.

**Guidelines under Patios and Decks:**

- 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 demolition be delayed for 6 months to allow the accessory building to be moved to a new location and restored.
- That the deck walkway not expand past the sidewall of the existing porch and that the existing mature landscaping be retained to shield the deck from view from the street.

**In Support:**

James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street

Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Ms. Bowers stated that this is application number 1426 for work at 303 and 305 South Mendenhall Street. The applicants are Dan Curry and James Keith. The description of work is to remove garage, construct shared parking areas and driveway, and construct walkway from porch to deck. Stefan-Leih Geary, City staff, stated that staff is in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. She cited demolition guidelines suggesting that the demolition of the garage be delayed six months. She distributed a picture of a Belgard paver, a cement product. 305 South Mendenhall will have a large parking area with pavers and there will be two more areas where pavers will be added. She cited *Historic District Design Guidelines- Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 30), guidelines 1, 2, and 3, 5, and 6. Ms. Geary commented that the fence extension needed staff approval and cited guidelines 5a and 5c under *Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 26). In addition, there will be a deck built to connect the existing side porch that would not be visible to the street and the deck walkway will not be permanently attached to the historic building or the side porch. She cited guidelines 1, 2, and 3 for *Patios and Decks* (page 42). The recommended conditions were (1) that demolition of the accessory building be delayed for 6 months to allow it to be relocated or restored and (2) that the deck walkway not expand past the sidewall of the existing porch and that the existing mature landscaping be retained to shield the deck from view from the street. Speaking in favor of the application was James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, who passed around samples of the pavers. He indicated that demolition is no longer an issue as a decision to rehab the building has been made. The walkway would not be exposed to the street due to copper downspouts that hide the extension of the steps. He said that the space is currently nonfunctional and a walkway would create a useful space. The sand rock is one foot thick and the pavers would go over the sand rock, not the concrete. Water is an issue and it will be dealt with to insure it is absorbed and redirected. Also speaking in favor was Dan Curry, 305 South Mendenhall Street, who said the sand rock still looks good but it tracks inside. It is as hard as concrete but it has been there for 30 years. They plan to install a drain system and paving will be done on the areas already used for parking. Also in favor of this application was Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, representing the neighborhood association. The neighborhood is in support of the garage restoration. They do not really object to the connecting walkway but to the materials used. They hope the applicant will consider making it look more like a porch and not like a deck. There was no one speaking in opposition.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1426 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-- Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 30), guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; and *Patios and Decks* (page 42), guidelines 1, 2, 3; and that staff comments are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1426 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Dan Curry and James Keith for work at 303 and 305 South Mendenhall Street with the following condition: (1) that the deck walkway not expand past the sidewall of the existing porch and that the existing mature landscaping be retained to shield the deck from view from the street. Mr. Burroughs amended his motion not to stipulate anything about the deck walkway as long as the existing landscaping was retained. Mr. Lucas seconded the amended motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (e) **Application No. 1424**  
**Location: 815 West Market Street**  
**Applicant: Susan Sessler**  
**Owner: Greensboro College**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Install brick pavers at crosswalks along College Place. Install stop signs at Adult Education Center and Odell Memorial Building crosswalks. Relocate planters to southern section of College Place.

**Staff Recommendations:**

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. The HPC recommended in favor of the street closing based on conceptual plans for construction of a pedestrian mall, amphitheater and other improvements to the northern portion of College Place. Detailed engineering drawings were approved for the project but it was not constructed. Planters were placed on the northern section of College Place to prevent through traffic.

**Facts:**

College Place will remain a private street owned by Greensboro College. The proposal is intended to allow campus vehicular traffic on the northern section of College Place and limit vehicular traffic on the southern section of College Place.

**Facts:**

The proposed physical changes include cutting out asphalt and laying brick pavers at pedestrian crossings, installing stop signs, and relocation of 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 applicability to commercial and institutional properties there are two factors that must be considered when reviewing an application.*

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

**Guidelines under Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way:**

- 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.

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That the project be reviewed by the Greensboro Department of Transportation.
- That the design of the stop signs be submitted for staff approval.

**In Support:**

Susan Sessler, Greensboro College, 815 West Market Street  
Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

**In Opposition:**

None.

Mr. Burroughs moved to excuse Ms. Spaeh from the meeting, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

**Summary:**

Ms. Bowers stated that this is application number 1424 for work at Greensboro College, 815 West Market Street. The applicant is Susan Sessler. The description of work is to install brick pavers at crosswalks along College Place, install stop signs at Adult Education Center and Odell Memorial Building crosswalks and to relocate planters to southern section of College Place. Staff recommends in favor of this application. In staff's opinion, the work is congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines-Introduction* (page 9), guidelines 1 and 2. The proposed changes include cutting out asphalt, laying brick pavers at pedestrian crossings, installing stop signs, relocation of existing planters from the northern section to the southern section. Staff felt these changes would have minimal impact on the character of the campus and historic district. Staff also cited guidelines 1 and 2 under *Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* (page 20). There were two conditions recommended by staff. These conditions were (1) that the project be reviewed by the Greensboro Department of Transportation, and (2) that the design of the stop signs be submitted for staff approval. Mr. Macy asked about vehicular traffic patters and Ms. Sessler indicated traffic would be blocked off at the end of McGee Street and that College Place is a private drive. Speaking in support was Susan Sessler, 815 West Market Street, with Greensboro College. The stop bars are the white lines on the pavement to calm the traffic. College Place is needed to allow access to most of the campus; safety is an issue. The cross walks will be brick pavers with a slight rise and a concrete edge. At the southern end the circulation is really not changing and it will be a plus for the neighborhood. Also in support was Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, representing the College Hill

neighborhood association. The association is in support of the application and feels it can only have good results. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1424 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— Introduction* (page 9), guidelines 1 and 2 and *Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* (page 20), guidelines 1 and 2 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1424 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greensboro College for work at 815 West Market Street, with the following conditions: (1) that the project be reviewed by the Greensboro Department of Transportation, and (2) that the design of the stop signs be submitted for staff approval, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (f) **Application No. 1427**  
**Location: 711 Fifth Avenue**  
**Applicant: Jon and Jacynthia Mitchell**  
**Owner: same**  
**(DENIED)**

**Description of Work:**

Tree removal.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**Facts:**

The application requests to remove two trees. Both trees are located in the front yard along the driveway.

**Facts:**

The Chinquapin Oak has a large section that is leaning over the drive. The City Urban Forester recommends the removal of this portion of the Chinquapin Oak due to its leaning which causes it to be unstable.

**Facts:**

Due to the proximity of the trees to the drive, the Poplar tree is dropping sap on vehicles parked in the drive. However, the City's Urban Forester does not consider this cause for removal of a healthy mature tree.

**Facts:**

The area does provide alternative parking on-street that could eliminate the sap issue.

**Guidelines under Trees and Landscaping:**

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

**Recommended Conditions:**

That the Poplar tree is not removed.

**In Support:**

Jacynthia Mitchell, 711 Fifth Avenue  
Linda Fuscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Ms. Bowers stated that this is application number 1427 for work at 711 Fifth Avenue. The applicants are Jon and Jacynthia Mitchell and the description of work is tree removal. Stefan-Leih Geary, City staff, recommended in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. They feel the work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines-Trees and Landscaping* (page 23) citing guidelines 1 and 5. Two trees are involved, a Chinquapin Oak and a Poplar tree. Ms. Geary stated that the City Urban Forester recommended the removal of the leaning portion of the Chinquapin Oak and not the Poplar tree as dropping sap was not a cause to remove a healthy mature tree. Staff suggested the homeowners investigate alternate parking. The application was considered congruous because of the recommendation to allow half the Chinquapin Oak to remain. Staff's recommended condition was to leave the Poplar tree. Speaking in favor of the application was Jacynthia Mitchell, 711 Fifth Avenue, who said they had lived in the home for five years. They have done extensive renovation to the house in addition to landscaping. The Poplar tree had been dropping sap on their old car and it is likely to drop sap on their new car. There is not enough room to put in a garage or an alternate parking space. A true garage would cost \$45,000 which would price the house out of the neighborhood. There are some issues with parking on the street such as vandalism, side-swiping accidents, and theft. The applicant would like to take down both trees and add a Willow Oak tree that has some age, not a sapling. Mr. Macy inquired if the house was for sale. The applicant said that the house was for sale and had been on the market since January, 2011. The contract is up July 11, 2011. The homeowner indicated that they may stay in the home for three more years. Mr. Macy felt the trees were very important to the streetscape. He asked if the applicant would consider taking out the Poplar and half the Chinquapin and planting a Willow Oak in its place. The homeowner agreed but felt the Willow Oak would possibly crowd the remainder of the Chinquapin Oak. Ms. Cantrell commented that Willow Oaks were very slow growing trees. Speaking on the application was Linda Fuscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue, representing the neighborhood association. She said there was much discussion on the matter at the neighborhood meeting but the vote was split; therefore, the association does not have a position on the tree removal issue. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Geary clarified staff's recommendation is to remove the leaning half of the Chinquapin Oak and leave the Poplar tree. Their recommendation is based on comments made by the Urban Forester. Members felt that there was no justification in the guidelines for cutting down the trees.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1427 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is

incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with *Historic District Design Guidelines-Trees and Landscaping* (page 23), guidelines 1 and 5, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1427 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jon and Jacynthia Mitchell for work at 711 Fifth Avenue. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Mr. Cowhig pointed out that the applicant does have the right to appeal the Commission's decision. Ms. Geary explained the appeal process to the applicant.

**ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Ms. Geary stated that staff is in process of finalizing a contract with MDM Consulting Company to do a National Register nomination for the Sunset Hills neighborhood. Work on the nomination should begin in late August, 2011.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:23 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 27, 2011**

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

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

**WELCOME:**

Vice-Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the July 27, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Vice-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:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that the absences of Ms. Bowers, Ms. Spaeh, and Mr. Sears were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 29, 2011 MEETING:**

Ms. McManus moved to approve the meeting minutes from June 29, 2011 as amended, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- a)      **Application No. 1418**  
          **Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street**  
          **Applicant: Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation**  
          **Owner: City of Greensboro**  
          **(CONTINUED)**

**Description of Work:**

Install standard cobra head street lights on 6' arms on existing poles.

