

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JANUARY 27, 2010
(draft)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Thomas Sears; Jennifer Burns; Ann Bowers; Andrena Coleman; and Cynthia Hatfield.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Housing and Community Development (HCD); and Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the January 27, 2010 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.

1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Mr. Spencer was approved.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 9, 2009 MINUTES:

Ms. Bowers moved to approve the December 9, 2009 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Bowers. Nays: None.)

2. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 910 Magnolia Street**
Application No. 1263
Applicant: Wanda Hovander, City of Greensboro Engineering and Inspections Department
Property Owner: Thelma Keaton Estate, c/o John O'Brien
Date Application Received: 12-18-09 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Demolition of house pursuant to Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. The staff recommends that the date of issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed 365 days. In the staff's opinion, delaying the approval of this application for 365 days under NC state enabling legislation will be congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines-Demolition (page 73)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This house is classified as a “contributing” structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. Its removal will do harm to overall quality of the historic district.

Fact:

The house appears to be in sound 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.

Conditions:

- That the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 60 days of demolition and the property be maintained.
- 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:

John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court

Summary:

Vice-Chairman Wharton stated that this is Application Number 1263 for work at 910 Magnolia Street. The applicant is Wanda Hovander with the City of Greensboro, Department of Engineering and Inspections. The application is for demolition of the house pursuant to the Minimum Standards Ordinance. Mike Cowhig, with the City of Greensboro, stated that the house is classified as a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District and removal of the house will harm the overall quality of the district. The house appears to be in sound structural condition although there are a number of housing deficiencies that would make this a good candidate for restoration and continued use as a single family dwelling. He indicated that the Minimum Housing Standards Commission (MHSC) has approved the demolition and the Historic Preservation Commission must approve this application by law; however, the demolition can be delayed by 365 days. A petition for Demolition by Neglect has been submitted on this house but Code Enforcement was already working on the investigation. Wanda Hovander, City of Greensboro, explained the processes involved and that the MHSC would not rehear this case. After 90 days following the expiration of the Order to Demolish, there was a 6-month window under which the homeowner could post a bond for the cost of demolition and hire a licensed general contractor. The homeowner would have six months to repair the house. This provision of the law would be made moot if the Commission decided to delay the demolition for 365 days. She also explained that the six-month delay could not extend after the Commission’s decision to delay. There was no one present to speak in favor of the application. Speaking in opposition was John McLendon of #2 Magnolia Court. He is the President of Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood does not want the house demolished and he encouraged the City to proceed quickly with the demolition of the shed on the property which has already been approved for demolition. He felt the shed should be demolished quickly as an indication to the owner of the City’s intention to demolish the house. The neighborhood association is eager to work with the City, Preservation Greensboro, and the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund to find ways to save this property. He expressed concerns about the nature of the Demolition Ordinance possibly not giving time for repairs. Commissioners also asked that the value of the house and a list of repairs be made available for potential buyers of the property.

Discussion:

Members indicated that their earlier questions regarding this application provided sufficient discussion and there was little option left in this case.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 1263 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, proposed conditions, and guidelines under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Demolition (page 73)* to delay demolition 365 days are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Bowers. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 1263 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Wanda Hovander with the City of Greensboro Engineering and Inspections Department for work at 910 Magnolia Street with the following conditions: (1) That the site of the house be graded and seeded with grass within 60 days of demolition and the property be maintained, (2) 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, and that the Commission delays the demolition 365 days, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Bowers. Nays: None.)

**(b) Location: 312 Isabel Street
Application No. 1269
Applicant: William Martin
Date Received: 1-11-10**

(CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Construction of garage.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project, with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed structure is sited at the rear of the house and accessed by an existing driveway that will be extended. Both alternative site plans are similar to garage siting patterns found in the neighborhood.

Fact:

The garage is two bays wide with a single entrance in order to accommodate a boat. The total size is 376 square feet. There are numerous examples of two car garages in the neighborhood. The footprint of the garage is less than half the footprint of the house.

Fact:

The garage will be constructed of lap siding similar in design to the siding of the house. The roof will have exposed rafters, some overhang, and a dormer similar to the roof of the house.

Guidelines (page 36) :

1. *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.*
2. *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.*
3. *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*

Proposed Conditions:

- That a site plan that shows accurate measurements for structures, driveway, distances to property lines and spacing between structures be submitted and approved by staff prior to construction.
- That the Willow Oak tree be protected during construction.
- That roofing shingle color match the color of the house roof.

In Support:

John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is Application number 1269 for work at 312 Isabel Street. The applicant is William Martin and the description is for work on a garage. Mr. Cowhig indicated that the applicant met with the Design Review team and they suggested he incorporate design features such as a wider overhang using lap siding and dormers in order to make the project more congruous with the design guidelines. He said the proposed structure is sited at the rear of the house and accessed by an existing driveway that will be extended. The applicant has submitted two alternative plans which are similar to garage site patterns found in the neighborhood. The garage is two bays wide with a single entrance to accommodate a boat. The total size is 376 square feet. There are numerous examples of two-car garages in the neighborhood. The footprint is less than half that of the house which makes the size and scale congruous with the house. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff was recommending a number of conditions as follows: (1) That a site plan that shows accurate measurements for structures, driveway, distances to property lines and spacing between structures be submitted and approved by staff prior to construction, (2) That the Willow Oak tree be protected during construction, and (3) That roofing shingle color match the color of the house roof. In response to a question, Ms. Geary indicated that the applicant had discussed using two concrete strips instead of a solid concrete driveway to the rear of the house and expressed no objection to that concept. In support of the application was John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court, who is President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the neighborhood was in support of the concept and the conditions mentioned by staff. They were concerned that the tree in the rear of the property required protection. Commission members expressed concern with the HVAC unit on the side of the house and were in favor of the applicant submitting a detailed plan showing the positioning of the unit.

Discussion:

Comments were made that the design of the garage was very good; however, the drawing was inappropriate because it showed the concrete at the side of the house and it did not take into account the setback off the property line. Members felt a precise set of drawings to scale was necessary and not enough information was provided.

Mr. Sears moved to continue this application, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Bowers. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location: 811 Cypress Street**
Application No. 1268
Applicant: Shirrell A. Williams
Property Owner: Guilford County Schools
Date Application Received: 1-12-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of informational sign next to walkway to front entrance of school near public sidewalk.

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:

Fact:

The proposed sign is constructed of brick. It is a low sign of simple design, constructed of brick, in the location of the former school sign.

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.*

Proposed Conditions:

- That the total height of the sign not exceed 5'.
- That the brick be similar to the brick of the school or other approved school signage and a sample be provided to staff prior to construction.

In Support:

Cassandra Mayo, 2107 Starlight Drive
 Linda Foscoe, 721 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is Application number 1268 for work at 811 Cypress Street. The applicant is Shirrell A. Williams with Guilford County Schools. The description is for construction of informational sign next to walkway to front entrance of school near public sidewalk. Mr. Cowhig indicated that this would be a two-sided sign parallel to the walkway in front of the school similar to one that he showed Commissioners at Sternberger Elementary School. He felt the sign at Aycok School would be similar to the one at Sternberger except the Aycok sign should be a little smaller. The sign will not be internally lighted. Staff recommended approval of this application with conditions. Ms. Geary also added that the Commission previously approved a sign for Aycok School at the corner of Bessemer and Cypress which she referred to as the "neighborhood" sign. Staff is working with the neighborhood association and the Aycok School PTA to coordinate the design between the neighborhood sign and the PTA sign. The PTA sign is the sign referred to in this application. Speaking in favor of the application was Cassandra Mayo of 2107 Starlight Drive.

She is Aycock School PTA President. She stated that the PTA is working with Pine Hall Brick with the hope of having the brick donated. Pine Hall cannot duplicate the brick on the school at no charge; however, they can donate brick to match as closely as possible. The school wants to use brick that is donated. Also speaking in support of this application was Linda Foscoe of 721 Fifth Avenue. She is a member of the Aycock Neighborhood Association Board of Directors. She indicated that the Board supported the application but they have asked for a modification on the brick surround to include brick caps on either side of the sign that match the brick caps that appear on the neighborhood sign at the corner of Yanceyville and Summit Avenue.

Ms. Hatfield moved to excuse Ms. Coleman from the meeting, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Hatfield, Bowers. Nays: None.)

Discussion:

In response to a question, Mr. Cowhig clarified that the sign will be parallel to the walkway but perpendicular to the sidewalk. Members commented that the sign would look better if it was lower because it is a contemporary shape, not a traditional one. Ms. Geary stated that she and Ms. Mayo discussed concern with the height of the sign in an earlier conversation. Ms. Mayo discussed the placement of the sign and possibly shrinking the cabinet size of the sign. The Group clarified options available to Ms. Mayo who decided to proceed with conditions attached to the application.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 1268 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines—Signs (page 33)* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Hatfield. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Hatfield, Bowers. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 1268 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sherrill Williams for work at 811 Cypress Street with the following conditions: (1) That the total height of the sign not exceed 5', (2) That the brick be similar to the brick of the school or other approved school signage and a sample be provided to staff prior to construction, (3) That the brick caps be placed upon the columns similar to those on the neighborhood sign on Yanceyville and Summit, (4) That the sign be kept in scale with the lowered height, and (5) That final project approval is to be given by staff, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Hatfield, Bowers. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the demolition delay for 111 Cypress Street ends on February 25, 2010. The owner has made progress but at this point it is uncertain if repairs ordered by the Inspections Department have been made. There is an upcoming meeting with the Inspections Department to discuss the status of repairs on the property.

Mr. Cowhig updated members on progress being made regarding Commission membership. Staff has advertised the openings and is now working on the process to have applicants appointed by City Council.

Mr. Cowhig informed Commissioners that the case involving window replacement at the house on Leftwich Street has gone to the Legal Department and a lawsuit has been initiated.

Ms. Geary clarified responses from members planning to attend the Historic Preservation Dinner.

Ms. Burns reminded members that the issue of rezoning the Newman-Whitney Machine Company property will go before City Council on March 2, 2010. She encouraged members to support the neighborhood.

ADJOURN:

Ms. Hatfield moved to adjourn the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Hatfield, Bowers. Nays: None.)

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
FEBRUARY 24, 2010
(draft)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Thomas Sears; Jennifer Burns; Doug Spencer; Andrena Coleman; and Cynthia Hatfield.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Housing and Community Development (HCD); and Jim Clark, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the February 24, 2010 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.

1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

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

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 27, 2010 MINUTES:

Mr. Sears moved to approve the January 27, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission unanimously voted 5-0 in favor of the motion.

2. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 312 Isabel Street**
 Application No. 1269
 Applicant: William Martin
 Date Received: 1-11-10 **(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Construction of garage.

Note: This application was continued at the last meeting. Since then staff has met with the contractor and a revised site plan has been submitted showing the proposed location of the garage. The storage shed will be moved to the left rear corner of the lot and a tree will be removed and a new tree started. The HVAC equipment will be relocated to the back of the house and the driveway extended leaving green space between the house and the driveway.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project, with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The proposed structure is sited at the rear of the house and accessed by an existing driveway that will be extended. The proposed location of the garage is consistent with garage locations in the neighborhood.

Fact:

The garage is two bays wide with a single entrance in order to accommodate a boat. The total size is 376 square feet. There are numerous examples of two car garages in the neighborhood. The footprint of the garage is less than half the footprint of the house.

Fact:

The garage will be constructed of lap siding similar in design to the siding of the house. The roof will have exposed rafters, some overhang, and a dormer similar to the roof of the house.

Guidelines (page 36):

1. *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.*
2. *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.*
3. *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*

Proposed Conditions:

- That a new shade tree of at least 2" caliper be started. If the tree dies within 2 years it will be replaced.
- That roofing shingle color match the color of the house roof.
- That the dormer window be divided into two parts.
- That a green planting area be maintained between the house and driveway.

In Support:

William Martin, 312 Isabel Street
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1269 for work at 312 Isabel Street. The applicant is William Martin and the description is construction of a garage. Staff reported that this was continued from the last meeting due to questions from the Commission and need for more information. A site plan has been submitted and staff met with the contractor. The storage shed has been relocated in the site plan. The current plan requires removal of a tree which is proposed to be replaced. The applicant will relocate the HVAC on the side of the house making the driveway go straight back. This has been reviewed by the Design Review Committee and staff recommends approval of this application with conditions. Speaking in favor of the application was William Martin of 312 Isabel Street. He said they propose to keep the 3' wide grass strip next to the house. The driveway would go straight back and widen at the fence line. In the back yard there is a 5' separation between the driveway and the neighbor's yard. A willow oak will be lost where the garage is proposed to be built. In response to Commissioner's questions, he said he would be willing to put trim around the windows and doors. Questions were asked about what kind of materials would be used. A quote was submitted in evidence of showing the original quote was for vinyl siding. Also speaking in support was Robert Kantlehner representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. They are in favor of the application. He recommends a window on the

side of the house to make it consistent and he wanted a ribbon-style driveway to be considered. Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 4:33.

Discussion:

Ms. Burns expressed concern with the practicality of ribbon strips for the driveway as the owner will be backing a boat down the drive. Commissioners discussed the materials and felt wood lap siding or smooth finish hardy should be considered. Mr. Spencer felt the windows should be simulated divided light with exterior muntins. Members discussed materials for the door to the garage and Mr. Cowhig stated he felt it should be a utility-looking door. Vice-Chair Wharton suggested a metal or fiberglass door to the side entrance as it would not be visible to the street. It was suggested that the big door should not be vinyl. The guidelines discourage the use of vinyl, aluminum, or plywood panels. Mr. Spencer suggested that the materials should be approved at staff level and a cut sheet provided. He also discouraged putting a window on the side of the garage for security reasons.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Sears moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1269 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 36 that state: (1) 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, (2) 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 (3) 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. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer. Nays: None.) Ms. Hatfield abstained from the vote as she was not present at the beginning of the presentation.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Sears moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1269 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to William Martin of 312 Isabel Street with the following conditions: (1) That the driveway will be coordinated to the existing driveway, (2) A green planting area will be maintained between the house and the driveway, (3) That a new canopy tree of at least 2-inch caliper will be started and if the tree dies within two years it will be replaced, (4) That the roof and shingle color will match the color of the house, (5) The dormer window will be divided into two parts, (6) A cut sheet must be approved by staff, (7) The siding must be either wood, smooth hardy plank, or a composite that is of acceptable material to be approved by staff, (8) That appropriate trim is needed around the doors and windows, and (9) That the front main door should be compatible fiberglass material with staffs approval, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer. Nays: None.) Ms. Hatfield abstained from the vote as she was not present at the beginning of the presentation.