**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:

**Facts:**

The City of Greensboro is proposing to install 4 standard streetlights on existing wooden poles in the 800 and 900 blocks of Spring Garden Street. An assessment of street lighting in the

neighborhood showed that current lighting is not adequate to meet traffic and pedestrian safety needs along this section of Spring Garden Street. Two fixtures will be installed at the intersection of South Mendenhall Street and Spring Garden Street. A third will be installed near 912 Spring Garden Street and the fourth near the intersection of South Tate Street and Spring Garden Street.

**Facts:**

In the late 1980s the standard streetlights in College Hill were replaced with period streetlights as part of a comprehensive neighborhood revitalization strategy. These decorative streetlights have limitations due to the design of the fixtures, light source and intensity, post height, etc. The new lights would not replace the existing period streetlights but would augment the light provided at key locations. Selective placement of streetlights at key locations is a common method of achieving adequate lighting in many historic areas.

**Facts:**

Meeting the lighting needs along Spring Garden Street by adding new decorative lights would be difficult and expensive. Installation requires that the electrical service be placed underground which is problematic given all the other pipes and cables buried along streets as old as Spring Garden Street. It would also result in an irregular spacing pattern and an intense light effect that could disturb residents.

**Facts:**

There are two types of standard streetlight fixtures: the cobra drop lens, and the cobra flat lens. The drop lens provides more light but it also produces more glare because the light travels horizontally. The flat lens directs the light downward and reduces the glare. The full cutoff flat lens gives the least amount of glare. There are a number of residential properties along this part of Spring Garden Street. They are generally close to the street so glare could be a problem for residents.

**Facts:**

There are decorative streetlights available that are designed for installation on existing poles.

**Guidelines:**

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 a pedestrian scale decorative street light at location 3 be investigated and installed if feasible.

Mr. Lucas joined the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

**In Support:**

Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation  
Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue

**In Opposition:**

Bill Burckley, 615-A Morehead Street  
Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Street

**Rebuttal:**

Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1418 for work at Spring Garden Street from South Mendenhall Street to South Tate Street. Mike Cowhig, City staff, recommended in favor of granting this application. He discussed the application with the neighborhood association and recommended using flat lens lights. Speaking in support of the application was Kym Smith, City of Greensboro Department of Transportation, who also recommended a cobra flat or drop lens light. She mentioned that tear drop lens are available and she is exploring other options with the neighborhood association. Also speaking in support of the application was Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He presented research about other possible pole fixtures and suggested changing the luminaries or the light bulbs. He said that the neighborhood association would prefer flat lens if they went with the pole lights. Speaking in opposition was Bill Burckley, 615-A Morehead Street, who noted that decorative lighting came with the original concept plan of the historic district in 1979. He said that the cast iron poles can be bought for less than the amount quoted by Duke Power and installed without difficulty. He emphasized the importance to the historic district of maintaining the original plan. Also speaking in opposition was Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Street, who indicated she and other neighbors had not received proper notification of information. She was in favor of the decorative style lighting. Speaking in rebuttal was Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation, who said the aluminum poles had been approved by the College Hill Neighborhood Association previously as an alternative to the cast iron poles. She noted there was not enough space on Spring Garden Street for the decorative lighting to be put in to meet the City's lighting standard.

**Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated his opinion that the application should be continued as the parties indicated they would like to continue conversations on this matter.

**Motion:**

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

Mr. Burroughs stated that he did not support the motion because he felt the lights proposed by the City were not congruous with the historic district.

Mr. Burroughs moved to excuse Vice-Chair Wharton from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Vice-Chair Wharton left the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Mr. Lucas left the meeting unexcused at 5:15 p.m.; therefore, all of his votes for the remainder of the meeting will be counted in the affirmative.

Ms. Cantrell agreed to conduct the meeting in Vice-Chair Wharton's absence.

- b) Location: 508 S. Cedar Street  
Application No. 1432  
Applicant: Aric Naylor  
Property Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 7-8-11  
(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Install fencing according to attached site plan.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion this project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 24) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The proposed fence project is needed in order to confine a large dog. It is a wood fence of an open picket design. Because this is a corner lot it is visible from the street.

**Fact:**

The height of the fencing is 48" which is necessary given the location next to a major thoroughfare. The fence will come just forward of the main wall of the house so that the water spigot will be inside the fence.

**Guidelines (page 26):**

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

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

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

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

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

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That fence location conforms with the sight obstruction requirements as determined by City Department of Transportation staff.

**In Support:**

Don Robinson, 512 South Cedar Street

Aric Naylor, 508 South Cedar Street

Bill Burckley, 615-A Morehead Street

Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Street

Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Ms. Cantrell stated that this is application number 1432 for work at 508 Cedar Street. The applicant is Aric Naylor and the description of work is for fence installation. Staff indicated they were in favor of the application with the conditions to relocate the fence and trim the tree according to the site obstruction guidelines suggested by the City. Speaking in favor of the application was Don Robinson, 512 South Cedar Street, who is a neighbor. Also speaking in favor was the owner, Aric Naylor, 508 South Cedar Street. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated he would be glad to answer questions from Mr. Naylor regarding the exact relocation of the existing fence. Speaking in favor of the application was Bill Burckley, a neighbor, of 615-A Morehead Street. Mr. Burckley also approved of the design. Speaking in support was Cindy Sheppard, 608 Morehead Street, who indicated she had never had any issues with sight while walking this intersection. Ron Walters, 610



Morehead Street, was also in support of the application. He is the president of the College Hill Neighborhood Association and he said the association also supported the COA.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Macy commented on the small size of the backyard property.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. McManus moved to approve the findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Macy, Burroughs, Cantrell, Lucas, McManus. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. McManus moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1432 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Aric Naylor for work at 508 South Cedar Street, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. Mr. Burroughs amended the motion and moved to add the following conditions: (1) to relocate the fence, and (2) to trim the tree with the site obstruction requirements as determined by the City of Greensboro Department of Transportation staff, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Macy, Burroughs, Cantrell, Lucas, McManus. Nays: None.)

- c)     **Application No. 1434**  
           **Location: 919 Spring Garden Street**  
           **Applicant: Don A. Ray**  
           **Property Owner: College Place United Methodist Church**  
           **Date Received: 7-11-11**  
           **(CONTINUED)**

**Description of Work:**

Demolition of house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Historic Preservation Commission may not deny an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition. Because this is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District, the staff recommends that the date of issuance of this Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed for 365 days.

**Fact:**

The house at 919 Spring Garden Street was given the highest rating possible for architectural significance during a survey conducted by the consulting firm, Glave, Newman, Anderson in 1977. It occupies a pivotal location on Spring Garden Street. Its removal would leave a hole in the fabric of the historic district and diminish the overall quality of the district significantly.

**Guidelines (page 73):**

The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored. During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions:

- Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition? Could another site serve the purpose just as well?

- Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs?
- Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building?
- As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?
- Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance?
- Is the structure of national, state or local significance?

If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted:

- Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site.
- Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.

If the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days, it should be cleared of debris, reseeded and maintained in a manner consistent with other properties in the Historic District.

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 30 days of demolition and the property be maintained on a regular basis.
- That City of Greensboro staff and/or preservation and architectural professionals be given the opportunity to document the structure prior to demolition.
- That any trees or mature shrubbery be protected during the demolition and a plan to that effect be submitted prior to demolition.
- That a plan be submitted to screen existing parking areas from view from the street, and that prevents parking on the site of the house, either through fencing or landscaping.

**In Support:**

Don Kay, College Place Methodist Church  
 Jason Harvey; Pastor, College Place Methodist Church  
 Benjamin Briggs, 477 West Washington Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Burroughs felt a continuance was needed to allow time for the parties to continue negotiations.

**Motion:**

Mr. Burroughs moved to continue this application until the next meeting so that the applicant can inform the Commission of the outcome of negotiations, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Macy, Burroughs, Cantrell, Lucas, McManus. Nays: None.)

- d) **Location: Springdale Park Corner Spring Garden Street and Springdale Court**  
**Application No. 1436**  
**Applicant: Nasha McCray, Parks and Recreation Department**

**Property Owner: City of Greensboro**  
**Date Application Received: 7-13-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)**

**Description of Work:**

Install sign at entrance to Springdale Park.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**Facts:**

The proposed sign is constructed of aluminum. It is a relatively small sign, approximately 44" high by 48" long. It is a simple design to provide information and branding as part of the City of Greensboro's park system.

**Facts:**

This is one of the smallest parks in the city. Although relatively small, the sign is large enough that it may interfere with views into the park.

**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.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That consideration be given to reducing the overall size of the sign.
- That the final siting of the sign be approved by staff.

**In Support:**

Nasha McCray, Greensboro Parks and Recreation Department  
 Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Ms. Cantrell stated that this is application number 1436 for work at Springdale Park at the corner of Spring Garden Street and Springdale Court. The applicant is Nasha McCray with the Greensboro Parks and Recreation Department. The description is to install a sign at the entrance of Springdale Park in College Hill. Staff recommends in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that consideration be given to reducing the overall size of the sign and that the final siting of the sign be approved by staff. Speaking in favor of the application was Nasha McCray, Greensboro Parks and Recreation Department, who said that they were willing to work with the size and the siting of the sign. Also speaking in favor was Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Street, who is the president of the College Park Neighborhood Association. The association approves of this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. There was no one present wishing to speak in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Burroughs said the area was very tight and felt that the sign should have a minimal impact. He recommended, as the guidelines state on page 34, that the sign be no larger than necessary and if possible, the applicant should work with staff to get a smaller sign.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Macy moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1436 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with the following guidelines on page 33: (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;* and (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;* these are acceptable as finding of fact; seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Macy, Burroughs, Cantrell, Lucas, McManus. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Macy moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1436 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City of Greensboro Parks and Recreation Department for work at Springdale Park at the corner of Spring Garden Street and Springdale Court with the following condition: (1) that the approval of the size and siting of the sign be done in conjunction with the staff's approval, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Macy, Burroughs, Cantrell, Lucas, McManus. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Counsel Williams explained the importance of stating Findings of Fact into the record to reference "how" and "why" a decision is made in case the Commission's ruling is appealed in the future.

**ITEMS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS:**

Mr. Burroughs invited Commission members and staff to attend the Warnersville Historic and Beautification Society's second annual music and heritage celebration on August 27, 2011.

Mr. Burroughs stated that he would like to invite Dabney Sanders, Project Manager for the Downtown Greenway, to the September 28, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting to update members on the Greenway. Members were supportive of the idea.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
AUGUST 31, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Vice-Chair; Paul Macy; James Burroughs; Christina Cantrell; Lois McManus; Jill Spaeh, Thomas Sears, and Patrick Lucas.

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

**WELCOME:**

Vice-Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the August 31, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Vice-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 excused absences.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 27, 2011 MEETING:**

Ms. Spaeh moved to approve the meeting minutes from July 27, 2011 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) **Application No. 1418**  
**Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation**  
**Owner: City of Greensboro**  
**(CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the City has requested a continuance until the September, 2011 meeting. The City recently met with a lighting representative and explained the complex lighting issues involved in this application. The City is working to respond to the concerns of the Commission and neighborhood and will return next month to present a solution to the lighting issue.

**Motion:**

Mr. Lucas moved to continue this application until the September, 2011 meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Application No. 1434**  
**Location: 919 Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Don A. Ray**  
**Property Owner: College Place United Methodist Church**  
**Date Received: 7-11-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Demolition of house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Historic Preservation Commission may not deny an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition. Because this is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District, the staff recommends that the date of issuance of this Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed for 365 days.

**Fact:**

The house at 919 Spring Garden Street was given the highest rating possible for architectural significance during a survey conducted by the consulting firm of Glave, Newman, and Anderson in 1977. It occupies a pivotal location on Spring Garden Street. Its removal would leave a hole in the fabric of the historic district and diminish the overall quality of the district significantly.

**Guidelines (page 73):**

*The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish a historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored. During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions:*

- *Is there a well-developed proposal for use of the site necessitating demolition? Could another site service the purpose just as well?*
- *Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs?*
- *Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building?*
- *As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?*
- *Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance?*
- *Is the structure of national, state, or local significance?*

*If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted:*

- *Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structure, and archeological significance of the site.*
- *Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.*

*If the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days, it should be cleared of debris, reseeded and maintained in a manner consistent with other properties in the Historic District.*

**Proposed Conditions:**

- That the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 30 days of demolition and the property be maintained on a regular basis.
- That City of Greensboro staff and/or preservation and architectural professionals be given the opportunity to document the structure prior to demolition.
- That any trees or mature shrubbery be protected during the demolition and a plan to that effect be submitted prior to demolition.
- That a plan be submitted to screen existing parking areas from view from the street and that prevents parking on the site of the house either through fencing or landscaping.

**In Support:**

Don Ray, Trustee of College Place United Methodist Church

**In Opposition:**

Benjamin Briggs, 447 West Washington Street  
Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1434 for work at 919 Spring Garden Street. The description of work is for demolition of the house. The applicant is Don Ray and the owner is College Place United Methodist Church. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund has been meeting with the owner to find ways to preserve the house. Speaking in support of the application was Mr. Don Ray with College Place United Methodist Church. Speaking in opposition to the application was Benjamin Briggs, 447 West Washington Street, who said that the Preservation Development Fund was working to acquire the house. They hope to return it to single-family zoning and put a preservation easement on the property. Also speaking in opposition was Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She strongly encouraged the repair and renovation of the house. She felt that demolishing the house would be a horrible loss to the neighborhood. She supported delaying the demolition 365 days. Mr. Ray declined the opportunity to rebut.

**Discussion:**

The consensus of Commission members was to delay the demolition 365 days. They noted that the 365-day delay started on August 31, 2011.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1434 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with the following guidelines on page 73: *The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District. Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish a historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored. During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions: (1) Is there a well-developed proposal for use of the site necessitating demolition? (2) Could another site service the purpose just as well? (3) Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs? (4) Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building? (5) As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location? (6) Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance? (7) Is the structure of national, state, or local significance? If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted: (1) Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structure, and archeological significance of the site, and (2) Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition. If the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days, it should be cleared of debris, reseeded and maintained in a manner consistent with other properties in the Historic District,* seconded by Mr. Burroughs. 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 1434 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish property located



at 919 Spring Garden Street with the conditions to delay demolition for 365 days, that the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 30 days of demolition and the property be maintained on a regular basis, that City of Greensboro staff and/or preservation and architectural professionals be given the opportunity to document the structure prior to demolition, that any trees or mature shrubbery be protected during the demolition and a plan to that effect be submitted prior to demolition, and that a plan be submitted to screen existing parking areas from view from the street and that prevents parking on the site of the house either through fencing or landscaping, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**(c) Location: 908 N. Eugene Street**  
**Application No. 1438**  
**Applicant: David Staub**  
**Property Owner: Susan Edwards**  
**Date Application Received: 7-20-11 (DENIED)**

**Description of Work:**

Remove and replace seven windows with new wood windows that match the design of the original windows.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion this project is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines –Windows and Doors (page 57)*.

**Fact:**

This house is a “contributing” structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. It is a Queen Anne/Colonial Revival cottage. It is one of the oldest houses in the neighborhood. The tall, two-over-two windows are more closely associated with late-Victorian residential architecture rather than the Craftsman and Colonial Revival styles that dominate the neighborhood.

**Fact:**

The windows proposed for removal are early windows, probably original, which would make them around 100 years old. They appear to be in relatively good condition. Windows constructed from old growth timber have the advantage of being repairable. With periodic maintenance they will last indefinitely. Adding storm windows and weather stripping will increase their energy efficiency. Storm windows protect the sash from the long term effects of weather.

**Fact:**

The proposed replacement windows are wood Simulated Divided Light (SDL) windows and 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. Simulated Divided Light windows are commonly approved for new construction and additions.

**Guidelines (page 57):**

*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 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 o the building*
- 5. Existence of lead paint or other safety hazards*
- 6. Material performance and durability.*

Mr. Lucas moved to excuse Ms. Spaeh from the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

**In Support:**

David Staub, 908 North Eugene Street  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

**Rebuttal:**

David Staub, 908 North Eugene Street

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1438 for work at 908 North Eugene Street. The description of work is to remove and replace seven windows with new wood windows that match the design of the original windows. The applicant is David Staub, 908 North Eugene Street and the owner is Susan Edwards. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that the windows appeared to be old and possibly original. The windows are in good condition. Staff recommends against window replacement. Speaking in support of the application was David Staub who stated his opinion that the windows were not original to the house and that they had already replaced two windows that were not part of this addition on a previous COA. He noted the reason for replacement was energy efficiency. Speaking either in support or opposition was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood decided not to vote on the matter and were of the opinion the windows were not original. Speaking in opposition was Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, who noted the style of the windows appeared to be old. She remarked on the superiority of old growth wood for windows in terms of durability and character. Speaking in rebuttal was David Staub who noted they are not installing what would be called replacement windows but they are wooden divided light windows that would be painted and well maintained.

**Discussion:**

At the request of members, staff provided a copy of the 2003 COA for members to review and there was considerable discussion about the addition and replacement of the windows as mentioned in the application. Mr. Staub pointed out the windows that were replaced in the 2003 COA and Ms. Geary provided minutes from the October, 2003 meeting in an effort to provide more clarity for Commissioners. The minutes were unclear if the replacement of the two windows in question even occurred.

Mr. Macy stated that he was uncomfortable denying this application if window replacement had been approved in 2003.

Mr. Lucas stated that the windows in question are rarely seen after 1925. He commented that the origin of the district came well after the age of the windows and therefore, the question of whether or not the windows were original was not relevant to the discussion. He felt the Commission was charged to protect all the materials sitting in the house at the time the district was established.

Vice-Chair Wharton read from the guidelines and stated his opinion that even if the windows were not original, they still deserved the protection of the Commission. He felt that the 2003 COA was ambiguous and the language and drawings did not specify the number of windows to be replaced. Despite the wonderful job the applicant has done on the house, he felt that the guidelines were very clear in this matter.

Mr. Sears and Mr. Macy commented that the matter of the energy efficiency of the windows could not be ignored.

#### **Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1438 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 recommending against granting the COA because the house is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District; it is one of the oldest houses; the fact that the windows proposed for removal are early windows, probably original, which make them about 100 years old; that the windows appear to be in relatively good condition; and the proposed replacement windows are wood simulated divided light windows and match the design dimensions of the original windows; and the guidelines on page 57 that states: *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, and (guideline 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 and (guideline 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, and (A) it is not appropriate to replace true divided light windows with vinyl windows or windows with snap-in muntins, and (B) window products will be reviewed on an individual basis using the following criteria: (1) kind and texture of materials, (2) architectural and historical compatibility, (3) comparison to original window profile, (4) level of significance of original windows to the architectural style of the building, (5) existence of lead paint or other safety hazards, and (6) material performance and durability, are acceptable as finding of*

fact, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Lucas, Cantrell, Burroughs. Nays: McManus, Macy.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1438 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at property located at 908 North Eugene Street. The Commission voted 5-2 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Lucas, Cantrell, Burroughs. Nays: McManus, Macy.)

- (d) **Location: 908 N. Eugene Street**  
**Application No. 1439**  
**Applicant: David Staub**  
**Property Owner: Susan Edwards**  
**Date Application Received: 7-20-11 (DENIED)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace existing front door with new wood, Queen Anne style door.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion this project is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines –Windows and Doors (page 57)*.

**Fact:**

The existing front door may or may not be original but it is an early door and of a design that is in keeping with the architectural style of the house. Its mortise-and-tenon joinery contributes to the historic character of the house.

**Fact:**

Over time the front door has been cut in order to fit the door frame. The replacement door is a double-glazed door of a style that is in keeping with the character of the house.