- (b) Location: 900 Carolina Street**
Application No. 1279 Amendment to 1176
Applicant: Jeff and Mary Beach
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 2-10-10 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Construction of additions to house; relocation of garage; tree removal and landscaping plan at back of house.

Note: This amendment is for changes to the approved plans. The addition on the south side of the house has been eliminated. A garden pavilion is proposed instead.

Staff Recommendation:

The staff recommends in favor of approving this amendment to the Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (page 35) and Fences and Walls (page 24)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The garden pavilion is small 22'x 14', and it will be located at the back of the house. Materials and design elements such as the roof balustrade will match those 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.*

Fact:

A wood picket fence with brick base and brick line posts will enclose the back yard. The materials and design are compatible with historic fences and walls found in the historic districts.

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.*

In Support:

Joe Bauer, 811 Lily Avenue (New Age Builders)
Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1279, an amendment to former application 1176. The address is 900 Carolina Street and the applicants are Jeff and Mary Beach. This is an amended plan to build the garden pavilion from the plan previously approved by this Commission. Staff recommends in favor of this amended plan. The pavilion is small, 22' x 14', and would be located at the back of the house. The material and design elements will match those of the house. The wood picket fence will have a brick base and a brick-lined post will enclose the back of the backyard. Materials and design are compatible with fences and walls found in the historic district. Speaking in favor of the application was Joe Bauer, 811 Lily Avenue, with New Age Builders. He noted that the building elements are designed to match those of the existing screen porch. Also speaking in favor of the application was Robert Kantlehner, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He stated that the neighborhood association approves of this application.

Discussion:

Members commented that they felt this was a great accessory structure and it was very reminiscent of many of those that have been lost in the neighborhood from earlier years. It combines the older

design with the newer interest in indoor-outdoor spaces. Ms. Hatfield thanked the applicants for their efforts and added that it is a great addition. Co-Chair Wharton commended the applicants on the attention to detail that complimented the rest of the house. Mr. Spencer liked the separation from the main structure and felt the addition was elegant and would be enjoyed. Ms. Burns felt the addition complemented the symmetry of the applicant's original plan.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Spencer moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 1279, an amendment to former application 1176, and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and the following guidelines on page 36, (2) *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example, (3) Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished, and (4) New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house* along with the following guideline on 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; are acceptable as finding of fact*, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Spencer moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application number 1279, an amendment to former application 1176, and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jeff and Mary Beach for work at 900 Carolina, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Application No. 1280 (Amendment to 1247)**
Location: 409 S. Mendenhall Street
Applicant: Kurt Kronenfeld
Property Owner: Presbyterian Campus Ministry of Greensboro
Date Received: 2-10-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of single-family residence.

Note: The Certificate of Appropriateness application was approved on condition that the applicant would present a revised site plan and information on materials. The applicant is requesting that some of the materials be changed. The windows would be aluminum clad one-over-one double-hung, and the porch floor would be a composite material.

Staff Recommendation:

The staff recommends in favor of approving this amendment to the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed materials and the site plan are congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 80) Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 24) and Trees and Landscaping (page 20)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The previous site plan showed 5 parking spaces at the back of the house and very little green space. The revised site plan shows 4 parking spaces and significantly more green space. A walkway from the sidewalk to the street was added.

Guidelines (page 30):

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

In Support:

Kurt Kronenfeld, 3909 Hazel Lane
Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1280, amended from application number 1247, for work at 409 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Kurt Kronenfeld and the description is for changes to approved renovation and presentation of materials for construction of a new house. Mr. Cowhig stated that this is a revised plan. The applicant was requested to submit a revised site plan that reduced the number of parking spaces from five to four to allow for more green space. They are amending the plan for one over one windows. He stated that these are consistent with the neighborhood. He stated that aluminum vinyl siding double hung windows possess most of the characteristics of new wood windows and tend to last longer than inexpensive wood windows. Commissioners noted that the site plan still needs more screening and the bathroom windows as shown in the architectural drawings do not appear to be properly placed. Speaking in support of the application was Kurt Kronenfeld of 3909 Hazel Lane. He stated that the bathroom window issue has been addressed and he brought a clad one over one exterior window for the Commissioners to examine. He said the sashes were mostly wood but the exterior framing is a polymer that the group identified as PVC. This material was chosen for durability. He also showed a sample of porch flooring material that had a rounded off finish on the front. He stated that they would return with a landscape plan. He said that the walkway from the parking lot to the side porch entrance would be concrete and the edging of the pea gravel parking lot would be submitted with the landscape plan. Also speaking was Gary Comer, 2804 Beaconwood, who stated that the area surrounding the two trees in the parking lot had asphalt removed from around them. It was removed 12 or 15 feet from the tree roots and no damage was done to the roots. He was unable to say how close the turnaround area on the site plan in the parking lot would come to the two trees. Also speaking in favor was Julie Davenport of 821 Rankin Place. She represented the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The association approved aluminum clad windows that were different from the ones shown. They support aluminum clad windows that would not be paintable or would not be PVC. The association approved a tongue and groove flooring; however, they did not support the width of the flooring material shown. Ms. Davenport wanted to make sure that the flooring ran perpendicular to the house, rather than parallel. The association felt that the driveway should go from twin strips directly to pea gravel and preferred that there not be a transitional area of concrete in between. They also wanted the issue of the porch ceiling to be addressed so that it had a tongue and groove bead board appearance. In addition, the association felt that there should be as much green space as possible on the property.

Discussion:

Ms. Burns suggested continuing this case until more details could be made available regarding materials and the parking area. Mr. Spencer indicated that he would like to hear from the Urban Forester and stated his concern with the parking plan and tree preservation. Ms. Burns was hesitant with the PVC material and the width of the porch floor materials. Vice-Chair Wharton felt caution should be taken setting precedents with new materials in historic districts. Mr. Spencer commented that the numerous amounts of staples in the window material increased the chance of the material causing problems and being short lived. Mr. Cowhig indicated new composite materials are

available made primarily of wood fiber and polymer that could be painted and used on the porch floor. Vice-Chair Wharton summarized that the Commission was not satisfied with the window and flooring product samples. Members indicated they did not want to hold up the project and the group discussed the use of a powder coated fully aluminum clad exterior window. Mr. Kronenfeld indicated that he was willing to drop the fourth car space in the parking lot and he would provide a mock-up of the flooring material. There was also a discussion relating to the use of scored bead board on the porch ceiling. The Commission agreed to approve the windows with hardy trim and requested that the applicant return with a landscaping plan and porch flooring materials.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1280, amended from application 1247, 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 80) Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 24) and Trees and Landscaping (page 20)* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1280, amended from application 1247, and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Presbyterian Campus Ministry of Greensboro for work at 409 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) That the window be powder coated aluminum clad fully clad wood window, (2) That the trim be smooth hardy trim, (3) That the applicant returns to the Commission to discuss the porch flooring and parking layout, (4) That they consult with the City Urban Forester on the parking layout, and (5) That staff approves dimension of the trim and windows as well, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

Mr. Sears moved to excuse Ms. Hatfield from the meeting, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Burns, Coleman, Spencer. Nays: None.) Ms. Hatfield left the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Vice-Chair Wharton informed members that the Demolition Order for 111 Cypress Street is in effect.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig brought members up to date on membership. One new member is in process of being appointed leaving two additional vacancies. He hopes to fill the vacancies as soon as possible.

Mr. Cowhig discussed holding a training session for members. He will advise the Commission when a date has been set.

A class from UNC-Greensboro, along with Professor Austin Michael, was present during the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. They requested comments from Mr. Cowhig and members on orders for Demolition by Neglect. Counsel Clark also participated in the discussion.

Ms. Coleman left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR:

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Street, addressed the Commission regarding the Newman-Whitney property. The College Hill neighborhood is opposed to the student dormitory project proposed for the site. She updated members on the project. The number of beds has been reduced to the 600 range from the original plan for 770 beds, and a parking lot has been added behind heavily owner-occupied houses on Mendenhall Street. The association had a successful fund raiser and sign campaign. She encouraged anyone opposed to the dormitory project to attend the City Council meeting. Information is available on the website www.savecollegehill.com. The neighborhood association is adamant that a better development can be done on the large piece of property.

ADJOURN:

The next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on March 31, 2010.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:46 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 31, 2010
(draft)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Thomas Sears; Doug Spencer; Andrena Coleman; Ann Bowers; Cynthia Hatfield, and Jill Spaeh.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Housing and Community Development (HCD).

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the March 31, 2010 Historic Preservation Commission meeting. He stated that Approval of Absences and Approval of the February 24, 2010 Minutes would be heard when a quorum of members was present.

Mr. Cowhig stated that since there were no public hearing items on the agenda, the focus of the meeting would be training and discussing issues.

MEETING PROCEDURES TRAINING AND DISCUSSION OF HISTORIC DISTRICT PROGRAM ISSUES:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that the Planning Department and the Housing and Community Development Department will be merging effective July 1, 2010. He explained how the merger would affect the Historic Preservation Department. All of the functions of the Historic District Program would be in the same department along with Local Ordinance Enforcement, Minimum Housing, and Zoning Enforcement.

Ms. Spaeh joined the meeting at 4:08 p.m. Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed Ms. Spaeh, the Commission's newest member. He added that a quorum of members was now in attendance.

The City Manager has recommended the alignment of budgetary decisions with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Cowhig suggested that the Commission discuss ways to improve the Historic District Program and incorporate some time into each meeting to continue the discussion over the next few months.

Mr. Cowhig pointed out that the adoption of the new Land Development Ordinance would also have an affect on the Historic District Program. Staff has been asked to look at expanding the rules, procedures, and guidelines to have all the information relating to the Historic District Program and the Commission in one place.

The Commission discussed the importance of information contained in the Historic District Manual and Design Guidelines and agreed that it should be required that all homeowners in the historic district be given the manual upon moving in. Vice-Chairman Wharton asked staff to investigate ways to get the Manual into the hands of new homeowners in the historic districts.

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

Members discussed the need for one dedicated enforcement officer working with the three historic districts at all times. Vice-Chairman Wharton suggested the formation of a neighborhood coordinator who would act as a point person between City staff and neighborhood representatives to deal with problems in a more comprehensive way.

Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Mr. Cowhig distributed copies of the Rules of Procedure to members for their review. He introduced the idea of adding a consent agenda to streamline the meetings and members discussed the concept from a procedural point of view.

Mr. Cowhig pointed out that staff has started preparing a list for Commissioners of projects that do not require a COA, projects that can be approved at staff level, and projects that should come before the Commission. Commissioners agreed that it would be very helpful to review the list at every meeting and discuss questionable items.

Following a lengthy discussion on adding a consent agenda, the Commission decided to table the idea for now and reconsider the idea as the program grows.

Mr. Cowhig reviewed the procedure regarding the election of officers. He stated that unlike the Historic Preservation Commission, other boards and commissions elected their own Chairman. He checked with the Legal Department and there is no problem changing the rules of procedure for members to have an election of the Chairman. The Commission agreed that this was a good idea.

Mr. Cowhig informed the Commission that the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions is conducting Commission Training in Hillsboro, North Carolina on May 1, 2010. The City will pay the registration fee if members are interested in attending.

He also handed out copies of an article by James Reap entitled, "*How to Conduct a Preservation Meeting.*" Topics of discussion generated from the article included effective communication, the role of the Chairman, and room placement. Members discussed the viability of the room currently being used along with the seating arrangements. Mr. Cowhig commented that feedback indicated the audience was more comfortable in the current room than in Council Chambers. Members discussed audience and member seating and decided to rearrange the set-up at the next meeting to improve communication.

Mr. Cowhig referred to a handout and introduced discussions on topics including non-participating members, being prepared for meetings, acknowledging the public, assuming too much, conflicts of interest, side conversations during meetings, introducing facts that do not support decisions, acting outside of purview, attempting to design, and using language that makes a decision seem based on personal opinions rather than guidelines..

The Commission also discussed increasing the deadline for applications from two weeks to three weeks. Comments were made that although the increase would insure that all interested parties had sufficient time to review the application, feedback from the public might not be positive. Mr. Cowhig commented that a public meeting on the Guidelines is being planned and he will request feedback from the districts at the meeting on the idea of increasing the deadline for applications.

Mr. Cowhig stated that he would like to continue the training discussion at another meeting. He also requested feedback from the Commission at the next meeting on the rules of procedure along with any other ideas in light of the upcoming merger.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 24, 2010 MINUTES:

Mr. Spencer moved to approve the February 24, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Spencer moved to excuse the absence of Ms. Burns, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

None.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

None.

SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR:

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, was present to represent the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She requested copies of the Guidelines to distribute to new residents in the neighborhood. She stated that she was in support of the merger and cross-training the enforcement officers. She felt that the enforcement officer should attend the Commission meetings to insure that the process works more efficiently.

She invited the Commission to join the College Hill neighborhood at the next City Council meeting to hear the request of Edwards Communities to override the Zoning Commission's decision in favor of the neighborhood. She reiterated the negative impact the student housing dormitory would have on the College Hill neighborhood.