**Guidelines (page 57):**

*The front door is usually the focal point of the house and a key architectural feature. Original doors found in Historic Districts typically are wood panel doors with a fixed pane of glass, often with a muntin pattern similar to that of the windows.*

*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.*

**In Support:**

David Staub, 908 North Eugene Street  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1439 for work at 908 North Eugene Street. The description of work is replacement of existing front door with new wood, Queen Anne style door. The applicant is David Staub, 908 North Eugene Street, and the owner is Susan Edwards. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted the door was old and worn; however, it was in reasonably good condition. Staff recommended against replacement of the door. Speaking in support was David Staub, 908 North Eugene Street, who said the door had been cut and out of square because of motion in the house. There is a gap of almost one inch at the top. He had not pursued having the door repaired. He felt the Queen Anne style door would be aesthetically more appropriate to the house. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said the association voted to approve the application.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Lucas responded to an observation made by Mr. Macy, and stated his opinion that the door should be protected and kept even if members felt the door did not look good. Mr. Macy stated that he disagreed and would not be comfortable voting to deny the application.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1439 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and the following guidelines on page 57 that state: *The front door is usually the focal point of the house and a key architectural feature. Original doors found in Historic Districts typically are wood panel doors with a fixed pane of glass, often with a muntin pattern similar to that of the windows, and (2) retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, etc., and (3) when repair is not feasible, as determined by City staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement, are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lucas, Cantrell, Burroughs. Nays: Sears, McManus, Macy.)*

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1439 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Staub for work at 908 North Eugene Street, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted 4-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lucas, Cantrell, Burroughs. Nays: Sears, McManus, Macy.)

- (e) **Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**  
**Application No. 1451**  
**Applicant: Susan Sessler, Vice President for Facilities**  
**Property Owner: Greensboro College**  
**Date Application Received: 8-16-11 (CONTINUED)**

**Description of Work:**

Install signage on the back of the Greensboro Building, above the cornice.

**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:**

The location of the proposed signage is on the back of a dormitory and will not be easily visible from the historic district.

**Fact:**

The proposed sign is of a simple design utilizing a series of large letters spelling out “Greensboro College”. The sign will be visible from downtown Greensboro and is intended to be seen from a distance identifying the college much like the signs on water towers that identify UNCG and Bennett College.

**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.*

**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.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

That externally lighted letters be used rather than internally illuminated letters if possible.

**In Support:**

Susan Sessler, 815 West Market Street  
Julie Davenport, 821 Rankn Place

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1451 for work at 815 West Market Street. The description of work is to install signage on the back of the Greensboro College building, above the cornice. The applicant is Susan Sessler of 815 West Market Street. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that staff was in favor of the application because of the unusual situation of the siting. The sign would not be visible in the historic district. Staff is also in favor of the application because they are required to pay attention to the needs of institutional owners; however, they prefer externally illumination letters. Speaking in support was Susan Sessler of 815 West Market Street. She stated that Greensboro College has always considered itself a downtown college. The college wishes neither to be a “best kept secret” or a Chic-Fil-A. She said they would be amenable to backlit letters or externally illuminated letters but because of the expense of equipment for installation being rented, they would prefer a resolution today. Ms. Sessler would like the option to have letters as high as 32” with metal or preferably acrylic material. Also speaking in support was

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She indicated that the neighborhood supported this single location for a sign of this type.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Cantrell commented that she would prefer to use the resources of a design person rather than a signage company as they might be more accustomed to dealing with historic districts. Mr. Cowhig stated that an individual from the City's Design and Review Committee might be available to give input. Vice-Chair Wharton pointed out that the guidelines state that signs should not be internally illuminated and questioned whether or not external illumination would address the point. Mr. Macy expressed his opinion that the sign would appear garish because of the scale. Mr. Sears suggested that the letters should be smaller than the background of the sign and lit from the bottom, not internally, to be historically appropriate and in keeping with the building.

Members discussed whether or not enough information was available in the application.

Mr. Sears moved to excuse Mr. Macy from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Mr. Macy left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Mr. Burroughs stated that he could support an application that restricted the size of the letters, had letters that were not internally illuminated, and that delegated authority to staff to make a final decision. Members discussed the materials to be used for the letters. They felt that more details were needed to make a decision.

**Motion:**

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

Mr. Lucas left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Vice-Chair Wharton distributed a draft of preliminary ideas for the Heritage Community for members to review and give their feedback at the next meeting.

**ITEMS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS:**

Mr. Burroughs stated that Dabney Sanders, Project Manager for the Downtown Greenway, plans to give an update on the Greenway relative to the historic districts at the next meeting.

Ms. McManus moved to nominate Vice-Chair Wharton as Chairman of the Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:39 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 28, 2011**

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

**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 28, 2011 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 AUGUST 31, 2011 MEETING:**

Ms. McManus moved to approve the meeting minutes from August 31, 2011 as amended, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- (a) **Application No. 1418**  
**Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation**  
**Owner: City of Greensboro (CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the City has requested a continuance until the next meeting.

**Motion:**

Mr. Lucas moved to continue this application until the September, 2011 meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**  
**Application No. 1451**  
**Applicant: Susan Sessler, Vice President for Facilities**  
**Property Owner: Greensboro College**  
**Date Application Received: 8-16-11 (CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the applicant has requested a continuance on this application.

**Motion:**

Mr. Lucas moved to continue this application until the September, 2011 meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion.

(c) **Location: 549 S. Mendenhall Street**  
**Application No. 1458**  
**Applicant: Chris Martin, David Essa**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 9-14-11**

**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of addition to existing building.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines— Additions* (page 75) and *Signs* (page 33) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

A trailer designed for food vending will be modified so that it can become an addition to the building. A 6' x 10' concrete slab foundation will be constructed next to the building and the trailer would be placed on the foundation.

**Fact:**

The addition will not be attached to the historic building so that it does not damage the building and can be removed in the future without harming the structure. It will not hide or harm any character-defining architectural features. It will be recessed from the primary façade of the historic building.

**Fact:**

Because of its painted fiberglass construction and simple design, the addition will be easily distinguishable from the historic structure.

**Fact:**

The exterior is painted as a mural with a perpendicular sign attached to the roof.

**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. Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
5. *Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.*
6. *Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.*

**Guidelines (page 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.*
7. *Signage should be compatible with the original use of a building.*
  - B. *Place signs for historic commercial buildings in locations 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.*

**Conditions:**

That the graphics on the walls of the structure be removed or minimized if possible.

**In Support:**

Chris Martin, 549 South Mendenhall Street  
Bruce Cantrell, 1000 North Eugene Street

**In Opposition:**

Ronald Walters, 610 Morehead Street

Ms. Bowers joined the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application 1458 for work at 549 South Mendenhall Street. The applicants are Chris Martin and David Essa. The application is for the addition of a trailer, not permanently attached, and a concrete pad. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that staff was in favor of the application and noted that the trailer will not be permanently attached and will be recessed. The façade will be painted fiberglass. Speaking in support was Chris Martin, 549 South Mendenhall Street, who noted that the firehouse was built in 1896 by residents. He noted that the addition will not damage the original structure and the covering of it can be changed. Also speaking in support was Bruce Cantrell, architect, of 1000 North Eugene Street. He felt the building was compatible and that its painting was compatible with signage nearby. Speaking in opposition was Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue, who said he did not consider this structure to be compatible with an 1896 building. He preferred that the pizza be sold indoors.

**Discussion:**

Chair Wharton pointed out that if the addition was considered to be a sign, then it should conform to signage guidelines. It should also be determined if the addition was considered to be compatible. Ms. Cantrell stated that she would be more comfortable if the windows on the original structure were not covered up by the addition. Mr. Lucas felt the top part of the addition was definitely sign-like and the graphics on the main wall of the structure, particularly the website, made it sign-like. Chair Wharton and Mr. Lucas felt the top part of the sign was in scale and character with a building in the historic district; however, he felt the main wall of the structure was too large a statement. Mr. Lucas felt that if the structure was pushed back beyond the original window, it would be sitting on a flatter spot of pavement eliminating the wedge-shaped structure it sits on now. In addition, the pad below the structure should be faced with concrete and not brick to allow it to fade into the concrete below. Mr. Sears felt it was very important that the structure be slid back so that the original windows were not hidden. Chair Wharton cited guideline 3 from *Historic District Design Guidelines— Additions* (page 76) to support Mr. Sear's statement. Mr. Cantrell confirmed that there was available space to move the structure back beyond the window. Mr. Macy questioned moving the attachment back and noted the retail advantage to the owner of not moving it back. Ms. Bowers felt that moving the structure back symmetrically placed between the windows would make it a more pleasant look. Mr. Lucas suggested language that separated the two kinds of signs on the structure. Chair Wharton felt that the sign on top conformed to the guidelines in terms of scale and simplicity.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1458 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 including facts around the trailer size of 6' x 10', the fact that the addition will not be attached to the historic building, the idea this is fiberglass constructed with a wrap and simple design, and that the exterior has a mural attached to it, and the following guidelines stated on page 76 that are enumerated in the staff report: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 and guidelines on page 34: 1, 2, 7, subsets B and C, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Lucas, McManus, Cantrell. Nays: Macy.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1458 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Chris Martin and David Essa for work at 549 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) that the structure in question be located in a center line between the two arched historic window openings, (2) signs be restricted to the area above the top of the fiberglass structure, and (3) the structure be on a concrete pad remaining unfaced, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, Lucas, McManus, Cantrell. Nays: Macy.)

**(d) Location: 836 Olive Street  
Application No. 1441  
Applicant: Suresh Naggapan  
Property Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 7-21-11  
(APPROVED AND SPECIAL EXCEPTION RECOMMENDED)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of deck; request recommendation for Special Exception to setback requirement.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application and review, 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—Patios and Decks (page 41)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The location of the deck is at the back of the house. Since this is a corner lot the deck will be visible from the street. However, an existing fence covered with evergreen vines will help screen the deck from view from the street.

**Fact:**

The size of the proposed deck 16' x 14' is not so large as to monopolize the back of the house and is constructed so that it does not require removal of historic materials or damage or obscure architectural features.

**Fact:**

Because the house encroaches into the side yard setback a Special Exception is required to build an addition (deck). The commission may recommend Special Exceptions to setback requirements when they find that a COA application meets the Historic District Guidelines.