ADJOURN:

The next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held on April 28, 2010.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:06 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 28, 2010
(draft)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns;
Doug Spencer; Andrena Coleman; Ann Bowers; Jill Spaeh,
and Cynthia Hatfield.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Housing and Community
Development (HCD); and Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the April 28, 2010 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.

1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Thomas Sears was approved.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 31, 2010 MINUTES:

Mr. Spencer moved to approve the March 31, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission unanimously voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

2. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 611 Fifth Avenue**
 Application No. 1294
 Applicant: Sam Holcomb
 Property Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 4-12-10 (APPROVED WITH NO 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—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) and *Additions* (page 75) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The screened porch will be constructed at the back of the house. The addition is relatively small, 13'6" by 11'8". The gabled roof of the addition will be integrated with the main roof with shingles that match the

house. The porch roof will be lower than the main roof of the house and not visible from the street. The addition will be clearly delineated from the house by screening and framing.

Fact:

All materials will be wood and designed to match features on the house including fascia and soffit detailing and wood shingled gable ends. The foundation will be brick piers with wood lattice. The steps will be wood decking material.

Guidelines, page 64:

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

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.

Mr. Spencer asked to be recused from this case due to a conflict of interest. Ms. Bowers moved to recuse Mr. Spencer, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

In Support:

Doug Spencer, 407 Ridgeway Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1294 for work at 611 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Sam Holcombe. This is an application to construct a screened porch addition at the rear of the house. Mr. Cowhig, Housing and Community Development, noted that this is a revision to a previously approved application. The main change in this application is that the roofline of the porch addition is more integrated into the roofline of the house. The screen porch will be constructed onto the back of the house and the addition is relatively small. The gabled roof will be integrated into the main roof of the house with shingles that match the house. The porch will be lower than the house and will not be visible from the street. The addition will be clearly delineated from the house by screens. Speaking in favor of this was Doug Spencer of 407 Ridgeway Drive. Mr. Spencer was present to answer questions for the owner, Sam Holcombe. In response to a question from Ms. Coleman, Mr. Spencer indicated that the project would begin as soon as approval was given.

Discussion:

Members commented that they liked this design better than the first design.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Coleman moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1294 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) and *Additions* (page 75), are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Coleman moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1294 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sam Holcombe for work at 611 Fifth Avenue with no conditions, seconded by Ms. Bower. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

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

- (b) **Location: 755 Percy Street**
Application No. 1296
Applicant: Justin Smith
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 4-14-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Create screened porch by adding wood framing, screening and roof covering to existing pergola-patio structure at rear of house.

Staff Approval:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines— Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) and *Additions* (page 75) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The screened porch will be created by modifying the existing porch-pergola on the back elevation of the house that is not visible from the street. The screened porch will not involve any changes to the original structure.

Fact:

Wood will be used for the framing. The roof will be ribbed style panels that block out the sun's rays but allows light. Because the roof is nearly flat with wide exposed rafters, the covering material will not be easily noticeable and it will be completely hidden from the street. It is a very durable and cost effective material.

Guidelines, page 64:

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

Guidelines, page 76:

7. In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.
8. Distinguish additions from the original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material.
9. Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of the historic structure are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.

10. 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.
11. Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.
12. Minimize site disturbance for construction of additions to reduce the possibility of destroying site features and/or existing trees.

In Support:

Justin Smith, 755 Percy Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1296 for work at 755 Percy Street. The applicant is Justin Smith. The description of work is create a screened porch by adding wood framing, screening and roof covering to existing pergola-patio structure at rear of house. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff supports this application and feels it is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) and *Additions* (page 75). The porch will be created by modifying the existing porch-pergola. The back elevation is not visible from the street and the screen porch will not involve any changes to the original structure. Wood will be used for the framing and the roof will be rib-style panels that block out of sun's rays. Because the roof is nearly flat and with the wide exposed rafters, the covering material will not be noticeable and will be completely hidden from the street. In response to a question from Ms. Burns, Mr. Cowhig indicated that this material has been used once before in Fisher Park. Speaking in favor was the applicant, Justin Smith, of 755 Percy Street. He noted that the rafters of the porch would be raised to just under the house's soffits and would be attached with brackets. The roofing material would extend to the end of the current porch.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers commented that she was not fond of the material; however, she does not object as it meets the guidelines and is hidden. Mr. Spencer noted a structural concern and pointed out to the applicant that he may want to consider some solid blocking between the rafters to stabilize the screws to avoid the material blowing away in a strong gust of wind. Ms. Hatfield indicated that she liked the material and felt that it would work well on top of a pergola. Ms. Burns stated that she did not prefer the plastic-like roof material but would support it as it was not attached to a historic structure. She added that she would like to see roofing material trimmed so that it did not extend beyond the pergola beams. Members discussed whether or not the material of the screen door should be wood. Ms. Hatfield felt that the door did not have to be wood because it was not part of the original structure.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1296 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines—Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) and *Additions* (page 75), are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1296 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Justin Smith for work at 755 Percy Street with the following conditions: (1) that if the screen door at the back of the screened porch is other than wood, the door can be approved at staff level; (2) that the material not extend past an inch or two of the roof rafters, just sufficient to create a drip line to prevent deterioration of the rafters, seconded

by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

(c) Application No. 1300 (Amendment to #1247)

Location: 409 S. Mendenhall Street

Applicant: Kurt Kronenfeld

Property Owner: Presbyterian Campus Ministry of Greensboro

**Date Received: 10-14-09 (Part I—APPROVED WITH CONDITION,
Part II—APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

Description of Work:

Construction of single-family residence; revised site plan, tree removal

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness amendment. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 80) Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 24) and Trees and Landscaping (page 20)* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The revised site plan reduces the number of parking spaces from 5 to 3 and offers more protection for the Oak trees at the back of the property. Several volunteer trees would be removed along with a Bradford Pear which has proven to be a short lived tree prone to splitting and cracking. A construction fence is provided to protect the Oak trees during construction. A new shade tree is proposed for the front yard. The site plan was developed in consultation with the City's Urban Forester and a Certified Arborist.

Guidelines, (page 80):

1. 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.

Guideline, (page 23):

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

Guidelines, (page 30):

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

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

5. Select appropriate materials for new driveways including concrete tracks (narrow strips), macadam, brick, and crushed stone. Conceal edging materials used for gravel driveways. Keep new driveway aprons and curb cuts to the minimum width possible. Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property.

In Support:

Gary Comer, 2504 Beaconwood Drive

Kurt Kronenfeld, 3909 Hazel Lane

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1300, an amendment to application number 1247, for work at 409 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Kurt Kronenfeld. The description is for the construction of a single family residence, revised site plan and tree removal. Mr. Cowhig stated that this is a revised plan in response to Commission concerns regarding parking and tree preservation. Mike Cusimano, Greensboro's Urban Tree Forester and a certified arborist with Davey Tree Service were consulted by staff. They determined that in order to preserve the two healthy oak trees at the rear of the property, parking would need to be reduced from five spots to three spots. There are other trees on the lot and one was determined to be a Bradford Pear. The Urban Forester identified volunteer trees on the lot that could be removed. Mr. Cowhig said that there would be a fence at the rear of the property to protect the mature oaks. The revised site plan shows a new tree to be added to the front of the property. He also mentioned that in regard to the door and floor materials, staff would still like to see a sample of composite tongue-and-groove porch material that matches the traditional dimensions. Staff is in support of this application. Speaking in support was Gary Comer of 2504 Beaconwood Drive. He said that the area to the rear of the property under the oak trees would be mulched as there is little light for turf to grow. He added that they would be willing to plant turf if requested by the Commission. The current fencing would remain on the north side and a six-foot privacy fence would be added to the rear of the property on the east side. Also speaking in support of this application was Kurt Kronenfeld of 3909 Hazel Lane. He reiterated that the fencing would remain on the north side along with a six-foot privacy fence. The front door would be a non-light fiberglass smooth finish painted door and the side door is proposed to be a four-paneled smooth finish fiberglass door. He also recommended that the configuration of the porch steps of the side porch be changed to face the rear of the house. With regard to the porch materials, Mr. Kronenfeld stated that they were unable to find 2 3/8 or comparable tongue-and-groove composite flooring; however, 5-inch tongue-and-groove flooring of 1-inch thickness is available. He said that if this alternate material is installed, it would be trimmed with breadboard style trim on the front. He also showed possible composite railing and suggested that they use square pickets with posts and decorative caps. Also speaking in favor was Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, with the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She said that the Association did not care if the Bradford Pear tree was removed, but would like the largest of the volunteer trees along the fence line to be kept. They also supported the change in configuration of the side porch steps. Speaking on her own behalf, Ms. Davenport stated that she would prefer a wooden side door. She also said that the Association would prefer to see smaller dimension tongue-and-groove porch flooring. They would prefer that the granite curbing be retained if the curb cut was changed on the site plan and they would like more clarification regarding the paving materials on the parking plan.

Discussion:

Ms. Bower noted that the only comments from staff pertain to the site plan and tree removal and she questioned if the Commission could address other issues not in the application. Mr. Cowhig clarified that this is a two-part application. The first part is an amendment for a new site plan and parking plan. The second part addresses materials to be brought back to the Commission as part of a condition to the original approval. He felt that two votes would be appropriate for this application.

- **Part I –Discussion: Site Plan and New Parking Lot**

The first vote involved the site plan which addressed the trees, steps, and the new parking lot. Members discussed the trees on the property. Ms. Hatfield felt it was reasonable to remove the least healthy trees along the north side. Mr. Spencer requested clarification on the walnut trees as it would be an asset to the neighborhood if they were allowed to remain. There was no objection to removal of the Bradford Pear tree. Mr. Kronenfeld clarified the position of the trees and the Urban Forester's comments regarding the trees. Mr. Spencer commented that procedurally, a written report from the Urban Forester should be part of the application package. Ms. Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, identified the trees that the Association would like to remain. Mr. Comer, 2504 Beaconwood Drive, commented that they would remove any trees the Commission instructed them to remove to expedite the project. The Group discussed which trees should be removed and Mr. Spencer commented that he was inclined to accept the Urban Forester's recommendation for tree removal. Ms. Geary was sworn in and stated her recollection of the meeting with the Urban Forester. Mr. Cowhig located the Urban Forester's report and read it into the record.

Vice-Chair Wharton asked if anyone would like to make a motion on the first part of this application regarding the site plan and parking.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1300 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 *Historic District Design Guidelines —New Construction (page 80), Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 24) and Trees and Landscaping (page 20)* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Hatfield. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1300 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kurt Kronenfeld and Presbyterian Campus Ministry of Greensboro for work at 409 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) that a landscaping plan be submitted for further approval, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

• **Part II –Discussion: Materials**

Mr. Cowhig clarified that the conditions under the original application stated that all construction materials be brought back to the Commission for review. Ms. Hatfield asked for information and details on the railing. Mr. Kronenfeld referred to a handout and indicated two choices that would be white in color with a smooth finish. There was a discussion regarding the choices and he offered to provide a specific mock-up for members to review. The Commission agreed that they would like to see specific railing and a final decision on steps, flooring, and railing was delayed until a later meeting. The Commission discussed the materials proposed by the applicant for the front and side doors. Ms. Burns commented that her preference was for traditional wood doors but she would consider solid wood. Mr. Spencer felt that the doors that opened onto the wrap-around porch should be of similar material, and he had no problem using a single-light door at the rear. Since this is new construction and the porch will be made largely from composite material, Vice-Chair Wharton did not object to using a good quality smooth-finish fiberglass door. Ms. Hatfield suggested that the Commission should go as a group to a local supplier and consider other materials that are acceptable. Vice-Chair Wharton agreed with her suggestion and felt that the materials list should be revised in the near future. Ms. Hatfield stated her opinion that a quality fiberglass door would be appropriate and that the front and side doors did not necessarily have to be the same material. Ms. Burns felt that the side door should be wooden as it acts as a front door as far as its visibility in the neighborhood. Ms. Spaeh agreed with Ms. Burns regarding the wooden door and felt that it was more appropriate on a historic house. She had no objection to using a fiberglass door on the rear.

Vice-Chair Wharton asked if anyone would like to make a motion on the second part of this application regarding materials.

Motion:

Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1300 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Kurt Kronenfeld and Presbyterian Campus Ministry of Greensboro for work at 409 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) that both the front and side doors be solid wood paneled doors, (2) that the rear door may be single-light with the light decision to be approved at staff level, and (3) the relocation of the side stairs exiting to the parking lot is acceptable as presented in the application, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Coleman, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns, Spencer, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

None.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that cars are still parking illegally in the First Presbyterian Church parking lot on North Elm Street. He indicated that First Presbyterian Church needed to go through the TRC process to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow parking on the lot. Staff is working with the Church to resolve the situation.

Mr. Cowhig distributed copies of certificates issued at staff level. He reviewed highlights of each certificate and reviewed how the process was handled at staff level. Certificates approved at staff level will be included in the informational packets each month.

Staff is working on a training opportunity in partnership with Guilford County called Triad Training. Mr. Cowhig will keep members informed on the progress of the event.

SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR:

David Hoggard, 108 Cypress Street, spoke to the Commission regarding the preservation of War Memorial Stadium. Many efforts have been made since 2003 to redesign and preserve War Memorial Stadium, one of two National Registry properties in the City. He reviewed the history of these efforts along with several proposed design schemes. The current design scheme removes a great deal of the structure and would only restore the front façade of the stadium. The Parks and Recreation Department recently approved this design scheme. Ms. Geary pointed out that this design probably would not allow the historic building to retain National Registry status.

Mr. Hoggard requested that the Commission start proceedings to bring War Memorial Stadium into the Aycock historic district. By being in a historic district, the stadium would be protected under the guidelines and demolition plans could be delayed for at least a year. He also stated that he wanted the stadium to be under county landmark status. The Group discussed the process, the timeline, and consequences of bringing the stadium into the historic district. Vice-Chair Wharton requested that Mr. Hoggard's request be included as an action item on the Commission's agenda next month.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 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 26, 2010
(draft)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Doug Spencer; Ann Bowers; Jill Spaeh; and Cynthia Hatfield.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Housing and Community Development (HCD); and Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the May 26, 2010 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.

1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absences of Ms. Coleman and Mr. Sears were excused.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 28, 2010 MINUTES:

Mr. Spencer moved to approve the April 28, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

2. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: North side West McGee Street near South Cedar Street**
Application No. 1314
Applicant: Mike Mabe, Manager, Street Maintenance Operations, Field Operations Dept.
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 4-22-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

A handrail on top of the culvert wall above the creek was damaged and removed by unknown persons. The City installed a chain link fence for public safety.

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, Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way and Fences and Walls*, if the recommended conditions are met, for the following reasons:

Facts:

The fence was installed to meet an urgent public safety need.

This location is an entrance into the historic district and across from the Wafco Mills building, a designated Guilford County Historic Landmark. This location is also on the proposed greenway route.

MSD funds could be used for a decorative railing to replace the existing fence.

Guidelines (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. Most streets retain their original granite curbs and brick gutters, with a grass strip separating the street from the sidewalk. Neighborhood streets are usually two lanes wide and somewhat narrow compared with current standards. Mature shade trees along many streets provide a green canopy. On some streets, standard streetlights have been replaced by decorative lighting fixtures of a more human scale, adding to the pedestrian character of the districts. Future changes should maintain this character.

Guidelines (page 24):

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

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.)

Recommended Condition:

- That City staff work with the neighborhood association on a replacement railing that is more compatible with the historic character of the district.
- That the fence be replaced within one year.

Support:

Virginia Haskett, 207 Tate Street
Mike Mabe, Field Operations Department, City of Greensboro

Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Chair Wharton stated that this is Application Number 1314 for work on the north side of West McGee Street near South Cedar Street. The applicant is Mike Mabe and the description of work is to replace a handrail across a culvert that was damaged and removed for pedestrian safety. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that based on information contained in the application staff recommends granting a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. He noted that the handrail will be on the proposed Greenway across from Wafco mills, a signature building in the historic district. The handrail will stand at one of the entrances to the historic district and is an important location. The handrail replacement also addresses an important public safety need. Mr. Cowhig quoted guidelines on pages 18 and 24 emphasizing the importance of neighborhood setting. He also recommended that the placement of the chain link fences be in rear yards only. The recommended conditions stated that staff should work with the neighborhood association on a replacement railing that is more compatible with the historic character of the district, and that the fence be replaced within one year of this meeting. Speaking in support of the application was Virginia Haskett of 207 Tate Street. She represented the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She indicated the neighborhood would like to have the fence replaced but they do not want to bear the cost of replacing it with their MSD funds. Also speaking in support was Mike Mabe with the City of Greensboro. He noted the cost of the chain link fence that is currently there

now was \$2,900 and it was a custom-made fence. Replacement of the original handrail would run around \$6,000. He noted that the City could partner with the neighborhood in upgrading the fence.

Discussion:

Mr. Spencer expressed his frustration that \$2,900 had already been spent on a custom-made fence that clearly does not meet the guidelines. It was suggested that the conditions be amended for staff to work with the neighborhood and the Greenway Committee in the selection of an appropriate fence.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 1314 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 *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way* (page 18) and *Fences and Walls* (page 24) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application Number 1314 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mike Mabe with the City of Greensboro for work at West McGee Street at South Cedar Street with the following conditions: (1) that staff works with the neighborhood association and the City on replacement railing that is more compatible with the historic district also taking into consideration a meeting with the Greenway Committee to avoid further conflict, and (2) that the fence be replaced within one year, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

- (b) Location: 617 N. Elm Street (First Presbyterian Church)**
Application No. 1310
Applicant: Bill Strickland, Elder and Property Committee Member
Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church
Date Application Received: 5-11-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Construction of columbarium.

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, Fence, Walls and Site Features and Trees and Landscaping* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The columbarium will consist of brick walls with niches surrounding a walkway. Primarily, the materials will be brick that matches the existing columbarium, and concrete walkways. These materials are consistent with historic materials on this property and the neighborhood.

The columbarium will be below the grade of the sanctuary and therefore will not interfere with the view of this landmark building.

Construction of the columbarium will put nearby trees at some risk. If recommended measures are taken the risk should be reduced to a reasonable level.

Guideline (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.

Guideline (page 23):

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 during construction, every effort be made to protect the Magnolia and other nearby trees including following the procedures specified in reports and comments by Certified Arborist, Bill Lock and Urban Forester, Mike Cusimano.
- That if any of the nearby trees should die within a two-year period that they be replaced with new trees of the same species of a size to be determined by the Urban Forester.

In Support:

Bill Strickland, 617 North Elm Street
 John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court
 John McCrea, 2107 Medford Lane
 Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway Drive

In Opposition:

Jane Jackson, 115 North Park Drive

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is Application Number 1310 for work at 617 North Elm Street. The applicant is Bill Strickland, Elder and Property Committee member at First Presbyterian Church. The description is for construction of a columbarium. Mike Cowhig, with the City of Greensboro, stated that staff supports this application. He noted that the proposed columbarium is below the grade of the Church and will not block the view. Staff worked with the Church and the Urban Forester on recommendations for the magnolia trees that would frame the columbarium. The columbarium will consist of brick walls with benches surrounded by walkways. Mike Cusimano, Urban Forester, recommended the Tree Preservation Plan presented to the Commission. The Plan recommended replacing the trees if they die within two years. In support of the application was Bill Strickland, 617 North Elm Street, speaking on behalf of First Presbyterian Church. He stated that the project has been discussed for many years and would include 412 niches in the columbarium. There is no more room in the present columbarium and this project would provide an opportunity to address grade issues on the site. He noted that the 20-foot setback from the two magnolia trees was approved by the Urban Forester. The Church is in favor of preserving the trees and the plan was designed to be anchored by the magnolia trees. Also speaking in support of the application was John McLendon, #2 Magnolia Court, on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood supported the application with one concern regarding the trees. They recommended a 25-foot setback from the magnolia trees as they had not seen Mr. Cusimano's memo. He noted that caution was warranted. Mr. McLendon stated that personally, he supported the application although he would prefer to have a 25-foot setback from the trees. Also speaking in support was John McCrea of 2107 Medford Land. He is the architect on the project. Responding to a question from Ms. Spaeh, he stated that a 25-foot setback from the magnolias would make the project impractical. Also in support was Robert Cantlander of 306 Parkway Drive. He was also concerned about the 20-foot setback and felt that it encroached under the canopy. He preferred a 25-foot setback and supported a recommendation that the magnolia trees should be replaced within five years instead of two years if they die. Speaking in opposition to the application was Jane Jackson of 115 North Park Drive. She was speaking on her own behalf although

she is a member of Fisher Park Neighborhood Association and a member of the Church. She felt the columbarium location was inappropriate for mourning and she noted that the root system extended beyond the drip line of the tree. Although she stated she is not an expert on trees, root systems of magnolias are unique and would be damaged by construction.

Discussion:

Members discussed the age and health of the magnolia trees. Mr. Spencer pointed out that two reports existed stating the trees are healthy. He was impressed with the work put into the Tree Protection Plan and the way the project was worked into the architecture; however, the context of the site would be changed due to the loss of sloping on the side of the Church. Mr. Strickland commented that the project would be below the level of the Church and a good view would still exist. Mr. McCrea indicated that other locations on the immediate property area were considered for the columbarium. The close proximity of these locations to underground utilities and buildings requiring work prevented their potential use. Vice-Chair Wharton commented that although he was uncomfortable coming too close to the magnolia trees, the expert opinion of the Urban Forester should be relied upon. Ms. Spaeh agreed that she felt comfortable with the reports included in the application. Mr. Spencer indicated that he would be inclined to recommend a period of five years instead of two years for replacement of the trees. Ms. Bowers pointed out that the Church does not want to lose the magnolia trees as they are an integral part of the design. Ms. Burns commented that she was also relying on the opinion of the Urban Forester. She suggested that in the future when applications rely heavily on tree preservation, the Urban Forester should be present if possible to respond to questions.

Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Spencer moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 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 and the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Fence, Walls and Site Features* (page 26) and *Trees and Landscaping* (page 23) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.) Ms. Hatfield abstained from the vote.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Spencer moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application Number 1310 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to First Presbyterian Church for work at 617 North Elm Street with the following conditions: (1) that during construction every effort be made to protect the magnolias and other nearby trees including following the procedures specified in the reports and comments by Certified Arborist, Bill Lock, and Urban Forester, Mike Cusimano, (2) that if any of the nearby trees die within a five-period, they should be replaced with new trees of the same species of a size to be determined by the Urban Forester, and (3) that a fertilization and monitoring program take place over the 5-year period as well, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Bowers, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.) Ms. Hatfield abstained from the vote.

- c. Location: 303 S. Mendenhall Street**
Application No. 1312
Applicant: James Keith
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 5-11-10 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Construction of connector between deck at back of house and side porch.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Fact:

The proposed deck connector will have a railing that matches the railing of the deck at the back of the house. This would effectively bring the deck around the side of the house.

Fact:

Another option would be to lower the connector structure so that a railing is not required.

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.

Ms. Hatfield moved to excuse Ms. Bowers from the meeting, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Spaeh, Burns, Hatfield. Nays: None.)

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

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1312 for work at 303 S. Mendenhall Street. The applicant is James Keith and the description is for the construction of a deck connector. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff recommends against approving this application because the connector will essentially bring the deck around the side of the house. There was no one speaking in support or in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Spencer expressed his concern that the drawing provided by the applicant was not properly to scale and there were no dimensions indicated. He felt that the inaccurate drawing made it difficult to make a determination. Vice-Chair Wharton suggested that new definitions relating to an acceptable level of information contained in an application be included in the next guideline revision. The Group discussed the lack of information on the site plan and what could be done to avoid the situation in the future.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in Application Number 1312 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 in part because the proposal brings a deck around to the side of the structure and would violate the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Patios and Decks (page 41)* and in part because the application does not provide a drawing that is to scale with proper measurements so that the Commission could completely consider the application and understand the full details of what is proposed and how it would visually effect the historic structure are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Hatfield, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve Application Number 1312 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to James Keith for work

at 303 South Mendenhall, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Hatfield, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

- d. Application No. 1300 (Amendment to #1247)**
Location: 409 S. Mendenhall Street
Applicant: Kurt Kronenfeld
Property Owner: Presbyterian Campus Ministry of Greensboro
Date Received: 10-14-09

Mr. Cowhig stated that this was a condition of approval that stated materials would be brought back for the Commission's approval.

A sample of a PVC-based, durable, tongue-and-groove material was presented for members to inspect. A finalized Landscape Plan was mailed to members earlier. Staff recommended in favor of the flooring product.

Ms. Burns asked if an edging material was specified for the back parking area. Gary Comer, 2504 Beaconwood Drive, indicated that there will be a curb around the entire area to provide separation. He also presented a sample of railing material. Members commented that the samples looked good.

Mr. Spencer moved to approve the Landscape Plan, railing material, and porch floor material, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Spencer, Hatfield, Spaeh, Burns. Nays: None.)

4. PRESENTATION BY DABNEY SANDERS OF ACTION GREENSBORO REGARDING THE DOWNTOWN GREENWAY:

Dabney Sanders, 805 Simpson Street, is the Project Manager for Downtown Greenway. She distributed maps and gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Greenway. She specifically addressed the area of the Greenway that will run adjacent to the historic Aycok neighborhood. She also described items being considered for consistency with the Guidelines for the block and a half of the Greenway that will run through Fisher Park.

Ms. Sanders asked Commissioners for their feedback on the overall concept. The Greensboro Department of Transportation will be applying for a COA at the appropriate time.

Ms. Burns commented that College Hill should also be included on the map as the neighborhood will run alongside the Greenway.

In response to a question from Ms. Spaeh, Ms. Sanders confirmed that no restroom facilities are planned at this point due to maintenance issues.

Vice-Chair Wharton asked about shifts in Murrow Boulevard traffic and was informed that the Greenway would be located on the far eastern lane of traffic. She added that curb cuts on the east and west side along with median changes would allow greater space for the Greenway above the northern part of Washington Street.

Ms. Burns asked about parking. Ms. Sanders replied that one parking area is planned at Spring Garden Street and Freeman Mill Road. Future parking sites are being considered at three other cornerstone areas.

Mr. Spencer observed that some sort of separation between people and traffic should be installed where there is no room for trees or plantings. Peggy Holland, Bicycle Pedestrian Coordinator for the

City of Greensboro, responded that the five-foot separation required between the street and the side path has been met throughout the entire Greenway corridor. She added that bushes exist along the Greenway providing a barrier.

5. PRESENTATION BY PEGGY HOLLAND OF GDOT REGARDING SIDEWALK REPAIR AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that he was asked to investigate the reason behind paint indicators appearing on sidewalks in Fisher Park. He explained that Greensboro recently received a federal grant for sidewalk construction and repair and a requirement of the grant is full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Peggy Holland, Bicycle Pedestrian Coordinator for the City of Greensboro, gave an overview of ADA and accessibility requirements.

Ms. Holland will return to the Commission with a blanket COA application to cover all future sidewalk and ramp modifications for ADA compliance as part of the City's ADA Transition Plan.

Ms. Spaeh left the meeting at approximately 6:40 p.m.

6. DISCUSSION OF WAR MEMORIAL STADIUM:

David Hoggard, 108 Cypress Street, reiterated his request for the Commission to consider bringing War Memorial Stadium into the Aycock historic district. He updated members on private funding attempts that have occurred since the last meeting. It was determined that since \$200,000 of the \$1.5 million allotted to repair the stadium had already been used, leveraging the funds was not an option. He discussed strategies being considered to get around the constraint. Following a discussion of possible options to bring the stadium back into use, Commissioners considered starting an investigation into the historical significance of the stadium and preparing a report using information contained in the National Register application. Mr. Spencer volunteered to work on the investigative report, form a subcommittee with Benjamin Briggs of Preservation Greensboro, bring the results to the next Commission meeting, and attend the Aycock Neighborhood Association meeting to share the report.

7. ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that very clear direction should be given to staff regarding applications. Site plans containing decks or buildings must contain accurate measurements. Mr. Spencer quoted from the guidelines on page 84 specifying that individual dimensions pertinent to the project should be added. Ms. Burns felt that direction should also be given on material specifications to make for easier process. Counsel Williams recommended that a letter should be sent to the applicant when an incomplete application is received.

8. ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed members that a combined training with Guilford County will be scheduled shortly. All members expressed interest in attending the training. He will inform Commissioners of the details when arrangements have been made with the County Planning Director.

9. SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR:

None.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/sm-jd

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JUNE 30, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Doug Spencer; Ann Bowers; Andrena Coleman; Thomas Sears, Cynthia Hatfield; and Lois McManus.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Housing and Community Development (HCD); Lori Loosemore, Ordinance Enforcement Officer; Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office; and Vaughn Patrick.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the June 30, 2010 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 absence of Ms. Spaeh was excused.

APPROVAL OF MAY 26, 2010 MINUTES:

Mr. Spencer moved to approve the May 26, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a) **Location: 517 Park Avenue**
 Application No. 1313
 Applicant: Robert Ricks
 Property Owner: Judy Worsley
 Date Application Received: 5-14-10 **(CONTINUED)**

Description of Work:

Replace metal shingle roof with asphalt shingles. Remove chimney.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, and field inspection, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the application is not congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, 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 of the house 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:

The metal shingles were part of this house's historic character. Apparently, the front slope was covered over with asphalt shingles by a previous owner. It is not known if the metal shingles were deteriorated beyond repair or not.

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.*

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

Discussion:

Mr. Cowhig stated that the owner has requested a continuance on this application.

Lori Loosemore, Ordinance Enforcement Officer, described the process for LOE cases in the historic district. She stated that properties are inspected to insure minimum housing standards are met. Applicants are given 30 days to communicate their plan for repairs, an Order to Repair is issued, and extensions may be granted depending on the circumstances. She indicated that they work with applicants to allow time to make repairs, as it is not their desire to tear down historic properties.

Ms. Loosemore stated that a continuance of this case would not affect the LOE process. The applicants are in the first 30-day stage and have not appeared before the Minimum Housing Standards Commission.

Mr. Spencer moved to continue this application, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Burt Vandervene, 719 Fifth Avenue, spoke on behalf of the Aycock Historic Neighborhood. They would like the owner to restore the chimney on this house. They have a problem with the asphalt roof and the deteriorative state of the house. He pointed out that this is the third COA for this property that has been submitted late or by force. He requested that the Historic Preservation Commission write a letter to the owner, who owns multiple properties, as a reminder of her commitment to restore historic properties.

(b) Location: Intersections in Historic Districts
Application No. 1326
Applicant: Peggy Holland
Property Owner: City of Greensboro
Date Application Received: 6-15-10

(APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Reconstruct wheelchair ramps within the public right-of-way throughout the historic districts to bring them up to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

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, Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way* for the following reasons:

Facts:

In order to meet the design specifications of the Americans with Disabilities Act granite curbing at intersections must be removed and replaced with concrete. This is contrary to the historic district guidelines. However, it appears that it is impossible to retain the granite curbing and meet the standards of the Americans with Disability at intersections which is contrary to the historic district guidelines.

Guidelines (Page 2):

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 Condition:

- That the detectable warning surfaces on ADA ramps at intersections and other pedestrian crossings be dark green or black to be compatible with the special character of the historic districts.

In Support:

Peggy Holland, Bicycle Pedestrian Coordinator for the City of Greensboro
Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway Drive
Burt Vandervene, 719 Fifth Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1326 and the applicant is Peggy Holland with the City of Greensboro. The description of work is to reconstruct the wheelchair ramps within the public right-of-way throughout the historic districts to bring them up to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. Mr. Cowhig said that staff recommends in favor of this application as nearly all the wheelchair ramps in the district are out of compliance. Staff recommended adding a condition that the detectable warning surfaces on ADA ramps at intersections and other pedestrian crossings be dark green or black to be compatible with the special character of the historic districts. Speaking in support of the application was Peggy Holland with the City of Greensboro. She indicated that the City could use black for warning surfaces because dark green is not available. The City is not able to dye the concrete. Also speaking in support was Robert Cantlander of 306 Parkway Drive, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the Association is in favor of the application and recommends dark green or black warning strips as well as dark green or black signs and poles for pedestrian crossing. Also in support was Burt Vandervene, 719 Fifth Avenue, representing the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association. The Association is in support of the application with the preference for dark colors on the warning ramps.

Discussion:

Ms. Coleman stated her support for the work to meet modern day requirements while still complying with the character of the historic district. Mr. Spencer commented that concrete workers could bring special equipment for small jobs. If two colors could not be used, he specified that the granite curb should stop not more than six inches from the new construction. Mr. Sears commented that visually impaired individuals do not easily detect dark colors. He stated his preference for yellow instead of the dark colors. Ms. Holland stated that meetings were held with disability and senior groups and both groups expressed a preference for yellow. Vice-Chair Wharton felt that the focus should be on the color that will help individuals with disabilities the most.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Coleman moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1326 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 *Design Guidelines, Streets, Sidewalks, and the Public Right-of-Way, and guidelines on page 2, number 2* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission unanimously voted in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Spencer moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1326 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Peggy Holland, City of Greensboro, for work at intersections of historic districts with the following condition: (1) that the granite curbing should end no more than six inches from the ramp, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- c. **Location: 308 Parkway**
 Application No. 1319
 Applicant: Don Smith
 Property Owner: Same
 Date Application Received: 6-10-10 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Remove Mulberry tree located in right side front yard.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, and inspection by the Urban Forester, 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, Trees and Landscaping* for the following reasons:

Fact:

Greensboro Urban Forester, Mike Cusimano, inspected the tree and made the following comments: "The tree has some trunk damage. It is leaning enough that the grade has heaved. It's over-topping or crowding the willow or whatever he planted. You should have pictures of all of that. I'd remove it."

Fact:

The property was heavily landscaped when the house was built in 2003. New Oak trees were started in front of the house a couple of years ago and will grow to very large size and provide ample shade and canopy. Because of the abundance of trees and other plant materials, the

removal of this particular tree should not have a significant impact on the overall character of the property or the historic district.

In Support:

Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway Drive

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1319 for work at 308 Parkway Drive. The applicant is Don Smith and the description is to remove a Mulberry tree. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff is in support of the application. Mike Cusimano, Greensboro's Urban Tree Forester, has recommended the removal of the Mulberry tree. There are several Willow Oak trees in the yard and therefore, the overall canopy would not be damaged. Speaking in favor of the application was Robert Cantlander of 306 Parkway Drive. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Vice Chair Wharton commented that there are six Willow Oak trees nearby providing a line of canopy.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1319 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 under *Trees and Landscaping* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1319 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Don Smith for work at 308 Parkway Drive, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Vice-Chair Wharton and members addressed the earlier request by an Aycock Neighborhood Association representative to send a letter to a property owner regarding after-the-fact applications and the responsibility of owning in the historic district. Following a lengthy discussion, members decided to form a subcommittee to research how other municipalities handle after-the-fact applications. The subcommittee will present their findings and make recommendations to the Group. Mr. Spencer and Ms. Burns volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Spencer gave an update on efforts to explore extending the boundaries of the Aycock Historic District. He stated that the National Registry Report and a cover letter would be submitted to the State office. Staff will distribute copies of the Report and accompanying letter electronically to members. Vice-Chair Wharton asked staff to include this item on the July agenda so the Commission can vote to endorse it as their investigation.

Burt Vandervene, 719 Fifth Avenue, reported on the Aycock Neighborhood Association's endorsement of expanding the district. The Association voted unanimously to ask the Commission to pursue extending the boundaries of the historic district to include War Memorial Stadium.

Mr. Cowhig suggested that the July meeting should include an agenda item regarding the newly adopted LDO and the outlined process for boundary amendments.

Vice Chair Wharton recommended that the Parks and Recreation department, A&T University, and Greensboro College should be solicited for their feedback at some point regarding extending the boundaries of the Aycock historic district.

Ms. Hatfield felt that it would be helpful to the Commission to have a more detailed, fluid, and up-to-date list of acceptable materials. Members discussed the need to be general and not recommend a specific brand of product. Following a discussion, Ms. Hatfield and Mr. Sears agreed to develop a concrete proposal regarding acceptable materials to present to the Commission.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig reviewed current applications approved on the staff level.

Mr. Cowhig welcomed Ms. McManus to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Cowhig stated that several Commission terms would expire on August 15, 2010. He reviewed steps being taken to fill the seats.

Mr. Cowhig discussed a training plan for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010. He recommended that members attend the Preservation North Carolina Conference in Durham from September 23 through September 25. It is required that at least two Commissioners and staff attend a training session each year. An in-house training session will also be held.

Mr. Cowhig reviewed the LOE system with the upcoming merger between Housing and Community Development and the Planning Department.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 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 28, 2010
(draft)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Doug Spencer; Andrena Coleman; and Lois McManus.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Sue Schwartz, Housing and Community Development (HCD); Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office; and Vaughn Patrick.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the July 28, 2010 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. Hatfield, and Mr. Sears were excused.

APPROVAL OF JUNE 30, 2010 MINUTES:

Ms. McManus moved to approve the June 30, 2010 minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Spencer. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a) **Location: 517 Park Avenue**
 Application No. 1313
 Applicant: Robert Ricks
 Property Owner: Judy Worsley
 Date Application Received: 5-14-10 (DENIED)

Description of Work:

Replace metal shingle roof with asphalt shingles. Remove chimney.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, and field inspection, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the application is not congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, 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 of the house 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:

The metal shingles were part of this house's historic character. Apparently, the front slope was covered over with asphalt shingles by a previous owner. It is not known if the metal shingles were deteriorated beyond repair or not.

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:

Robert Ricks, 519 Park Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1313 for work at 517 Park Avenue. The applicant is Robert Ricks who is not the owner of the property. The owner is Judy Worsley. The description of work is to replace the metal shingle roof with asphalt shingles and to remove the chimney. City staff recommends against this application. Mike Cowhig indicated that reroofing does not require a COA except when the roofing material is a historic material such as metal. The chimney is a defining feature of the house. Staff would like to see it repaired based on guidelines on page 50 that state corbelling of chimneys is a significant detail. Removal is not consistent with the guidelines and metal shingles are a part of its historic character. Speaking in support of the application was Robert Ricks of 519 Park Avenue. He stated that the house has not had asphalt shingles on the front portion for several years. According to his memory, the chimney fell around February of 2010 and replacement of the metal shingles at the rear of the house began shortly after that.

Discussion:

Members commented on the absence of the owner at today's meeting. Mr. Cowhig responded to a question from Ms. Burns and discussed the use of asphalt shingles. Ms. Burns felt that the chimney should be rebuilt. Mr. Spencer commented that comparable shingle-style metal material was available locally. Vice-Chair Wharton responded to a comment from Ms. Coleman and agreed that a condition could be placed on the application that materials could either be approved at staff level or brought before the Commission. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that this house is in disrepair and is the focus of an ongoing Minimum Housing enforcement case. Members discussed their options in this matter.

Findings of Fact:

Mr. Spencer moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1313 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 under *Masonry and Stone and Roofs, Guideline 1, page 50* (“*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.*”), along with *Guideline 3 on page 5* (“*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.*”), and in addition, the Commission finds that the corbelling in the chimney and roofing materials are historically significant on this house are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Spencer moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application number 1313 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Ricks, applicant, and Judy Worsley, owner, for work at 517 Parkway Drive, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- b) Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**
Application No. 1334
Applicant: Susan Sessler, Vice President for Facilities
Property Owner: Greensboro College
Date Application Received: 7-14-10 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Remove approximately 60' of Wax Myrtle hedge behind goals at either end of athletic field. Install wind screen with college logo on fence.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Commercial and/or Institutional and Fences and Walls* for the following reasons:

Facts:

The windscreen with the college logo is being requested as an enhancement to the athletic field. Two sections of hedge would be removed. Otherwise the hedge would grow into the fence and damage the windscreen. The Wax Myrtle hedge was planted when the athletic field was expanded in the 1980s. It has grown into a very thick and wide hedge over the years. Removing the two sections of hedge is necessary to ensure that the hedge does not damage the windscreen in the future. Removing the hedge would expose portions of the chain link fence in full view of houses on West McGee Street.

Although in plain view, the athletic field is considered to be part of the “back yard” of the Greensboro College campus.

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.*

Guidelines: (page 26)

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.)

Recommended Conditions:

- That steps be taken to screen or soften the effect of the chain link fence. The hedge could be replaced with a more suitable plant material, one that would not grow into the fence and damage the windscreen.