**Guidelines (page 41):**

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

**In support:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1441 for work at 836 Olive Street. The applicant is Suresh Nagappan and the description of work is construction of a deck with a nonconforming setback. Mike Cowhig, City staff, stated that staff felt the application was congruent with the guidelines and they were in favor of granting the Certificate of Appropriateness. Speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated the neighborhood was in favor of the application.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1441 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 including the fact that the deck is located at the back of the house, the deck is not too large for the house and it does not require any removal of historic materials or obscure architectural features, and the house encroaches into the side yard setback and a Special Exception is required to build the deck, and the following guidelines on page 41 as follows: (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. These comments are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Lucas. 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 1441 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Suresh Nagappan for work at 836 Olive Street with no conditions, seconded by Mr. Lucas. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Lucas moved to recommend a special exception to the Board of Adjustments for the property at 836 Olive Street for the construction of a deck, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

(e) **Application No. 1452**  
**Location: 108 Fisher Park Circle**  
**Applicant: Charles Harden**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Received: 8-24-11**

**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Tree removal.

**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-Trees and Landscaping* (page 23) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

A large Oak tree was removed without a Certificate of Appropriateness; therefore this is an "after-the-fact" application.

**Fact:**

The tree appeared to be healthy. There is evidence that the tree was causing some damage to the concrete driveway and was leaning somewhat in the direction of the neighbor's house.

**Guidelines:**

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

**Conditions:**

That a new tree with species, size and location to be determined by the City's Urban Forester, be planted on the property within 60 days and that if it does not survive for 2 years that it be replaced to match.

**In Support:**

Charles Harden, 108 Fisher Park Circle

**In Opposition:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**Rebuttal:**

Charles Harden, 108 Fisher Park Circle

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1453 for work at 108 Fisher Park Circle. The applicant is Charles Harden and the description of work is tree removal. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that staff was in favor of this application. Speaking in support was Charles Harden who noted that after the tree removal, he planted a Maple tree in the backyard to replace the removed tree. Another Maple tree had previously been planted in the front yard through the NeighborWoods program. Speaking in opposition was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood association was opposed to the tree removal. Speaking in rebuttal was Mr. Harden who noted that the tree roots had partially blocked a drain.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Lucas stated his support to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness after-the-fact; however, he was not comfortable saying that removal of the tree was an act congruous with the guidelines. Members discussed wording in the findings of fact that would reflect comments made by Mr. Lucas. Mr. Macy recommended conditions and members expressed their support.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1452 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 (1) explicitly that a large Oak tree was removed without a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore, this is an after-the-fact application, and (2) the tree appeared to be healthy and there is evidence that the tree appeared to be causing damage to the concrete driveway and was leaning in the direction of the neighbor's house, and the following guidelines (page 23) under staff comments as follows: (1) *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district,* and (5) *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased,* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, despite their incongruity, Mr. Lucas moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1452 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Charles Harden for work at 108 Fisher Park Circle with the following condition: (1) that the Urban Forester review the placement of the Maple tree in the backyard and make a recommendation to staff within 30 days and that such action be carried out within 60 days by the property owner, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- (f)     **Application No. 1455**  
           **Location: 206 Fisher Park Circle**  
           **Applicant: Robert H. Beaumont**  
           **Owner: Lee Bristol**  
           **(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS AND SPECIAL EXEMPTION RECOMMENDED)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of garage.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines-Trees and Landscaping* (page 23), *Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36) and *Demolition* (page 73) for the following reasons:

**Facts:**

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

**Facts:**

The proposed garage will be constructed of materials that match the house: brick walls and wood doors and trim. It will be of a size and siting pattern that is consistent with other garages in the neighborhood.

**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.*

Note: A special exception from the Board of Adjustment is required to site the garage less than 10' from the property line. An exception of 8 feet and 9 feet will be required.

**In Support:**

Robert Beaumont, 206 Fisher Park Circle  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1455 for work at 206 Fisher Park Circle. The applicant is Robert Beaumont and the description is construction of a garage. Mike Cowhig, City staff, stated that staff is in support of this application. Speaking in support was Robert Beaumont, 206 Fisher Park Circle, who noted that a basketball court will be removed along with a young tree and that the building would be painted brick to match the house. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the neighborhood was in support of the application.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Bowers noted that the rear of the house cannot be seen from the street when driving or walking by the property. It was clarified that the garage would have simulated divided light wooden windows and garage doors.

**Findings of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1455 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as amended as follows: the proposed garage will be 12' 3" by 24', the garage will be constructed of painted brick with painted wood trim doors and windows to match the house, and it will be one and a half stories tall, along with the following 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 and (4) New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. 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 1455 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Beaumont for work at 206 Fisher Park Circle with the condition that the concrete pad serving as a basketball court be removed to allow construction of the garage, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Lucas moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment that an exception be granted that the garage be less than 10' from the property line, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- (g) **Location: 230 South Park Drive**  
**Application No. 1454**  
**Applicant: Gina Hensley**  
**Property Owner: Siri Realty**  
**Date Application Received: 9-6-11** (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

**Description of Work:**

Repave existing parking area and driveways.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**Fact:**

The pavement for the driveways and parking areas serving this apartment building are cracked and broken. The proposal is to repave the drives and parking areas with asphalt.

**Fact:**

Two trees near the back of the building are causing some of the cracking. The City's Urban Forester inspected the trees and feels they should be taken down and replaced with new trees in a suitable location on the property. He also recommends that a diseased Mulberry tree behind the building be removed and replaced.

**Guidelines (page 30):**

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

**Conditions:**

That three new canopy trees be started within 60 days in consultation with the City's Urban Forester.

**In Support:**

Gina Hensley, 4711 Perquimans Road

**In Opposition:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

Ms. McManus moved to excuse Mr. Macy from the meeting, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. Mr. Macy left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

**Rebuttal:**

Gina Hensley, 4711 Perquimans Road

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1454 for work at 230 South Park Drive. The applicant is Gina Hensley and the description of work is repaving driveway and parking areas and removal of one Oak tree at the corner of the driveway. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness based on the application. Speaking in support was Gina Hensley of 4711 Perquimans Road. Speaking in partial opposition was Robert Kantlehner of 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The association was opposed to the tree removal but in favor of the repaving.

**Discussion:**

Chair Wharton was of the opinion the application was for the removal of a single tree and he was in favor of allowing that, especially since there is another canopy tree in the area. He indicated he could also support a condition that allowed the removal of the volunteer Mulberry tree as the Urban Forester had recommended its removal. Leaving the third tree, a canopy tree, would address neighborhood concerns about shading. Mr. Sears commented that the Mulberry tree is not considered an unimportant tree in other historic districts in Piedmont North Carolina. He indicated he would be opposed to cutting down the Mulberry tree as it does not appear to be endangering anything and it adds a texture to the area. Mr. Lucas stated that he supported the repaving; however, he did not support removal of the trees.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1454 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments that the pavement for the driveways and parking areas serving this apartment building are cracked and broken, the proposal is to repave the driveway and parking area with asphalt, one tree in the back of the building as part of the application is causing some cracking and is to be removed to accommodate the paving, and the following guidelines on page 30: (5) *Select appropriate materials for new driveways, and (6) Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property*, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, McManus, Cantrell. Nays: Lucas.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1454 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Gina Hensley for work at 230 South Park Drive with the following condition: (1) a canopy tree be planted to replace the one tree removal, (2) that it be started within 60 days in consultation with the City's Urban Forester, (3) the tree needs to survive for two years or be replaced, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, McManus, Cantrell. Nays: Lucas.)

(h) **Location: 302 Isabel Street**  
**Application No. 1457**  
**Applicant: Joe Thompson, New Age Builders**  
**Property Owner: Robert P. Doolittle**  
**Date Received: 9-14-11** **(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of addition at back of house.

**Staff Recommendation:**



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

**Fact:**

This is a small, single-story addition to create a breakfast room off of the kitchen. The location is at the back of the house where it would not be visible from the street. It does not affect principle elevations of the house nor will it obscure or damage any character defining features. Construction materials and architectural details will match the house.

**Guidelines:**

1. *Design additions to be compatible with the original structure in materials, style, and detailing.*
2. *Design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged or radically changed.*
3. *Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.*
5. *Additions that radically change the proportion of built area to green area on the site are discouraged.*
6. *Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.*

**Fact:**

The addition will be distinguishable from the original structure by an offset from the wall and roof plane of the kitchen.

**Guideline:**

3. *Clearly distinguish additions in roofline and wall plane from the original structure.*

**In Support:**

Joe Thompson, 1006 North Eugene Street  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Rebuttal:**

Joe Thompson, 1006 North Eugene Street

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1457 for work at 302 Isabel Street. The applicant is Joe Thompson, New Age Builders, and the owner is Robert Doolittle. The description of work is construction of addition at the back of the house. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that staff feels the application is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. Speaking in support was Joe Thompson, 1006 North Eugene Street, who is the contractor. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner of 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood is in support of the project.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Lucas commented that the design work is beautiful but even though the original material is being reused, guideline 2 states: *Design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged or radically changed.* He

said he would be more comfortable with a wood addition to clearly show it was different and an addition. Mr. Thompson commented that the foundation brick will be new and is different from the brick above. In terms of the materials, the door unit will be new and will be simulated divided light. He felt it would be obvious that this was an addition.

**Findings of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1457 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, 4,5, 6 on page 38, and citing the fact that the addition will be distinguishable from the original structure by an offset on the wall citing guideline 3, are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, McManus, Cantrell. Nays: Lucas.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1457 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Joe Thompson for work at 302 Isabel Street with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Bowers, Sears, McManus, Cantrell. Nays: Lucas.)

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig informed members that Dabney Sanders will update the Commission at the next meeting on the Greenway's impact on the historic districts. The next meeting will be held October 26, 2011.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, referred to a particular case as an example where fines should have been issued. Members discussed the issuance of fines and staff clarified actions taken in the case.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
OCTOBER 26, 2011  
(draft)**

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

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

**WELCOME:**

Chair Wharton welcomed everyone to the October 26, 2011 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 SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 MEETING:**

Ms. McManus moved to accept the minutes from the September 28, 2011 meeting as written, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- (a) **Location: 617 N. Elm Street (First Presbyterian Church)**  
**Application No. 1472 (Amendment to COA #1310)**  
**Applicant: Tim Millisor, Property Director**  
**Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church**  
**Date Application Received: 10-18-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Change to approved plan for construction of columbarium.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this amendment to Certificate of Appropriateness #1310 with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Trees and Landscaping* (page 23) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The COA was approved on the condition that precautionary measures be taken to minimize the risk of harming nearby trees.

**Fact:**

Construction will come closer to the trees than planned due to OSHA safety regulations.

**Fact:**

The problem has been carefully studied by experts who have proposed additional measures to give the trees the best chance for survival including excavation with an air spade and hand pruning of exposed roots.

**Guideline (page 23):**

6. *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That the recommendations of Arborist Bill Lyon and City Forester Mike Cusimano be followed during construction.

**In Support:**

Tim Millisor, 617 North Elm Street, First Presbyterian Church  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway  
Mike Cusimano, City of Greensboro Urban Forester

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1472, an amendment to COA #1310, for work at 617 North Elm Street. The description is for change to approved plan for construction of a columbarium at First Presbyterian Church. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that the amendment was to increase the encroachment to the tree root area because of OSHA requirements on the process. Staff recommended in favor of the application. Mike Cusimano, Greensboro Urban Forester, indicated that the OSHA back slope required an encroachment of six more feet. Mr. Cusimano and the applicants arrived at the solution to expose the tree root system with an air spade. Bill Lyons of Bill's Tree Service has agreed to do the service. Mr. Lyons would hand trim the roots and then backfill with topsoil amendments. He said that deep root fertilization has already been done and most of the ivy would be replaced with mulch except on the slope. Although the encroachment decreased the chances of survival from the original proposal, the remediation would help with survivability. He also recommended that the applicants consider a 10-year replacement policy with substantial trees. Speaking in support was Tim Millisor of 617 North Elm Street. He said the trees were important to the project and encroachment was only about 32 percent of the arch. Also in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood is in support of the application.

**Discussion:**

In response to a question concerning exposed roots during the procedure, Mr. Cusimano explained that the exposed roots would be pruned to avoid detrimental exposure. Ms. Spaeh related similar circumstances with root pruning and saving trees on the campus of UNC-G and felt the project would be successful.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1472, an amendment to Certificate of Appropriateness #1310, 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 relating to the original Certificate of Appropriateness issuance as well as the changes that resulted in the amendment being filed, and

guideline 6 on page 23 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 1472, an amendment to Certificate of Appropriateness #1310, and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to First Presbyterian Church for work at 617 North Elm Street with the following conditions: (1) excavate the tree's root system with an air spade and prune roots by hand in consultation with the Urban Forester, (2) the area behind the wall to be backfilled with amended top soil to assure good root medium, (3) additional application of deep root fertilizer and mycorrhizae as directed by the Urban Forester, (4) removal of most of the ivy and replace with mulch to facilitate a better root area environment, (5) the church will replace the trees within the first ten years after construction should they die, said replacement with a trunk caliper no less than 4" diameter as directed by the Urban Forester, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Location: 1008 N. Eugene Street**  
**Application No. 1468**  
**Applicant: Perry Cornelius**  
**Property Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 10-12-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of addition at back of house

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Non-Contributing Structures* (page 67) and *Additions* (page 76), for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This house is classified as "non-contributing" in the Fisher Park National Register nomination because of its age circa 1945.

**Fact:**

The addition will be constructed at the rear elevation and therefore will not alter character-defining features of the house. The addition will be offset slightly and lap fiber cement siding used for the walls so that it will be distinguishable from the original portions of the house. Fiber cement siding has proven to be a compatible material for additions and new construction in the historic districts.

**Guidelines for Non-Contributing Structures (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.*
2. *It is not appropriate to add historic ornamentation to create the illusion of an historic structure.*
3. *For additions and alterations, choose materials and treatments that maintain the character of the building's architectural style.*
4. *Retain features that are characteristic of the architectural style of non-contributing buildings. It is not appropriate to simply remove deteriorated architectural features rather than replacing them in kind.*

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

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That beveled cement siding be used if available.
- That wide window and door casings be used similar to other houses in the historic district.
- That windows be simulated divided light wood windows.

\*Note: The brick patio and the new asphalt composition shingle roof are approvable at staff level.

**In Support:**

Perry Cornelius, 1008 North Eugene Street  
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1464 for work at 1008 North Eugene Street. The applicant is Perry Cornelius and the description of work is construction of addition at the back of the house. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that staff felt this application was congruous with Historic District Design Guidelines but raised questions about the window casings, the width of the window casings, the finish of the siding, and the covering of the soffits. Speaking in support of the application was Perry Cornelius of 1008 Eugene Street. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated the neighborhood supported the application but not "grid between glass" windows.

**Discussion:**

Members discussed the non-contributory status of the house. Mr. Cowhig commented that the National Register District was designated 20 years ago and if revisited, this house probably would be ranked as a contributing structure. Following a discussion about retaining the historical character of the house, members reached a consensus not to use the wide window casings recommended by staff. It was pointed out that smooth siding would be in harmony with the house as it would have originally been built; however, it is not in harmony with the enclosed porch. Mr. Cornelius indicated his first preference was to use brick but the cost was prohibitive. The type of siding used on the enclosed porch represented a cost savings and it differentiated the porch from the original structure. Ms. Spaeh felt that smooth siding would be best for this project and Commissioners discussed the option and availability of hardie board trim with a beveled edge.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1468 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments that the addition will be constructed at the rear elevation, will not alter character defining features of the house, the addition will be offset slightly, lap fiber cement siding used for the walls so that it will be distinguishable from the original portions of the house, and guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4 (page 68), and guidelines 1, 2, 3 for *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, Ms. Cantrell moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1468 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Perry Cornelius for work at 1009 North Eugene Street with the following conditions: (1) the soffits and fascia will be covered in some material other than vinyl or aluminum, (2) the siding will be smooth siding, (3) window trim will be of the original size and not the larger window trim originally recommended by staff, (4) and simulated divided light. Mr. Burroughs made a friendly amendment that the work is at 1008 North Eugene Street. Ms. Cantrell accepted the friendly amendment. Chair Wharton made a friendly amendment that simulated divided light windows with permanently attached interior and exterior muntins be used. Ms. Cantrell accepted the friendly amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (c) **Location: 200 West Bessemer Avenue**  
**Application No. 1466**  
**Applicant: Brandon M. Maley**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 10-7-11 (CONTINUED UNTIL DECEMBER, 2011)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of brick retaining walls.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 26) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The applicant proposes to construct a brick retaining wall along the front of the property at the sidewalk and along the driveway.

**Fact:**

Brick retaining walls of similar design are commonly found in the Fisher Park Historic District. The proposed wall follows the grade of the property rather than being "stepped". This technique seems to be more in keeping with historic retaining walls.

**Guidelines (page 26):**

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

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That details be provided for staff approval showing how the new walls will tie in with the existing steps and for the brick piers that will be constructed at the driveway.

**In Support:**

Brandon Maley, 200 West Bessemer Avenue  
 Paul Ingold, 3500 Turnberry Lane  
 Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1466 for work at 200 West Bessemer Avenue. The applicant is Brandon Maley and the description of work is construction of a brick retaining wall. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated it was staff's opinion that the project was congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines. Speaking in support of the application was Brandon Maley, 200 West Bessemer Avenue, who is the property owner. He noted that this is part of a larger landscape project. The steps were recently repaired and will not be replaced in this project. Also speaking in support was Paul Ingold, 3500 Turnberry Lane, who is the contractor. He said that they plan to integrate the wall with a roll-lock on the steps and the existing concrete block wall at one end. Also in support was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said that the association was in support of the project.

**Discussion:**

It was pointed out that a wall higher than 30" would require a fence. Mr. Lucas commented that without a detailed sketch of the proposed plan, it was difficult to envision the final result and how the wall would tie to the steps. He also felt that a high wall would be too massive for the space. The group described scenarios that would comply with height requirements while maintaining proper scale. It was suggested, since new information was brought forth during the discussion, that the application should be continued to allow the applicant to talk with the landscaper. Mr. Maley was concerned that waiting until the next meeting on December 7, 2010 would mean that plantings could not be done until the spring. In addition, he will be out of town on the date of the next meeting. He was amenable to a shorter wall with a slightly sloped hill. He plans to meet with Mike Cusimano, Greensboro Urban Forester, on November 1, 2011 to review the site. Ms. Spaeh commented that it would be useful to have an elevation of the area. Mr. Lucas said that it was difficult to understand how the existing fabric that was repaired and the new wall will come together. He felt there was not enough information available to see what the owner and contractor wanted to do on the property. Mr. Macy commented that the application conformed to the guidelines and therefore, he was in support. Ms. Spaeh stated that there was no site plan and an elevation would be helpful. Mr. Burroughs pointed out application requirements on page 25 and reiterated that a site plan was not included in the application. Chair Wharton stated that the wall would make a big impact in the neighborhood and he would like to see a site drawing with more detail on how the wall would integrate at the ends and the steps. Mr. Maley asked if Mr. Ingold could present information at the next meeting and he agreed to accept a continuance. Mr. Ingold confirmed the additional details requested by the Commission. Chair Wharton added that a scaled site plan would be in order due to the size of the project along with scaled elevation drawings, especially where the wall turns the corner. He also asked for drawings showing how the wall would integrate with the steps.

**Motion:**

Mr. Lucas moved to continue application number 1466 until the December 7, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Cantrell, McManus, Lucas, Spaeh, Burroughs. Nays: Macy.)



- (d) **Location:** 115 North Park Drive  
**Application No.** 1467  
**Applicant:** Freeman R. Jackson  
**Property Owner:** same  
**Date Application Received:** 10-10-11 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

**Description of Work:**

Demolition of garage.

**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—Demolition* (page 73) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The garage is classified as a “contributing” structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District nomination.

**Guidelines:**

*The following questions apply to this proposal:*

*As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?  
 Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance?  
 Is the structure of national, state or local significance?*

*If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted;*

- *Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site.*
- *Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

- *That the effective date of issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed for 365 days.*
- *That efforts be made to investigate the possibility of moving the garage.*
- *That the structure be documented prior to demolition.*

**In Support:**

Jane Jackson, 115 North Park Drive

**In Opposition:**

Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

**Rebuttal:**

Jane Jackson, 115 North Park Drive

Mr. Burroughs moved to excuse Mr. Macy from the meeting, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Mr. Macy left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1467 for work at 115 North Park Drive. The applicant is Freeman Jackson and the work description is demolition of garage, a contributing structure. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated that staff was in support of the application because it is

congruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines. Speaking in support was Jane Jackson, 115 North Park Drive. She stated that the cost to restore the garage was about equal to the cost to tear down and rebuild. In opposition to the application was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, with the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the association urged the Commission to delay the project for 365 days.