In Support:

Susan Sessler, 815 West Market Street

In Opposition:

Janet Frohman, 1001 West McGee Street

Jane Moore, 911 West McGee Street

Dan Smith, 126 South Mendenhall.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1334 for work at 815 West Market Street. The applicant is Susan Sessler with Greensboro College. The description of work is to remove approximately 60 feet of Wax Myrtle hedge behind the goals at either end of the athletic field and install a wind screen with the college logo on the screen facing inward to the field. Staff recommends in favor of this application citing the guidelines for Institutions. Mike Cowhig noted that according to the guidelines, the functional needs of institutions must be considered by the Commission. He noted the guidelines on page 26 for chain link fences that state when wire fences are used, they should be coated or otherwise softened. Staff recommended softening the effect of removal by painting the fence or using some other kind of screening. Commissioner Burns noted that the guidelines for signs were applicable. Speaking in favor of the application was Susan Sessler of 815 West Market Street. She said that colleges like to use their logos and she would be willing to use conical, upright plants in place of the Wax Myrtles to screen the fence from the street. She would also consider painting the fence a darker color. She indicated that the Athletic Department felt this was needed as a functional use. In response to questions from Commissioner Burns, she said that the signage could possibly be applied to the backstop shown in the application or they might consider the installation of a fence within a fence. Speaking in opposition to the application was Jane Frohman of 1001 West McGee Street on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Association objected to further advertising and did not want the sign facing the street. Also speaking in opposition was Dan Smith of 126 South Mendenhall Street. He is personally opposed to the hedge removal but not necessarily to the sign. He suggested preserving the hedge or attaching the sign to the backstop or to use a wooden fence instead of a chain-link fence. Jane Moore, 911 West McGee Street, was opposed to the fence. She asked if Greensboro College could use a temporary sign raised on game days. She noted that the thickness of the hedge was intentionally used to hide the fence and she suggested the use of Leland Cypress trees. In addition, she wanted to know the reason for the windscreen, how close it would be to the fence, and the height of the sign. In rebuttal was Susan Sessler of 815 West Market Street. She noted that the banner would be six feet tall from the ground to the top of the fence and the sign would be inward to the field. She was willing to consider working with the neighborhood but did not

want to appear again before the Commission. She would prefer to have changes approved at staff level.

Discussion:

Ms. Burns expressed concern that one side would be very visible and she suggested a continuance to work on the available options. At six feet, it is a very large sign and she felt there should be more consensus. Vice-Chair Wharton stated that using a sign only on game days would be a viable option because it would not require a COA. Mr. Spencer was concerned that there would be damage to the Sycamore tree resulting from the removal of the Wax Myrtles. The option of a fence within a fence would not result in danger to the Sycamore tree. Members discussed the high placement of houses on McGee Street and their view of the north end of the field. Mr. Spencer stated that he had no problem with the sign as this is a sports field; however, denying the sign does not take away the functionality. Ms. Burns suggested a compromise with placement of the sign only on the south side. Ms. Coleman was in support of continuing the application to discuss other options and involve neighbors directly across the street. Vice-Chair Wharton recognized the need for branding to keep colleges viable and felt the sign was directly related to functionality. He felt the application could be approved with conditions or continued to work on options with the neighborhood. Mr. Spencer felt that options were available that would make everyone happy and he was in favor of continuing the application.

Ms. Burns moved to continue this application, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- c) **Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**
Application No. 1333
Applicant: Susan Sessler, Vice President for Facilities
Property Owner: Greensboro College
Date Application Received: 7-14-10 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

The college would like to purchase a DONKEY (portable elevated multi-purpose center) that can be used for athletic events. This unit has an aluminum frame and a vinyl canopy. It can be used as a scorer's station or a press box.

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

Fact:

The "Donkey" is a moveable multi-purpose unit that will be used on the athletic field. It is not very large and is fairly innocuous in terms of its design. Therefore it should not have a significant impact on the character of 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.*

In Support:

Susan Sessler, 815 West Market Street
 Janet Frohman, 1001 West McGee Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1333 for work at 815 West Market Street. The applicant is Susan Sessler of Greensboro College. The description of work is to purchase a DONKEY (portable elevated multi-purpose center) that can be used for athletic events. This unit has an aluminum frame and a vinyl canopy. It can be used as a scorer's station or a press box. Staff indicated that the DONKEY should not have a significant impact on the character of the historic district and recommends in favor of the application. Speaking in support was Susan Sessler of 815 West Market Street. She said that this is a mobile press box with dimensions of 11 feet high by 11 feet wide by 7 feet deep. It would be finished in aluminum and have the college logo. It would stay on the field during the season and be stored during the off season. The DONKEY would replace temporary scaffolding that is erected during the season for the press and score keeper. Also speaking in support was Janet Frohman of 1001 West McGee Street representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. She stated that the Association supports the application.

Discussion:

None.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Coleman moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1333 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 under *Historical and Constitutional Guidelines* are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Coleman moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1333 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greensboro College and Susan Sessler for work at 815 West Market Street, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

d) **Location: 115 S. Mendenhall Street**
Application No. 1336
Applicant: Annette Gaddy
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 7-14-10

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

Install a satellite dish on the roof at the west end of apartment building to serve all units by using existing interior cable in CATV box. The dish would be placed on the north slope of the roof 10' back from the front wall of the building and 3' up from the eaves.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and a meeting with the installer on site 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—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (page 38) for the following reasons:

Facts:

The installer said that this was the most reasonable location from a technical feasibility standpoint. This location would allow the use of existing cabling inside the walls of the building. It would avoid external cables on inside walls of the apartment units.

The dish itself is a small unit that will be on top of the roof in a relatively inconspicuous location. A signal could not be obtained if the dish were located on the ground. The building will not be altered and cables can be hidden by existing vegetation on the brick wall.

FCC regulations prohibit local governments, landlords, or associations from restricting a property owner or lessee's placement of consumer-owned satellite dishes and other types of antenna called "over-the-air-reception-devices" on property he or she controls under its OTARD Rules. However, exceptions apply to properties located within National Register Historic Districts. College Hill is a National Register District and restrictions may be applied as long as they are consistent to all types of communication devices without prohibiting their use.

Guidelines: (page 40)

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

In Support:

Annette Gaddy, 115 South Mendenhall Street

In Opposition:

Dan Smith, 126 South Mendenhall Street

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1336 for work at 115 South Mendenhall Street. The applicant is Annette Gaddy and the description of work is to install a satellite dish on the roof on the west end of the apartment building to serve all units by using existing interior cable. The dish would be placed on the north slope of the roof 10 feet back from the front wall of the building and three feet from the eaves. Staff recommends in favor of the application noting that there is much vegetation screening it. The installer indicated that this is the most feasible position due to positioning of internal cabling. It is relatively inconspicuous. Federal law says that a satellite dish cannot be prohibited. Mr. Cowhig quoted guidelines on page 40 that allow positioning to be modified in National Register districts: *(1) Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building, and (2) Locate utilities, satellite dishes, and antennae as low to the ground as possible, at the rear and side of the structure where it is not readily visible from the street. Smaller satellite dishes of 18 inches are most appropriate and create the least amount of visible impact on the district.* Speaking in support of this application was Annette Gaddy of 115 South Mendenhall Street. She noted that the desire was to install this in the current location to make use of the Time Warner cable box and to reduce the need for more internal and external cabling. Speaking in opposition was Dan Smith, 126 South Mendenhall Street, representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association. He indicated that the Association did not know the proposed location of the satellite at the time they considered the application. They prefer the satellite to be located as far east away from the street as possible. Speaking in rebuttal was

Annette Gaddy of 115 South Mendenhall Street. She noted for the record that there is only dish being applied for in this application.

Discussion:

Ms. Burns proposed that staff be allowed to make the final decision on the location of the dish with the Commission's encouragement that the location be as far back as possible. She realized there were tree issues but felt 10 feet might be a little close. In response to a request from the Commission, Mr. Cowhig agreed to meet the installer on the property.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1336 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 *Utilities and Mechanical Equipment* (page 38) and guidelines on page 40 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1336 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Annette Gaddy for work at 115 South Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: (1) That staff meet with the installer at time of installation and select a location as far eastward on the property as feasible with a minimum of ten feet from the west side that faces the street and three feet from the eaves, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ACTION ITEM:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this item is pursuant to the request from the Aycock Neighborhood Association to include War Memorial Stadium within the boundaries of the Aycock historic district local boundaries. It was discussed earlier that the National Register nomination would be appropriate as the local study. The next step in getting the Stadium included in the historic district is forwarding it to the State Historic Preservation office for their comments.

Mr. Spencer moved to submit the National Register nomination to the State Historic Preservation office, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig stated that staff is working on a number of municipal service district projects to be implemented in the Aycock and College Hill neighborhoods. Preliminary work is being done relating to the bidding process for the retaining wall on Park Avenue. He will keep the Commission updated on the process.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Vice-Chair Wharton requested that the Commission meet in closed session to discuss personnel and legal matters.

Ms. McManus moved to meet in Closed Session, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Ms. Coleman left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

The Closed Session ended at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 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 25, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Lois McManus; Thomas Sears; Jill Spaeh; Anne Bowers; and Paul Macy.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, and Sue Schwartz, Housing and Community Development (HCD); Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the August 25, 2010 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. Coleman and Ms. Hatfield were excused.

APPROVAL OF JULY 28, 2010 MINUTES:

Ms. Spaeh moved to approve the July 28, 2010 minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a) **815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**
Application No. 1334
Description: Install wind screen with college logo on chain link fence.
(Continued from July 28, 2010 meeting)

Mr. Cowhig stated that this application has been withdrawn from the agenda.

- b) **Location: 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)**
Application No. 1343
Applicant: Susan Sessler, Vice-President for Facilities
Property Owner: Greensboro College
Date Application Received: 7-14-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work:

Relocate existing brass letters located on right front side of building to area above round bay window at center of building. Install new aluminum panels on top of mullions to create an uninterrupted sign face where brass letters will be installed. New aluminum will be beige color. Replace faded aluminum panels above other market street entrances with new aluminum panels; use beige color.

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 and Non-Contributing Structures* for the following reasons:

Guidelines (page 34):

1. *Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts.*
2. *New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street.*
3. *Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights.*

Guidelines (page 10):

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 (page 9):

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

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

In Support:

Susan Sessler, 815 West Market Street (Greensboro College)
Ronald Walters, 610 Morehead Avenue

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1343 for work at 815 West Market Street for Greensboro College. The description of work is to relocate existing brass letters located on right front side of building to area above round bay window at center of building. In addition, install new aluminum panels on top of mullions to create an uninterrupted sign face where brass letters will be installed. The new aluminum will be beige color. Replace faded aluminum panels above other market street entrances with new aluminum panels; use beige color. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, indicated that staff supported the application. He cited guidelines 1, 2 and 3 on page 34; *Guidelines for Non-Contributing Buildings* on pages 10 and 68; and *Guidelines for Institutional Buildings* on page 9. He stated that these buildings had not been identified for architectural merit; however, he noted the style was the international style. In response to a question, Commissioner Burns noted that this was a Lowenstein designed building. Speaking in support was Susan Sessler of Greensboro College, 815 West Market Street. She noted that the mullions would be covered by the new aluminum and the panels would be beige. Also speaking in support was Ronald Walter,

610 Morehead Avenue, on behalf of the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The Association supported the application.

Discussion:

Ms. Burns expressed her concern that the verticality of the bay window will be lost when the mullions are covered. Ms. Bowers and Mr. Sears commented that the integrity of the building can be restored in the future by pulling off the aluminum panels because the original will be maintained underneath. Mr. Macy commented that there are other vertical features existing elsewhere on the building. Ms. Spaeh suggested that a possible solution to this concern might be to leave the vertical mullions on each side to restore some verticality. In addition, this would enhance the dominance of the sign.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Bowers moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1343 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 from page 34, page 10, guidelines 1 and 9 on page 68 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Bowers moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1343 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Susan Sessler of Greensboro College for work at 815 West Market Street with the condition that it is an option to look at leaving the two side panels in the original space to add verticality as opposed to having the whole side of the building built, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

It was noted that the actual address where the work will be done is 1015 West Market Street.

- c) **Location: 706 Magnolia Street**
Application No. 1342
Applicant: Russ Clegg
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 8-11-10 (APPROVED)

Description of Work:

Demolish existing shed; construct new storage building; construct brick walkways and patio.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35-37) and Patios and Decks (page 41)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

This application is for the removal of a non-contributing shed and replacement with a larger prefabricated storage building in the same location. The location is not easily visible from the street and is consistent with site patterns for historic outbuildings. The building will be constructed of wood with a gabled roof. It will be similar to historic accessory buildings in terms of size (12' x 16'), materials, location and form.

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

Fact:

The patio is of a design that is consistent with historic patios and will be constructed of brick.

Guidelines (page 41):

4. *Select appropriate paving materials for patios, including concrete, brick and stone.*

In Support:

Russ Clegg, 706 Magnolia Street
Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1342 for work at 706 Magnolia Street. The applicant is Russ Clegg and the description of work is to demolish existing shed, construct new shed, and add brick walkways and patio. Mike Cowhig said that the City is in support of the application. He noted the application is for the removal of a non-contributing shed and replacing it with a slightly larger prefabricated storage building in the same location. The location is not easily visible from the street and is consistent with site patterns for historic buildings. The building will be constructed of wood with a gabled roof. It will be similar to historic accessory buildings in terms of size which is 12 feet by 16 feet. Mr. Cowhig cited guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 36 along with guideline 4 on page 41. In support of the application was the applicant, Russ Clegg, 706 Magnolia Street, and also Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association.

Discussion:

In response to a question from Mr. Macy, Vice-Chair Wharton discussed the restriction of sheds and said that in the past, sheds have been regulated lightly with the appropriate location and materials in place.

Findings of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1342 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments and guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5 (A and B) from page 36, guideline 4 on page 41 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burns, McManus, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers. Nays: Macy)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1342 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Russ Clegg of 706 Magnolia Street for work at 706 Magnolia Street, seconded by Ms. Bowers. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Burns, McManus, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers. Nays: Macy)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Vice-Chair Wharton asked for an update on the subcommittee looking into the assessment of fees. Since Ms. Burns is now the only member on the subcommittee, he asked if there were any other members wishing to participate. Ms. McManus volunteered to serve with Ms. Burns on the subcommittee.

Mr. Sears and Ms. Hatfield serve on the Materials Subcommittee. Mr. Sears reiterated his feeling that for the long-term, adapting materials that can survive and at times last longer than previous materials, as long as they have an acceptable look, is crucial to the survival of the historic district.

Vice-Chair Wharton requested that the two subcommittee updates be listed as separate agenda items at the next meeting.

Vice-Chair Wharton discussed four applications for possible inclusion into the next revision of the manual. The applications are as follows: (1) windows, (2) columns, (3) porch flooring, and (4) siding. Mr. Cowhig stated that energy efficiency, green rehabilitation, and sustainability practices should also be considered when the guidelines are revised.

Vice-Chair Wharton updated members that a letter has been sent to the State Historic Preservation Office asking them to comment on the feasibility of including War Memorial Stadium into the Aycock Historic District boundaries.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Ms. Burns advised the Commission that members of the College Hill district have expressed concern with the large banners that have been placed on the porch of the Presbyterian Campus Ministries house. She asked staff to follow-up and make sure that the banners are of a temporary nature.

Ms. Burns asked staff to retrieve information on the COA application that justified the closing of South Cedar Street. The College Hill Neighborhood Association would like the information along with any conditions on the application. If South Cedar Street were reopened for truck access to the site where student housing is being constructed, there is concern that once opened, the street would not be closed to student traffic.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig informed the Commission about a training opportunity September 23 through 24, 2010 in Durham, North Carolina. He distributed an informational packet to members. Mr. Sears informed Mr. Cowhig that he recently completed an audited course that would count toward the Commission's training requirements.

Ms. Schwartz, Interim Director of Housing and Community Development, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding actions taken as a result of the Means Report from 2005. Topics in the presentation included enforcement, meeting procedures, recruitment of Commissioners, training, education and outreach, and next steps.

There are three proposed committees to facilitate the next steps. These include a Best Practices Committee, an Education and Outreach Committee, and a Historic Resources Committee. Ms. Schwartz acknowledged that this entailed a lot of work for a small Commission. She advised them to focus on one or two committees and incorporate individuals from the community into the committees headed by a Commission member. She specifically asked the Commission to consider studying the issue of fees and penalties.

Vice-Chair Wharton commented on the committee recommendations. He felt that the subcommittees already focusing on fees and materials could be folded into a Best Practices Committee. Mr. Cowhig commented that this would tie in nicely with the guidelines update.

Ms. Schwartz distributed a handout to Commissioners detailing the presentation.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, recognized that improvements have been made as a result of the Means Report; however, things could still be made better. She stated that enforcement was a critical issue along with fees for after-the-fact applications. In addition, she recommended that staff approvals be shared with the Neighborhood Associations.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 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 29, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Jennifer Burns; Lois McManus; Thomas Sears; Jill Spaeh; Anne Bowers; Andrena Coleman, Cynthia Hatfield, and Paul Macy.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, Housing and Community Development (HCD); Mike Williams, Esq., City Attorney's Office.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the September 29, 2010 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 AUGUST 25, 2010 MINUTES:

Ms. McManus moved to approve the August 25, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **811 Cypress Street (Aycok Middle School)**
Application Number 1354
Description: Placement of modular classrooms and addition of nine parking spaces.
(WITHDRAWN)

Mr. Cowhig stated that the application has been withdrawn.

- (b) **701 Morehead Avenue**
Application Number 1358
Description: Replace roofing shingles with pressed metal shingles.
(WITHDRAWN)

Mr. Cowhig stated that the application has been withdrawn.

**PUBLIC HEARING TO REVIEW NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION FOR MOCK JUDSON
VOEHRINGER COMPANY HOSIERY MILL—2610 OAKLAND AVENUE:**

Ms. Hatfield joined the meeting at 4:13 p.m.

Mr. Cowhig reviewed the process for National Register nomination. Local governments are asked to provide an opportunity for public comment on National Register nominations and to make a recommendation that the nominated property meets listing criteria. Mr. Cowhig discussed the Statement of Significance located in Section 8 of the Nomination Report and the Mill's significance in the industrial history of the City. He presented a slideshow to the Commission along with historic commentary.

Members discussed the significant history associated with the building.

Ms. Spaeh moved to recommend support of the nomination, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

DISCUSSION OF STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHARLES B. AYCOCK HISTORIC DISTRICT BOUNDARY INCREASE TO INCLUDE WAR MEMORIAL STADIUM:

Mr. Cowhig referred to a letter from the State Historic Preservation Office and stated that they do support the addition of War Memorial Stadium to the Aycock historic district. As a condition, additional research and documentation is required to show links between the stadium and the neighborhood.

The Commission discussed the best way to research and provide documentation to define linkage between the stadium and neighborhood. There was a consensus among members to follow through with the research and submit it to the State along with a letter requesting their recommendation to include War Memorial Stadium in the Aycock historic district.

DISCUSSION OF BEST PRACTICES SUBCOMMITTEES:

- **Education & Outreach**

Mr. Cowhig stated that a series of listening meetings is being planned in each of the historic districts during the month of October. Feedback will be useful in improving and updating the Guidelines. Staff and members discussed the best ways to inform neighborhoods of the meetings.

- **Fees & Penalties**

Mr. Cowhig reviewed a list of cities comparing fees for Certificates of Approval and after-the-fact applications. He stated that although the majority of historic districts on a national basis do not charge fees, there seems to be a developing trend toward fees. Members discussed introducing the topic of fees and penalties at the listening meetings to get a clearer sense of how to proceed.

- **Alternative Materials**

Mr. Sears distributed copies of two articles to members. He described the articles that focused on saving old windows and technical aspects of aluminum, wood, vinyl, and fiberglass windows.

Members discussed creating a database of accessible information from articles and other resources to share with applicants and neighborhoods.

Robert Cantlander, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, requested that the information be geared specifically toward historic districts.

ITEMS FROM CHAIRMAN:

Members discussed possible responses to the Means Report. Discussion included the following suggestions: (1) creation of a Best Practices Subcommittee, (2) creation of a Communication & Outreach Subcommittee, (3) changes in Commission procedures, (4) internal and external communication and transparency, (5) improved enforcement, and (6) increased education within the community.

The Commission agreed to form two new subcommittees, Best Practices and Communication & Outreach. Mr. Sears, Ms. Coleman, Ms. McManus, and Ms. Hatfield volunteered to serve on the Best

Practices Subcommittee. Volunteering for the Communication & Outreach Subcommittee were Ms. Spaeh, Ms. Bowers, Mr. Macy, and Ms. Burns.

Vice-Chair Wharton recommended that the two groups meet before the next Historic Preservation meeting. Counsel Williams discussed the procedure required for subcommittees to meet.

ITEMS FROM HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Mr. Cowhig updated members on the issue of enforcement. The Zoning Enforcement Officer assigned to handle historic districts is completely tied up on other matters. Until the situation is resolved, an intermediary response effort has been started. He described the process that begins with a report that work has been done without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff will investigate and if a violation has occurred, the violation will be entered into the database tracking system and the property owner will be notified in writing of the necessary requirements. If there is no response from the letter, the violation will be turned over to Enforcement as a high priority for appropriate action to be taken.

Vice-Chair Wharton acknowledged the consensus between Commissioners and neighborhoods that improved enforcement in historic districts is needed. Members discussed drafting a jointly signed letter to City Council stating the need for improved enforcement.

Members requested to see Certificates of Appropriateness approved at staff level electronically on a monthly basis.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:03 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 27, 2010**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, HCD; and Mike Williams, City Attorney.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the October 27, 2010 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. Burns, Ms. Coleman, and Ms. McManus were approved.

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2010 MINUTES:

Ms. Bowers moved to approve the September 29, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 747 Park Avenue**
 Application No. 1365
 Applicant: Blade Properties, LLC
 Property Owner: Blade Properties, LLC
 Date Application Received: 10-12-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

After-the-fact replacement of front door.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

Based on documentary photographs taken as part of the 1983 designation survey and the 2005 photographic survey, the door that was replaced was a multi-light "French" door style. The new

door is a modern steel paneled door that does not replicate the original door or door styles found in the historic district.

Fact:

The material of the replacement door is not a compatible material with those found in the historic districts. Doors traditionally were constructed of wood.

Guideline 2 (Page 57):

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.

In Support:

Raymond Trapp, 3233 Dreiser Place

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1365 for work at 747 Park Avenue. The owner and applicant is Blade Properties, LLC. The description of work is an after-the-fact replacement of front door. Mr. Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that the door that was replaced was a multi-light French door. The replacement door is a modern steel paneled door that does not replicate the original door as found in the historic district. It was noted that the steel door does not actually fit the door opening. Mr. Cowhig stated that a similar replacement had been done at 520 Percy Street and approved which included a modern French door with simulated divided lights. Staff recommended against the application. Speaking in support of the application was Mr. Raymond Trapp of 3233 Dreiser Place. He noted that the divided light door had been replaced due to multiple break-ins and they felt the steel door provided better security.

Discussion:

Ms. Spaeh confirmed that the original door had single panes in each of the openings and she asked Mr. Trapp if a door with one large pane of connected glass been considered. He replied that they chose the current door for security reasons. The replacement door is smaller and a wood jam had to be put in the top of frame for the door to fit. The replacement was a standard size door.

Ms. Hatfield recalled another case where the Commission allowed a metal door for security reasons. The door fit the opening and was similar in style to the original. The look had to fit into what was appropriate for the house. She felt an appropriate door could be found that was still secure.

Ms. Spaeh said that there were ways to address the opening without closing it in with wood by using a transom effect. She agreed there were secure doors available that would look similar with the half-light to go along with the historic look of the house.

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that one way to handle this would be to add a condition that the door must fit the original opening. Members discussed the options available to them.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1365 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* regarding *Windows and Doors* (page 55-57) considering the conditions that would be described below are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1365 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Blade Properties, LLC, for work at 747 Park Avenue with the following conditions: (1) that the replacement door be of a size that is the same as the size of the door being replaced and fits the full opening left by the original door, and (2) the design for the door including the material and light pattern is to be approved by staff prior to being installed, seconded by Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

- (b) **Location: 515 Charter Place**
Application No. 1364
Applicant: Blade Properties, LLC
Property Owner: Blade Properties, LLC
Date Application Received: 10-12-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

After-the-fact replacement of front door.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors* (page 55) for the following reasons:

Fact:

Based on documentary photographs taken as part of the 1983 designation survey and the 2005 photographic survey, the doors that were replaced were a multi-light "French" door style. They architecturally match the surrounding side lights as noted in the 1982 survey. The new doors are modern steel paneled doors that do not replicate the original doors or door styles found in the historic district.

Fact:

The material of the replacement doors are not a compatible material with those found in the historic districts. Doors traditionally were constructed of wood.

Guideline 2 (Page 57):

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.

Fact:

The replacement door does not fit the original door opening. Trim has been added to accommodate the new door.

Guideline 1 (Page 57):

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

In Support:

Raymond Trapp, 3233 Dreiser Place

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1364 for work at 515 Charter Place. The description of work is an after the fact replacement of front door. The owner is Blade Properties, LLC. Mr. Cowhig noted that the material of the replacement doors is not compatible with those in the historic district. Staff recommended against approval of this application based on guidelines on pages 55-57. Speaking in support of the application was Mr. Raymond Trapp of 3233 Dreiser Place who noted that the door in Unit A had been replaced in 2007 and Unit B in July of 2010.

Discussion:

Mr. Macy pointed out that houses of a similar age would have had a screen door. Although not durable, a screen door would define the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Cowhig commented that Architectural Salvage has a good supply of salvaged French doors that the owner might want to consider. Ms. Bowers said that this case was similar to the previous one and perhaps staff could approve an appropriate door.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1364 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* regarding *Windows and Doors (page 55-57)* considering the conditions that would be described below are acceptable as findings 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 1364 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Blade Properties, LLC, for work at 515 Charter Place which is to include: (1) the replacement of the two front doors to the unit with doors the same size as the original doors, (2) fit the original openings of the doors properly, (3) the material and light pattern for the replacement doors are to be compatible with

the historic district and style of the house, and (4) pre-approved by staff before they are installed, seconded by Bowers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:

Vice-Chair Wharton reported that he has written to the neighborhood associations regarding the enforcement issues previously discussed by the Commission. John McLendon, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, responded with a request to ask City staff to post all COAs on the City website. Ms. Geary responded that it would be better to post the COAs on the website monthly instead of weekly due to the nature of the set-up of the website. Members and staff discussed the best way to proceed with the request.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

(a) Discussion of Guidelines Update Project

Mr. Cowhig stated that three "listening" meetings have been set up; one in each of the historic districts. Notices have been sent out to property owners. The meetings are scheduled for November 4, November 11, and November 15. He explained that the format of the meetings would include a presentation about the Guidelines Update Project and a review of important issues to generate discussion. He went through a review of the presentation and asked Commissioners for their feedback.

(b) Discussion of Energy Efficiency Workshop

Ms. Geary informed the Group that an Energy Efficiency Workshop is planned for January 8, 2011 at the Carriage House on the grounds of Blandwood. There will be a three-part presentation consisting of (1) education on energy audits, (2) a presentation by David Hoggard on original wood windows, and (3) resources and tools for energy efficiency.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURN:

The next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be December 8, 2010.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:06 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 8, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Wharton, Vice-Chairman; Thomas Sears; Jill Spaeh; Anne Bowers; Jennifer Burns; Andrena Coleman; Lois McManus; and Paul Macy.

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, HCD; and Mike Williams, City Attorney.

WELCOME:

Vice-Chairman Wharton welcomed everyone to the December 8, 2010 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 absence of Ms. Hatfield was approved.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 27, 2010 MINUTES:

Ms. Spaeh moved to approve the October 27, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Location: 1119 Virginia Street**
Application No. 1369
Applicant: Austin George
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 10-27-10 (APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work:

After-the-fact replacement of door to side porch.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The replacement door and sidelight unit is a modular unit of a design that is somewhat different from the design of other entrances on the house. The original entrance was a double French door according to the owner.

Fact:

The replacement unit has aluminum clad casings and the door is either metal or fiberglass with a faux leaded glass panel.

Guideline #2 (Page 57):

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.

In Support:

Margaret Regan, 1121 Virginia Street

Michael Regan, 1121 Virginia Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1369 for work at 1119 Virginia Street. The applicant is Austin George. The description of work is to replace the side porch doorway. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, noted that this is an after-the-fact application. Staff felt the doorway that was installed was not compatible with the house. He noted the original doors were French-type doors and he cited Guideline 2 on page 57 that says original windows and doors should be preserved and retained if possible. Staff does not support this application.

Speaking in support of the application was Margaret Regan of 1121 Virginia Street who had no objections to the door. She noted that the house had been in foreclosure, auctioned off, and beautifully remodeled. Also speaking in favor of the application was Michael Regan of 1121 Virginia Street. He also had no objections to the door and noted that the door that was replaced was in bad condition. There was no one present speaking in opposition to the application.

Discussion:

Mr. Macy felt the door looked nice and appeared to be similar to pictures of doors used as appropriate examples on page 61 in the Guidelines. Ms. Burns commented that a nice job was done on the restoration; however, the side door seemed to be more in keeping with a grander front door style. She would like to see the French doors put back and suggested approving the application with restrictions. Ms. Bowers was not in favor of the door and felt it should be replaced. Ms. Spaeh agreed that the door on the side was a front door usage. She also felt the door should be replaced with a French-style door. Mr. Sears commented that the owner did a very good job in the restoration. He agreed that the side door is a more in keeping with a front door style. Vice-Chair Wharton summarized that the majority of members felt the door style was not appropriate and would probably not have been approved originally. Mr. Macy reiterated his opinion that there are similarities between the door and the acceptable examples given in the Guidelines. He added that the door does not have an overall impact on the structure or visibility from the street. Members discussed misinformation about the guidelines given to the owner by neighbors, the fact this is not a principle elevation, and the after-the-fact status of the application.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Burns moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1369 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 for *Windows and Doors* (page 55) are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission unanimously voted 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Burns moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1369 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Austin George for work at 1119 Virginia Street with the following conditions: (1) that the design of the replacement door including the light pattern and material is to be approved by staff prior to being installed, (2) that the door should be a French-style door, either a double French door or a door similar in style to the opposite side of the house, (3) that the door be wood material with true divided light, (4) that an option could include a door with simulated divided light with interior and exterior grids, and (5) the current door is unacceptable, seconded by Ms. McManus. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Burns, Coleman, McManus. Nays: Macy)

(b) Application No. 1375

Location: 711 Simpson Street

Applicant: Gary and Marion Hosey

Property Owner: same

Date Received: 11-23-10

(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work: Demolition of house and carport. Construction of single-family residence and garage (conceptual).

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the house and carport with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed demolition meets the Guidelines for Demolition on page 73 of the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. The staff is not prepared to make a final recommendation on the new construction plans until detailed plans are submitted. However, the staff does feel that the conceptual plans demonstrate a sensitivity to the fundamental design criteria for the historic district, including setback, scale, massing and material, as described in the guidelines under *New Construction* (page 80) *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 24) and *Trees and Landscaping* (page 20) for the following reasons:

Fact:

The house and carport were built outside of the period of significance for the historic district and are considered "non-contributing" structures. The building lot was probably created from an adjoining lot. Therefore, removal of the house and carport would not have an impact on the integrity of the historic district.

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.

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. Generally speaking most pergolas have either been removed or roofed over. There are numerous examples of terraces in Fisher Park, although the wall is unusual.

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.

Guideline #6:

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.

Guideline #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 detailed plans be submitted and approved by the commission prior to demolition of the house including the following:
 - Elevation drawings of all sides of house and garage.
 - Materials examples.
 - Site plan showing the location and type of mechanical equipment, outside lighting, telecommunications equipment and similar items required for the project.
 - Landscape plan with detailed plant information.
 - Tree protection plan.
- That if the property is to be vacant for more than 60 days, it be graded and seeded and maintained on a regular basis.
- That a walkway be constructed connecting the house with the public sidewalk.

Ms. McManus left the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

In Support:

Gary Hosey, 711 Simpson Street
 Marion Hosey, 711 Simpson Street
 Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway
 Anne Stringfield, 1005 Eugene Street

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1375 for work at 711 Simpson Street. The applicants are Gary and Marion Hosey. The description is demolition of a non-contributing structure with a conceptual plan for replacing the house. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, stated that staff recommends in favor of this application and noted that the set-back, scale, massing, and height are congruous with the Guidelines on pages 77-78 and page 80. He cited *Guidelines for Demolition* on page 73. The house's orientation toward the street, parking, the garage placement, the hipped roof, the roof overhang, and the steep pitch of the roof are congruous with the Guidelines. The terrace and pergola give the house a human scale and the wall in front is an unusual feature. Mr. Cowhig also said the proposed construction materials are commonly found in the district. Staff recommended conditions including elevation drawings of all sides of house and garage, materials examples, a site plan showing the location and type of mechanical equipment, outside lighting, telecommunications equipment and similar items required for the project, landscape plan with detailed plant information, and a tree protection plan to be submitted. In addition, if the property is to be vacant for more than 60 days, it be graded and seeded and maintained on a regular basis; and that a walkway be constructed connecting the house with the public sidewalk.

Speaking in support of the application was Gary Hosey of 711 Simpson Street who is the applicant. He noted his love of Greensboro, Fisher Park and Simpson Street and engagement with the pedestrian

life. This is his retirement home and after moving in, he and his wife determined the renovation was not cost effective for what they wanted and they opted to demolish and replace. He noted the existing house is out of place and the new house would not be as large as the two-story houses on either side. They have hired preservation professionals and architects to design the new house. Also speaking in support was Marion Hosey of 711 Simpson Street. She noted the support of neighbors for the design although a concern about the pergola has been expressed. The pergola was included to add interior light and the front door concept was borrowed from a house in Irving Park. Also in support of the application was Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway, on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood supported the application although they had concerns about the pergola and the front door. Speaking in support was Anne Stringfield of 1005 Eugene Street. She is active in the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association and supports the application; however, she has concerns about the placement of the front door and pergola. She noted on page 62 of the Guidelines that the placement of doors and windows in a primary elevation are very important. She also cited page 72 of the Guidelines referencing that if doors and windows do not replicate the design, they should at least be similar.

Mr. Sears moved to excuse Ms. Coleman from the meeting, seconded by Ms. Spaeh. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers stated that the current house is the only house on Simpson Street that is out of character. She felt that the computer rendering gave the concept an air of coldness and members should think beyond that. She stated her support of the demolition and the mass of the proposed house. Ms. Burns indicated the door placement added some confusion; however, she was in favor of the demolition and felt the design was headed in the right direction. She wanted to see more work on the left side of the design. Vice-Chair Wharton asked the architects to address the feasibility of making adjustments to the design.

Mr. Steve Johnson, 491 Hyatt Drive, is with Southern Evergreen Architecture. He addressed the pergola, doors, and low front wall. In addition, he provided pictures of homes in the neighborhood to show the design is not out of character and he described the intent of the two doors.

Ms. Spaeh felt that symmetry was missing in the design. She expressed her support of the demolition. Vice-Chair Wharton expressed his support for the design and its compatibility with the neighborhood.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1375 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 for Demolition on page 73 and New Construction on page 80 are acceptable as findings of fact, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Burns, Macy, McManus. Nays: None.) Ms. McManus left the meeting unexcused and therefore, her vote counts in the affirmative.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1375 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Gary and Marion Hosey for work at 711 Simpson Street with the following conditions: (1) that detailed plans be submitted and approved by the Commission prior to demolition of the house including the following: (a) elevation drawings of all sides of house and garage, (b) materials examples, (c) site plan showing the location and type of mechanical equipment, outside lighting, telecommunications equipment and similar items required for the project, (d) landscape plan with detailed plant information, and (e) tree protection plan; (2) that post demo, if construction does not commence within 60 days, the property must be graded and

seeded and maintained on a regular basis, and (3) that a walkway be constructed connecting the house with the public sidewalk; seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Spaeh, Bowers, Burns, Macy, McManus. Nays: None.) Ms. McManus left the meeting unexcused and therefore, her vote counts in the affirmative.

- (c) **Location: 614-620 N. Elm Street**
Application No. 1377
Applicant: Tim Millisor
Property Owner: First Presbyterian Church
Date Application Received: 11-23-10 (CONTINUED)

Description of Work:

Construction of new parking area, fencing and landscaping

Background:

In 2005, First Presbyterian Church acquired the 620 N. Elm Street property in order to expand their existing parking area. The Historic Preservation Commission delayed the demolition of the house for 365 days, and in 2006 it was moved to a new location in the neighborhood and restored. In 2007 the church submitted an application for a COA for a new parking lot that combined the 620 property and the existing parking lot. The Historic Preservation Commission denied that application. A sticking point was the removal of a large Willow Oak tree. The church appealed the commission's decision to the Board of Adjustment but the decision was upheld. The 620 property has remained vacant since.

First Presbyterian Church has submitted an application for a COA to create a gravel parking lot on the 620 property that would be accessed through the existing parking lot. The existing driveway access would be removed. No trees would be removed and shrubbery would be started along the north side of the parking lot. A privacy fence would be constructed along the rear of the 614 and 620 properties.

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

Fact:

The applicant, First Presbyterian Church, 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 would be removed. The property is partially covered with asphalt which is the remnant of a parking area for employees when the house was used for offices. The property will not be graded.

Guideline #10:

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

Fact:

Grading of the property is not proposed.

Guideline #8:

Grading for new parking areas should not dramatically change the topography of the site or increase water runoff onto adjoining properties.

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. The fence will be in a highly visible location.

Guideline # 7 (page 30):

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.

Fact:

All existing trees on the site will be retained:

Guidelines #1:

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

Fact:

Because of the relative small size of the property there is not much opportunity to divide the parking area into smaller components. However, removal of some of the asphalt pavement at the back of the lot would result in a green area that would buffer the parking area from the adjacent residential area.

Guideline:

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.

Fact:

The City's Urban Forester is concerned that the proposed shrubbery around the Oak trees will harm their root systems and recommends removing some of the asphalt.

Guideline #6 (page 23):

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 requirements.

Recommended Conditions:

- That a portion of the existing asphalt at the back of the 620 lot be removed per the recommendations of the City's Urban Forester to protect the existing trees on the property and create a green buffer between parked cars and the residences on Magnolia Court.
- That the applicant work with City staff to come up with a design for the 8' privacy fence that is both functional and attractive, possibly incorporating some type of trellis feature.
- That the 8' privacy fence stop at the front corner of the house and a 4' picket fence be constructed from that point to the end of the property.
- That the stone wall at the back of the property be stabilized so that it does not continue to deteriorate.
- That a landscape be created along the front of the property to soften the impact the parking lot.

Ms. Bowers left the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

In Support:

Ted Millisor, First Presbyterian Church, 617 North Elm Street
 Robert Cantlander, 306 Parkway
 Anne Stringfield, 1005 Eugene Street
 John McLendon, 2 Magnolia Court

In Opposition:

None.

Mr. Macy left the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton observed that the interested parties appear to be coming to a convergent decision; however, he noted a large quantity of detailed recommendations for the plantings. He asked if the parties would be interested in meeting with Mr. Mike Cusimano, Greensboro Urban Planner, the Church, and neighbors. Vice-Chair Wharton asked representatives from the Church if they would be willing to continue this case to come up with detailed plans. Mr. Millisor agreed to a continuance.

Motion:

Ms. Spaeh moved to continue this application, seconded by Ms. Burns. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Spaeh, Burns, Macy, Bowers, McManus. Nays: None.) Ms. McManus, Ms. Bowers, and Mr. Macy left the meeting unexcused and therefore, their votes count in the affirmative.

(d) 617 North Elm Street (APPROVED AT STAFF LEVEL)

This application was approved at staff level and has been removed from the agenda.

**(e) Location: 200 Fisher Park Circle
Application No. 1374
Applicant: Stacey Lawson
Date Received: 11-24-10 (APPROVED)****Description of Work:**

Alterations to existing garage.

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 application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35)* for the following reasons:

Fact:

The existing garage is not a "contributing" structure because it was built outside of the period of significance.

Fact:

The garage faces Carolina Street and is visible from the public right-of-way. The proposed modifications will add ornamentation and interest to the front of an otherwise nondescript garage structure. Materials will be compatible with the character of the property and the historic district. The proposal calls for two doors instead of one long door which is more in keeping with historic garages in the neighborhood.

Guidelines (page 36):

1. 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.
2. 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.

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

In Support:

None.

In Opposition:

None.

Summary:

Vice-Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1374 for work at 200 Fisher Park Circle. The applicant is Stacey Lawson and the description is for alterations to existing garage. Mike Cowhig, City of Greensboro, said that staff is in support of granting this application and feels it is congruous with *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines for Garages and Accessory Structures* (page 35.) This is not a contributing structure and it faces the public right of way. The proposed modifications will add ornamentation and interest to the front of an otherwise nondescript garage. There was no one speaking in support or opposition to this application.

Discussion:

Members expressed their support of the alterations.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Spaeh moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1374 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 for *Garages and Accessory Structures* on page 36: (a) *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;* (b) *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 (c) *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 Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Spaeh, Burns, Macy, Bowers, McManus. Nays: None.) Ms. McManus, Ms. Bowers, and Mr. Macy left the meeting unexcused and therefore, their votes count in the affirmative.

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Spaeh moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1374 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Stacey Lawson for work at 200 Fisher Park Circle, seconded by Mr. Sears. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Sears, Spaeh, Burns, Macy, Bowers, McManus. Nays: None.) Ms. McManus, Ms. Bowers, and Mr. Macy left the meeting unexcused and therefore, their votes count in the affirmative.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

None.

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

Ms. Geary informed the Commission that the Green Workshop has been scheduled for January 8, 2011. Postcards have been sent out in the mail to property owners.

Mr. Cowhig referred to a list of comments received at the Guideline Meetings that have been typed up and distributed. He asked members to review the list and be thinking about proposed revisions to the

Guidelines. The Group discussed the possibility of holding a special meeting in January to discuss issues.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm-jd