**Discussion:**

Members felt that time should be allowed for the owners to explore all possibilities.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1467 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines on page 73 as stated on the staff comments page are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Cantrell. 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 1467 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Freeman R. Jackson for demolition at 115 North Park Drive with the following conditions: (1) the effective date of issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed for 365 days, (2) other efforts be made to investigate the possibility of either renovation or moving the garage, and (3) that the structure be documented prior to demolition, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

- (e) **Application No. 1418**  
**Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Kym Smith, Greensboro Department of Transportation**  
**Owner: City of Greensboro**  
**(CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that a request was received to continue this case.

- (f) **Application No. 1451**  
**Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**  
**Applicant: Susan Sessler, Vice President for Facilities**  
**Property Owner: Greensboro College**  
**Date Application Received: 8-16-11**  
**(CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that a request was received to continue this case.

- (g) **Application No. 1466**  
**Location: 715 Morehead Avenue**  
**Applicant: Martha Carter**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**(APPROVED /RECOMMENDED FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of 6' aluminum picket fence.

**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 fence will be congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines-Fences, Walls and Site Features* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The proposed ornamental fence is of an open design. It will combine with Emerald Arborvitae trees to provide a landscape screening solution for this property which was exposed to Fulton Street when underground utility work caused the removal of the existing privet hedge.

**Fact:**

This is an atypical location within the Historic District. At one point in time this property was situated on an internal neighborhood street. When Spring Garden Street was constructed in the 1970s Morehead Avenue was closed at Fulton Street. The industrial property to the west and south has been re-developed into a large student housing complex. The fence and trees will provide a buffer and privacy for this property.

**Fact:**

The proposed fence will be 6' tall. Fences may not be higher than 4' within 15' of a street under the zoning ordinance. Therefore a Special Exception will be required. The Board of Adjustment can grant a Special Exception with the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**GUIDELINES:**

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.)*

**In Support:**

Ronald Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1466 for work at 715 Morehead Avenue. The applicant is Martha Carter and the description of work is construction of a 6' aluminum picket fence. Mike Cowhig, City staff, indicated staff's opinion was that this proposed fence with arborvitae landscaping was congruous with the Historic District Guidelines. Speaking in support of the application was Ron Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue, who is president of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He indicated the neighborhood association was in favor of the application due to the close proximity of the property next to student housing with balconies.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Burroughs urged members to be consistent based on previous decisions and cited a similar application that recently came before the Commission. Chair Wharton agreed and noted that the property is on the border of the historic district between two densities that are very different. He felt this warranted a special exception in this matter.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1466 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 relating to the open nature of the design, its atypical location, the potential for buffer and privacy for this property owner, noting the special exception that would be required from the Board of Adjustment, and guideline 5, subset A, B, and C, on page 24 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. 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 1466 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Martha Carter for work at 715 Morehead Avenue, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion for Special Exception:**

Mr. Lucas moved to recommend to the Board of Adjustment the case for a special exception for the height of this fence, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE CHANGES TO CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:**

Sue Schwartz, Director of Planning and Community Development, gave an overview of a report requested by City Council reviewing Boards and Commissions in the City of Greensboro. The report looked at the number of Boards and Commissions, how well they function, and if there was any overlapping or redundancy. In the report a recommendation was made to retain the Historic Preservation Commission but to reduce membership down to seven with two alternate members. Ms. Schwartz asked the Commission for their feedback regarding the recommendation.

Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Comments from members included the following:

- Diversity in the districts represented on the Commission is important. Reducing the number of members to seven poses a concern that community members may not be represented.
- The balance of expertise on the Commission might be compromised by reducing the number of members.
- The Commission balances historic district representation, professional expertise, and district representation. The problem has not been finding interested individuals to serve but in getting the individuals appointed.
- Training is an important element.
- Cost is obviously a factor in the report; therefore, cut costs by changing to an electronic online agenda packet instead of a mailed printed packet.

Ms. Schwartz thanked Commissioners for their service to the community. She asked members to email any additional comments or questions.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton updated the Commission on the Heritage Community program. A meeting is being arranged between the Heritage Community subcommittee and City staff. He will provide more information at the next meeting.

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that Dabney Sanders is scheduled to give an update on the Greenway at the next meeting.

Ms. Geary gave an update on the Sunset Hills National Register Nomination project. She indicated that Jennifer Mitchell, consultant for the project, and Ann Swallows, National Register Coordinator, were in attendance at the recent Sunset Hills Neighborhood meeting. Ms. Geary commented that the meeting was successful and served to educate, clarify, and build momentum and enthusiasm for the project.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
DECEMBER 7, 2011  
(draft)**

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

**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 December 7, 2011 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 excused absences.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 26, 2011 MEETING:**

Mr. Lucas moved to accept the minutes from the October 26, 2011 meeting as written, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):**

- (a) **Location: 800, 900 blocks Spring Garden Street  
Application No. 1418 (CONTINUED)**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the applicant has requested a continuance on this item.

Mr. Sears moved to continue application number 1418, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)  
Application No. 1451 (WITHDRAWN)**

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

- (c) **Location: 200 West Bessemer Avenue  
Application No. 1466  
Applicant: Brandon M. Maley  
Property Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 10-7-11 (APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of brick retaining walls.

**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—Fences, Walls and Site Features* (page 26) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The application is for a brick retaining wall along the front of the property (West Bessemer Avenue) and the east side of the property (Carolina Street) behind the sidewalk.

**Fact:**

Brick retaining walls of similar design are found in the Historic Districts. The walls will generally follow the grade of the property rather than being "stepped". This technique is more in keeping with historic retaining walls.

**Guidelines (page 26):**

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

**In Support:**

Brandon Maley, 200 West Bessemer Avenue  
Don Smith, 308 Parkway  
Paul Ingold, 3500 Turnberry Lane

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1466 for work at 200 West Bessemer. The applicant is Brandon Maley and the description of work is construction of brick retaining walls. Mike Cowhig, City staff, said the City recommends in favor of this project citing guidelines 4 and 5 on page 26 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. Speaking in support was Brandon Maley, 200 West Bessemer Avenue, and Don Smith, 308 Parkway. Mr. Smith was present to represent the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association who supports the application. Also present in support of the application was Paul Ingold, 3500 Turnberry Lane, who is the contractor for the project. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Members commented that questions raised at the previous meeting had been answered in the applicant's presentation.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1466 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 regarding guidelines 4 and 5 on page 26 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1466 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Brandon Maley for work at 200 West Bessemer Avenue based on the above guidelines, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

(d) **Location: 206 Fisher Park Circle**  
**Application No. 1482**  
**Applicant: Robert H. Beaumont**  
**Property Owner: Same**

**(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Expand dormer on rear slope of roof.

**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—Additions (page 38)* and *Roofs (page 51)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The purpose of the project is to create additional living space in the attic. The existing dormer was added approximately 10 years ago to provide light and ventilation when the attic was finished for living space. Much of that space is not usable because of the low ceiling height. Creating a shed-roofed dormer that spans the full width of the house will result in much more usable space.

**Fact:**

Adding shed dormers on the rear slopes of gable-roofed houses is a longstanding and cost effective way to provide additional living space for growing families without changing the footprint of the structure and with minimal impact on the character of the house. The dormer will not affect principle elevations of the house or obscure any character defining features. Siding, windows, trim, shingles, etc. will match the existing. The addition will be set back slightly from the side wall of the house.

**Guidelines for Additions:**

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.*

**Guidelines for Roofs:**

1. *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and widow's walks.*
4. *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*



**Recommended Conditions:**

- The use of shutters should be optional. However, if shutters are used they should be wood and attached to the casings rather than siding.

**In Support:**

Robert Beaumont, 206 Fisher Park Circle  
Don Smith, 308 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1482 for work at 206 Fisher Park Circle. The applicant is Robert Beaumont and the description of work is for expansion of dormer on rear slope of roof. Mike Cowhig, City staff, stated that staff was in support of this application. He noted that the existing dormer is not original and is 10 years old. Staff felt the application was congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (page 38) and Roofs (page 51)*. Speaking in support was the homeowner, Robert Beaumont, of 206 Fisher Park Circle. Also speaking in support was Don Smith, 308 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association who stated the Association supported the project. There was no one present speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Members commented that the project would be an attractive change. Mr. Sears felt that if the project was done correctly, the placement of new gutters would eliminate the current problem with wood rot.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Cantrell moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1482 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 and *Historic District Design Guidelines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 -- Additions* and *Historic District Design Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4 -- Roofs* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. 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 1482 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Beaumont for work at 206 Fisher Park Circle, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (e) **Location: 910 Magnolia Street**  
**Application No. 1478**  
**Applicant: Tracy Pratt**  
**Property Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 11-9-11**      **(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

General exterior repairs and site improvements including restoring original Craftsman stickwork in the gable ends, construction of additions; replacement of front steps; construction of accessory building, driveway, pergola, patio and fence; tree removal; and landscaping.

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—Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes (page 44), Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35), Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38), Patios and Decks (page 41), Windows and Doors (page 55), Additions (page 75), Trees and Landscaping (page 22), Walkway, Driveways, and Parking Areas (page 28) and Fences and Walls (page 24)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This house was under a demolition order by the City of Greensboro for failure to meet the Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance. The Preservation Greensboro Development Fund gained title to the property and sold it to the applicant subject to complete renovation of the house and site.

**Fact:**

The renovation plan restores the exterior of the principle elevations of the house. Additional space needed for updating and expanding kitchen and bathrooms is gained through small additions at the back of the house and by enclosing the back porch. The additions have been designed so as to preserve character-defining features of the house to the extent possible. Compatible materials will be used for exterior walls, windows, and trim of the additions.

**Guidelines for Additions:**

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

**Facts:**

On principle elevations of the house, original siding, trim and architectural details will be retained to the extent possible. Deteriorated materials will be replaced with matching materials. Plywood will be removed from the gable ends and the architectural details restored. Windows will be refurbished and wood storm windows installed. The roof will be replaced and properly flashed. Half round gutters will be installed. Deteriorated steps will be replaced with brick steps.

**Guidelines for Exterior Materials and Finishes:**

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

**Facts:**

Utilities and mechanical equipment will be inconspicuously located where they are not easily visible from the street.

**Guidelines for Utilities and Mechanical Equipment:**

1. *Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building.*
2. *Locate utilities, satellite dishes, and antennae as low to the ground as possible, at the rear and side of the structure where it is not readily visible from the street. Smaller satellite dishes of 18 inches are most appropriate and create the least amount of visible impact on the district.*
3. *Install mechanical equipment, such as electrical panels or gas meters, at grade level when they are visible from the street, and screen with shrubbery or other landscaping.*
4. *Locate new mechanical supply lines, pipes, and ductwork on the interior of the structure. If an interior location is not feasible, place in inconspicuous locations and/or conceal with architectural elements such as downspouts.*
5. *Place utility service lines underground where possible, to eliminate overhead lines and poles.*
6. *Air Conditioning units and other similar mechanical equipment should be placed in the rear and side yards, with as little visibility from the street as possible. When equipment can be seen from the street, it should be screened with shrubbery or fencing.*

**Facts:**

One of the two trees at the back of the property must be removed to allow construction of the accessory building. It is the smaller of the two trees.

**Guidelines for Trees and Landscaping:**

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
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 site of the proposed storage building is consistent with other accessory structures in the historic district. It is a relatively small structure. Exterior materials such as fiber cement siding will be used which are similar but not identical to construction materials of the house.

**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 location of the driveway is similar to other driveways in the historic districts. It will lead to a parking space at the rear of the house. The driveway will be paved with a material that allows grass to grow through the pavers to soften the visual impact.

**Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas:**

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.*

**Fact:**

A 6' privacy fence will be installed in the back yard along the south property line. It will be constructed of wood. A brick patio and wooden pergola are proposed for the back yard.

**Guidelines (page 26):**

6. *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.*

**Guidelines for Patios and Decks:**

4. *Select appropriate paving materials for patios, including concrete, brick and stone. Simulations of natural materials, such as stamped concrete or interlocking pavers, are not appropriate.*

**In Support:**

Don Smith, 308 Parkway  
Benjamin Briggs, 447 West Washington Street  
Tracy and Cheryl Pratt, 108 Woodbourne Road

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1478 for work at 910 Magnolia Street. The applicant is Tracy Pratt and the description is general exterior repairs and site improvements including restoring original Craftsman stickwork in the gable ends; construction of additions; replacement of front steps; construction of accessory building, driveway, pergola, patio and fence; tree removal; and landscaping. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff was in favor of this application. He noted the house had been under a demolition order. He said that the additions maintained the character defining features of the house. In accordance with the Guidelines, he noted that the property owner will repair existing materials and replace exterior materials only as needed. Speaking in support of the application was Don Smith, 308 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He said the Association supported the project. Also speaking in support was Benjamin Briggs of Preservation Greensboro, Inc. located at 447 West Washington Street. He said this is an important project retaining the Craftsman style architecture of the house. He noted the homeowner is going to accept a preservation easement to prevent the demolition of the house. Also speaking in support were the homeowners, Tracy and Cheryl Pratt, of 108 Woodbourne Road. There was no one present speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Members discussed plans for landscaping and tree removal on the property. Mr. Cowhig indicated that major landscaping was planned for the project.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Lucas moved that based upon the facts presented in 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 staff comments, the staff report, and the following *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions* (page 75), guidelines 1 through 6; *Exterior Walls: Materials and Finishes* (page 44), guidelines 1 and 2; *Garages and Accessory Structures* (page 36) guidelines 2, 3, and 4; *Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (page 38), guidelines 1-6; *Patios and Decks* (page 41), guideline 4; *Trees and Landscaping* (page 22), guidelines 1 and 6; *Walkways, Driveways, and Parking Areas* (page 28), guidelines 4, 5, and 6; and *Fences and Walls* (page 24), guideline 6; are acceptable as finding 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 1478 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tracy Pratt for work at 910 Magnolia Street, seconded by Mr. Burroughs. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

- (f) **Location: Fisher Park**  
**Application No. 1477**  
**Applicant: Carl Myatt for Fisher Park Neighborhood Association**  
**Property Owner: City of Greensboro**  
**Date Application Received: 11-8-11** **(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Temporarily remove steps in West Park to permit excavation and inspection of stone wall.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**Fact:**

A stone wall was discovered near a set of steps in West Park. The Fisher Park Neighborhood Association would like to do some excavation to learn more about this historic feature of the park. Some of the steps would have to be removed temporarily to allow for excavation.

**Fact:**

Around 1990 a capital improvements bond package included funds to do streetscape work in the Fisher Park Historic District. Fisher Park residents decided to use the money to address the problem of erosion at the edges of the park caused by cars pulling off the road. This wall could have been covered by earth moving related to the creation of parking bays around the park.

**Guidelines for Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-Of-Way (page 18):**

*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. Future changes should maintain this character.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That the findings of the excavation be reported to the Historic Preservation Commission.
- That a COA be obtained for any permanent changes related to this project.

**In Support:**

Don Smith, 308 Parkway

**Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1477 for work in Fisher Park. The applicant is Carl Myatt for Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The description of work is to temporarily remove steps in West Park to permit excavation and inspection of stone wall. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that staff was in support of the application. The current wooden steps securing the wall are not congruous with the style of the park. Speaking in support of the application was Don Smith, 308 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association is in favor of the application. No one spoke in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1477 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments from *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 18)* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1477 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carl Myatt for the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association for work at the 402 Fisher Park Circle area with the following conditions: (1) that the findings of the excavation be reported to the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission, and (2) that a COA be obtained for any permanent changes, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**(g) Location: 601 Magnolia Street  
Application No. 1481  
Applicant: Cheryl Poole, Barry Allen  
Property Owner: same  
Date Application Received: 11-18-11**

**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace front porch flooring with composite tongue-and-groove porch flooring.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**Fact:**

The existing front porch floor is not original to the house. The floor was replaced at some point in time with wood tongue-and-groove porch flooring lumber. The replacement floor has not held up well probably because of the inferior quality of newer growth lumber or improper installation.

**Fact:**

The applicant is proposing to replace the floor with composite tongue-and-groove flooring. Composite flooring is available today that has the same characteristics as wood tongue-and-groove flooring and is intended to be painted. The fact that it is not wood will not be discernible.

**Guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies:**

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

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

**Recommended Conditions:**

- That a composite tongue-and-groove flooring be used that matches the design and dimensions of historic tongue-and-groove flooring and that it be painted.
- That the flooring be similar to Correct Porch™ or an equivalent product that uses wood fibers as a base ingredient and has a smooth finish.

**In Support:**

Don Smith, 308 Parkway

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1481 for work at 601 Magnolia Street. The applicants are Cheryl Poole and Barry Allen. The description of work is to replace front porch flooring with composite tongue-and-groove porch flooring. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that staff recommended in favor of granting this COA with conditions. He felt the application was congruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62). Also speaking in support of the application was Don Smith, 308 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The Association supported the replacement of the porch floor but they did not support the use of synthetic materials.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Cowhig clarified that staff is in favor of giving the applicant the option of using either wood or composite material. It was suggested that a closer look should be taken if the applicant chooses to use a composite material. Mr. Sears commented that he would like to see samples of the material to be used. Ms. Cantrell expressed her inclination to disapprove the use of composite or synthetic material at this point even as a test case. Mr. Burroughs felt that the full range of alternatives had not been exhausted and he suggested that a continuance be granted with a physical example of the material to be used brought back at the next meeting. Mr. Macy suggested approving the application with wood and attaching a condition that if the option of a composite material is chosen, the applicant must return to the Commission with samples.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Burroughs moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1481 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) and staff comments from

the agenda packet are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Burroughs moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1481 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Cheryl Poole and Barry Allen for work at 601 Magnolia Street with the following condition: (1) that the porch be replaced with wood and if not wood, then the applicant must bring back a sample of the synthetic material being considered for approval by the Commission, seconded by Mr. Sears. Mr. Burroughs accepted a friendly amendment made by Chair Wharton that the material be installed correctly and that the wood chosen be as close to the original as possible, seconded by Mr. Macy. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

**DOWNTOWN GREENWAY UPDATE:**

Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street, is the Project Manager for the Downtown Greenway. She updated members on progress being made on the Downtown Greenway project since her last presentation in May, 2010.

Ms. Sanders stated that a small Phase I section of the Greenway opened in the Warnersville neighborhood in May, 2010. Phase 1A, West Lee Street heading north toward Spring Garden Street, is scheduled to open in the spring of 2012. Phases 1B and 1C, Eugene Street and Bragg Street heading east toward Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and then heading toward the intersection of Lee Street and Murrow Boulevard, should be in active design in the spring of 2012.

Phase II, heading from Lee Street and Murrow Boulevard under Summit Avenue toward Greene Street, represents a major roadway project. Design work should be completed by the end of 2012 with construction anticipated to begin in 2014. Ms. Sanders indicated that this is the most expensive section of the Greenway to build and additional funding sources are being explored.

Phase III goes from the intersection of Fisher Avenue and Greene Street to Eugene Street southward to Smith Street and west to the railroad tracks. Ms. Sanders anticipated that design plans should be complete by January, 2012 and construction should begin in the spring or summer of 2012.

Ms. Sanders explained that Phase IV is currently an active railroad corridor. Design and construction dates will be determined when the railroad line is no longer in use

She commented that special art pieces, public benches, drinking fountains, and bike racks would be located along the trail. She also described innovative systems of trash management and storm water treatment planned for the Greenway.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Wharton stated that the subcommittee for the Heritage Community is in process of scheduling a meeting time to move forward with the project.

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig reported that staff received a very good response from the State on the Certified Local Government Annual Report. Chair Wharton thanked staff for their exemplary job.



**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

Ms. Bowers stated that Preservation Greensboro has taken ownership of Blandwood from the John Motley Morehead Commission. Easements are planned that would prevent the building from being demolished in the future.

**ADJOURN:**

The next meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission is planned for January, 25, 2012.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd