

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
January 26, 2022**

The meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission was held on Wednesday, January 26, 2022 at 4:00 pm, remotely via Zoom. Commission members present were: Chair Amanda Hodierna (Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (Vice Chair, At Large), (David Arneke (College Hill), Adrienne Israel (New Garden & Guilford College, At Large) Jo Leimenstoll (Fisher Park), Sharon Graeber (District 1, Clinton Hills Benbow Park), and Deborah Kaufman (District 5). Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih-Geary, and Russ Clegg were present from the Planning Department. Allen Buansi, City Attorney, was also present.

Chair Hodierna inquired if all Commission members were contacted to ensure a quorum and if the meeting was properly advertised and the applicants notified. Chair Hodierna inquired if copies of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications and meeting minutes were mailed to the Commission members five days prior to the meeting. electronic packet was sent to the Commissioners. Chair Hodierna inquired if everyone on the Commission had received their packet and had an opportunity to review everything via email. Chair Hodierna inquired if reasonable efforts were made to identify and notify the surrounding property owners and other interested parties for all of the COA applications. Mr. Cowhig responded they were. Chair Hodierna welcomed everyone to the January 26, 2022 meeting of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission. Chair Hodierna advised this was a remote meeting being conducted in accordance with Session Law 20-20-3. Certificates of Appropriateness are subject to Quasi-Judicial hearings. Chair Hodierna advised of the policies, procedures, and process rights related to the remote meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. Commissioners and staff were introduced to the attendees of the meeting. Chair Hodierna inquired if any of the Commissioners had a conflict of interest regarding any of the items on the meeting agenda. With no response, Chair Hodierna inquired if any of the Commissioners had any ex parte communications or discussions that should be disclosed on any of the agenda items. Chair Hodierna disclosed she met with the applicant for Item 3, along with Mike Cowhig and Stefan -Leih Geary, to speak about the process and procedure to allow the applicant to ask questions about the proceedings to help the applicant in presenting a more efficient presentation. No merits, discussion items, or substance of the case was discussed. Chair Hodierna advised she could remain unbiased and objective regarding her decision making.

1. APPROVAL OF ABSENCE and UPDATE:

Mr. Cowhig stated there were two items removed. First was Item 4, 822 Spring Garden Street, was moved to the February meeting and Item 6, a presentation by Jeff Sovich regarding the College Hill street name project was also moved to the February meeting. Mr. Cowhig advised Linda Lane was an excused absence.

2. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 27, 2021 MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Arneke made a motion to approve the October 27, 2021, minutes as written, Seconded by Ms. Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 8-0. (Ayes: Chair Hodierna, Graeber, Wharton, Kaufman, Arnett, Arneke, Israel and Leimenstoll; Nays: 0).

3. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS:

3a. #2558; 603 N. Greene Street – Request for reconsideration of denied COA. (DENIED)

Chair Hodierna swore in Mr. Cowhig for his testimony and consent to the remote hearing.

Mike Cowhig, Planning Department. Mr. Cowhig advised this was a reconsideration request of a denied Certificate of Appropriateness application. Mr. Cowhig stated when a COA is denied, the applicant has certain right; the right to appeal and a right to request a reconsideration. It would be up to the Commission to grant a reconsideration. Mr. Cowhig read the criteria needed for reconsideration of the applications that were denied:

A: The chair shall entertain a motion from a Commission member that the applicant be allowed to present evidence in support of the request for reconsideration. Evidence shall be limited to that which is necessary

to enable the Commission to determine if there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence or conditions related to the application. Provided that the applicant shall be given the opportunity to present any other additional supporting evidence if the Commission decides to reconsider the application.

B. After receiving the evidence, the Commission shall deliberate on whether or not there was a substantial change in the facts, evidence, or conditions related to application warranting reconsideration. If the Commission finds there has been such a change, the request will be treated as a new application received.

Mr. Cowhig advised the Commission denied an application for an “after the fact” approval for changes to the front porch of 603 N. Greene Street on June 30, 2021. The existing porch railing clade in wood shingles, was replaced with a new railing of spaced pickets. The Commission based its denial on the **Historic District Design Guidelines, Porches, Entrances, and Balconies (pages 62-66)**. Mr. Cowhig advised Mr. Buansi was present to add anything regarding procedure.

Mr. Alan Buansi, City Attorney, advised procedurally the Chair will entertain a motion for reconsideration. If a motion is introduced, seconded, and voted on favorably by the Commission, the Commission will then hear a presentation from the applicant and representatives. At the conclusion of that presentation, the Commissioner’s decision will be limited to if there was a substantial change in the facts, evidence, or conditions related to the applicant’s COA. The decision by the Commission may be based on information in the applicant’s presentation and public comments related to if there was a substantial change. If the Commission votes and decides there was a significant change, the applicant will then be treated as a new application for a COA. It would then be before the Commission at a subsequent meeting for a new hearing on the merits. Mr. Buansi encouraged those with questions to speak. Commissioner Hodierna inquired if the Commission members understood the process or had questions.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Wharton advised he had questions regarding a motion before discussion of a reconsideration. Mr. Wharton moved that the Commission reconsider the application, seconded by Mr. Arneke. Chair Hodierna inquired if there was discussion. Mr. Wharton stated he read all the materials provided and asked if the other Commissioners found anything substantial regarding the Historic District Guidelines that would warrant a reconsideration. Ms. Leimenstoll advised she did not know if there was information relevant for a review by the Commissioners. Chair Hodierna advised it should be a motion and approval to discuss. Mr. Arnett stated in reading the description of the reconsideration, it appeared as though there was an alternate proposal. Chair Hodierna stated her understanding was if and when the reconsideration motion was approved and new evidence heard, and the Commission felt it was enough change of circumstances to warrant a reconsideration in a new application, that would be considered as new. It was not on the table now. Ms. Israel asked if the original proposal was to open the enclosed porch so homeless individuals could not hide or sleep on the porch. Chair Hodierna responded that was her understanding. Ms. Israel asked if the proposal was rejected because it would alter the porch and no longer be consistent with the historical nature. Mr. Cowhig advised that was correct. Ms. Israel stated she had not read anything within the new request that addressed any of that issue and there appeared to be two proposals. Mr. Arneke advised there were two proposals. Mr. Wharton stated the only thing found approaching substantial information that would change circumstances was a survey of other shingle porches that was new information.

DISCUSSION:

Discussion among the Commissioners focused on keeping within the guidelines on what was relevant and new to the reconsideration request. It was agreed homeless issues were not within the Historic Guidelines. Different types of porches, open and closed shingles, history of the building and the new information it provided was thoroughly discussed. The functional needs of an institutional property owner and changes that may be made to the architecture of the building were discussed. Pictures of the railing were reviewed. Mr. Arneke felt strongly there was enough new material information to merit a reconsideration. Several Commissioners felt there were changes that made a difference. Lighting was felt to be a security issue and discussed at length. A compromise approach was discussed amongst the Commissioners versus a denial and a new application. Chair Hodierna asked staff if the reconsideration was denied, what would keep them from presenting a new COA with a new request. Mr. Cowhig responded if the request for reconsideration was denied, they would not be able to submit a new

application for this issue. If the reconsideration request was to be approved, an application could be submitted that could be heard at another meeting. There would not be an opportunity to submit a compromised COA, other than the reconsideration. The applicant was in violation currently and the City would be obligated to enforce that violation. Chair Hodierna reiterated there was only two ways of considering a new proposal; the reconsideration standards are met and the applicant goes to court for a Judge to decide to remand it back to the Commission. The Commission would be mandated to consider a new application. Mr. Buansi reminded the Commission of the standards. The application was not only for new facts or information, it is new information and different information heard indicating a substantial change in the facts and circumstances related to the application.

QUESTIONS:

Ms. Graeber asked if the application was rejected, would the applicant would be required to restore the porch. Mr. Cowhig responded the applicant would be. Ms. Leimenstoll asked for clarification regarding after the fact reviews, and the Commission being asked to not consider things that happened since the work was done. Chair Hodierna responded the Commission has been told to consider after the fact applications as if they were not constructed yet.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Hodierna stated the minutes and memory appeared to collaborate there was a lot of testimony from the applicant regarding the homelessness issue and this was not the first-time hearing that. Chair Hodierna stated the information from the applicant at this meeting would be anything that would warrant a substantial change in the facts, evidence, or condition regarding historical structures and the types of porch treatments. Chair Hodierna stated the survey introduced new information to allow the Commission to review the shingle treatment under the guidelines to bring in the language for commercial and institutional uses. Chair Hodierna felt there was new information to consider the fact that the shingle treatment is not a feature to be. The severity issue of the homeless issue should have been addressed at the June meeting. Chair Hodierna advised she felt she had enough information from the new survey information to reconsider the shingle treatment. Mr. Arneke stated a feature of house can be historic and contribute to the historical character of the house even if not original. Mr. Arneke referred to the Eastern Building being restored and his own home as examples. The survey done was more supportive of restoring the porch as it was, as opposed to destruction by the church. It may not be the way it was originally, but that feature on the house should remain historically as it was. Ms. Leimenstoll stated the survey pointed out it was a unique shingle application. Being in the district makes it more important and was character defining of the house when the district was created and definitely appreciated by whoever observed it. Ms. Graeber felt the uniqueness made the house more special and should be kept. Mr. Arneke referred to the Guideline standards, on page 9. Mr. Arneke felt the Commission was not respecting the original contributing character of the building by allowing the shingles to be removed. Even if not original, it has become an historically significant characteristic of the building. Mr. Arnett stated with other institutional cases more flexibility was allowed by the standards. The open railing is not inappropriate in reviewing other styles which provided the flexibility for institutions structure. Mr. Arnett felt this Commission has been far too lenient dealing with institutions and far too willing to sacrifice historic character of structures when an institution says something needs to be done. Regarding this case, there could be other measures taken that would not require that type of physical alteration to the house. Mr. Arneke felt it was an extreme measure and not consistent with maintaining the historical character of the historic district. If this had been before the Commission before the fact, it would have been a new application and his reaction would have been to try something else first and if it didn't work, to think about other options. The Commission was robbed of that discretion by the applicant going on its' own. Ms. Israel agreed there was an element of punishment of doing something without permission first. Ms. Israel stated what is there is compatible with the roof and questioned how it destroyed the historic character of the house. Mr. Arneke responded the applicant removed an historic characteristic of the house, not that they replaced it with something that matches the house somewhere else. The point is what they destroyed, not what it was replaced with. Chair Hodierna stated the decision now is a reconsideration. Mr. Arnett requested to make a motion on the reconsideration request. If the reconsideration request is approved, there will still be an opportunity to deny a second COA application.

MOTION:

Mr. Arnett moved that the Commission finds there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence, or conditions related to the application. The Commission approves the request for a reconsideration for this COA application. Second by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 4- 4. (Ayes: Chair Hodieme, Wharton, Arnett, and Israel; Nays: Graber, Kaufman, Arneke, and Leimenstoll. Staff advised there has never been a tie vote on a reconsideration request in the past. Discussion was held on how to go forward with a tie vote. Mr. Buansi advised there was nothing regarding reconsideration rules and advised to go forward as in a vote for a COA; which would mean that a tie vote means failed to obtain a majority for the motion and therefore the motion fails. Chair Hodieme advised the motion for reconsideration failed and the item will not be reconsidered. Ms. Geary requested to speak. Chair Hodieme swore in Ms. Geary for her testimony and Ms. Geary consented to the remote hearing.

Stefan-Leih Geary, City of Greensboro Planning Department. Ms. Geary advised the applicants rights at this point, because they have the tolling agreement put in place to allow an extension of the appeal period of the original denied COA. At this point in time, the applicant would have the option to appeal the original denied COA to Superior Court. Ms. Geary inquired of the City Attorney what the timeline for the appeal was. Mr. Buansi advised the Tolling Agreement extends through the end of January 31, 2022. The applicant has until that time to appeal the decision regarding the original application to Superior Court.

At 6:08 p.m., a break was taken by the Commission. The meeting resumed at 6:15 p.m., with all Commissioners present.

Mr. Cowhig advised Ms. Geary would be doing the next presentation. Ms. Geary stated Mr. Buansi, City Attorney would be speaking first on a matter. Mr. Buansi stated it was related back to the vote ballots taken on the reconsideration item. In the Rules & Procedures, there was a rule pertaining to members who vote on a reconsideration or an application who were not present for previous deliberations on said application. There was one member not present at the June 30, 2021 application which was Mr. Arnett. Mr. Arnett was a yes vote but that would not change the result. Before the vote, there should have been an opportunity offered for the Commission to vote on whether to allow Mr. Arnett to vote and if the Commission did not approve that motion, he would not count as a vote. Chair Hodieme stated there were two Commissioners in June who were not appointed to the Commission. Ms. Geary advised Commissioner Kaufman was in September and Commissioner Graeber's first meeting was in September. Ms. Leimenstoll advised she attended the June 30 meeting, but left before the final vote. Ms. Geary advised Wharton, Arneke, Israel, and Chair Hodieme were yes, and Arneke was the only no at that. Mr. Buansi advised the proper step would be to vote on whether to allow Commissioners who were not present at the June 30 meeting, to now vote on the reconsideration. If the Commissioners are approved, a revote would be taken. A question was asked on who would be voting on and did those who were not, count. Mr. Buansi responded it would be only the Commissioners who were present now. Out of those present at that time, there were four Commissioners present currently who voted at that time. Chair Hodieme stated all of the Commissioners sat through a lengthy consideration and some things were not totally on point. There was a good reexamination and Chair Hodieme was comfortable letting everyone vote. Mr. Buansi stated that would be the motion to be potentially introduced on who was present. Chair Hodieme advised she was jumping to the need to vote on who votes, obtain that vote, and then finalize this item to have a clear resolution and answer for the applicant. Mr. Wharton stated everyone at this meeting had a full understanding of the case. Mr. Wharton did not feel it would be fair consensus of the Commission. The Commissioners did their due diligence on this and would move to allow the Commissioners who were present at the June meeting to vote at this meeting.

MOTION:

Mr. Wharton moved to allow the Commissioners who were present at the June meeting to vote on item 3a. at this meeting. Mr. Arneke seconded the motion. The Commission voted 3-0. (Chair Hodieme, Wharton, and Arneke.) Ms. Israel requested to abstain. Mr. Buansi advised every member has an affirmative duty to vote. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Hodieme, Wharton, Arneke, and Israel). The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Hodierna stated the Commission would allow all 8 members present at this meeting to vote on item 3a. Chair Hodierna inquired if there was a motion to reconsider the COA denied in June for 603 N. Greene Street, application 2558. Mr. Arnett moved to allow the Commissioners who were present at the June meeting to vote on 3a. Seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 4-4). (Chair Hodierna, Wharton, Arnett, and Israel; Nays: Graeber, Kaufman, Arneke, and Leimenstoll.). Chair Hodierna advised the motion failed for lack of majority and the reconsideration denied. The appeal period was tolled to January 31, 2022 and the applicant can still appeal to Superior Court.

3b. #2565; 701-709 N. Greene Street and 208 West Fisher Avenue. (CONTINUED)

Ms. Geary advised David Stone of D. Stone Builders, Inc., is the applicant. The current property owner was not the same as the applicant. The 5 properties are owned by First Presbyterian Church. This is a large project with a combination of 5 existing parcels. Some still hold their historic integrity and some have been compromised through demolition and construction of parking lots. This request is for the demolition of 3 structures, 2 of which are historically contributing both to the local historic district and the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The unfortunate item is that this Commission under state neighboring legislation has little authority with demolition requests, resulting in the Commission not having the ability to deny demolition requests of historic structures. The power is in the opportunity to delay up to 365 days. Wording with demolitions can be confusing and can lead to feeling staff supports historically contributing buildings which they are not. It is not within the Commission's ability to deny that request.

Ms. Geary stated West Fisher Avenue and North Greene Street was reviewed in June with a request for rezoning. The property went from a combination of zonings to an RM-8 (Residential Multi-family-8). For this particular land, it would allow up to 9 units to be built on this site. Based on information contained in the application, staff was recommending in favor of granting a COA for this project with conditions. The proposed new construction is congruous with the **Historic District Design Guidelines under New Construction, page 30; Walkways, driveways, and parking areas**. Ms. Geary reiterated staff does not believe the demolition is consistent with the standards but recognize the Commission cannot prevent demolition and can only delay issuance of the COA for 365 days (page 73). Ms. Geary stated 705 North Greene Street is a Colonial Revival foursquare house constructed between 1910 and 1915 for Ms. E.J. Monroe. The National Register Nominations: Simply finished, hip-roofed house with front hipped dormers, plan cornerboards, friezeboards, and round columned front porch; 707 North Greene Street is a Colonial Revival brick home constructed between 1915-1920 for C.H. Boyst, owner of Gate City Candy Company; 208 West Fisher Avenue is a non-contributing modern brick apartment building constructed between 1950 and 1970. Ms. Geary stated the **Guidelines from page 73, under Demolition: The Commission has the authority to approve a demolition COA with an up to a 365-day delay**. The chapter asks the following questions be considered: 1. Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition; 2. Could another site serve the purpose just as well; 3. Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs; 4. Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building; 5. As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location; 6. Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance; 7. Is the structure of national, state or local significance. If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted: 1. Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site; 2. Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition. If the site is to remain vacant for more than 60 days, it should be cleared of debris, reseeded and maintained in a manner consistent with other properties in the Historic District.

Ms. Geary displayed images of the historical slated for demolition mature canopy trees. Images of First Presbyterian Church, the apartment building built in 1950 to 1970, Greene Street, West Fisher Avenue, Trinity Church, buildings within Greene Street, the back of the buildings of 705 and 707 were displayed and both slated to be demolished. Ms. Geary indicated the front of the apartments with nice detailing in the corners. Different angles of the site were displayed. A community garden was shown with the area in back where the home was demolished by First Presbyterian Church. The Community Garden has been an asset but it was sad to lose a historic contributing structure. Staff understands the limitations in place for the Commission. Ms. Geary advised prior to receiving and after the application, both Chair Hodierna and Jesse Arnett volunteered to participate on the

sub-committee. Additional plans were submitted the morning of this meeting incorporating the discussion and recommendations that were suggested. Ms. Geary stated in talking with the Sketch Plan Review Committee, a function of Greensboro and a pre-cursor before going to the Technical Review Committee. The process is about helping property owners, applicants, and developers to work through the City's process for new construction with members from Fire and Police departments, Water Resources, Transportation, Building Inspections, Engineering, and Planning department. Ms. Geary displayed some of the comments from that conversation. A photograph was depicted indicating a storm sewer, a drainage structure, and a 20 foot easement on the site that has a buffer on either side that the building foundation could not be done if there was not a ratio in place. Ms. Geary stated there was a corner that pushes the siting pattern of the buildings. There were also grading constraints. The buildings proposed are two new construction buildings with four units in each and oriented to Greene Street with a flat roof design. There is an option for a third floor to allow for a third floor terrace and some additional living space. The third floor, if a buyer was interested, the terrace would be re-set from the front of the building. From the free front and a pedestrian vantage point it would appear to be a two-story building. A Commissioner on a sub-committee made a request to lower the roof that the new plan accommodated. There will be front walks leading directly from the front portico entrance ways of each unit directly to the public right of way. The setback of the front facade is 35 feet and the minimum required for RM-8 zoning. The distance is consistent with the sitting patterns along Greene Street. The prevailing estimated current setback is approximately 40 feet. The design includes single driveways opening to Greene Street, minimizing the impact to the traditional public right of way design. The parking lot is located underneath the building and surface parking is at the rear of the property behind the building. A central CBU mailbox will be located on the interior of the property. Concerns have been expressed regarding ADA accessibility that will be answered by the applicant or at future meetings. Ms. Geary cited the **Guidelines on page 80 under New Construction: 1. Site new buildings so that the setback, spacing, and orientation to the street are consistent with the historic buildings within the district; 2. New construction should have a similar height and width of existing buildings within a block or street; 3. Relate the roof form, pitch, and overhang of new construction buildings to historic roofs within the district. Guidelines on page 30 were also cited: 4. To 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 the buildings, and walkways should lead directly to the front steps of the house; 6. Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.** Regarding the landscaping plan, there are several mature trees slated to come down as part of this plan. Staff would ask that consideration be given to safeguard those trees during construction. This landscaping plan also provides multiple new canopy trees. In looking over the landscape plan with Elizabeth Blank, Land and Planning Architect in the Planning Department it was agreed there should be street canopy trees lining the streets. If it will not be obstructed through public infrastructure. Photographs were shown delineating the individual units. Ms. Geary depicted the modifications provided with an alternate window pattern and brick pattern. All will have a flattened roof on top of the optional third floor and would reduce the over height. Windows were added that will match the style on the elevation. More designs and elevations of what is being proposed for the building. The buildings constructed of brick predominantly with Cementitious siding accents. The proposed windows would be a wood aluminum clad product with simulated divided lite muntins. They will be cased in windows. The fenestration pattern of the windows and door on the main façade will be consistent with fenestration patterns on historic examples in the district.

Chair Hodierna inquired if there were any further questions for staff from the Commissioners. Seeing none, Chair Hodierna inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the application. Ms. Geary stated the Commissioners could talk about which fenestration pattern meets the guidelines more. A front portico was depicted with a recessed front door and a side window. These presently have will have solid sides with a flat roof and masonry products. A portico with solid walls is appropriate for the historic district. **The Guidelines on page 80, New Construction: (4.) Design the spacing, pattern, proportion, size, and detailing of windows, doors, and vents to be compatible with existing historic examples within the district; (5.) Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using**

exterior material typical of historic building in the districts. To include, 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 finished 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. Ms. Geary stated the conditions associated with this request.

The date of issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness be delayed for a period that gives ample time to explore alternatives to demolition, including moving of structures.

1. If any of the structures are moved to a location within a historic district, that a COA is obtained be obtained.
2. Details pertaining to site development are brought back to the Commission for approval, including, but not limited to, lighting, walkways, ADA compatibility, for example.
3. Details pertaining to window cladding color, paint colors and any painted masonry be brought to the Commission for approval.
4. At least 2 additional canopy trees are planted along Fisher Avenue and 2 additional canopy trees are planted along Greene Street. All new canopy trees should have a minimum diameter growth height of 2 inches. Any new landscaping that does not survive for 2 years must be replaced in kind.

Ms. Geary displayed an example of products and colors the applicant was proposing to use. The applicant will provide more information on materials to be used.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Arneke stated County records indicate 208 Fisher Avenue building being built in 1938. In the City directory it was listed as 1940. Ms. Geary responded it was based off of the National Register Nomination. Mr. Cowhig stated Mr. Arneke was probably right. In looking at the building it appeared to be earlier. It is officially considered non-contributing for National Register purposes. Mr. Wharton asked if the lentels and stills would be stone. Ms. Geary responded to her understanding that was correct. The applicant was present to answer any of those details. All of that would be open to future discussion if this portion of the application were to be continued. Chair Hodieme asked if both her and Mr. Cowhig did any research or reached out to do preliminary discussion of some of the alternatives to the demolition. Ms. Geary responded she was fairly sure testimony would be provided from several individuals in the community and some things the applicant would speak to regarding working toward relocating one or more of the structures. Mr. Arnett asked where storm sewer was in relation to the existing 208 West Fisher Lake. Ms. Geary indicated the location of the storm sewer that was 10 feet in either direction from the center line. Ms. Geary indicated on the map where the apartment building was. Mr. Arneke stated it appeared to him it looks like it runs underneath the driveway beside the apartment building and then when it gets to the back edge of the driveway, it takes a diagonal toward the property line. Ms. Geary advised she was told from the City engineer that you can pave over public sewer and infrastructure but you cannot construct buildings on it. It is different if it is a private line. It is not recommended. In this case it is public and the only thing this applicant could do with the space would be paving. If the Commission would like a deeper explanation on that, Ms. Geary could obtain it. Ms. Geary did not feel the percentages and all of the mathematics that are looked at was necessarily pertinent at this point. Mr. Arnett asked it was storm water and sewer. Ms. Geary stated it was storm sewer and drainage structure with a 20 foot easement. Ms. Leimenstoll asked at what point would the Commission be commenting on that windows. Ms. Geary stated the applicant has indicated is not necessarily looking for full approval at this meeting, but also mainly looking for feedback and guidance. The applicant is here to lay out the project and receive feedback and then make accommodations to the plan based on that feedback. Ms. Geary advised the applicant was present to speak. Ms. Leimenstoll stated she did not see under conditions a configuration of the windows and asked if it was a condition to be determined later. Ms. Geary advised the Commission can decide which direction the Commission feels would be best, if the project makes sense to the Commissioners. Chair Hodieme requested to hear from the applicant, David Stone. Chair Hodieme swore in David Stone and Mr. Stone consented to the remote hearing.

David Stone, D. Stone Builders, Inc., 2904 Lawndale Drive, Greensboro. Mr. Stone stated he was President of D. Stone Builders, Inc., custom home builder and real estate developer based in Greensboro since 1982. Mr. Stone presented their development plan for the parcels located on Greene Street and Fisher Avenue. Mr. Stone stated he

is very familiar with the area and property. It is utmost important that D. Stone Builders design a project the community will be proud of and fits the neighborhood. This process started with conceptualization. After several meetings with architects and engineers, it was determined that a total of 8 townhomes would best suit the property spread across two buildings. The preliminary sketch plans were developed by the engineers depicting the two buildings located on the property, set back approximately 35 feet from Greene Street, consistent with the existing buildings. The proposed built upon area is the same or less than what exists currently. The sketch plan calls for a reduction of the number of curb cuts on Greene Street and Fisher Avenue from 3 to 1 and will serve as a means of ingress and egress for the homeowners and their guests. Garages and parking for the development will be located at the rear of the property with required CBU mailbox. All of the townhomes will have a private walkway from the front door to the sidewalk located along Greene Street. As much green space as possible is surrounding the buildings and have a preliminary landscape sketch plan providing inside into what plantings are being considered to install around the buildings. The goal with the landscape sketch plan was to create a design enhancing both the development and the neighborhood by strengthening the visual representation and improving upon what is existing there currently by implement a number of different plant species that will thrive in our climate and present a cohesive environment of different shapes, sizes, and colors. Along Greene Street the conceptual plan calls for 3 canopy trees. Two Willow Oak and 1 Laurel Oak, 2 Yellowwood tree, 2 dogwood trees, 2 Serviceberry trees with low evergreen soft hedges, hydrangeas, and day lilies located in the plant bed surrounding the buildings. Along Fisher Avenue, the larger canopy trees will be planted to enhance the visual elements along the Greenway while also providing screening for both the homeowners, pedestrians, and drivers along Fisher Avenue. The conceptual plan calls for 5 canopy trees along Fisher Avenue, 3 Blackout trees, 1 Natural Oak and 1 Willow Oak. On the lawn area, 2 Emily Burke Bruner Hollies and low Evergreen soft hedge along the side of the building. Along the rear property line, the conceptual plan calls for a mix assortment of species for screening, in addition to 6 more canopy trees with holly accents and lawn. The driveways would have double cobbled edging, finished with a Riverstone pea gravel on a compacted base. Between the driveways will be additional landscaping to include Carolina Cherry Laurels, Camelias, and Day lilies with daffodil underplanting's. The right property line will feature 2 Emily Burke Bruner hollies and 3 dwarf Burning Bush plantings. The drive into the development will be lined with vegetation consisting of Carolina Cherry Laurels, Sweet Bay Magnolias, and Camellias. Each building will be constructed with a brick veneer featuring soldier course patterns over the windows and core boring along the roof top. Windows will be simulated divided light wood windows with aluminum cladding on exterior. The siding will be located on the third floor with Hardie board smooth lap siding. Porches will feature Bemark ceilings and bluestone finish floor. The front doors will be mahogany wood 6 light door to match the windows. Throughout this process, Mr. Stone has been in communication with neighbors, the Neighborhood Associations, and members of the Commission. It started back in October when he attended the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association monthly board meeting on October 25 to review the sketch plan and preliminary elevations previously shown. Mr. Stone attend a Historic Preservation meeting on October 27 for the recommendation of the zoning application. On November 15, 2021, Mr. Stone mailed out letters to surrounding neighbors, notifying them of the rezoning request and inviting them to attend a Zoom meeting on December 9, 2021, to review the sketch plan preliminary elevations and answer any questions. December 20, 2021, Mr. Stone appeared before the Zoning Commission and received a unanimous vote of approval. January 4, 2022, Mr. Stone met with the Preservation Commission sub-committee and City staff to review development plans. Answered feedback and answered questions prior to submitting the COA application. A handful of modifications were made as a result to the elevations to include flattening of the roof pitch, eliminating the grids on the third floor exterior door, adding brick access between the townhomes for delineation purposes, and continuation of the brick corbeling around the perimeter of the building. On January 12, Mr. Stone submitted the COA application bringing him before the Commission currently. Mr. Stone stated D. Stone Builders believes the development plan and design presented meets each of the 7 key principles that should be considered for new construction as outlined in the Historic District Program Manual and Design Standards. Mr. Stone welcomed feedback and questions. Chair Hodieme inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Stone.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Wharton asked if soldier courses for the door window lintels were being used instead of stone. Mr. Stone responded that was correct. The original drawing did not have the stone accents but the latest version it has been changed to a brick soldier course under the windows and doors. Mr. Wharton asked if that was a cost issue or something else. Mr. Stone responded a combination of both. Mr. Arnett stated along Fisher Avenue, the part that runs down toward where the parking area will be, how would that grade change be handled or will there be a retainer walls or what was the idea for there. Mr. Stone responded the plan has gone through multiple different reviews. Their engineers are not done with the plan yet and that has not been determined to date. Ms. Leimenstoll thanked Mr. Stone for his thorough and concise explanation of the project and commended him on the revisions made that really improve the way it fits into the neighborhood, such as the continuation of corbeling of the cornice and the roofing of the casement windows to be triple. Ms. Leimenstoll asked if this was more of schematic approval versus a final version. Mr. Stone the latest version shown is the one they want to move forward with. Instead of having all those single windows lined up 4 townhomes long. The thought was it appeared harsh and having triple windows softens the look and is the look they want to move forward. With no other questions, Chair Hodierna swore in Tim Milisor and Mr. Milisor consented to the remote hearing.

Tim Milisor, Director of Property for First Presbyterian Church, 617 N. Elm Street, Greensboro. Mr. Milisor stated the church is in support of this request. The church considered the request carefully and felt it was a great use of the property as the church can no longer support through their operating budget all of the properties they currently have. With no questions for Mr. Milisor, Chair Hodierna inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the request. With no further speakers in support, Chair Hodierna moved on to speakers signed up in opposition. Chair Hodierna swore in Kristin Huff and Ms. Huff consented to the remote hearing.

Kristin Huff, 705 Simpson Street, Greensboro. Ms. Huff purchased a home in August. Her company will be opening in the spring and hopes to bring in over 200 employees to the downtown area. Both her company and herself are here to invest. One of the reasons was not only the diverse talent pool but also the historical nature of downtown Fisher Park. Ms. Huff was happy to hear Mr. Stone's history in Greensboro and connection to the area but wished that had been reflected better in the plan. The plan could do a better job of preserving the character of Fisher Park. Ms. Huff implored on the company's sensibilities and the sensibilities of HPC to not destroy the mature trees on the property. Ms. Huff did not understand why the trees that have been there for decades in the making would not meet the needs of this planting. With no questions, Chair Hodierna called upon Cheryl Pratt.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, Greensboro. Ms. Pratt advised the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board voted unanimously to not support the COA at this time and were requesting a continuance. All the plans provided in the original COA were sketches and they did not receive the updated plans until the afternoon and were not available on the website. Per page 77 of the **HPC Guidelines, "new Construction should contribute and amplify the characteristics that make the neighborhood unique."** The neighborhood is still not seeing. Some are in the corbel details and the windows being grouped but the Association is very concerned about the front doors, particularly the side walls, no cornice corbels, and would like to see more design elements from the neighborhood incorporated into this building. **Page 77 of the Guidelines "buildings should not be sided with sidewalks facing the street."** The Association understands the drainage in the corner but there still could be perhaps 2 units facing Fisher Avenue because the side wall of these buildings, especially as they currently stand, are not very attractive. They would like to not see the large wall of a 20,000 square foot building. The Association was asking for a 365 stay of demolition for all three buildings currently on the site. Guidelines for tree and landscaping, page 23. All of the trees cannot be saved due to construction and asked that the large trees currently standing between the existing buildings and the sidewalk be saved. The Big Oak trees and the current setback should be required to protect existing trees included on page 86 of the tree production guidelines. The trees are between the current building and the street and would like them to remain on the campus. Emails were shown depicting indicating the times Mr. Stone discussed the brick regarding painting, or a modular brick. Discussions were shown regarding painting the brick white with charcoal trim and gutters. Paint is not in the guidelines. White brick with charcoal trim and gutters is not a paint. It is a trend that was started via tv show. It is the avocado green of this decade and not appropriate for the 20th century. New York called it dead and the Association would like to bury it. With no further questions, Chair Hodierna advised Tracy Pratt was the next speaker.

Tracy Pratt, 914 Magnolia Avenue. Mr. Pratt advised what is objectionable is how the property is being developed, where everything is torn down so the lot can start from the ground up. The major canopy trees should be required to remain and anything planted would not compare in any way to the current trees. Mr. Pratt felt Mr. Stone has not looked into preserving any of the existing structures on the site and felt the two houses should have some expiration on whether they could be saved, moved, or readapted in the development. There are local groups interested in the houses and a possibility that they could be moved. Mr. Pratt felt the information was somewhat deceptive with updated plans not being provided to be reviewed prior to this meeting. Mr. Pratt stated the design is simplistic, lacking in detail, and not sympathetic to the neighborhood. Mr. Pratt echoed the request the request from Ms. Pratt requesting a 365 delay on the demolition and would like more time for the neighborhood to look over the plans before any decision is made. Mr. Pratt reiterated the request to delay the demolition and the major canopy trees not removed. Chair Hodierné inquired if there were questions for Mr. Pratt.

Mr. Arnett and understood seeing things that there was no chance to prepare for. Mr. Arnett felt a good effort was made to accommodate the feedback received 3 months ago bring it to the meeting. Chair Hodierné stated with no other comments or questions, moved on to Julie Davenport. Ms. Davenport requested Ms. Stringfield to speak first. Chair Hodierné swore in Ms. Stringfield and Ms. Stringfield consented to the remote hearing.

Ann Stringfield, 1005 N. Eugene Street, Fisher Park Historic District. Ms. Stringfield asked the Commission to implement the 365 day delay of demolition of the 3 residences listed in the COA. Also asked the Commission what is a continuance of the COA because it was posted this day. Ms. Stringfield was aware of specific examples of concerns can aid the Commissioner's decision making. **The City Standards for New Construction, page 79, indicate that COA applications require that a site plan show utilities, lighting, mechanical equipment, and other things.** Those are absent in this COA at this point. **The Standards for New Construction Site Planning, page 77, "the building should not have "side walls facing the street."** The plan indicates a 3 story brick sidewall facing Fisher Avenue. In the **Standards for New Construction Site Planning, page 78, "blank walls should be avoided."** Today the designs show some windows on the side of the buildings that appear minimal and random. "The main entrance is usually the prominent feature of structures in historic districts and should be emphasized in new construction as well." It appears that when stepping out of the proposed entrances of the structures, you would be standing with a blank brick wall immediately to the right and left. The site plan and the landscaping pages, show no evidence of there being front porches which are in their elevation drawings. In the **Standards for New Construction Landscaping, page 78, "Every effort should be made to save existing trees, shrubbery and hedges."** Chapter for Trees and Landscaping, pages 22, indicates a site plan must show "the location existing tree and trees to be removed." Ms. Stringfield stated she did see those in this COA for the trees to be removed. In the **Standards for New Construction, page 79, also requires "all other documentation is required under the Neighborhood Settings, pages 18-41.** Even those more familiar with those chapters need more time to view if the COA submitted on this day meets those standards. Ms. Stringfield requested the City Attorney to explain the ramifications of a continuance so everyone is on the same page. With no questions, Chair Hodierné swore in Julie Davenport and Ms. Davenport consented to the remote hearing.

Julie Davenport, 821 Rankin Place, Greensboro. Ms. Davenport reiterated some of what everyone said. There needs to be a 365 day delay on the existing structures. Ms. Davenport did feel there was enough detail totally on the application to approve it at this meeting. There should be something attractive facing Fisher Avenue and Greene Street. The front porches are not specified in detail and the idea of brick walls was very unappealing. Porches are very prominent features on most historic houses. The Guidelines state that porches should be part of the details. There are no details on the garage doors or the back railing, grading of the lot especially on the Fisher Avenue side, the back-railing materials and the new third floor on the front façade. No one has had enough time to understand that floor area. The back of the façade appeared to have awnings or something. There is not enough information on this application as it stands. More details and materials are needed. Other details need to be worked out and a 365 day delay needs to be implemented as a condition. There are other locations to build in an historic district. Saving the houses is critical. With no questions, Chair Hodierné swore in Julie Curry and Ms. Curry consented to the remote hearing.

Julie Curry, 1009 Graylyn Street, Greensboro. Ms. Curry, On the Board of Trustee for the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund. Ms. Curry was supporting the Commission's right to delay demolition on all the

structure for 365 days. Ms. Curry advised her board saves properties that are in these types of situations. They have the opportunity to relocate properties, put them back on the tax role and able to have a family enjoy the facilities. They have been very successful and work with the City of Greensboro, UNCG, and private owners. Her Board would like to not see any of these structures in the landfill without a good try to relocate them. Ms. Curry advised she did support the neighborhood request to extend the 365 delay. With no questions. Chair Hodiernie asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition of the request. Seeing none, Chair Hodiernie asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. Chair Hodiernie inquired if Mr. Stone would like to speak in rebuttal.

David Stone, apologized for the lateness of the plans. There was no intent to spring anything on anyone by any means. The property was rezoned in December. A meeting was held with the sub-committee on January 4 and immediately reached out to their architect to have those revisions made. They were not received until earlier in this week and passed them along immediately. One of the main goals for this meeting was to have feedback and hear what the neighborhood had to say in order to make reasonable changes to the plans. Mr. Stone met with Benjamin Briggs, Executive Director of Preservation Greensboro on December 16 at the recommendation of city staff to discuss the house moving process, architectural salvage opportunities, and request recommendations for house movers. Mr. Stone met Mike Blake of Wolfe House and Building Movers on site December 21, to review the three buildings currently on the land and asked him to provide an estimate for costs to move. A proposal was received from him on January 4 for \$335,000, not including any right of way costs, nor did it include any costs to prep home for removal, cost of land for new house to sit or installation of new footings and foundation at the new location. The proposal did note that the height of the homes will have a high cost for right of way. A new location needs to be determined in order to complete the estimate in its entirety. Mr. Stone would meet with whoever he needed to talk to about getting them in touch with Mike to keep that ball rolling. Mr. Stone advised he was totally open to adding a 3x4, 2x4 open air window to be able to see out of either side. The reason the porch was enclosed was because it is not very large and wanted the homeowners and guests to be sheltered from any weather elements while waiting for the front door to open. Mr. Stone felt the units could not face Fisher due to the sewer easement. This project would not be feasible with any units facing Fisher.

Chair Hodiernie inquired if there were questions from the Board for the applicant before going to opposition rebuttal. Seeing none, Chair Hodiernie reminded it should be a true rebuttal to speak to anything just heard from the applicant and not a reopening of new items. Chair Hodiernie inquired if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition.

Julie Curry, stated they met with the First Presbyterian property manager and discussed the property. They technically still own it but there may be a letter of agreement. A house mover provided an estimate which was not near the amount of money Mr. Stone stated. But they were only looking at one property at a time and Mr. Stone was probably quoting for 3 properties. It is very doable. There are some sites to consider. It is a project that takes time to calculate all of the moving costs and everything. The permits also take a very long time to get because Duke Power is not easy to work with. It is very important to have as much time as they can to do the project should it get to that point. Several routes and ways to move it have been looked at and are financially desirable. Chair Hodiernie was hopeful based on what parties said, that they will connect after this hearing. It sounds like information needs to be shared. Ms. Curry advised she would be happy to do so.

QUESTIONS:

Chair Hodiernie requested to look graphics depicting the sewer easement conflict for Greene Street. Ms. Geary stated the easement is not shown on this plan and was why she consulted with the Engineering Department. Ms. Geary advised Laura Beasley in Water Resources did the review during the sketch plan review and mentioned they need to show the sewer easement. Ms. Geary referred to a dotted line depicting the pipe line and was told based on the size of the pipe it has a 20 foot easement and the easement is split from the center line of the pipe. It was explained to not only was there the easement but there is a buffer around the easement that disallows the foundation of any buildings to encroach into that buffer. There is a formula that is part of how the Engineering Department determines what that additional amount of space or land would be. Ms. Geary advised this is a public line and, in that case, only paved surfaces can go on it but no built structures can go on or over that pipe in that easement. Chair Hodiernie asked Mr. Stone about painting the brick as mentioned earlier. Mr. Stone advised there

was no intention to paint the brick. Ms. Graeber asked where the elevations of the stoop on the front would fall on the site plan and would they be after the 35 foot setback and how would it affect the easement at the back of the building. Mr. Stone responded the 35 foot setback is the requirement based off on the rezoning that was done. The front porch would be set right on the 35 foot mark and the building would extend roughly 77 feet deep. The starting point would be where the front porch would be, the 35 feet, and the back of the building would be 77 feet. Ms. Graeber asked if that would encroach on the setback Mr. Stone responded there was not an updated plan but the engineers were working on getting more detailed drawings indicating the utilities and everything discussed at this meeting and siting trees greater than 4 inches in diameter on the site. Ms. Israel asked if it was feasible to keep all of the large trees. Mr. Stone responded it was possible. It did appear it would be close to where the house would be, but the roots are probably right underneath. When digging out and disturbing the area, there will be root shock and the three could potentially die. A landscape plan has been put together framing the buildings where they will sit, designed to provide a visual representation of this new project that is being put together. Mr. Stone felt it was more appealing. Currently there are 3 canopy trees on the property and they are proposing to put 15 back.

Chair Hodiernie inquired if there were further questions for the applicant or the other speakers. Chair Hodiernie stated there were two requests, demolition and construction of the two residential buildings. Chair Hodiernie stated they were looking for two separate votes. Chair Hodiernie stated it would be helpful to discuss them separately. Mr. Arnett asked regarding the demolition, what exactly would the Commission would be voting on and was the Commission required to put some type of defined time limit. The second question was if the Commissioners were to decide to put a stay on it in order to see some goals achieved, what was the mechanism for removing the stay once those goals were achieved. Mr. Buansi stated under Section 30-4-12.4, subsection d of the Greensboro Land Development Ordinance, for an application for a COA authorizing demolitions. Those applications cannot be denied. They can be delayed up to 365 days. That period of time can be delayed. If the Commission finds a 365-day delay would cost the owner extreme hardship, those are the grounds on which the Commission can reduce the amount of time that is delayed. Otherwise the 365 days is the rule in terms of a delay. Mr. Buansi responded during the delay period, the Commission may negotiate with the owner and any parties in an effort to find the means of preserving the building structure or object in question. In that context a delay period may be shortened. Ms. Leimenstoll stated it appeared that both issues were tied very closely and asked why would the Commission want to start a delayed demolition approval as it appears there are very strong concerns from many folks for a continuance to further flesh out more details of this project. Ms. Graeber agreed with Ms. Leimenstoll and thought there should be a motion for a continuance to give both the contractor, the community and Ms. Curry a chance to work out the relocation issues to perhaps come to an agreement. And to also obtain the drawings needed to properly review the project and give the community a chance to look at the most recent drawings that have been submitted. Ms. Israel agreed and stated the staff recommendations were to grant a continuance and all the other recommendations made seem to apply. The Commission needed recommend all of the recommendations. Chair Hodiernie stated to continue it, a lot of the details might be flushed out. Ms. Israel stated a motion could be made to have a continuance. Mr. Arnett felt even if the Commission ultimately decided on a continuance as the best course of action, it would be a disservice to everyone to not hash out all of the reactions to the proposal. The applicant was very receptive to feedback. The more specific criticism that can be provided, the better the results would be if the application was continued. Ms. Geary stated procedurally it is staff's understanding and is part of the difficulty and why there was so many conditions. There is the request for demolition which cannot be denied and cannot be continued because that in effect is reaching for a larger amount of delay time; 365 plus another 30 days to the next Commission meeting and one of the reasons why this outcome is written in a way seems like the Commission wants it approved, but at the same time clearly is trying to convey that the new construction still has outstanding questions and work to resolve. Mr. Cowhig asked if it was being said that the Commission can not continue the demolition. There is not anything addressing you cannot continue the demolition. You can continue an application to the next meeting, if you choose no matter what the application is for. A demolition cannot be denied, but can continue and make a decision at a subsequent meeting. There was some thought that now the Commission can continue items for up to 120 days, that might be seen as a way to further delay the project.

Mr. Buansi advised with continuances, there has to be a valid reason. As long as a valid reason is stated for a continuance, it would be an appropriate course of action for the Commission. Ms. Israel stated the reason to continue on the demolition would be to provide time to determine whether the structures could be relocated. Mr. Buansi stated what was said about a continuance applies to any type of COA, even a COA for demolition. Ms. Geary felt there needed to be a differentiation between continuation and delay. A delay can be made for the purposes of finding alternatives to demolition. The only authority is to grant a COA for a demolition with an up to 365-day delay. Ms. Graeber asked if the Commission could not have a continuance on their request because additional information came out during this hearing in reference to the possibility of conversations between the contractor and a local agency to help relocate and would also impact the demolition request. The other specific reason is to get more detailed drawings so the Commission can make a decision. Ms. Geary advised the 365-day delay is to explore alternatives to demolition. There would not be a need to continue the demolition piece of it because the State Enabling Legislation authorizes up to 365 days of delay for that purpose. Mr. Wharton asked if it was 365 days from the day the Commission votes on the COA. Mr. Cowhig advised that was always his understanding.

Mr. Buansi stated for a standard continuance, for a standard application, the rule would be applied to have a valid reason for continuing a COA. For a COA demolition, it specifies that a delay for an authorized demolition may happen but the reasoning has to be tied to exploring alternatives to the demolition. That is what would control in this particular circumstance.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Wharton was confused whether it would be required to vote on the demolition portion of this at this meeting or whether the vote could be continued on that to the next meeting. Mr. Cowhig responded he believed the Commission can continue a demolition COA. If you are not ready to make that decision at this meeting, it can be continued until the next meeting. Ms. Leimenstoll was confused because Mr. Cowhig stated it could be continued and Ms. Geary saying there is not that option. Ms. Geary stated that was not her understanding of not having an option. The delay is your form of a continuance. Mr. Buansi stated to clarify, there has to be particular reasons for the delay. It has to be tied to wanting to work out an alternative. If that is the Commissioner's intent, that is a way to go. Mr. Buansi thought some people want to continue this item or have a more robust discussion before approving the COA. The 365-day delay is a delay after approval of the COA. A continuance comes before a vote on the COA. Ms. Leimenstoll stated it did not have to be 365 days, it could be 180-day delay. It was not her intent to slow this project down if all the parties agreed with the new development. Chair Hodierné stated consistency was important and the Commission has never forced an application to proceed together just because it was filed as one. There was a long history and precedence of bifurcating requests filed under one application. Mr. Wharton asked if it would be acceptable to place a condition, not only on an approved site plan, approved tree preservation plan. Mr. Wharton did not feel the Commission was done with the architecture. The neighborhood had some points they wanted to negotiate on. If the Commissioners have given a COA for demolition, First Presbyterian might find it more attractive to sell the site if it has been raised. Chair Hodierné advised in the case law in North Carolina does establish that is permissible for Quasi-Judicial decisions to have conditions that require adherence to other relevant regulations, including those related to securing subsequent permits or approvals. Mr. Wharton stated it could be delayed subsequent to an approval of the architecture site plan and preservation plan. Chair Hodierné felt it should be tied to something specific named approval such as construction drawing approval or building permits. Something very tangible to make it super clear what the trigger event is, is that is the route the Commission wanted to go. Mr. Clegg suggested approval by who would also be important. Several different bodies have been looked at through the approval processes. Chair Hodierné agreed and stated it would need to be very specific about what subsequent approval and permit was discussed. Mr. Arneke suggested it be conditioned by the Commissioners approval. The building permit cannot be issued until there is a COA and it would make sense if the Commission wanted to condition it that way, that it be the Commissioners approval of the part of the COA specific to the new structure. Ms. Israel stated she was not ready to recommend anything one way or the other. Ms. Israel is in favor of the project in one sense but felt it was not yet time for the Commission for a COA and to vote on it for either thing. Ms. Israel did not understand why the Commission cannot be given a period of time to come back with the whole thing and then vote. Chair Hodierné stated it wasn't that the Commission can't

do that. Especially for construction of the two new residential buildings, there are no issues or concerns. Chair Hodiernie expressed her concern that it is not proper, or appropriate, or lawful for the Commission to vote and continue the demolition request. Ms. Geary stated the staff comments were in favor of granting the COA because there is no choice but to approve the demolition and invoke the condition of a delay. The recommended condition currently in the staff comments, is the date of issuance of the COA be delayed for a period that gives ample time to explore alternatives to demolition, including moving of structures. There was also had a condition addressing if one of the structures is moved to a location in one of the local historic districts, a COA would be needed. That would be a separate matter. It is the Commissioner's discretion how long to delay as long as it not more than 365 days. Mr. Arnett made a suggestion that the Commission tables the demolition discussion for the time being. It sounds as if the Commission is in general agreement on what they want to see happen and are struggling with the mechanism to implement that. Mr. Arnett requested to set it aside and move on to discussing the actual building and side work itself. Feedback could be provided to the applicant that would be very valuable at this point. Mr. Arnett stated there had been a lot of comments from neighbors and other opposition regarding the location of these buildings. Specifically, the side of the unit facing Fisher Avenue. The units that front on Fisher did not feel right. Fisher was the more important street. The corner and Greene Street is more modern. The proposed landscaping on that side felt suburban to him. The locations of the buildings do not do justice to that location. The storm water easement was talked about in detail. Chair Hodiernie advised there was a need for time and credence to providing good, appropriate feedback for wanting to see this come back. Chair Hodiernie asked if anyone else had any specific requests to provide the applicant with feedback and constructive criticism. It was agreed that applicant needed to look at the site more and to find a way to orientate some of the units toward Fisher Avenue. Ms. Kaufman felt it could be done and may lend itself to saving some of the trees. There needed to be more detail on the site plan as it appeared the site plan was showing the footprint at the basement level. There needed to be a floor plan super imposed on the site plan. Ms. Leimenstoll stated a floor plan with more clarity would be helpful to understand what is in the rear. Placement of street trees was discussed at length. Chair Hodiernie stated it appeared there was a consensus regarding the construction design with tangible items and specific requests to be further explored. The discussion then focused on what do with the demolition and construction. A suggestion was made to continue the COA on the basis that there is not a sufficiently well-developed proposal for use of the site. It would be reasonable to continue discussion in the interest of obtaining a more well developed that addresses the issues and answered questions raised at this meeting. There were a lot of questions still unanswered.

David Stone, stated 30 days on top of the 365 appeared to be a harsh penalty. Mr. Stone asked if the continuance could be contingent upon however many days in waiting would be subtracted off the 365 once approved. Chair Hodiernie stated the Commission even if a delay is granted, does not have to be 365, it could be up to 365 days. Chair Hodiernie felt the applicant could use the 30 days to speak and address some of the issues raised at this meeting. No decision has been made yet on the length of the delay and was still to be determined.

MOTION:

Mr. Arneke moved that application # 2565, for work at 701-709 North Greene Street and 208 West Fisher Avenue, be continued until the next meeting because the Commission does not have a sufficiently well-developed proposal for use of the site to make a decision with what has been presented with the original COA. Seconded by Ms. Graber. The Commission voted 7-1. (Ayes: Graeber, Wharton, Kaufman, Arnett, Arneke, Israel and Leimenstoll; Nays: 1, Chair Hodiernie). The item was continued to the February 23 meeting.

3c. #2564; 115 S. Mendenhall Street. (APPROVED)

Mr. Cowhig advised this was an application for the replacement of the windows at this apartment building in College Hill at 115 S. Mendenhall Street. The building is a non-contributing building, built in 1971. The new owner advised he was under the impression that the rules did not apply to non-contributing buildings and was the reason why he did not obtain a COA. The work has been substantially done, consisting of replacing the original wood windows with vinyl windows and covering the wood trim with vinyl. The Guidelines are clear regarding window replacement, but also discuss non-contributing buildings and imply there was flexibility in the review of non-contributing buildings. Mr. Cowhig stated the **Guidelines on page 76 state that every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example;**

Covering of wood trim with vinyl on a brick building was not recommended and not appropriate to add historic ornamentation to create the illusion of a historic structure. This home is not consistent with the guidelines. Mr. Cowhig pointed out that the building is oriented in a manner that the windows are not as prominent as they might otherwise be. The building has been used as example illustrating the guidelines especially for orientation. It is not how a building would be oriented in the historic district, according to the guidelines. It is a building built on a site of a former house and a typical long, narrow building lot in College Hill. A structure built that fit the lot but has a blank wall facing the street. Mr. Cowhig indicated on an image where gravel was dumped in the backyard and also a violation of the historic district ordinance. Mr. Cowhig advised the gravel was not realized until recently. If this building were well landscaped and had a well landscaped parking area, it could perhaps compensate for the windows. It was not a part of a recommendation, but was something to consider. Chair Hodieme inquired if there were questions for staff. Seeing none, Chair Hodieme swore in Mr. Zolot for his testimony and Mr. Zolot consented to the remote hearing.

Adam Zolot, 3715 Tuxford Lane, Jamestown. Mr. Zolot apologized to the members unintentionally breaking the rules. There was a misunderstanding. In other historic districts, programs are run differently. Traditionally the historic properties are only the ones subject to new buildings. After obtaining a better understanding with the Historic District Program Manual Design Standards, learned that the main focus is preservation, conservation, restoration, and rehabilitation of historically and architecturally significant areas. The initial focus with the property was to make it a functional, residential apartment. Mr. Zolot did not know much about the previous ownership but it did sit half occupied for an unknown number of years. The two residents previously living in the property, was a previous owner who passed away while in residence at the property and other unit was rented out to cover property taxes. The closest two units to Mendenhall Street, the driveway is falling by inches. When the property was acquired, there was significant deferred maintenance on the interior such as wood rot on the exterior. There was 4 feet of standing water in the basement for the half of the property. A petrified racoon, corroded pipes, broken windows, and dried cat urine in the carpets and many more issues. His team of plumbers, contractors, electricians, have renovated the entire interior. While working on the exterior learned they were subject to these standards while doing the windows approximately 5 months later. The goal was to remedy the windows. There were issues with opening, there were rotten sills. Glass was replaced panes in attempt to improve the situation. There has been a lot of expense in attempting cool the property in the summer and heating in the winter. Very high energy bills which caused their desire to change the windows inappropriately. Their purpose and goal are to rent to local students from UNCG, Greensboro College. One of the four units is currently occupied as a test to make sure all of the mechanical systems were working without issues. The unit rented out is rented by one of the sons of one of the owners, who is a student and UNCG, Greensboro. They would like to seek tenants for the other units upon completion of the windows. Mr. Zolot provided background information about himself and how this opportunity came to be. In the future there will be requests for a new roof, new gutters, and redo the driveway and will come to the Commission ahead of time, not after the fact. Mr. Zolot would like a conversation regarding landscaping to at least improve the appearance of the actual true front of the building. Mr. Zolot would like to have flexibility warranted for the non-contributing property as vinyl windows are not recommended, but not specifically prohibited. Mr. Zolot referred to the standards for non-contributing structures, considerable flexibility is warranted and would like the opportunity to be granted an approval of a COA for the windows. COAs will be submitted for future projects on the horizon and will speak with the local stakeholders through this channel or through an individual responsible for College Hill to ensure landscaping is completed and take the appropriate methods and measures to be in compliance. They are attempting to be a local hometown feel group. Chair Hodieme inquired if there were questions for the applicant. Chair Hodieme inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Seeing none, Chair Hodieme swore in Rosemary DiGregorio for her testimony and Ms. DiGregorio consented to the remote hearing.

Rosemary DiGregorio, 716 Walker Avenue, Greensboro. Ms. DiGregorio thanked Mr. Zolot for submitting a COA. Ms. DiGregorio advised she had a written statement from the College Hill Neighborhood Association that she read into the record. "The College Hill Neighborhood Association met on January 24, 2022 to discuss the COA application for 115 S. Mendenhall. We thank the owners for submitting a COA even though it was after the fact and we appreciate the owner's explanation that they did not know that the Design Guidelines pertained to

non-contributing built properties. However, it is every homeowner's responsibility to read and understand the historic district standards and it is clearly stated on page 10 "For Greensboro's Historic Districts, non-contributing properties should follow the standards as set out under neighboring settings and preserve the neighborhood spirit and character; (1.) The original architecture and style of the building should be evaluated for merit and when architectural quality is noted, changes should strive to respect the character and features of the original structure." The CHNA would like to make the following points: (2). This structure was built in 1971. It is now 51 years old which technically qualifies it as historic. Although the building was considered non-contributing when the landmark district was established in 1980, it has the potential to become a contributing resource at a future date; (3). The guidelines do not differentiate between street facing or non-street facing. The changes, when it comes to the repair and placement of windows, the reference to the windows as non-street facing, is irrelevant. Changes like these are detrimental to our neighboring setting. For all of the above reasons, The CHNA is not in support of the replacement of wood windows with aluminum windows. Several voiced their desire for the HPC to require the property owner to remove the aluminum windows and replace them with wood. They then went on to explain that they want a written, separate, COA for the additional improvements. It did sound that Mr. Zolot was only prefacing those additional improvements and does plan to go forward with COAs for the roof and other things discussed. The Association understands that repairs and updates are important but it is imperative that all changes adhere to the historic guidelines. Deviations from these guidelines set a bad precedent. Chair Hodiernie inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Hodiernie advised Mr. Zolot he had the opportunity to respond to the opposition. Mr. Zolot agreed that it is not street facing and is otherwise irrelevant. Their opinion is they do not see a significant difference as people are walking by the windows when it is viewed from the side. There are many other things for eyes to focus on. Mr. Zolot completely agreed there is a slight difference. Mr. Zolot personally did not see too many and could not tell from the street view without looking very closely at the difference between wood and vinyl. Mr. Zolot stated he is usually looking at the general view but agreed the structure did not like it was made or built in the early 1900s. It definitely is a weird looking building and the only one that is a non-entry from the street. Mr. Zolot was thankful for the points provided. They do want to be more involved and want to have those conversations. They do want to engage the community and make steps appropriate even for those things that may not technically matter for a COA, but will make sure things are in line with what the College Hill Board and the Commission would appreciate. Chair Hodiernie asked if there was a response from Ms. DiGiorgio. Ms. DiGiorgio responded the College Hill Board does appreciate all the work and effort that has been put toward the building in providing affordable housing for the students and other residents in the neighborhood. There is a precedent set for guidelines and is very important for everyone to adhere to them. The CHB understood Mr. Zolot completely misunderstood and did not understand the guidelines. It is an unfortunate situation that they are in. Chair Hodiernie inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners for either speakers. Seeing none, the public hearing was closed for the Commission to discuss. Chair Hodiernie asked staff if the only issue was the window replacement or should they be taking an action on the gravel. Mr. Cowhig responded the gravel should be a separate issue, but does constitute a violation that will have to be addressed. Mr. Cowhig stated and the covering of the trim with vinyl. The public hearing was reopened to allow Mr. Zolot to speak on a clarification. Mr. Zolot stated the windows were vinyl, the trim is aluminum. Chair Hodiernie closed the public hearing and asked if there was discussion from the Commissioners.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Arnett stated Ms. DiGiorgio shared some of the standards on page 10, and Mr. Arnett read the rest of the section that says for Greensboro's Historic Districts, noncontributing properties should follow those guidelines so that other neighborhoods can preserve the neighborhood's spirit and character. The original architecture and style of the building should be evaluated for merit if no architectural qualities are noted, changes should strive to respect the character and features of the original structure. When making changes to the buildings themselves, the guidelines in this document pertaining to exterior changes should be followed. However, considerable flexibility is warranted when making changes to non-contributing buildings. Decisions that make practical and esthetic sense that may be contrary to specific outlines, are welcome when they uphold the overall character of the guidelines." Ms. Israel commented she was struck by how bad the building looked in picture 9. Mr. Cowhig responded those were the original wood windows. The ones Mr. Cowhig saw that had not been completely covered did not look like they were in great shape and the trim work was beat up. Ms. Israel felt this was a hard decision because she thought it was a great improvement from what was previously there. It is ethically pleasing but not is not historical. Ms. Israel stated she would not have known it was vinyl painted white versus wood painted white unless was told that. It was definitely an improvement. Ms. Kaufman asked if all the windows were completed.

Mr. Cowhig responded not all but would say 90% was completed. They were in the process when they were stopped. Ms. Israel stated it felt unnecessarily punitive to her. It appears as it is wood painted white. Mr. Wharton stated this was similar to the case in Dunleath where the building was in similarly poor shape. The Commission allowed replacement windows in that. Mr. Cowhig responded it was not wood. Ms. Geary advised she thought it was an after the fact or a partial after the fact situation because it was a noncontributing building. Mr. Wharton stated it was slightly different in that they consulted with the Commission. Mr. Cowhig advised 707 Chestnut Street of the conditions associated with the application. Mr. Cowhig advised one of the conditions was the Commission did not want to see grids in it because that shouts vinyl. Ms. Leimenstoll pointed out the original windows were wood and were 6 over 6 from the description. There are a number of settings shown that wood windows, if maintained, will last much longer than vinyl windows. In the short term it could be cost effective but in the long the wood windows can be repaired and maintained. Ms. Leimenstoll appreciated Mr. Arnett pointing out the text regarding more flexibility for non-contributing buildings. This case is hard because of the lack of visibility and the clear challenges of rehabbing the building. Chair Hodiernie agreed with the thought process and appreciated the language that Mr. Arnett pointed out. The Commission should be sensitive to the fact that if it is onerous to rehab the marginal properties in the district, they will not be rehabbed at all. They will continue to be unused and useable. It was advised the Commission could approve this with a condition when the vinyl windows fail, that they be replaced 6 over 6 wooden windows. It will need to be remembered in 20 years. Ms. Israel stated this is what is done during historical renovations. The building should never have been built and they should not be penalized. Mr. Arneke stated this was not a punitive action. When the Commission receives an after the fact application, it has to be considered as if the work had never been done, not as a punitive measure but because to do otherwise would reward anyone who goes ahead and does without a COA. Ms. Israel agreed and was not arguing about that. The standards appeared to be subjective. Chair Hodiernie felt it was intentional in order for the Commission to have the discretion to balance the objectives. The Commission has the authority to use the rules in a way that makes sense. There are rules but there is ability to interpret in ways that make sense. Ms. Kaufman inquired if there were mechanisms in place to educate homeowners before the fact when a property is purchased in the historic districts to prevent this type of thing from happening. Mr. Cowhig responded staff does a lot of things to make people aware. The Neighborhood Associations have their welcome wagons. College Hill when they see a property that is sold, they go to the new owners and provide them a set of Guidelines. Properties change hands without there being any outward sign that is has happened. Mr. Cowhig did know if that applied to this case. At times that is the case. There is no guarantee that a new owner will be aware that they are in a historic district, other than checking the City's Zoning Board. Historic districts are a function of Zoning. Ms. Kaufman inquired if realtors had copies of the historic district standards. Mr. Cowhig responded many do. Staff talks to realtors on a daily basis. It is not foolproof and not like when you have a flood map certification advising you are in a flood plain or something like that at closing. Property sales are county responsibility. Staff has no control. Mr. Arnett felt it would be fair to think about what would the discussion have been like if this was not an after the fact COA. Mr. Arneke stated the Commission has seen many applications like this, before the fact and what it came down to was either repair the wood windows or replace them with wood windows. The white casings really jumps out and were extremely inconspicuous before being brown. Discussion continued regarding the previous COA application that was similar to this request. The Commission has approved vinyl in the past. Mr. Wharton felt the general insignificance of this building and the fact that this building would be moderate income housing for students, he would be in favor of making a similar decision as the one in Dunleath.

FACT FINDING MOTION:

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts found in application #2564, in the public hearing of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the **Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and staff comments and that the Guidelines on page 57, Non-Contributing Structures and the Guidelines on page 76** and staff comments are acceptable as finding of fact. And the **Guidelines on Non-Contributing Structures on page 10**. Second by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted 6-2. (Ayes: Chair Hodiernie, Graeber, Wharton, Kaufman, Arnett, and Israel; Nays: 2, Arneke and Leimenstoll).

MOTION:

Mr. Wharton therefore moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2564 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Adam Zolot for work at 115 South Mendenhall. Second by Ms. Israel. The Commission voted 6-2. (Ayes: Chair Hodiernie, Graeber, Wharton, Kaufman, Arnett, and Israel; Nays:

2, Arneke and Leimenstoll). Chair Hodierné advised this item could be appealed to Superior Court within 30 days of the Commission's decision, by any party with standing.

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIR:

Chair Hodierné stated she had no items to discuss.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

No items.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no speakers.

MOTION:

Chair Hodierné requested a motion to adjourn. Ms. Leimenstoll moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was concluded at 10:12 p.m. Unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig
Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary

MC/cgs

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CONDUCTED REMOTELY VIA ZOOM
April 27, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amanda Hodieme (Chair and Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Sharon Graeber, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll, Adrienne Israel

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary, and Russ Clegg; Planning Department, Allen Buansi and Al Andrews, City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Katherine Rowe will be absent. Her absence was approved unanimously.

Chair Hodieme read the remote meeting authority standards into the record.

Staff stated that item 2E will not be heard by the commission. There are no other corrections to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY AND MARCH REGULAR MEETINGS:

There were no minutes to approve due to the not having a minutes recording service.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number 2576 (continued from March meeting) DENIED**
Location: 622 Joyner
Applicant: David Taylor
Owner: David Taylor and Mary Mason
Date Application Received: 3/10/22

Description of Work:

Removal of trees.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion removing a healthy pine tree is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23)* for the following reasons:

Fact

This is a large pine tree that appears to be healthy. However, the roots have caused some damage to the front porch and driveway in the past. The City Arborist thinks that the tree should be monitored to determine if any changes are occurring that would indicate a risk of the tree falling. The Field Operations staff have visited the site and did not find any indication of problems with natural gas or other underground utilities.

Guidelines

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

Commissioner Kaufman joined the meeting.

Commissioner Leimenstoll advised that the application was continued because the College Hill neighborhood did not have a chance to review it.

In Support:

Non one was present to speak in favor.

In Opposition:

Rosemarie DiGiorgio, 7156 Walker Avenue, GSO

She thanked the HPC for postponing the application. The CHNA met and is not in favor of the removal because the tree is healthy and the sidewalk is no longer a tripping hazard.

Summary:

Chair Hodiernie stated that the HPC heard from the applicant at the last months meeting.

Discussion:

Ms. Leimenstoll stated that the HPC heard the concerns of the applicant at the last meeting and she is ready to move forward with a decision.

The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2574, and the public hearing of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed changes are incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the following Staff Comments page 21 Standard 1: *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district* are acceptable as finding of fact.

Seconded by Jesse Arnett. The Commission voted 7-0. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodiernie) Nays: 0).

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2574 and does not grant a Certificated of Appropriateness to David Taylor and Mary Mason for work at 622 Joyner Street, seconded by Jesse Arnett. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodiernie Nays: None.)

(b) Location: 815 Market Street APPROVED
Application Number 2577
Applicant: Anne Hurd
Property Owner: Greensboro College
Date Application Received: 3/31/22

Description of Work:

Request modification to approved COA application for digital sign.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness modifications. In the staff's opinion the proposed changes to the conditions are not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standard—Application of the Guidelines-Commercial and Institutional (pages 4-10) and Signs (Page 33-34)*.

Facts

This fairly small and relatively unobtrusive electronic messaging sign is located on West Market Street a main thoroughfare in Greensboro. It is located on the edge of the neighborhood in a primarily institutional area. This sign was designed to have a minimal impact on the character of the historic district and at the same time meet the college's communications needs.

Facts

The following conditions were placed on the COA at the time of approval:

That the electronic messaging sign have a black background with white letters.

That flashing text not be used.

That the sign be automatically dimming according to ambient light conditions.

That the messages change no more frequently than one per hour.

The standards for signs were written before electronic messaging signs became commonplace on college campuses. Today they are regarded as an important tool in managing communications with students and the visiting public. They can be vital in a campus emergency. The conditions limit the college's ability to fully utilize their sign.

Application of the Guidelines Commercial and Institutional (page 9)

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

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

Guidelines (page 34)

1. *Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts.*
2. *New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street.*
3. *Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights.*
4. *An appropriate location for a freestanding sign in a residential area is close to the front walk and near the public sidewalk.*
5. *Billboards (outdoor advertising signs) and other tall freestanding signs, portable signs, flashing or lighted message signs, plastic signs, and signs with internally illuminated letters are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*

Staff further indicated that in consulting with the State Historic Preservation Commission they expressed concerns that this may be moving into regulating the content of the message which would be outside of the commission's authority.

Commissioner Adrienne Israel joined the meeting.

In Support:

Anne Hurd, 534 Woodbale(?) Drive, GSO, VP for advancement and admissions at Greensboro College. Ms. Hurd stated that they need to change the messaging more frequently than what the conditions allow because they have so many activities that they need to advertise. The frequency needs to increase. They do not want to add any lighting that is flashy or colorful. They would like more freedom in what they put on the sign. For example, students wanted to put the Ukrainian Flag but the conditions prohibit the use of color. All messaging goes through the office of Communications including emergency situations. They already abide by the Department of Transportation rules regarding flashing lights that could distract passer byers. In answer to a question by Ms. Hodierna, the lighting condition is already regulated by the sign itself. And they would like all the conditions removed.

Rosemarie DiGiorgio, CHNA is in favor of lifting the conditions as long as the DOT standards are met. They also believe this is a COA issue.

In Opposition:

None

Discussion:

David Arneke expressed willingness to change the conditions and allow the messaging to change more frequently but believes the conditions should be maintained but modified to meet their new needs. He would like to keep the condition that flashing text not be used. Jo Leimenstoll stated that if they meet the DOT standards then she feels that the color could change without it being intrusive or problematic. Jesse Arnett stated that even though Guideline #5 says that flashing and lit up signs are not appropriate that there are some pretty compelling testimony that the standards were written before electronic signage and the CHNA being in favor. And also that the sign is on the edge of the district along a major thoroughfare with business he would be in favor of removing all of the restrictions. Chair Hodierna said that they are fortunate to have been able to see how the sign has functioned and that it works well and additional latitude to meet their institutional needs is compelling and agrees with Mr. Arnett's comments. Deborah Kaufman spoke in favor of removing all of the conditions in this particular situation and in this particular case to look at the Standards regarding lighting to revise that language to allow for commercial situations. Russ Clegg confirmed that the DOT standards are required.

Finding of Fact:

Jesse Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2577 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 testimony from Mike Cowhig and the Guidelines on Page 9 and page 34 are acceptable as finding of fact, seconded by Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierna. Nays: Arneke.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arnett moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2577 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Anne Hurd and Greensboro College for work at 815 West Market Street. And to be clear this motion is to remove all conditions in the previous COA. seconded by Deborah Kaufman. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierna: Nays: Arneke)

- (c) **Location: 603 North Greene Street APPROVED WITH 365 DAY DELAY**
Application Number: 2578
Applicant: Brett Hacker, Junior Warden for Holy Trinity Episcopal
Property Owner: Holy Trinity Church

Date Application Received: 4-1-22

Description of Work:

Demolish house.

Staff Recommendation:

Mike Cowhig presented the staff comments.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the house, but delaying the effective date for 365 days. In the staff's opinion the proposed demolition is not congruous with the *Historic District Design Standards— Demolition* (page 73).

An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition of a designated building or structure or the destruction of an object may not be denied. However, the effective date of a Certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of approval. The maximum period of delay may be reduced by the Commission where it finds that the delay would cause the owner extreme hardship or deprivation of beneficial use of or return from the property. During the delay period the Historic Preservation Commission may negotiate with the owner and with any other parties in an effort to find a means of preserving the building, structure, or object.

Facts

The house to be demolished is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. Built around 1900 it is a Foursquare with Colonial Revival and Queen Anne features.

Guidelines (page 73)

During the delay period, the Commission should negotiate with the owner or other interested parties including State and local preservation organizations and seek answers to the following questions:

- Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition?
- Could another site serve the purpose just as well?
- Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs?
- Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building?
- As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?
- Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance?
- Is the structure of national, state or local significance?
- If alternatives to demolition are exhausted and approval for demolition is granted:
- Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site.
- Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.

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

Staff stated that as paradox as it sounds we recommend granting the COA but delaying the issuance for 365 days. Staff provided at the request of Commissioner Arnett, background. Staff stated it was noted in the last year that exterior changes had been made to the property without a COA and the Church submitted an after-the fact application and denied the application. The Church submitted a request for reconsideration and that request was denied by the commission. Staff stated that Planning staff met with the church on several occasions.

In Support:

Brett Hacker, Junior Warden, 1005 Northern Shores Ln, Greensboro, 27455

Mr. Hacker referenced the letter in the COA application and said he is present to answer any questions. Ms. Leimenstoll asked if any alternatives have been used to address the issues of homeless individuals on the porch including lighting. Did the church look into that possibility? Brett Hacker stated that they have looked into lighting and off duty police officers and found this to be successful. Jo asked is there a good use planned for the site to warrant demolition. Mr. Hacker answered no. Mr. Arneke asked if they have considered selling the property and he answered no. Mr. Arneke asked if the church feels a vacant lot is better than the house. Mr. Hacker stated that is not what they said in their letter. Mr. Hacker said that if the solid railing goes back it will bring back inconvenient activity. They have heard from parishioners about their experiences with the homeless people that includes hypodermic needles and exposing themselves. Mr. Arnett asked that presumably up until this past year this building has been part of the Church's long term plans and obviously, that is no longer the case that you no longer need the space so why isn't selling an option? Mr. Hacker could not answer that but said that they own the entire block and two other homes that are in Fisher Park. Also, the building is the music school and it was suggested at looking at the entire campus space and they are in the process of doing that. Ms. Hodiernie asked if there were any renewed efforts to address the issues that have been going on at the property. Mr. Hacker did not understand the question. Ms. Hodiernie elaborated and said we first heard this as an after the fact and then reconsideration and there was testimony on what has been tried in the past and how that stacked up against the railing change. There seemed to be efforts that had not been explored so can you give any testimony on that. Mr. Hacker state that all of the other suggestions are contingent on putting the railing back. We have not put the railing back and so we didn't try any other recommendations. Commissioner's expressed concern that this is such an extreme choice. Both the church and the commission were boxed in procedurally during the previous hearings. Mr. Arnett stated that the initial issue is that the church proceeded with work without a Certificate of appropriateness which then limited the Commission's ability to discuss options that could have solved the issue outside of the change to the railing. He stated that he would hope that the church would withdraw this request and work with commission to come up with a solution. The commission wants to work with the church. Mr. Hacker provided explanation that Holy Trinity performed the work because they did not realize it was in the district. The church representative presented the change and did follow the process once it was pointed out to him. The church looked at the outcomes of the previous hearing which was put the solid railing back but that compromises the safety of individuals that come to Holy Trinity and (audio goes out for several seconds) we also know that there are fines associated with this. Mr. Arnett stated that the commission has been advised legally to consider after the fact applications as if the work has not been done and that limits the options for the commission and that he doesn't see how tearing down the house resolves the issues. And again this is a large escalation of the situation. Ms. Leimenstoll stated she echoes the statements of Mr. Arnett. She continued to say that the issue of homelessness is far outside the purview of the commission and she hopes that the church realizes that the house does not solve the issue of homeless people gathering on their property. Ms. Kaufman reiterated that the church will not sell the property and would rather demolish it. And would rather than demolishing this beautiful historic building to solve the situation it seems extreme and sad.

There was no one else to speak in favor.

In Opposition:

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street. Our neighborhood board met but there was not a quorum. The group that was present want to see if Holy Trinity would keep the railing as is and not demolish the house. Ms. Pratt stated, speaking for herself, that this sets a bad precedent of making changes and then threatening demolition. She stated that Holy Trinity has done this twice and then threaten to demolish. We expect the religious institutions to do better. She considers this demolition by

extortion. If they can't keep the house the way they want they will just tear it down. She asked to show an image of the outdoor life center that is an area with stone and concrete solid railings and a roof and fire place. She has personally seen early in the mornings homeless individuals staying in this area. She finds it hard to believe that the church can't deal with solid railings on the historic building but are keeping this. She reiterated she has seen the homeless individuals and this is an issue across their entire campus. She showed images of the life center and how easy it is to access the area and hide behind the walls. She doesn't understand the difference in the two areas. She referenced the January testimony of the church and they testified that there are issues at both locations.

Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer. She echoed the results of the Fisher Park board meeting . She said that the official statement is: "The FPNA does not support Holy Trinity Episcopal Church's COA for demolition of the property at 703 N. Greene Street and by law may seek a 365-day delay of the project. We are willing, however, to accept the alteration currently in place, if the church will agree to withdraw its application for demolition of the structure now and in the future."

Tracy Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street. He expressed sadness and anger when he learned of this request. Holy Trinity has proven they are a horrible neighbor and horrible steward of the Fisher Park neighborhood. In the past, they have torn down two other properties and we may see future demolitions. He echoed that the solid railing that they are saying is the issue at this property is what they chose to construct at the outdoor Life Center. He spoke to the reconsideration and testimony of the members of the church. All of the testimony was excuses for why they should not have to comply with the guidelines. No individual homeowner in the district would be allowed to do something like this and that they seem to believe they can do whatever they please. He suggested that they should move outside of the district if they have such an issue with it. He stated that he would prefer a denial but he understands they cannot but asks that the guidelines on pg. 73 are met. As of now, none of them have even been met. They won't consider selling. There should be conditions including the full 365 day delay be imposed. They should also go through the items of page 73 and alternatives to demolition. They should be required to fully document the structure with photographs and scaled drawings at the church's expense. And if it is demolished that PGI should be able to salvage any historic items of value. The cost of demolition will be far greater than the cost to repair the original railing.

Rebuttal: There was no rebuttal.

Discussion:

Ms. Israel stated that she wondered if it is appropriate from the previous suggestions that lighting and other measures have been looked into. This is very drastic. She mentioned motion sensors and other measures could help. The applicant restated that they did not do that because the open railing is there and that is when they saw positive results. He kept saying that the recommendations were contingent on putting the railing back. Ms. Israel stated she is talking about other security measures outside of lighting that could help people from encroaching on the property. His response seems like they are just brushing the issue off. She is shocked as well and other institutions seem to be using other measures and not just lighting and not just the police. Ms. Hodieme said it is not accurate to say that the previous decision and recommendations was contingent on the railing going back. It is the role of the commission to evaluate the proposal and make recommendations to meet the standards. We should arrive at the request of demolition because all other measures have not worked. It seems that this has not happened. It seems to her that protecting the "whole block" would be a priority and the lovely walk. She said that this is a pretty transparent attempt to just convince people to allow the unoriginal railing to be kept. The measures we are talking about right now should be analyzed and as a neighbor she hopes that the church would stay open minded and respectful of the rules that protect the neighborhood that benefits us all. Mr. Hacker said that he understood the only directive from the last meeting was to put the railing back. With the open railing they have no more issues. Ms. Leimenstoll said that the decision was in keeping with the Standards

and the other recommendations were just that and certainly were not tied to the railing alone. Mr. Arnett said that the commissioners were open to a compromise and trying to help resolve the issue within their authority. He recognizes that it's unfortunate that the work would cost money to fix the issue but he reiterated that the initial work was done without a COA. Mr. Harnett stated that he understood that at the reconsideration they were asking for a compromise but it was shot down. Mr. Arnett responded that because it was an after the fact project and the application was for the work already done which is what was denied. Ms. Hodierna added that the analysis and the process that the commission must use puts the burden on the applicant to explain the reason to keep their after-the-fact change. The commission felt there was still information left to explore. Ms. Hodierna said there was a speaker from the audience that would like to speak. Commissioners approved and the public hearing was re-opened. Cheryl Pratt spoke again and stated that one of the issues is that security lighting was not tried. They removed the porch railing and left the porch light on. There was no security lighting or motion lighting and then removed the original railing. She asked if there is currently security lighting. Mr. Hacker said that he is not aware and he does see a porch light and the only thing he can state at this time. He is the junior warden but is not aware of what was represented by the previous junior warden. Mr. Arnett reiterated that he feels that the reasons given for demolition are flimsy and made worse by the fact that it is a community of faith that is making the request. It is a poor witness to the community and church resources and he wonders what the larger church community thinks about this. He expressed some sympathy for Mr. Hacker who was put in a position to defending this decision. Mr. Hacker asked to speak but the public hearing had been closed and commissioners chose not to reopen it. Commissioners stated that they have heard plenty of testimony and we should not allow applicants to respond to every comment by the commission which is outside of their procedure. Mr. Arneke made one last comment that he is disappointed that the church has shifted the reasonability on the homeless population. We haven't heard any testimony that the church is working with homelessness advocates or how the property is treated. In a community with a significant homeless problem that an institution like Holy Trinity is not trying to address the problem through the viewpoint of the homeless and only through the view point of their institution.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2578 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Standards* and that staff comments and the Standards under page 73 are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Mr. Arnett. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierna. Nays: None.)

Mr. Arnett asked a question regarding the items listed on page 73 and stated that the applicant has not answered any of those provisions and would that be grounds for denial. Al Andrews, Deputy City Attorney, stated that they are at the limits of their jurisdiction and can only delay the issuance for 365 days. Mr. Arnett further asked that the process would be to approve it with the condition of the delay and what happens if that motion fails. Mr. Andrews stated that the commission would be back where they first started. He believes that Mr. Arnett is looking for a mechanism to deny the demolition. Mr. Arnett said he understands they cannot deny demolition but does not want to see it entered as an in favor decision.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2578 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Holy Trinity Church, for work at 603 North Greene Street with the following conditions: (1) that demolition be delayed for 365 days and that staff work with the church to answer the questions posed on page 73 in particular could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building and could the building be moved to another location. seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 6-2 in

favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodiern Nays: Arnett, Israel.)

- (d) **Location: 202 W. Bessemer Avenue APPROVED**
Application No. 2580
Applicant: Pam Frye
Property Owner: Thomas Ramsey
Date Application Received: 4/6/22

Description of Work:

Demolish garage and construct carport.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff explained that this demolition request has a well-developed proposal that requires the demolition of the garage. The garage is from a later period than the house and the majority of the neighborhood.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Demolition* (page 73), and *Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-37), for the following reasons:

Fact

The garage is classified as a “contributing” structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. It is a very simple two-bay, gable front structure with a greenhouse addition. It is not in very good condition and it interferes with the applicants’ plans to construct a turn-around so they do not have to back out onto busy West Bessemer Avenue.

Guidelines

The following questions apply to this proposal:

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

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

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

Fact

The simple gable front carport is compatible with historic garages and accessory buildings in the historic districts in design, placement and materials. The exterior of the storage area will be covered in cementitious lap siding and the site is roughly where the garage is currently. It will not be so large that it will compromise the integrity 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.*

Recommended Condition:

Staff does not recommend a delay

In Support:

Thomas Ramsey, 202 W. Bessemer Avenue.

Mr. Ramsey explained that they want to retain the integrity of the property but want to remove an unstable garage and greenhouse. They would like both vehicles to be under shelter and also have better safety backing out. It will be similar to the neighbors and will have materials that closely match the house. They carefully selected Pam Frye as their builder because of her reputation and experience.

In Opposition:

Tracy Pratt, 910 Magnolia St.

Mr. Pratt stated he is not entirely opposed to the project but he has concerns. He does not have a problem with the greenhouse but the structure is contributing to the neighborhood as Staff stated. Did anyone look into the possibility of reworking the garage and alter it to look like what is being proposed. He pointed out from the drawings it was hard to tell if the new building would comply with current setbacks. If it doesn't it would not be able to be built in the same footprint and also would like to know the height dimensions.

Keisha Hadden, (previously sworn in) stated that the board is in support of the project but there is confusion about the age of the garage. Some individuals thought the existing garage was built in the 1960's but it might be older. She thought from prior discussions with staff that it wouldn't be approved because it is contributing.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Ramsey stated that they did discuss re-using the existing garage. The new garage will be within the setbacks. The new design is 14 feet at the peak and meets height requirements.

Discussion:

Chair Hodiernie asked if the buildings are connected and staff and the applicant described that the garage was built with cinder block and has become an eye sore. Mr. Cowhig spoke on the status of contributing on a National Register Report. All properties and features including accessory buildings and retaining walls are part of a survey. Each resource must be categorized and if it's old enough it would be contributing even if it doesn't have any special architectural significance. Ms. Leimenstoll appreciated the explanation of contributing and non-contributing. She said that the new design does seem compatible with other garages in the district. From the photographs it also seems that the greenhouse and garage are in poor condition. Mr. Arnett stated that re-use is always the first option but in the past they have run into issues with the dimensions that make them functionally obsolete for modern vehicles and uses. He noted that the proposed car-port is dimensionally more in keeping with modern needs. Mr. Arneke appreciated the explanation on contributing status from staff and believes that this property does not contribute much to the property from an architectural aesthetic. The needs of the homeowner easily outweigh what little historic significance the garage actually has.

Finding of Fact:

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2580 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is

not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines on page 36 which address new garages and outbuildings are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodiern Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2580 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Thomas Ramsey for work at 202 W. Bessemer Ave, seconded by Mr. Vanderveen. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodiern Nays: None.)

- (e) **Application No. 2582 APPROVED**
Location: 614 S. Mendenhall Street
Applicant: Jim Dutton
Property Owner: same
Date Received: 4/13/22

Description of Work

Add 2 parking spaces and landscape parking area at back of house

Staff explained that the property owner could not make this meeting. They have provided a drawing that shows the additional spaces and that there will be landscaping with shrubbery.

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

Facts

An existing gravel parking area behind the house will be expanded by 2 parking spaces and will be screened with shrubbery. The spaces will be delineated with wheel stops to keep the parking organized and take up the least space possible. Gravel or crushed stone is a recommended material. There is a limited supply of on-street parking in this part of the neighborhood and the additional spaces are needed to serve the tenants of this 3-unit apartment house.

Guidelines (page 30)

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

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

Amanda Hodiern asked if this is an extension of the existing area into the area with vegetation. Mr. Cowhig answered yes. The total number of parking spaces will be 5.

In Support:

Rosemarie DiGeorgio, (already sworn in)

The College Hill neighborhood association is in support and agree to it as long as the tree debris is not the removal of any trees. The project will not be easily visible from the street.

In Opposition: none.

Discussion:

Ms. Hoderne asked staff to verify that there will be no tree removals and Mr. Cowhig said there will not be any.

Mr. Vanderveen commented that the extra parking will be helpful but he does worry that it will make it difficult to do something different at the property in the future. Mike Cowhig stated it will be gravel and not paved. Commissioners agreed that the gravel is less permanent.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Vanderveen moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2582 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments along with guidelines on walkways, driveways and parking areas are acceptable as findings of fact; seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hoderne Nays: None.)

Ms. Israel's vote counts as a yes vote as she was having technical issues.

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 2582 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jim Dutton for work at 602 S. Mendenhall Street seconded by Mr. Kaufman. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hoderne Nays: None.) Ms. Israel is a yes because she had dropped out of the meeting due to technical issues.

2:31

PUBLIC HEARING ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION FOR THE PILOT LIFE INSURANCE HOME OFFICE:

Mr. Cowhig explained that the City participates in the listing of properties on the National Register of Historic Properties. We receive a request from the NC SHPO letting us know that we have received a nomination within Greensboro's jurisdiction. As a Certified Local Government we are responsible to obtain public input. The Commission also makes a recommendation as to if the property meets the criteria for National Register designation. The property address is 5300 High Point Road. It is the first corporate suburban campus in North Carolina. The buildings were built in the Georgian Revival Style. The Pilot Life Insurance Company was a large company in the 20th century. Today the company is known as Lincoln Financial. The nomination says that it is significant because of criterion c: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. The question for the commission is if this property meets that criteria. This nomination is a sign that there is something in the works for a new use of the property after being vacant for so many years. The designation would open up resources to help with the restoration of the property. National Register nominations do not need to come from a property owner however, this one does.

This is a public hearing to receive comments about the nomination. Commissioners agreed that the site is a special property and this is a good sign.

Public Speakers in Support of the Nomination:

Laura Allred, 3103 Sedgefield Gate Rd. GSO

Ms. Allred stated that her mother worked at the building in the 1950's and she is currently a neighbor to the site. She is supportive because this could be the best use of the property and a landmark amongst suburban sprawl even if repurposed for a new use.

There were no other speakers in support or opposition.

Mr. Cowhig stated it will go before City Council on the consent agenda and pass a motion of support. Then the statement of support from the HPC and CC will go on to the NC National Register Advisory Committee at their meeting on June 9th. Staff will forward other comments that they have received. All comments have been supportive.

Mr. Cowhig read the following statement:

The Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission has reviewed and discussed the proposed nomination of the Pilot Life Insurance Company Home Office at 5300 High Point Road to the National Register of Historic Places and finds that the proposed nomination meets the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as found under section 8 of the report. We therefore recommend in support of the nomination.

Ms. Hodierne made this motion as stated by Mr. Cowhig. Seconded by Ms. Graeber. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierne. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

The chair had none. Ms. Leimenstoll asked for clarity from legal staff what is appropriate or not appropriate for individual commissioner's as it pertains to discussion on the demolition of the Holy Trinity house. Mr. Andrews stated that the commission is an advisory board and commissioners may speak in their individual capacity. The decisions of the HPC are open to the public so the details of this meeting can be shared and discussed. But we would rather you not speak on behalf of the City of the HPC if you are speaking in whatever other capacity that you have. If you want to effect change, the regulations give you the structure of what can be done which is the 365 days. You are looking really at finding a purchaser and that would require a change in leadership at the institution but that is not within the purview of the HPC. You are engaging in those efforts as an individual. You may ask elected officials to advocate on behalf of your efforts. Ms. Leimenstoll stated that commissioners, staff and members of the community had a meeting in regards to another demolition request and that could also happen on this case. How to navigate our personal and commission roles and quasi-judicial requirements pertaining to ex-partite communication but in this case the decision has been made so discussions may take place. There was discussion on the concern that the Commission must vote in favor of a demolition request which is concerning from a record perspective. Mr. Andrews stated that they must work within the confines of their jurisdiction which allows for the delay and a lot can happen in 365 days.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Russ Clegg discussed the question of when to come back to in person meetings. Other City boards and commissions are starting to do this and we should develop a time-line. Because HPC is quasi-judicial we do not have the option of moving forward with a hybrid setting. Commissioners and staff discussed the pros and cons of each setting but all agree that we have greater public participation from the public within the remote setting. Staff relayed that the State Historic Preservation Office is hearing from other communities this same benefit. One of the negative aspects is that we have a

formal process that does become cumbersome as we move through the meeting process with often times repetition and technology hurdles. There is an added benefit of being able to look up past meetings or information on the internet to help further inform their decision. Ms. Hodierne said that feedback can be sent into staff with any other thoughts. Staff presented a postcard that will be mailed out to help with awareness of the Historic Districts. Mr. Arnett asked for a QR code to be added and staff said they would look into adding this feature. Ms. Hodierne stated that it looks good and she is happy to see this happen.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CONDUCTED REMOTELY VIA ZOOM
May 25, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amanda Hodieme (Chair and Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Sharon Graeber, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll, Adrienne Israel, Katherine Rowe

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary; Planning Department, Allen Buansi, City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that there were no absences.

Chair Hodieme read the remote meeting authority standards into the record.

Staff stated that item 2C would be continued until the June 25th meeting. Motion was made by Ms. Israel, 2nd by Ms. Leimenstoll., will not be heard by the commission. There are no other corrections to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL REGULAR MEETING:

There were no minutes to approve at this time.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number: 2583 APPROVED**
Location: 211 Isabel Street
Applicant: Annik Adamson
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 4/19/22

Description of Work:

Removal of 4 trees; construction of carport; extend concrete driveway. Other items in the application can be approved at the staff level.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-37), Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (pages 28-30), Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

Fact

The proposed carport will be located behind the house. It will not be so large that it compromises the integrity of the house or the lot. Materials include fiber cement lap siding which has been shown to be compatible with the character of the historic district.

Guidelines (page 36)

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

Facts

The front walkway is being pushed up by tree roots. To replace the concrete would require cutting roots and risking the loss of a significant tree. As an alternative, the concrete will be removed and replaced with stepping stones. A new concrete walkway will be constructed that leads to the front corner of the lot along with a brick garden wall. Low brick walls are found throughout the historic districts and curved walkways are also found.

Facts

The existing concrete driveway will be extended to the back yard to serve the carport. The existing driveway does not extend to the back of the house therefore this will be more in keeping with the guidelines.

Guidelines page 30

2. *When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials and design.*
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.*

Facts

Removal of the trees is necessary in order to construct the driveway and carport. One of the trees is dead and another is an invasive species. The 2 pine trees appear to be healthy. The trees will be replaced with new trees in a suitable location.

Guidelines (page 23)

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
2. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*
3. *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*

In Support:

Annik Adamson, sworn in, 211 Isabel Street, the applicant and property owner was sworn in. Ms. Adamson stated that she considered the openness of a carport to be less confining on the property rather than a structure with walls. She stated she plans to plant 2 to 4 new trees once construction is complete. Ms. Rowe had a quest about the front walk and staff stated that is not part of the application.

Keisha Hadden, sworn in, of 404 Bessemer Avenue, for the Fisher Park neighborhood association stated that they are in support but suggest wood columns instead of fiberglass. They also brought

up a concern for the paving material and suggested that it should be something more permeable to help absorb water on the driveway because it slopes.

Cheryl Pratt, sworn in, 910 Magnolia Street, also with the FPNA, added that of the trees, 1 is dead, 2 are leaning and the 4th is a ligustrum which is a bush not a tree.

Ms. Leimenstoll ask about the columns in relation to the front of the house that has larger swaure columns with shingles. Ms. Adamson said she would like smooth fiberglass or wood rather than the shingles for better maintenance and upkeep.

In Opposition:

No one spoke in opposition.

Discussion:

Ms. Hodierne asked for more details on the trees and staff described the condition stating that in some cases a leaning tree may not be a hazard. Ms. Leimenstoll asked about the drainage issues and Ms. Annik stated that with the recent heavy rain last evening she inspected the backyard and found no standing water. She is willing to add a permeable system but would have to defer to her contractor on the details of how that would be done.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Arnett moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2583, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed changes are incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the following Staff Comments page 21 Standard 1: *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district* are acceptable as finding of fact.

Seconded by Jesse Arnett. The Commission voted 7-0. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodierne) Nays: 0).

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2574 and does not grant a Certificated of Appropriateness to David Taylor and Mary Mason for work at 622 Joyner Street, seconded by Jesse Arnett. The Commission voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodierne Nays: None.)

Ms. Graeber was unanimously voted to be recused from the next agenda item due to a financial conflict. Motion, Jo Leimenstoll 2nd by David Arneke.

- (b) Location: 709 Magnolia Street**
Application Number 2588 addendum to 2568
Applicant: Jose Reyes, Wits and Associates LLC
Property Owner: Wits and Associates LLC
Date Application Received: 5/4/22

Description of Work:

Replace apartment entrance with window; construct privacy fence; pave driveway

Staff said this is an addendum to the application approved in January. The project has removed the aluminum siding, and the exterior staircase to the upstairs, and the house was a single family home with an apartment added at some point. When the exterior stairs were removed, returning it to single family occupancy the standards recommend using historic structures for their originally intended purpose. However, the applicant purchased the house without realizing they were in a

historic district so we are working through notices of violations. The commission must look at projects as if the work had not been completed in order to apply the standards. A COA was issued by staff to replace the 2nd floor apartment door with a window to match the window next to the door that matches a set of windows on the opposite dormer side. The window used does not match the original windows. A second issue is that they would like to paint the brick foundation. Areas have been repointed but done with the intention to paint as the work does not meet the standards for repointing. The Guidelines are clear about not painting unpainted brick work for aesthetic and practical reasons of deterioration and trapping moisture. A third issue is that when the roof soffit was replaced they used OSB board with nails protruding instead of tongue and groove. This is at the front of the house and visible. A fourth issue is the request to widen the existing driveway and repaved. Staff does not see an issue with repaving and widened some but not more than 9 feet in total width to stay in character with the more narrow driveways. And staff would prefer that it be extended more to the back of the property so that the driveway does not serve as a parking pad with cars at the front of the house.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and photographic evidence, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work, if conditions are met, is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Windows and Doors (pages 55-61), Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 48-50) and Roofs (pages 51-53) and Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (pages 28-30)* for the following reasons:

Facts

The second story of this house was converted into an apartment possibly in the 1950s when the aluminum siding was installed, a set of outside stairs was constructed and a window replaced with a door. The new owners have removed the stairs and filled in the apartment entrance with a window. The window does not match the existing window.

Guidelines (page 57)

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations, and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units. It is not appropriate to introduce new window and/or door openings into the principal elevations of a contributing historic structure.

Facts

The foundation has been repaired where there was a concrete landing for the apartment stairs and the bricks repointed. The repointing was not done according to the Standards and resulted in mortar being smeared onto the bricks and an unsightly appearance.

Guidelines (page 50)

4. Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry/stone is not appropriate, because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry/stone feature, and can accelerate deterioration. Previously painted surfaces may remain painted.

Facts

When the roof shingles were replaced, the original roof decking, which was likely planks, was replaced with OSB sheathing. The exposed tongue-and-groove soffits were removed. Tongue-and-groove soffits are a universal feature of bungalows with wide roof overhangs and are a detail that helps define the character of the house.

Guidelines (page 53)

4. Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown molding, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.

Facts

There is existing driveway and driveway apron. Widening it out to the foundation of the house would essentially make it a double width driveway. Anything wider than 9' would be out of character with historic driveways which are usually no more than 8' or 9' wide. Extending the driveway to the back of the house would be in keeping with driveways in the historic district.

Guidelines (page 30)

2. *When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials and design.*

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.*

Recommended Conditions

That the foundation not be painted. Steps could be taken to mitigate the cement smeared on the bricks and shrubbery could be planted. A red lime wash would also be acceptable.

That the look of the original soffit boards be restored.

That the driveway be extended to the back of the house and be no wider than 9'.

Mike added that he contacted the Register of Deeds to learn if there is anything that can be done to alert buyers of being in the historic district. If a property does not go on the open market there is no tool at this time. We want to come away from the meeting with a resolution that allows them to move forward. Staff clarified that he did not include changing the smaller window as a condition because he sees the other issues as more concerning. In answer to questions from the commissioners staff said that: he is unaware if there is a functional need for the smaller window, the driveway site plan goes right to the property line and confirmed there is not space for a planting yard and that a hedge is encroaching on the driveway. Staffed clarified that the window remains a violation and the commission does need to address it. The curb cut for the driveway will likely need to be extended. After discussing some proceduraely questions ultimately they moved forward with reviewing the application today.

In Support:

Jose Reyes, 709 Magnolia Street. Sworn in. Mr Reyes apologize for not understanding the process that he needed to follow. He said that the soffit had OSB board but they have no problem putting tongue and groove back. The plan is to widen the driveway and extend it back about halfway mark to the house. He said that they could not get the right size windows and had to get the best size at Architectural Salvage because the opening needed to be closed up. He explained that a waterproofing company came out because of issues with the foundation. The company recommends waterproofing on both sides of the foundation. He asked for clarification on why he would not be allowed to paint he brick because other properties have the brick painted. In response to a question he said that the water proofing was applied to the inside and the footing part of the foundation and they will do foundation plantings once completed. Commissioners asked questions about the water proofing on the exterior and the described water may be condensation. The applicant said that they are open to other methods. There is a vapor barrier. A French drain was suggested. Commissioners stated that there is regrettable repointing and they need to avoid painted brick and with the painted waterproofing the look of the brick foundation will be significantly reduced. Consideration of a red lime wash could be considered.

In Opposition:

Cheryl Pratt, previously sworn in. She reiterated that the windows need to be matched and that the brick should not be painted and noted that it is the second worst repointing job that she has seen in the last 10 years of looking at properties. She agrees that a red lime wash may be the solution. In doing the water proofing a trench has been dug which may work to transition a French drain. She mentioned that the condition of the trees was unknown and that the giant oak tree was massacred and is a shadow of its former self. They have no concerns with the privacy fence. They do not agree with widening the driveway but agree with making it longer. They want to see the soffits repaired and the vinyl window issue resolved. She mentioned that three of the main windows downstairs were sheetrock'd over on the inside which is outside of the HPC because it is on the interior.

Chair Hodierna restated the issues 1) the wrong size window, 2) the foundation painting 3) the OSB sheathing where the tongue and groove once was and 4) the widening of the driveway to 10 feet. Commissioner Leimenstoll asked about the fence but that is approvable at staff level because it is at the back of the house. There was a question about approving the one mismatched window and if they approve that will then be approving the vinyl windows under the February COA. It was clarified that they are under two separate applications. The vinyl window application was denied and is still a violation that needs to be corrected. It is not part of the COA application tonight. Commissioner Hodierna explained that the applications are in their packets and they can view the application in that way. Commissioners continued to discuss what items they were reviewing on the application today. There was confusion on if the trees need to be approved and staff said it is approved at staff level. Commissioner Hodierna relisted the items that are before the commissioner's review on this application. Commissioner Arnette asked if they could request different approaches if the best way to proceed would be to approve with conditions on what modification should be made and staff agreed. The porch ceiling could be considered tonight if they wanted to. They clarified that they are only looking at the one window this evening.

Mr Reyes was given a rebuttal opportunity where he stated that he consulted with staff on the trees and that he would like to be better prepared on how to handle the other items. Ms. Pratt did not have any rebuttal. The public hearing was closed.

Discussion:

They discussed continuing the item and agreed that they did not want to delay the project another month and could make a decision through conditions. Commissioner Leimenstoll suggested conditions to replace the small window to match the original, that the tongue and groove materials that were removed would be used to replace the soffit and roof overhangs and duplicate the original appearance, that the foundation not be painted and hope that the owner find a more successful way to deal with water and that the driveway not be wider than 9 feet and lengthen deeper into the lot. Commissioner Israel suggested that the red lime wash be add as an option. Commissioners discussed the grooved porch ceiling and if they would be setting a precedent. Legal staff stated that the porch ceiling that was not noted in the application is not clearly lined out in the ordinance. Commissioner Arnett asked about the windows and asked about the windows still in place as violations. Staff reminded that the minutes from February are not available because we lost our minutes recorder. He stated that application was denied because there was evidence that the original windows were there when they purchased the house. It does not cover the windows on the first floor. We are still in discussion on what windows should go back under that COA. The decision on this single window needs to be made in a way that does not conflict with the previous decision or inadvertently apply to the other windows on the property. Commissioners discussed at length how to proceed with the porch ceiling and ultimately agreed to wait for the proper process and ask the staff to let them know. Commissioner Arnett suggested that the soffit be installed in the appropriate orientation.

Finding of Fact:

Jo Leimenstoll moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2588 which is an addendum to 2568 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Standards-- Standards under Windows and Doors on page 57 on and Painting of Masonry and Foundations on Page 50 and Preservation of roof details on page 53 and Driveways on page 30 as finding of fact. Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierne, Arneke, Rowe. Abstain: Graeber. Nays: None.)*

Motion:

Therefore, Ms. Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions application number 2588 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jose Reyes for work at 709 Magnolia Street with the following conditions: that the window that has been replaced in the side gable is not of the correct dimension and that a new window should be installed that is a double hung wood window that matches the windows in the original second floor window configuration. Number 2 that the soffits of the porch and roof that have been replaced with OSB sheathing that should be replaced with tongue and groove material in the correct orientation with staff's direction. Number three that the foundation not be painted with the option of a red lime coating and condition four is that the driveway may be widened no more that 9 feet and extended to the depth of the house. Seconded by Ms. Israel. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierne, Arneke, Rowe: Abstain: Graeber Nays: none)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

The chair asked for an update on the window replacement on the applicant that they just heard. Staff described that they are still working with the property owner on what would be an appropriate replacement product and remains a violation. Tonight was a good reminder for them. The chair noted a second item that the commission would like staff to review the material used under the porch and move forward with the proper procedures. Commissioner Arnette asked if there had been any contact with Holy Trinity and staff said a follow up letter was sent offering to meet at their convenience to discuss possible alternatives to demolition and no response has been received. Its different because the house is not part of a larger project so it does not leave much room for discussion. Chair Hodierne asked if under our Standards the 7 items that are listed if there are any teeth to forcing the property owner to participate? It would seem that there is no way to force them other than to delay the demolition. Commissioners expressed a desire for a solution and encourage the church to value the house as a part of their campus and if there is guidance to help them resolve their homeless issues.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mike state that we had a discussion about holding an in-house training and commissioners agreed this would be helpful. In answer to a question Staff stated that we will continue to meet remote as there was a mixed response. Having the video format is helpful to creating the minutes until a permanent solution is found. And other staff members for all boards and commissions are looking into the appropriate technology to address this need.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CONDUCTED REMOTELY VIA ZOOM
June 29, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amanda Hodierna (Chair and Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Sharon Graeber, Jo Leimenstoll, Adrienne Israel, Katherine Rowe

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary; Planning Department, Allen Buansi, City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Chair Hodierna stated that Deborah Kaufman was absent.

Chair Hodierna read the remote meeting authority standards into the record.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL AND MAY REGULAR MEETING:

Adrienne Israel stated that there was an error in the April 27th minutes in the last line on page 8. The motion regarding the house on 603 Greene Street stated that there was a unanimous 6-2 vote. She requested that the word 'unanimous' be removed.

Jesse Arnett made a motion to approve the April and May minutes with the revision to the April minutes requested by Adrienne Israel in place. This motion was 2nd by Bert Vanderdeen.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number: #2589**
 Location: 115 Mendenhall Street
 Applicant: Adam J. Zolot
 Owner: Adam J. Zolot
 Date Application Received: 4/22/2022

Description of Work:

Expand parking area behind apartment building

Staff Recommendation:

Based on the application, the expansion of this parking area does not meet the requirements of this Historic District since it does not meet guidelines by breaking up large expanses of pavement into smaller components to provide more green space. By converting nearly the entire backyard into parking spaces, this plan is not consistent with the standards of this Historic District. Staff suggested adding more landscaping to help break up the parking bays in order to

reduce the impact on the district. The commission also recommended that the number of spaces be reduced from 16 to 12.

Fact:

The proposed parking lot will be entirely made of gravel, and will contain 12 spaces for the 12 bedrooms within the apartment building, as well as 4 spaces for visitors. To divide the spaces equally, 84 x 9 x 8.5 inch parking blocks will be installed at the front of each space.

Guidelines (Page 30)

1. Retain historic driveways and walkways, including steps and sidewalks, in their original locations. When deteriorated, repair with materials that match or are compatible to the original.
2. Select appropriate paving materials for new walkways, including concrete, brick, and stone. Simulations of natural materials such as stamped concrete are not appropriate.
3. When needed, introduce new driveways and walkways that are compatible with existing driveways and walkways in terms of width, location, materials, and design. Generally, double width driveways and circular driveways are not appropriate.
6. Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.

Recommended Conditions:

Facts:

The parking lot was constructed prior to receiving a COA. The applicant wishes to adjust the lot and add landscaping in order to meet requirements of the historic district.

In Support:

Adam Zolot, sworn in, 3715 Tuxford Lane, Jamestown, NC, Mr. Zolot stated that the main focus of this project is to alleviate the concerns of off-street parking. This will benefit not only the tenants but also all of the neighbors on S. Mendenhall Street. Previously, there were only two tenants in the building - to the knowledge of Mr. Zolot, neither of which drove - thus there was much less parking stress. After converting the current 8 bedrooms into usable space, there will be at least 8 cars in need of a parking space. This gravel lot was constructed to avoid issues with having them park on the street. Mr. Zolot added that the team was unaware of the guidelines within the Historic District prior to the parking lot construction. He also added that roughly 90% of the invasive Bamboo plants surrounding the property are on land which belongs to Greensboro College.

Rosemary DiGeorgio, sworn in, 716 Walker Avenue, Ms. DiGeorgio provided a statement by the College Hill Neighborhood Association. The statement declared that the College Hill Neighborhood Association met to discuss the COA for 115 S. Mendenhall Street during their May and June meetings. Adam Zolot was present at both meetings to discuss the COA and ask about suggestions for future improvements to the property. The CHNA did not have any

negative feedback concerning the parking lot, but wishes to defer to the question on their decision. On a relative note, the neighborhood is very much in favor of the improvement.

In Opposition:

No one spoke in opposition.

Discussion:

Commissioner Graeber asked if the parking spaces went all the way up to the property line on both sides. Mr. Zolot answered that the intent was to get it as close to the property line as they comfortably can. Ms. Graeber then asked what neighbors were on either side. Mr. Zolot responded that the patio side of the property are owner occupants who they have been unsuccessful in making contact with; on the other side, Mr. Zolot assumes that it is a landlord renting out individual rooms within the house. Facing the back is Greensboro College. Commissioner Arnett then asked Mr. Zolot if he anticipated if his tenants would be students, to which Mr. Zolot replied that it could be a mixture.

Commissioner Andrews stated that the two current options for this application are to hold the item over until the next meeting, or a decision could be made following a developmental standards review with the Technical Review Committee. Mr. Andrews also stated that - while keeping time in consideration - he believes it would be in the applicants best interest to continue this item into the next meeting.

Motion:

Commissioner Leimenstall moved to continue this item to the July meeting in order to make a revision to the number of parking spaces, as well as clarity on landscaping as based upon staff recommendations.

Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierne, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber. Nays: None.)

- (b) Application Number: #2591**
- Location: 808 Olive Street**
- Applicant: Mark Gabriel**
- Owner: Mark Gabriel**
- Date Application Received: 5/26/22**

Description of Work:

Completely replace front porch flooring with composite flooring.

Staff Recommendation:

Based on the Historic Preservation guidelines, the applicant must replace the flooring with a material that meets the standards of this historic district. The city will be able to recommend or approve a more durable flooring option that will also fulfill the district's needs.

Fact:

The front porch will be repaired and the flooring replaced with new composite tongue-and groove flooring. The porch wraps around the house and is partially uncovered and exposed to the elements. The floor has been replaced before yet has structural issues. Cellular PVC tongue-and groove flooring has the same physical characteristics as wood tongue-and groove flooring.

Guidelines (Page 64)

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

Recommended Conditions:

That the composite flooring chosen must meet the standards of the historic district in terms of appearance, texture, and the ability to be painted.

In Support:

Cheryl Pratt, sworn in, 910 Magnolia Street, Charyl shared that the Fisher Park Board met and discussed the COA. The board was split with several members stating that only wood flooring would be appropriate, while others expressed that they believe there are sufficient composite options. Ms. Pratt also shared that the entire porch was replaced with wood 8 years ago and has already rotted almost all the way through in some of the exposed areas. She requested guidance from the commission on what kinds of composite would be appropriate to be utilized.

In Opposition:

No one spoke in opposition.

Discussion:

Commissioner Vanderdeen shared that Azek flooring is not able to be painted, however due to the circumstances surrounding the short length of time that it took for the current wood flooring to rot, he would allow for the flooring to be replaced with composite flooring. Commissioner Rowe agreed with Mr. Vanderdeen, and added that there could possibly be another flooring

option that is not Azek, but has the correct dimensions/could be painted that would better fit the district's standards.

Mike Cowhig stated that based on the commission's guidelines, the city would be happy to share a recommendation for a composite flooring that would better fit the standards required. The city would also approve or deny an option found by the applicant.

The public hearing was closed.

Finding of Fact:

Mr. Arnett moved that based upon the facts presented in application #2591, the Greensboro Historic Preservation commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic District program manual and design standards and that staff comments as well as the guidelines on Page 62 are acceptable as finding of fact. Seconded by Katherine Rowe. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierne, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Arnett moved the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions application number 2591 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mark Gabriel for work at 808 Olive Street with the following conditions: that the porch flooring material selected be approved by city staff and that it be consistent with recommendations from the state historic preservation office, specifically in regards to size, texture, that it be tongue-and groove, and that it be paintable. Seconded by Adrienne Israel. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierne, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber. Nays: None.)

- (c) Application Number: #2598**
- Location: 305 W. Bessemer Avenue**
- Applicant: Joe Bugni**
- Owner: Matthew Cashwell**
- Date Application Received: 10/16/19**

Description of Work:

Landscaping and site improvements. Increasing the width of the driveway to 19 feet, cutting 5 feet of curb on the West side. Addition of trees, shrubs and other basic landscaping.

Guidelines (Page 30)

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

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

Recommended Conditions:

That the plan for the driveway be reduced to 12 feet and the fence/wall beside the driveway be replaced with plantings instead.

In Support:

Joe Bugni, 305 West Bessemer Avenue, sworn in, Mr. Bugni stated that the driveway previously the plan for his driveway was drawn larger, to the property boundary. At the Fisher Park Neighborhood meeting, there was concern expressed that even with the plan being narrowed, and a french drain added, that there would be too much concrete for the side of the property. Joe is willing to reduce the amount of driveway to appease the neighborhood association. When he measured the current driveway, it was 10 feet wide. He is requesting 12 feet to (two feet additional to the West) to help center the driveway better with his garage. Next he would remove 2 trees (a Magnolia with root problems, and a Lilac Chase shrub in the front yard) and replace them with Hornbeams. When the landscaping goes in, a Trident Maple will be added as well to satisfy a previous COA. The fencing will have a lateral design which was previously approved within the district.

In Opposition:

No one spoke in opposition.

Discussion:

Commissioner Leimenstall stated she was satisfied with the driveway being changed to 12 feet. She also stated that the revision to the plantings rather than the wall beside the driveway is an improvement.

The public hearing was closed.

Finding of Fact:

Jo Leimenstall moved that based upon the facts presented in application #2598 in the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Standards, and that the staff comments in the following guidelines for plantings on page 23, for fences on page 26 and for driveways on page 30, are acceptable as a finding of facts. Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodieme, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore Commissioner Leimenstall moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve application #2598, and grant a COA with the condition that the width of the driveway as revised to 12 feet instead of 19 and that hedges are planted rather than the low wall, to Joe Bugni for work at 305 West Bessemer Avenue. Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Israel, Hodierna, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

No items from the Commission Chairman

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

No items from the Planning Department.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
July 27, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amanda Hodierne (Chair and Fisher Park), Jesse Arnett (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Sharon Graeber, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll, Katherine Rowe

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Stefan-Leih Geary; Planning Department, Allen Buansi, City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Cowhig stated that Adrienne Israel is an approved absence.

Jesse Arnett stated that although he is on the Board of Preservation Greensboro Development Fund he has no financial interest in item 3b.

Staff stated that item 3A 115 S. Mendenhall Street would be continued until the August meeting to allow for the project to go through the City's Technical Review Committee. A motion was passed to continue the item until the August 31 meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL REGULAR MEETING:

There were no minutes to approve at this time.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (b) **Application Number: 2603 APPROVED with CONDITIONS**
Location: 212 Florence Street
Applicant: Emily Hinton
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 7/7/22

Description of Work:

Remove partially enclosed front porch, remove vinyl siding and repair original siding and trim, and other exterior work.

Staff Recommendation:

The application is to restore the house. The front porch will be restored. It had been enclosed for interior space by a prior owner. The original window will be moved to its original front wall. The vinyl siding will be removed and staff expects that based on their experience, the original wood siding will be in a condition that can be restored. Staff refers the commission to guidelines on **porches, entrances and balconies on 62-66, windows and doors 55-61 and exterior walls on pages 44-47**. Once the vinyl siding is removed staff would like the opportunity to review the condition of the original siding to properly evaluate. It is an excellent application and it is clear it meets the standards. The recommended conditions are: That the new front door and any substitute replacement materials are brought back to staff for approval prior to installation and that staff inspects the original exterior materials once the vinyl siding is removed. Chair Hodierne asked for clarification on what is approvable at staff level and what the Commission is looking at

today. Ms. Rowe asked about the paintable PVC product that is being proposed. Mr. Cowhig stated that he spoke with the State Historic Preservation Office who said that in some cases they allow when the material in specific situations. A request like this could be in a condition to come back to the commission. Ms. Leimenstohl stated that this is the reason for the condition to require substitute materials come back to staff. At the end of the porch, where the ramp will be removed,

In Support:

Emily Hinton, 56 Nandina Drive, the applicant and property owner was sworn in. Ms. Hinton stated this is a large undertaking and she has tried to anticipate obstacles as much as she can. She intends to restore the structure from a 3 unit multi-family to a single family where she will be the owner and resident. She stated about 75% of the brick foundation is already painted. The unpainted brick is part of some new brick from a repair. Once the porch enclosure is removed the intent is to replicate the original details of the porch on the left side to the right side. There is currently no guard rail and because of height it is not required. She stated that she is utilizing the State Historic Preservation Tax Credits which means that there will be oversight of the project at the State level.

Cheryl Pratt, sworn in, 910 Magnolia Street, also with the FPNA, stated she is also a part of the PGDF but has no financial ties. The board voted in favor of the project unanimously. They had concern about the PVC but will leave that to the SHPO tax credit project to decide.

Julie Curry, 1009 Grayland Ave, Preservation Greensboro Development Fund, PGDF sold Ms. Hinton the property which requires a rehabilitation plan and restored based on the organizations mission statement. She also stated that she contacted the NCSHPO office about the pvc product but that it is typically not approved for residential properties. She also stated that PGDF put an easement on the property that prohibits demolition. This is something they place on all properties that PGDF acquires.

In Opposition:

No one spoke in opposition.

There were no questions for the speakers. The public hearing portion was closed.

Discussion:

Ms. Leimenstoll stated that since the property owner is working with staff and the state it seems that the condition would be that they could ask for approval. Mr. Arnett pointed to the proposed condition by staff as being acceptable and commissioners agreed. There was no further discussion.

Mr. Arnett moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2603, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed changes are not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the following Staff Comments as well as the guidelines on pages **porches, entrances and balconies on 62-66, windows and doors 55-61 and exterior walls on pages 44-47 are acceptable as finding of fact.**

Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0. (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodierne, Rowe) Nays: 0).

Mr. Arnett moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2603 and grants a Certificated of Appropriateness to Emily Hinton for work at 212 Florence Street with the following conditions: That the new front door and any substitute replacement materials are brought back to staff for approval prior to installation and that staff inspects the original exterior

materials once the vinyl siding is removed. Seconded: Vanderveen. The commission voted 8-0 (Ayes: Arneke, Arnett, Graeber, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Rowe, Hodierne) Nays: 0

- (c) **Location: 517 South Mendenhall Street APPROVED with CONDITIONS**
Application Number 2604
Applicant: Curtis Chesney
Property Owner: same
Date Application Received: 7/822

Description of Work:

Construction of addition to house, remove 1 tree, replace front walkway and steps.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Cowhig described the deteriorated condition of the front steps that lead from the sidewalk to the front. On close inspection the cheek walls are broken all the way through. He mentioned that it is unfortunate to remove early concrete work but you can see how they are broken completely through and this is a reasonable request. The addition meets the standards based on the location, design and materials. We did recommend a condition that staff be provided more detail on the materials that can be included as a condition. We refer you to the **Standards for Additions 75, 76 Patios and Decks pages 41-42, Trees and Landscaping pages 21-23 and Walkways, Driveways and Parking areas pages 28-30.** One tree will be removed and we are recommending a condition to start one new tree in a better location.

Ms. Leimenstoll had a question about how the existing wall will align with the new addition wall. It looks as if there will be no differentiation. After reviewing the drawings it was determined that there is an indentation between the deck and the addition but not the addition and the existing wall plane. Ms. Geary was sworn in and commented that she did not realize that there was no indentation and this is in fact recommended. She also clarified that the screened in porch is the footprint of the deck on the drawings.

In Support:

Curtis Chesney, 207 S. Mendenhall Street. Sworn in. Mr. Chesney described his project speaking of course in favor. He clarified that there is not a screened in porch but a covered porch. They are happy to start a new tree and would appreciate flexibility on the location of the tree describing some new plantings they are planning on the property. They have Greensboro College along the back line and plan to start new trees along that area. There are no plans for the addition to be inset from the original wall plane. The wall keeps going straight back. He said if it needs to be inset they would appreciate the least amount possible due to the narrow width of the lot. Ms. Hodierne asked him to describe the covered porch. Mr. Curtis said the addition roof would extend out to cover the deck. She asked about the indentation and asked about interior that might prohibit moving the wall in. He described the slight constraints. Ms. Leimenstoll said she is not talking about a large indentation and that the materials would likely create a slight set back of 1 or 2 inches to compensate for the change in material depth. They pointed out a 12 foot dimension on the bedroom and (inaudible).

Adam Zolot, 115 S. Mendenhall St. College Hill NA, sworn in. The College Hill Neighborhood Association would like to speak in favor of the 207 S. Mendenhall COA request. On the stairs we think it is appropriate to replace the stairs with like materials. On the addition we would like to have more information about the specific fiber cement siding intended for the use. Our assumption is that the siding will conform to design guidelines holding a "similar texture, appearance and reveal dimension to wood siding."

We would like more information about the fenestration on the new addition. We want to confirm that the windows will be made of wood and that the configuration of the windows match the rest of the house (a six over one windows for the smaller size and a larger six-over-one window with flanking. Smaller six-over-one windows on either side for the large size). The windows should appear consistent with the front and side elevation of the original structure.

We appreciate that the addition is a single story, rear addition which will not be visible from the street. We also appreciate the matching shingles that will be used on the addition to contribute to its continuity with the original structure.

On the tree we would like more information about the tree: species, size, and location. If at all possible, we desire that the tree be untouched (no larger than 4 inches dbh).

Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition.

Rebuttal: Mr. Chesney said the tree he believes is a pecan and the foundation of the addition goes right next to the tree and will likely damage the tree. The other materials question he may have to get more information. The vision is to match with 9 over 1 windows and his builder is present to answer questions. Ms. Hoderne stated the drawings are showing 6 over 1 so that is what would be approved. Mr. Cowhig said that for additional windows that are simulated divided light with muntins permanently attached and whether they are wood or clad has not mattered. Trim work matches traditional detailing with wider casings. Cementitious siding has been approved with the smooth finish. Mr. Chesney said that his windows are 9 grids over 1 with a few 6 over 1 on the smaller windows. The windows on the addition will be of the larger size.

The public hearing portion was closed.

Discussion:

Mr. Vanderveen pointed out that there is a recommended staff comment that pertains to the materials and design. Mr. Arneke asked about the steps and building inspections. Ms. Geary stated that modern building code can impact the ability and suggest a condition to make sure those discussion are a collaboration and that what is built is in keeping with what the Commission expects to have happen while also meeting the building code requirements. Mr. Arnett asked about the guideline about distinguishing the addition with material and the guideline is satisfied through roof line and material and the question is if an offset is appropriate. Ms. Leimenstoll said it won't be visible from the street and stated it will be very challenging to perfectly align the two wall plans. Ms. Geary stated that a slight difference that moves it inward so that inset is not visible. Mr. Arnett suggested a vertical differentiation and appreciates that they are trying to maintain the window on the other side. He also commented on the transom window and suggested that it be a divided lite pattern. Without the divers/muntins it seems too modern. Lastly he commented on the roof overhang and how it turns the corner at the left side elevation. (Inaudible discussion) but concern was explained. Commissioners discussed the removal of the tree and that there is a precedent for the removal for a project of this type. Staff stated that for replacement the recommended dbh is 2:" because it helps with the new tree to acclimate and ultimately grows faster.(inaudible Jo Leimenstoll). Mr. Arneke stated that it is reasonable to allow the removal and require a new tree. Mr. Vanderveen commented that the concern about new building codes is a valid concern and Mr. Arnett discussed the need for a handrail depending on how many steps. Ms. Hoderne stated that if Building Code changes anything staff could help bridge that gap and work with them when they get to that point. Ms. Geary stated that it would be most prudent to have that discussion prior to demolition so that the property owner is aware of what would be required for complete replacement and then this would allow the opportunity to consider repair rather than demolition, if possible. Ms. Rowe pointed out the recommended staff comment that addresses the steps.

Finding of Fact:

Bert Vanderveen moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 2604 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Staff Comments and the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Standards*-- under Additions page 76, Patios and Decks page 42, Trees and Landscaping page 23 and Driveways and Parking Areas page 30 are acceptable as finding of fact.

Seconded by Katherine Rowe. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, , Hodiernne, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber. Nays: None.)

Motion:

Therefore, Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves the application number 2604 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Curtis Chesney for work at 207 S> Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: 1) That the details on material and design for the windows and doors are brought back to staff for approval and are consistent with the new construction materials list.

That details on the design and materials for the covered porch are brought back to staff for approval prior to construction.

In replacing the walkway steps, changes to the design and dimension may be required under NC Building code. Prior to demolition, City Historic Preservation staff and City Building Inspectors should be consulted to determine any necessary changes and redesign to best meet historic compatibility with the original.

A new canopy tree, at a minimum of 2" dbh, should be planted. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement should be started.

The foundation and wall plane should be offset from the original and that the detail of that should be provided to staff.

Seconded by Ms. Rowel. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Arnett, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Hodiernne, Arneke, Rowe, Graeber Nays: none).

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Ms. Hodiernne asked about a bible and Ms Geary said that we affirm so a bible is not necessary. Commissioners commented on who will be attending the training on August 3rd in Burlington. We are hopeful there will be a video version to share.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mike updated the commission on the oral history project and the Benbow National Register Nomination project. Bernetae Reed has been hired to conduct the oral histories along with some staff from NC A&T to help with the interviews. A community meeting will be coming up in August 18 at Providence Baptist Church. We will include the Commissioners.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
August 31, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jesse Arnett (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Sharon Graeber, Katherine Rowe, Adrienne Israel

STAFF PRESENT: Stefan-Leih Geary, Russ Clegg; Planning Department, Andrea Harrell, City Attorney's Office.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Ms. Geary explained that item 3a was withdrawn. This is an after the fact application for an expanded parking lot. The application was received in January and since then the applicant has worked with the Technical Review Board and has decided to remove the gravel and reseed the area.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary stated that Deborah Kaufman and Jo Leimenstoll have approved absences.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL REGULAR MEETING:

David Arneke moved to approve the July 27, 2022 minutes. Seconded by Sharon Graeber. Approved unanimously.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

Jesse Arnett asked to recuse himself as he is the architect for the project and therefore has a conflict of interest. David Arneke moved to recuse Commissioner Arnett, seconded by Sharon Graeber. David Arneke lead the meeting.

- (b) **Application Number: 2610 APPROVED**
Location: 810 Simpson Street
Applicant: Lindsay Morgan and Joseph Rieke
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 8/10/22

Description of Work:

Construction of addition and deck with the removal of one tree.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. Staff stated that they are testing a new presentation format this evening. Staff described the setting showing the different sides of the structure and pointed out the existing original side porch with a flat roof, the brick exterior, and the tree and deck proposed to be removed.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's review the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Additions* (pages 75-76), *Patios and Decks* (pages 41-42), *Trees and Landscaping* (pages 21-23) for the following reasons:

Facts

This application is for construction of a 12' by 17' addition with an attached 12' by 17' open deck at the rear of the house. It will require the removal of an existing deck and one large tree. It is located in the Fisher Park district.

Facts

The design of the addition is similar to the existing covered porch on the side elevation of the house in that it will have a flat roof. The proposed addition has square corner pilasters which resemble the square columns on the existing side porch. The addition will be enclosed utilizing true divided light wood windows over wood paneling. The main exterior material on the house is brick. The span of original windows on the left rear façade will be retained. The change in materials from brick to wood will distinguish the new construction from the historic structure.

Guidelines under Additions (page 76)

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

Facts

The deck will be completely behind the house and not visible from any street. The railing is wood with a beveled two-piece top rail. The balusters about the tail in a traditional railing design versus typical deck railing that are

Guidelines under Patios and Decks (page 42)

- 1) Locate decks at the rear of the structure or in a location not readily visible from the street. Decks that are visible from the street should be screened with shrubbery or other landscaping materials.
- 2) Decks should be of wood construction, and of dimensions that do not monopolize the rear elevation or significantly detract from the architecture of the building.

Facts

1 tree will be removed. It is located close to the house eaves and foundation. There are multiple trees on the property.

Guidelines under Trees and Landscaping (page 23)

- 1) Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.
- 2) When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.
- 3) Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.
- 4) Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work. Refer to the Tree Protection Guide in the appendix of this document for specific precautions and requirements.

Condition:

That a new canopy tree of a minimum of 2" diameter at breast height (dbh) be started. The species and location should be selected in consultation with the City Arborist. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement tree should be started.

Staff noted that Adrienne Israel joined the meeting at the beginning of the staff presentation.

Speakers were sworn in.

Acting Chair Arneke swore speakers in and asked if anyone was present to speak in favor of the application.

In Support:

Lindsay Morgan, 610 Simpson Street, the applicant and property owner was sworn in. Ms. Morgan thanked staff for the presentation. She described the benefit of the addition will be for her family to have a more communal eating area. The house is older and a foursquare that doesn't allow for that flexibility. The existing deck is small and this will extend the deck to make it more useful for a family with small children. She said that she is 100 percent in favor of the condition on the tree but mentioned that the back yard has a significant number of trees. Mr. Vanderveen asked if staff would be agreeable to not having a new tree if there are enough existing trees. Ms. Geary explained that staff typically recommends a 1 for 1 replacement but it would be in your, the HPC's, purview to decide if that is appropriate to not require a new tree. Staff navigated to google to show the tree canopy on the property. Ms. Morgan described the foliage in the backyard as having a full lush backyard. Staff recommended that the condition could simply be to work with the City arborist to determine if one is necessary and he determines that it is not need that would be acceptable.

Keisha Hadden, sworn in, 404 W. Bessemer Avenue, with the FPNA. The board voted in favor of the project unanimously. They also agree that a new tree is not necessary and pointed out that there is only one grassy area in the back yard that would accommodate a new planting but this would like serve as the play area of the yard.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, sworn in. Ms. Pratt provided staff with 3 digital images showing the tree foliage in the back yard. Staff walked the images around to each commission member. Ms. Pratt stated that the brick is actual wood siding. Ms. Geary thanked Ms. Pratt for that information because staff discussed this earlier and the NR nomination does not mention this detail so without confirmation did not want to include that.

In Opposition:

No one spoke in opposition.

There were no questions for the speakers. The public hearing portion was closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Vanderveen remarked that they support the project and it appears that there are many trees in existence. Commissioner Rowe stated that the tree could be a choice for the property owner. Commissioner Graeber was concerned that a new planting would not have enough sunlight given the existing full canopy. Staff reminded commissioners that they do not have to include a condition and are not required to agree with staff comments. Commissioner Arneke said he would be happy to approve with the condition. It would not be a precedent to not require replacement in future applications.

Ms. Rowe moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2610, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the Staff

Comments and **Standards 1,2,3,4,5 and 6 under Additions page 76, under Patios and decks Standards 1 & 2 page 42, and Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 23 under Trees and Landscaping**.are acceptable as finding of fact.

Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor. Ayes: Arneke, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe. Nays: 0. Abstain: Arnett.

Legal Counsel confirmed that Ms. Israel

Ms. Rowe moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2610 and grants a Certificated of Appropriateness to Lindsay Morgan and Joseph Rieke for work at 610 Simpson Street. Seconded: Vanderveen. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor. Ayes: Arneke, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe. Nays: 0. Abstain: Arnett. APPROVED

Commissioner Graeber made motion for Vice Chair Arnett to rejoin. 2nd by Vanderveen and approved 5-0.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Vice Chair did not have anything to share.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Staff remarked on the first public meeting for the Benbow/Clinton Hills project last week with over 63 residents in attendance. There is a lot of enthusiasm about the project. John Horan from the State Archives, Valerie Johnson from the NR advisory committee and the oral historian Bernetiae Reed so we have several prominent people in the field of historic preservation and history in North Carolina.

She also mentioned that commissioners Rowe, Graeber and Israel attended the training that SHPO held earlier in the month. Ms. Graeber spoke on a few of the agenda including story maps, the Sec.Int. standards, the differ between the types of landmark designation and the powers of an HPC. A power point will be provided with details. Staff mentioned that the story maps created for Benbow and New Garden will be part of a presentation at the NC American Planning Association conference. Ms. Israel would like to have a sheet with all of the different acronyms so that she can better understand the information. She found it very valuable.

Ms. Graeber mentioned that the Benbow/Clinton Hills NR, if approved, will be one of the larger Districts. The concern on the naming convention to reflect all three areas, not just Benbow Park. Ms. Geary stated that she is for the time referring to the area, comprised of Benbow Park, Benbow Road and Clinton Hills as Benbow/Clinton Hills. Ms. Graeber described the boundaries as south Curry Street, to the west Florida Street, to the East Highway 29 and to the north is Ross, or the street that runs by Metropolitan Daycare and encompasses what was originally known as the Spalding area. Individual houses qualify and staff explained that each individual area could be survey and nominated individually but part of this grant from the NPS is to document Oral Histories pertaining to Civil Rights and there will be significant overlap and makes sense to do it all together. Discussion took place stating that Bennett College is outside of the area and the Ezekiel Blair residence where one fo the Greensboro 4 lives is right at the edge. The Old L Richardson is outside of the boundary in the Nocho Park Area.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Ann Stringfield addressed the commission stating her concern that houses in the historic districts are vulnerable to demolition. Currently, there are 3 buildings and 1 apartment building under a 365 day demolition delay and last year a house on Summit Avenue was demolished. She referenced a

project in Raleigh that demolished a National Register property for a multi-unit condominium development. She spoke on the concept of “missing middle housing” and that it is encouraging development that is not middle sized, middle priced, and does not foster a diverse community. Historic homes can be used for multi-family and converted to businesses. Missing middle housing should not be built at the expense of historic properties and the districts already offer opportunities for compatible development. She asked the HPC to improve the Standards for new construction and enforcement, provide funding for the ordinance to prevent demolition by neglect, and thanked the commissioners for their volunteerism.

Benjamin Briggs addressed the commission on the same topic of concern for the demolition of historic resources through the City and cited examples in Raleigh and Durham. In reviewing a City staff report in a rezoning case he noted that it was stated that the property is in a local district but did not state facts about the historic significance of the building. He spoke on existing tools for preservation including Easements that protect historic properties from demolition, and that designating a property as having statewide significance can provide protection from demolition, as was the case with Hillside.

David Wharton, from the Dunleath Historic District commented on the pressures to increase density, and how zoning regulations are changing. Developers look for sites that will make the most money and those areas may be in jeopardy, like Fisher Park but also the other neighborhoods surrounding downtown. It would be difficult to change the State Enabling legislation that does not allow Commission’s to prevent demolition, but perhaps a fee for demolition could be identified. He said that Historic Districts have multifamily housing and single family housing and contribute to missing middle housing with small developers and the addition of accessory dwellings. As properties have homes with higher values it becomes less lucrative for developers to re-develop those sites.

Russ Clegg, Planning Department spoke on the concept of missing middle. This is a range of housing between detached, single family subdivisions and large apartment complexes. It includes duplexes, triplexes, bungalow courts and small apartment buildings and are found in older parts of town. There was less of this built after the 1940’s. We need to diversify our housing stock so the planning department has looked into missing middle but has not made any changes to our zoning ordinance. We have worked with a consultant to determine where missing middle housing would be beneficial and successful; generally, those changes would make sense in areas that are walkable and have a mixed use. It shouldn’t be misused; one key is that true missing middle is house scale instead of block scale to address massing. The term does not refer to the price point, and that is not something that can be addressed through the rezoning process. There is more interest in the historic districts because of their proximity to the downtown. There are good infill opportunities in existing parking areas.

Stef Geary mentioned they contacted Tania Tully in Raleigh and the case cited is a National Register. She as a reminder spoke on the limitations that the HPC cannot stop demolition. Staff has discussed the idea of a delay for NR properties as well. She mentioned the option (and difficulty) in changing the State Enabling legislation. New Bern created their own local authority to deny demolition in local designated historic districts. It has not been challenged in court but the question is if it is defensible if there is no actual State authority.

Commissioner Graeber asked about Easement and Mr. Briggs stated that Non-profits hold these for private property owner who elect to place an easement on their property and can range from very detailed interior features or just demolition. They come with an allocation of funding to serve as a legal defense fund should the easement be challenged or violated. Easements have been challenged and upheld.

David Wharton mentioned the Standards for New Construction that address massing, setback and other features that address traditional siting patterns that require new construction to be consistent

and compatible with what is already in the districts. This in itself is a de-incentivize for new developers that would have to follow those standards.

Vice-Chair Arnett noted it's an important topic and try to determine what is the path forward that is not destructive. He said that HPC powers are limited and be realistic about the market demand for walkable neighborhoods.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
September 28, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jesse Arnett (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath) Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Sharon Graeber, Katherine Rowe, Adrienne Israel, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll

STAFF PRESENT: Stefan-Leih Geary, Mike Cowhig, Russ Clegg; Planning Department, Allen Buansi, City Attorney's Office.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Ms. Geary stated there are no changes to the agenda

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary stated that David Arneke is an approved absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL REGULAR MEETING:

Jo Leimenstoll noted that on the bottom of page 3 it should say "not incongruous" because it was approved. Adrienne Israel moved to approve the August 31, 2022 minutes. Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. Approved unanimously.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number: 2619 APPROVED**
Location: 1100 Hicks Street
Applicant: John Marks
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 8/25/22

Description of Work:

Remove Pecan Tree; Install security light.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. Staff stated that the City Arborist, Judson Clinton, visited the site and recommends in favor of removing this tree because it will continually be pruned due to the fact that overhead power lines run through the canopy from both sides to attach to an existing Duke Energy Pole. In his assessment the tree will never be able to grow to its full maturity and this is an opportunity to start a new tree to continue reforestation of the historic tree canopy. Mr. Clinton has identified areas on the property that would be an ideal location to start a new tree. She also stated that staff contacted Deniece Conway in the Transportation department who works with Duke Energy and she provided a link of the different types of security lighting available. Ms. Geary stated that she and Mike Cowhig reviewed the options and recommend a specific fixture due to its low profile design and directional lighting capability.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's review the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23) and Lighting (page 31-32)* for the following reasons:

Facts

The site is a non-contributing apartment building and parking lot. Due to issues with safety, the project proposes to increase security lighting in the parking area by attaching a light fixture to an existing utility pole. Staff recommends using the pedestrian shoebox LED light to create a downward cast.

Guidelines (page 32) under Lighting

- 1) Select lighting fixtures and poles that are compatible in scale, design, and materials with the individual property and the neighborhood.
- 2) Carefully locate low level or directional lighting that does not invade surrounding properties. Indiscriminate area lighting is not appropriate.
- 3) Site lighting should be designed and located to minimize the impact on surrounding properties.
- 4) It is not appropriate to install standard Duke Power security lights on tall poles in most residential locations in the historic Districts. When security lights are necessary, they should be shaded so that the light and light source have minimal impact on surrounding properties.
- 5) Locate utility poles for security lights at the rear of the site when possible, and place electrical service lines

Facts

The utility pole is located within the interior of the property running upwards through the canopy of an existing pecan tree. There are utility lines attached to the pole from both sides and directly impacting the tree canopy. The City Arborist has inspected the tree and determined that due to pruning and future pruning needs the tree will not ever reach its full size due to the continual need for pruning. He recommends that this is an opportunity to start a new pecan tree where the canopy growth will not interfere with the utility lines. In this new location a pecan tree could thrive and contribute to the tree canopy of the district.

Guidelines (page 23) under Trees and Landscaping

- 2) When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.
- 5) Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.

Conditions:

A new pecan tree, at a minimum of 2" dbh, will be planted in a location determined by the City arborist. The new tree should be started within 365 days after removal. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement tree should be started.

In Support:

There was no one to speak in support of the application.

In Opposition:

Rosemarie DiGiorgio, sworn in, 716 Walker Avenue, with the CHNA. The CHNA met on Monday, September 26 to discuss the COA for 1100 Hicks Court. The CHNA would like to request more supporting documentation concerning the complaints of drug dealing in the parking lot, for example police reports. We would also like to know if other neighbors have complained. We talked with one neighbor who lives near the apartments and two neighbors whose backyards adjoin the parking lot. None of them are in favor of more lighting or cutting

down a healthy tree. The CHNA in general is not in favor of removing healthy trees, unless there is a documented health or safety risk posed by the tree. The tree in the photo appears to need trimming to keep it from interfering with power lines but it does not look unhealthy. The CHNA is not in favor of more lighting as the neighborhood is already exposed to invasive lighting throughout the neighborhood and in many of those cases, the lighting is intruding in people's homes. Thank you!

Ms. DiGiorgio, speaking freely, stated that it is good the City Arborist visited the tree and that the neighborhood is very concerned about lighting spill over. The neighborhood requests that they carefully consider additional lighting and the need for perhaps police reports or evidence of security issues. She supports new trees being planted.

Discussion:

Commissioners discussed if there was a need to continue the application so that the applicant could present the issues that are occurring at the site. Commissioners felt that there was enough information to make a decision on the merits of the application. Staff also suggested that they might consider a height limitation that would help offset light overspill. Commissioner Vanderveen stated that the same fixture is at the Swann Middle School and it is an ideal fixture to limit spill over and at the same time provide security lighting that has eliminated the issues. Commissioners discussed the current lighting provided on the site and identified only a single arm cobra light fixture and a small free standing fixture. Staff explained that even if the light wasn't an issue the tree has been identified by Mr. Clinton that it is an opportunity for reforestation in a new location where a new tree would flourish. There has not been a study on the types of light patterns but Ms. Geary read the description of the light fixture that it is intended for parking areas needing directional light. The light fixture is meant to be fixed 12 feet to 17 feet on the pole. Mr. Vanderveen said this is an additional lot that appears to have little lighting. Commissioners determined that the additional information provided in the staff report has been provided and answers the neighborhood's concerns.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2619, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 23 under Trees and Landscaping , When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner and Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape are acceptable as finding of fact.**

Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions application #2619 and grants a Certificated of Appropriateness to John Marks for work at 1100 Hicks Court with the following conditions: .1) A new pecan tree, at a minimum of 2" dbh, will be planted in a location determined by the City arborist. The new tree should be started within 365 days after removal. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement tree should be started. 2) That the light fixture is installed at the lowest feasible height with approval by City Staff and 3) that it be positioned to create the least amount of light overflow. Seconded: Vanderveen. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann, Pratt. Nays: 0. Abstain: none APPROVED

(b) **Application Number: 2621 APPROVED**
Location: 210 W. Fisher Avenue

Applicant: Brooks Shippen-How
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 9/5//22

Description of Work:

Remove Willow Oak Tree.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. Staff stated that the draft agenda also showed the removal of a post oak and hack berry tree. After a site visit was completed by the City Arborist, Judson Clinton, it was determined that the Post Oak tree is not on this property and could not be approved under this COA. The tree removal can be approved at the staff level and the property owners will be coming back with a new COA application. The city arborist also determined that the Hack Berry, originally listed as a sugar berry tree, can also be approved at the staff level without Commission discussion. In providing additional details, staff stated that Mr. Clinton's analysis was that the tree is a Hackberry that is causing structural issues because of the location close to the structure. Ms. Geary agreed with the point raised by Commissioner Pratt that it would not be causing foundation structural concerns because of its distance from the house. Ms. Geary stated that her notes from the Arborist did state structural as a reasoning but she did not have further specifics with her to clarify this reasoning. The commission proceeded with the consideration of the removal of the Willow Oak tree which is a native species to the districts but is located very near to the historic structure.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's review the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23) and Lighting (page 31-32)* for the following reasons:

Facts

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's review, which includes a review by Judson Clinton the City Arborist, the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

Facts

This application requests the removal of several trees that are approvable at staff level based on the City Arborists site visit. However, the request to remove the Willow Oak tree requires commission approval. The City Arborist visited the site and stated that the property has a large number of trees with a diverse species composition.

Facts

The Willow Oak tree is in a healthy condition. The tree is located near the house. The applicant describes issues with tree clean up and small animals which is typically not a cause for removal. However, a significant concern identified by the Arborist is that it is not located in an ideal location and as it continues to grow it will create structural issues and require pruning that will be detrimental to the tree. The arborist recommends using this as an opportunity to start a new tree in a location that will add to the historic tree canopy without any future interference.

Guidelines (page 23) under Trees and Landscaping

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

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

Conditions:

That a new canopy tree of a native tree species such as Willow Oak or Pecan, at a minimum of 2" dbh, will be planted in a location determined by the City arborist. The new tree should be started within 365 days after removal. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement tree should be started.

In response to a question clarifying a fourth tree, Ms. Geary also stated that the fourth tree on the application was dead and was approved for removal without HPC discussion.

In Support:

Brooks Shippen-How, property owner, 210 Fisher Park Avenue, sworn in, described her project and the overall work she is planning to restore the property. She is in communication with her neighbor in regards to the first tree that is on her property. She spoke about tree number 2, the Willow Oak tree which is dropping limbs and branches on the house and is a big concern of hers because of animals getting into the house. This tree was approved to be removed by the PGDF board. Tree number three is the Hack Berry Tree. It is about 40 feet back from the house and is not necessarily old enough to be historic. It cannot be viewed from the street she is concerned about it during storms. There is a mature tree within 10 feet for it and this tree will be able to thrive and a benefit will be solar renewable energy. She is working with a landscape architect and she is very aware of the bio diversity on the property and would like to make the vegetation work compatible. The fourth tree is already dead. One of her goals is to bring it into the 21st century both environmentally by focusing on energy efficiency and lowering the carbon footprint and tightening the thermal envelope of the whole property as well as financially. Out of the 18+ fully mature trees on the property she proposed the removal of only 2 live ones which directly impact solar power and are hazardous that may hinder the preservation of this house for the next 100 years which is her goal. For every tree she removes she will plant 2 native trees to support the biodiversity and canopy as well as water mitigation. This will bring the tree count up to over 25 trees. This will ensure the house is preserved and affordable for generations to come. There were no questions.

Keisha Hadden, sworn in, 44 West Bessemer, with the FPNA. FP discussed all four trees and focused her discussion on tree number 2 and they would support removal because it is close to the house and young willow oak surrounded by others. She believes a new tree elsewhere on the property would grow fairly quickly. There were no questions.

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition

Discussion:

Commissioner Leimenstoll discussed that the plan is encouraging and that the City arborist has made a good point that the Willow Oak will not thrive in this location. And that the conditions make sense. Commissioner Israel stated she was happy to learn that the two property owners will work together for the removal of the first tree. Inaudible. Mr. Pratt asked for clarification that the HPC is only looking at the Willow Oak. Ms. Geary stated that the HPC makes their approval specific to the Willow Oak so that the first tree is not also approved. Mike Cowhig (sworn in) added that we approve tree removal at the staff level based on Judson Clinton's review and he approved the dead tree and the hackberry. Mrs. Geary restated that she does not have detail on this tree and can only say that he recommended that it be approved at staff level. Ms. Geary said she may have misspoke about the structural issue but that she does not have detail. She only has additionally in her notes that he said that it is a volunteer that was not intentionally planted. We approve the removal based on his review and determination. Trees that are growing against a property causing structural

issues, that are volunteers not intentionally planted, trees that are dead, diseased, dying and if Judson sees justification for the removal a tree. Mr. Cowhig mentioned that the property had not been well maintained and trees and vines have overgrown the property.

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2621, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 23 under Trees and Landscaping, number 2 and number 5 are acceptable as finding of fact. She specified this approval is for the 1 Willow Oak tree.**

Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions application #2621 for the removal of the Willow Oak tree and grants a Certificated of Appropriateness to Brooks Shippen for work at 210 W. Fisher Park with the following condition That a new canopy tree of a native tree species such as Willow Oak or Pecan, at a minimum of 2" dbh, will be planted in a location determined by the City arborist. The new tree should be started within 365 days after removal. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement tree should be started. Seconded: Vanderveen. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann, Pratt. Nays: 0. Abstain: Arnett. APPROVED

- (c) **Application Number: 2626 DENIED**
Location: 603 Park Avenue
Applicant: Michael J. Galligani
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 9/13//22

Description of Work:

Remove Magnolia Tree.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. Staff stated that the concern of the property owner is that the front walk is cracking.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's review by the City Arborist the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

Facts

This application requests the removal of a tree located at the front of the property. Based on review by the City Arborist, the tree is a healthy mature magnolia tree. Magnolia trees are a native tree species.

Facts

The tree drops leaves on the property that need to be removed. Tree debris is not typically a reason that the commission approves tree removal. The property owner is concerned that the tree is damaging the concrete walk.

Facts

The existing concrete walk is not the original walk. It was constructed without a substrate which increases the likelihood of the concrete shifting and cracking over time.

Commissioner Israel asked if staff is able to make suggestions to property owners before they submit an application. Ms. Geary said that in HPC staff's discussion with Judson Clinton, the city arborist, the idea of pruning the tree was suggested. Bert Vanderveen, the Dunleath representative on the Commission, mentioned that in this neighborhood there are many Magnolia trees that are not well pruned. They all have the waxy leaves that drop and they are much less destructive than other species. He said that at 608 Park Avenue is a very nice pruned Magnolia as an example. Ms. Geary mentioned that Judson suggested using the mulching setting can help with leaves.

In Support:

Patti Galligani, property owner, 210 Fisher Park Avenue, sworn in, described how the roots are coming up on the lawn and they can't mow the lawn because it would tear up the mower. They can't grow grass either. It is also cracking the walkway. She described that the roots come out and pointed to the areas in the picture shown. She said it's not just the waxy leaves, but they do get wet and are slippery. They try to get them up as quickly as possible. They have 3 tenants. But the main thing is that the continued growth of the roots tearing up the sidewalk is the issues. Commissioner Israel asked if the roots are causing damage to the house. She answered they are not growing to that side but more toward the street and walkway. She said there are huge roots that come out from the tree. They also put a box around it that has been lifted by the roots. Commissioner Arnett asked if they had tried pruning at all. She said they didn't think they could because of being in the historic district. She said it is not cracking the walkway behind the tree but pointed to a small retaining wall that has started to crack. It is about a foot high. Commissioner Rowe commented if it is finished growing and perhaps would not cause more issues. Staff commented that the arborist did not state the age of the tree. The Dunleath Tree Inventory in 2016 stated a dbh of 18 inches and that it looks like it has grown since then.

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition

Discussion:

Commissioner Israel asked if the roots could be cut based on the Tree Protection section in the appendix of the Standards. She said perhaps there is a compromise. Commissioner Vanderveen said that the rest of the sidewalk is not cracked. Commissioners discussed the result of not installing a substrate in concrete situations that further creates issues with leveling. Commissioner Israel's main concern is the house not be impacted. Ms. Geary said that she expressed the same concern and Judson did not feel that there was an issue to the house. Commissioner Vanderveen said that Magnolias have a shallow root system. Many neighbors have to put mulch down to help with this and remove the leaves. Commissioner Arnett stated it is a delicate balance to preserve the tree canopy but also have sympathy to the property owners trying to manage their trees. Ms. Geary mentioned that if the applicant tried some of the suggestions and another visit from the arborist perhaps the applicant could come back with another COA if nothing works. Mr. Buansi mentioned that a denial can be appealed. If that doesn't work out they could resubmit an application in a year's time. Commissioner Pratt said that at least a growing season should pass. Ms. Geary restated Mr. Buansi time frame of a year for a new application. Commissioners discussed a desire for a tree workshop. Staff said one was held about 10 years ago but we could do something like that again. City staff could provide guidance but the work would have to be down by the property owner or a professional they hire.

Ms. Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2626, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous

with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 23 under Trees and Landscaping, Retain Mature Trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.**

Seconded by Tracy Pratt. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Ms. Kaufman moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2626 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Michael Gallagani for work at 603 Park Avenue. Seconded: Israel. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann, Pratt. Nays: 0. Abstain: Arnett. APPROVED

Ms. Geary explained that the reason she asked Ms. Kaufman to state fully the Standard is because appeals are on the record only and restating the standard presents the information as part of the motion.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Vice Chair Arnett asked the commission to nominate a new chair and vice-chair. Sharon Graeber nominated Jesse Arnett seconded by Katherine Rowe. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Arnett asked for nominations for Vice-chair. He nominated Commissioner Leimenstoll who mentioned Sharon Graeber. Commissioner Vanderveen moved nominate Sharon Graeber, seconded by Commissioner Leimenstoll. The motion passed unanimously.

Chari Arnett moved to elect himself as Chair. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. Approved unanimously. Chair Arnett moved to elect Sharon Graeber as vice-chair. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. Approved unanimously.

Chair Arnett commented on the progress of the Greene Street townhome development that provides for white house to be moved onto Greene Street and the apartment building will be retained. He said this is a great example of the 365 day delay doing its job and allowing alternative solutions. Staff asked to not continue discussing the content of the project because we know a new application will be coming before the commission. Commissioner Pratt said that all of the suggestions in the Standards should be exhausted before an application is submitted. Chair Arnett said that the City and HPC cannot force a property owner to pursue those items prior to the application. Commissioner Leimenstoll stated that is the purpose of the delay. Chair Arnett stated that those items are not a condition of submittal of an application. And reiterated that our only tool is to delay. Commissioner Israel stated she asked that question and finally realized we just don't have the authority to deny a property owner from demolishing their property. Commissioner Rowe said that there are other ways through public awareness that our expertise could be used to be responsible commissioner members who could bring this to the public's attention. Chair Arnett the commission may not deny a request for demolition but it can delay the issuance and this is the frustration that the HPC faces. But this gives the opportunity to take the lead in working with the property owner for alternatives and we are fortunate to have an active preservation community to work with.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mike Cowhig provided an update on 709 Magnolia Street which has a violation for the removal of the original windows. The property is being renovated and many positive changes were made however the windows were replaced in the upstairs. Staff has evidence of the original windows from the site visit. The exterior stairs to the upstairs was removed and it is now for single family. It is now being sold with an amount of money in escrow to repair the windows. The person doing the work has experience in historic window restoration. We see this as a happy resolution. Commissioners noted

the foundation did not get painted. The new buyers have been looking for over a year and are very excited to be in the neighborhood. Commissioner Pratt asked about the windows that are covered up on the interior. Ms. Geary commented that since this is in the interior that the ordinance does not allow the commission to govern what is on the interior. She said that this issue came up in earlier conversations and legal had provided the decision. Mike said that hopefully the new buyers will adjust that.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
October 26, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice Chair) Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Katherine Rowe, Adrienne Israel, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll

STAFF PRESENT: Stefan-Leih Geary, Mike Cowhig, Russ Clegg; Planning Department, Allen Buansi, City Attorney's Office.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Ms. Geary stated that the commission will hear item 4 on the agenda first. Jo Leimenstoll made a motion to accept the revision. Approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Ms. Geary stated that Tracy Pratt is an approved absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL REGULAR MEETING:

Jo Leimenstoll stated that on page 3 she had seconded the motion. Adrienne Israel moved to approve the September 29, 2022 minutes. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. Approved unanimously.

Request for Modification of Approved Certificate of Appropriateness Application #2565 for demolition or 705 and 707 N. Greene Street and 208 W. Fisher Avenue.

Chair Arnett recused himself for a conflict of interest regarding his professional services were used in developing aspects of this overall project. Mr. Arnett left the Council Chambers. Vice Chair Graeber proceeded to conduct the meeting.

Ms. Geary explained that this is a procedurally matter only and the commission is not making a decision on this project other than to determine if enough of the facts of the project have changed to warrant bringing the application back for review of the commission. She emphasized they are not discussing the merits of the project at this time. She explained that this original COA was for the demolition delay of 365 days for three properties at this site. During the delay period a plan was developed that involves keeping the structure at 208 W. Fisher Avenue and moving the historic structure at 705 N. Greene Street to the corner of the property at W. Fisher Avenue and Greene Street.

Katherine Rowe moved that the Historic Preservation Commission re-hear application #2565 for the purposes of considering a modification to the approved to COA. Seconded by Sharon Graeber. Approved unanimously.

Chair Arnett returned to the Council Chambers.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number: 2633 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**
Location: 224 S. Mendenhall Street
Applicant: Tony Mule
Owner: same

Date Application Received 9/6/22

Description of Work:

Front porch floor was replaced with 1 x 6 wood boards.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the staff recommendation and showed images of the current porch flooring that is not in keeping with the Design Standards. She explained that this is an after-the-fact application where tongue and groove flooring was removed and replaced with 1 x 6 wood boards on the entire porch floor.

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's review the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards-Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (pages 62-66) for the following reasons:

Facts

The original front porch floor was constructed of traditional tongue-and-groove flooring lumber. The floor was replaced with 1 x 6 boards.

Standards (page 64)

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

Staff noted that in previous cases consideration has been given to approving the application with a condition that sets an extended deadline, to allow for the replacement of the boards with tongue and groove boards. For example: within 18 months. Ms. Geary also noted that there were no images that show the previous porch boards.

In Support:

Tony Mule, 224 S. Mendenhall St. and Kelly Hahn 1207 Lakeview Dr, were both sworn in. Mr. Mule described significant deterioration of the porch. They had purchased the property earlier this year and had identified the deteriorated porch at that time. Portions of the porch had been replaced with the type of boards that they used to eliminate the mix and match appearance. They are improving the condition of the entire house and are spending \$250-300,000 towards the work to restore the house that has been neglected. They will do the painting at the very end. They are looking at a 6 month time frame before beginning work as they are working with an engineering team to look at the structural issues. They apologized for not realizing the COA process and they will follow the rules moving forward..

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition.

Mike Cowhig from the Planning department was sworn in and made the point that there is a reason that tongue and groove was used because the fit was tight and help eliminate water issues. He mentioned the tax credit program is available.

Discussion:

Commissioner Rowe stated that this seems like a mistake and that she would cite the standard on page 64 is the answer and that the original flooring should go back. Commissioner Arneke said he is delighted to see someone interested in this house and that he agrees it is a mistake that can be fixed. Ms Geary clarified the staff recommendation that this type of flooring is clearly not consistent with the guidelines so that is why the recommendation is denial. However, this is an ongoing project and we understand the effort they are putting in so our other suggestion would be to approve the COA but with a condition that would give them a longer length of time to come back and complete this work. A Certificate of Appropriateness is active up to 365 days of inaction. If you start the project and then stop and 365 days go by then the COA has expired and you would need to come back for another COA which is why there is a recommendation of an extended time period. Chair Arnett explained that until the work is completed they would be in violation. Commissioners discussed the timing of when the work could begin and what type of condition they could place to allow the applicant enough time to complete the project. Commissioner Graeber suggested a 15 month period. Commissioners determined they would like to give them some flexibility with in this larger project. Steff explained that once the allotted time frame has passed if the project has not been corrected they are back in violation and the zoning enforcement office would follow up on this.

Mr. Arneke moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2633, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 64 under Porches standard 2 are acceptable as finding of fact.**

Seconded by Deborah Kaufman. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman.. Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Mr. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions application #2633 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Tony Mule for work at 224 S. Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: 1) the replacement decking boards be replaced with tongue and groove wooden flooring and the applicant confer with staff for the material chosen 2) we allow up to 18 months for this work to be done. Seconded: Vanderveen. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann. Nays: 0. Abstain: none APPROVED

- (b) **Application Number: 2632 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**
Location: 715 Simpson Street
Applicant: Rosemary Kennerly
Owner: same
Date Application Received 9/27/22

Description of Work:

Remove healthy magnolia tree. A second tree is approvable at staff level because it is diseased/dying as reviewed by the City Arborist.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary described the trees location and that is growing in between the two buildings. She added that staff now has a standing monthly meeting with Judson Clinton to make sure that he is able to review trees prior to the meetings. She showed images taken by the City Arborist during the staff site visit.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's review, the proposed work is

not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Trees and Landscaping* (pages 21-23) and *Lighting* (page 31-32) for the following reasons:

Facts

This is a request to remove a magnolia tree located on the south side of the house. The tree is approximately 3' from the house but there are no existing signs that it is causing structural or other damage. The City Arborist inspected the tree and determined the following:

The assessment requested of the subject tree was located between two homes as pictured in the attachments. The current health status of the tree does not pose imminent risk to the adjacent structures, however the tree has potential to outgrow the amount of space available where the tree is located. The subject tree is a southern magnolia which has a crown reaching to the roof of the structure adjacent to 715 Simpson St.

- The present concern of the property owner is that the limbs and leaf litter will damage the roof or ultimately increase in height and diameter which will likely press the roots, trunk & limbs closer towards the structures.
- Assessment of the tree indicated the overall health of the tree was suitable with the likelihood of failure being not probable. The primary concern is the tree growing in an inappropriate location based on the growth rate and species profile of the Southern magnolia.
- It is reasonable to consider that the tree would not be able to reach the full size at maturity without having some influence on the adjacent structures where it is currently growing and therefore this subject tree would not have the potential for future consideration as a historically significant tree.

Standards (page 23)

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
2. *When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner.*
5. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*

Condition

That a new canopy tree, at a minimum of 2: dbh, will be planted in a location determined by the City arborists. The new tree should be started within 365 days after removal. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, it should be replaced.

In Support:

Keisha Hadden, sworn in, 44 West Bessemer, with the FPNA. FP We support the COA as written. There were no questions.

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition

Discussion:

Mr. Vanderveen asked if there is a location on the site for a new tree to be planted. Staff identified that there is space at the front of the property which helps to reforest the historic street tree canopy. Commissioners felt it is reasonable because of the location.

Ms. Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2632, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 23 under Trees and Landscaping**, 1. Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district. 2. When replacing trees that are causing structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner. And 5. Replace mature trees with similar canopy and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape are acceptable as finding of fact.

Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman. Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Ms. Kaufman moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves with conditions application #2632 and grants a Certificated of Appropriateness to Rosemary Kinnerly for work at 710 Simpson Street with the following condition that a new canopy tree at a minimum of 2" dbh, will be planted in a location determined by the City arborist. The new tree should be started within 365 days after removal. If the new tree does not survive for a period of 2 years from planting, a replacement tree should be started. Seconded: Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann. Nays: 0. APPROVED

- (c) **Application Number: 2628 Approved with conditions**
Location: 720 Percy Street
Applicant: Nick Button
Owner: same
Date Application Received 9/22/22

Description of Work:

Construction of 12 foot by 20 foot gazebo in the backyard.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. She explained that this request does not fit in the normal accessory structure category but we are treating it as an accessory structure because a building permit is required. Staff stated that the concern of the property owner is that the front walk is cracking.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's review, the gazebo is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-37* for the following reasons:

Fact

The proposed gazebo will be located behind the house. It will be 12 feet by 20 feet in size and 10 feet in height. It will be set back from the main structure on the property and not be so large that it compromises the integrity of the house or the lot. The structure consists of a powder coated aluminum frame with a steel top. These materials are considered compatible with the character of the historic district.

Fact

The structure will be placed with a 5-foot setback and will require a building permit.

Standards (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.*

Condition: Any changes that may be required by Building Inspections will be brought back for staff review.

Commissioner Rowe asked about the recommended size of a structure and asked about the size constraints. Ms. Geary said that the smaller dimension is for staff approval and because of its larger size is why it is here. Staff considers this a temporary structure due to the fact that it does not have a foundation. Commissioner Israel asked about the visibility from the street and Ms. Geary showed the street view and how far back and behind the main structure is located that makes it not easily visible from the street.

In Support:

Mike Cowhig noted that the applicant is unable to attend at the last minute due to a work commitment.

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition

Discussion:

Commissioner Arnett asked about prefabricated metal structures as stated in the standards and he would guess that this is referring more to a storage shed and this is interpreted differently because of the style of it. Mr. Cowhig stated the standards refers to metal accessory structures and carports that have no detailing. Ms. Geary asked the question if this is considered a carport under building code and the building code does not consider this a carport. She also stated that this is why the commission exists when there are not projects that fit within the Standards. Ms. Rowe asked about the temporary nature of the structure. Ms. Geary said that it can be unassembled which makes it different than something that is constructed out of wood on the site. Mr. Cowhig spoke about the open design and that it is not visible from the street and just about any wooden storage building is acceptable. Mr. Arnett said guideline #5 speaks to gambrel styled accessory structures and this does not seem to fit. And our task is to decide if the design of this can fit within the standards. The intent is not to have a foundation. Ms. Geary reread the recommended condition that any additional changes required by building code are brought back for approval. She also mentioned that it is vented which may help with winds and that it will be anchored down but not with a poured footing. In response to Mr. Arnett, Ms. Geary stated that by the nature of the ordinance, the commission looks at permanent changes and temporary changes wouldn't need a COA, which is why we don't have that language often in the Standards. One area is in regards to handicap assessable ramps. Ms. Geary said that commissioner could look at roof guidelines for an appropriate design and the fence standards regarding aluminum fencing materials as guidance. The commission determined that it is more permanent than a tent and Ms. Israel remarked that the condition recommended by Staff would cover any additional changes required by Building Code. Mr. Vanderveen asked if the size is what requires the Building Permit and that his neighbor has one and it is a nice structure. Ms. Israel said the materials based on the picture do seem to be a problem or what the guidelines are referring to.

Ms. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2628, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not

incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 36 are acceptable as finding of fact.**

Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2628 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Nick Button for work at 720 Percy Street with the condition that any changes required by the building inspections office be brought back for review. Seconded: Jo Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann. Nays: 0. APPROVED with condition.

- (d) **Application Number: 2638 Approved with conditions**
Location: 203 Leftwich Street Street
Applicant: John Rodenbough
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 10/5/22

Description of Work:

Construction of an addition off of shed roof dormer addition on the rear elevation, a small first floor addition to the back porch and the removal of a side porch as part of general renovations to the house.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. She explained that this property has been vacant for 20 or more years and this work is part of a larger overall renovation of the property. Staff is excited to see this effort as it is a lovely example of a Craftsman style with flared rafters. She said that some of the work is for basic repairs. There is flexibility in making changes to secondary elevations and showed the existing enclosed porch. The original roof form will be maintained. Ms. Geary showed the architectural plans for the work along with images of the existing structure.

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion, the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards-Additions* (page 75), and *Masonry and Stone* (page 50) and *Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 62) for the following reasons:

Facts

A shed roof dormer addition will be constructed at the rear roof slope to provide additional space on the second floor. The proposed addition will not be easily visible from the street and will maintain the original roof form of principle elevations. It will not alter the overall height of the structure. The addition will be distinguishable from the house through change in roofline. The walls of the addition will be covered with lap siding and trim to match that of the house and will be slightly set in from the original walls.

Facts

The type of window product and siding material has not been specified.

Standards under Additions (page 76)

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

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

Facts

A boiler chimney at the back of the house will be removed. It is not a character-defining chimney.

Standards under Masonry and Stone (page 50)

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 application proposes to remove the side porch with entrance. The side porch appears to be an original feature to the structure and the footprint is shown on a 1919 Sanborn map.

Standards under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64)

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

Facts

A small addition will be constructed at the back porch which has already been enclosed. Siding, trim, windows and door will match original materials.

Standards under Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64)

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

Recommended Conditions:

That the side porch and entrance remain in place. That all new windows are wood Simulated Divided Light (SDL) windows or salvaged historic windows to match the original windows on the house. That the siding material is either wood lap siding or smooth cementitious siding to dimensionally match the original. These details should be verified by a materials list submitted to staff for approval.

That all repairs match the original in material and design.

Ms. Israel commented that the presentation helped clarify the project and she asked though if the removal of the side stoop is the same as the removal of the side porch. She asked how do we approve it if we don't approve of it. Ms. Geary explained that only the HPC has the authority to modify the request. In staff's review many portions of the project meet the standards but the side porch does not based on their analysis and the way to move forward is to approve the larger project with a condition that the side porch is not removed. The front porch repairs will be done to match. Staff mentioned issues with completely removing railings that require modern building code to be met but everything is being repaired instead of replaced and this should not impact the project.

In Support:

John Rodenbough, 609 Magnolia Street, property owner of 203 Leftwich Street, sworn in, and explained the structure has been very poorly taken care of for the last 30 years. The basement had 4 feet of water in it for a decade. The terra cotta pipes in the neighborhood collapsed and would drain into this basement. It was a storage shed for the family that owned it. Raccoons in the attic. Suffered a fire at one point in the 1940's. The partial repair of this work requires structural repairs to the roof. They want to return it to its historically correct state and they will repair everything to match. The front porch is completely rotted. The side porch is rotted back all the way. The reasons for removing the side porch include that the porch keeps them from being able to use the driveway to access the back yard because there is otherwise not enough width between the porch and the property line. They have determined based on the piers that this is not the original side porch as it matches later work at the back of the house possibly at the time of the fire repairs. There are modern bricks with modern cement. They would also like to install a fence along the side property line. They eventually will also come back with plans to replicate the original car port that was burned. But they would like to utilize the current driveway to access this carport in the future. The sister house on Isabel does not have the lead glass and does not have the side porch. He reiterated that the side porch is newer construction and does not match the original porch detailing on the front porch and the rafters are different. He also mentioned that they will be making extensive repairs to the interior. They will keep the same shed roof and rafter systems to help mirror some of the original features to help the addition to maintain the character of the house. The material that will be used is wood lap siding to match what is on the first floor. The cedar siding cannot be sourced to do this application and will mirror the first level siding. The windows have not been selected but will be working with the City on the type and they will be the proper style divided light. The windows on the closed in porch are not original. The chimney that will be lost is not visible from the street and is for a boiler system. Asbestos has also been removed and the chimney had asbestos as well. It had already collapsed at one point. The chimney on the side has been painted and the original columns have been painted as well. They will have professionals repair those features. The far right column is leaning and it will need to be repaired as well. They will save the original columns and rails. Portions of the railing are in good shape and will be stripped and repainted. The removal of the side porch is very important because they need use of the drive to lead to the rebuilding of the original car port.

Commissioner Arnett thanked him for the investment they are making in the house and the project. Commissioner Leimenstoll asked what year the fire took place and he speculated that it was in the 40s or 50s and it is what lead to the apartments next door. He said the creek empties behind the Presbyterian Church and they need to work to alleviate the water drainage issues. The apartment building owners have not been helpful in trying to figure out the water issues in this area. Their property is relatively dry and flood free at this point due to the work they have done.

Commissioner Rowe asked about the side porch and she asked about the divided light door and if it is original. He said that he could not identify where the door came from and that he could not say that there wasn't a porch there but it just appears that this porch is not as old as the rest of the

house because it doesn't have original materials like on the rest of the house. Ms. Rowe reflected that if the door is original it would indicate that there was a porch originally. Mr. Arnett asked how the side would be finished if the porch is removed and the door removed. It would be repaired to match the rest of the house with siding and it will be blended in along with other repairs to the siding.

Keisha Hadden, 404 Bessemer Ave, sworn in, FPNA. The board met and discussed to support as written even though there are concerns with the side porch they felt that there was reason to allow it so the owner could use the driveway.

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition

Discussion:

Ms. Leimenstoll stated the Sanborn maps do show a side porch but it does seem that it has been replaced over time and it becomes an issue of the use of the driveway and it is not the original fabric and perhaps not as character defining as we might think. Staff showed the side elevation without the side porch and that they are taking a very simple approach. The Sanborn date is 1919. Staff stated that there was a porch originally but it has changed based on testimony, although a footprint is there. This is the duty tonight is to decide if the porch as it currently stands should go in order to allow for the functional needs of the property owner as described in our introduction of the Standards. Mr. Vanderveen noted that a new side entrance is being added and will aid in making this all more functional. Staff brought this to attention because of the original footprint but based on the testimony there is compelling evidence for its removal. Mr. Cowhig noted that the new siding should be properly staggered into the old. Mr. Arnett noted a triple window with a quadruple window. Ms. Israel noted that perhaps the entrances were for the division of the house into apartments. Ms. Geary stated they could have utilized these original entrances when they divided it into multiple units. In some cases, Ms. Israel noted, that we have allowed the removal of non-original entrances. They determined that the porch could be considered as non-character defining. The commissioner discussed the history of the house as it was used for multi-family. Mr. Rodenbough came back up and said it was not used as multi-family until about 40 years ago the second entrance was a separate unit but it has been in the same family but not an apartment originally. The original ridgeline of the roof will not be impacted with the new addition. Mr. Arnett expressed concern about the lap siding versus the shake siding and the lap siding strikes him as not speaking the same language as the rest of the house, with lap on the first floor and the shakes on the upper level. Ms. Leimenstoll noted that the change in siding for lap would help to differentiate it as non-original and he and others agreed. Mr. Vanderveen stated his own house has cedar on the front and lap on the back. Mr. Arneke said that he does hate to lose the small dormer but it is on the back of the house and not noticeable. Commissioners agreed that the need for the drive outweighs the side porch.

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2638, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 76 standards #1-5, Standards on page 50 #6, page 64 #1-3 and page 64 #7 are acceptable as finding of fact.**

Seconded by Deborah Kaufman. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2638 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Rodenbough for work at 203 Leftwich Street with the conditions that all new windows are wood Simulated Divided Light (SDL) windows or salvaged historic windows to match the original windows on the house. That the siding material is either wood lap siding or smooth cementitious siding to dimensionally match the original. These details should be verified by a materials list

submitted to staff for approval. That all repairs match the original in material and design including the area where the door and side porch will be removed.

Seconded: Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann. Nays: 0. APPROVED

- (e) **Application Number: 2642 Approved with conditions**
Location: 110 East Bessemer Avenue
Applicant: Heather Grant
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 10/11//22

Description of Work:

Construction of 48" tall aluminum picket fence.

Staff Recommendation:

Ms. Geary presented the Staff recommendation. She explained that the request is for a 48" tall fence and that this height is higher than what is approvable at the staff level. She explained that the material is aluminum which is an acceptable material for fencing. The decision before the commission is whether the commission considers the increase in height for a front yard fence as a change that would have a negative impact on the district. She described that the site is a corner lot and the applicant has a dog that they need to confine.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's review the proposed fence is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Fences Walls and Site Features pg. 26* for the following reasons:

Facts

The proposed front and side yard fence is an open picket design of aluminum construction. It is 48" high in order to contain a dog. The extra height is needed since this is a busy street. It will be 6" higher than the standards recommend for front yard fences. However, since this house is on a boundary street rather than an internal neighborhood street, the extra height should not be very noticeable.

Facts

The material, color and design is designed to resemble original iron railings on the house.

Standards (page 26)

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

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

Recommended Condition

That the fence meet all City zoning and traffic visibility requirements.

In Support:

None.

In Opposition: Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer, FPNA, sworn in. Ms. Hadden stated that the FPNA board voted not to support this application for the following reasons 1) They do not like setting a precedent of encing for front yards and 2) the applicant is not the homeowner.

Discussion:

Commissioners discussed that the property is a corner lot without a traditional backyard, that front yard fences are consistent with the standards and that the design is open and relatively transparent. Ms. Rowe commented on the metal railing detail that is on the front of the house. Chair Arnett stated that the front yard fence height throughout the City is 48" and in the historic district staff level is 42" and this request is to add 6" to that staff level height. This area is a mixed-use area with both residences and businesses. It was discussed that the exact placement of the fencing might change due to other City requirements concerning traffic sight clearance issues through the Department of Transportation. Mr Arneke commented that he did not believe the additional height would be inconsistent with the Standards.

Ms. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2642, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 26 are acceptable as finding of fact.**

Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman Nays: 0. Abstain: 0

Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2642 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Heather Grant for work at 110 East Bessemer Avenue with the condition that the fence meet all City zoning and traffic visibility requirements. Seconded: ?. The Commission voted 7-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann. Nays: Rowe. APPROVED with condition.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Arnett did not have any items.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Ms. Geary stated that she and Mike Cowhig will be speaking at the Preservation North Carolina Conference on the Heritage Community Program and the Oral History and Civil Rights Grant Project. That conference is in Winston-Salem.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Keisha Hadden asked if it is possible for the agenda to be reorganized based on who is present in the audience. Mike Cowhig said that the agenda is created based on the order that they are submitted. Staff does not always know who will be present at the meeting. It is an advertised public hearing and attendees anticipate their item being heard in a certain order. Staff has also tried placing them on the agenda by district and then went back to using the date of receipt out of fairness. But staff does understand the point that is being made. Chair Arnett did agree that it is a difficult science and that we can't always anticipate which items will take longer to review.

Commissioners remarked that the meetings run smoother back in person. The next regular meeting is on December 7th. Mike mentioned that there is a possibility that a special meeting will be called to review the applications pertaining to the Greene St. townhouse project and the house moves. Staff will be in touch if that takes place.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**SPECIAL MEETING
GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
November 17, 2022**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice Chair) Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), David Arneke (College Hill), Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Katherine Rowe, Adrienne Israel, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Cowhig, Russ Clegg; Planning Department, Allen Buansi, City Attorney's Office.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

There were no adjustments to the minutes.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

There were no commissioners absent..

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL REGULAR MEETING:

There were no minutes to approve.

Chair Arnett asked to recuse himself for a conflict of interest regarding Item #3. Jo Leimenstoll moved that Chair Arnett be recused from Item #3 due to a professional conflict. Seconded by David Arneke. Approved unanimously.

Commissioner Pratt asked to recuse himself from items 3, 4a and 4b due to discussions on the projects outside of the hearing. Sharon Graeber moved that Commissioner Pratt be recused from items 3, 4a and 4b. Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. Approved unanimously. Vice Chair Graeber proceeded to conduct the meeting.

Request for Modification of Approved Certificate of Appropriateness Application #2565 for demolition or 705 and 707 N. Greene Street and 208 W. Fisher Avenue.

Mr. Cowhig explained that this is a request for modification of an approved COA per the rules of procedure. At the February 23 meeting a COA from D Stone was for demolition of 3 structures; this was approved with a condition for delay of 365 and that the applicant work with the neighborhood, preservation community and the HPC to find an alternative to demolition. Due to these discussions two of the structures will not be demolished. One structure will be relocated to the corner of the site and one will remain in place. 707 N. Greene Street will still be demolished as it was built in 1961 and not 1915 as previously thought and is not a contributing structure. He cannot move forward with the project with the delay in place and would like the delay to be lifted. Staff feels that he has met the condition of the COA. Chair Graeber asked if there were any questions. She stated while this is not a public hearing there can still be speakers.

In Support

David Stone of D. Stone Builders thanked the Commission and stated they have been busy since the meeting in February developing this new outcome. He said this is a best case scenario where 2 houses will be preserved with one house being moved to the corner and the apt building will be renovated and preserved.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, speaking for the FPNA stated they had their annual meeting last Sunday and they are in full support of the proposal.

Keisha Hadden, 404 West Bessemer was head of the sub-committee of the NA and is in support. Tim Millisor with First Presbyterian Church spoke in support. Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street, in support of the change to the COA.

Ms. Rowe asked if there will be an opportunity to salvage the 709 Greene and Mr. Stone stated Architectural Salvage will be given the opportunity.

Ms. Israel asked if it is less expensive to demolish than move and the answer is yes.

David Arneke moved that Application number 2565 be modified to remove the demolition delay and that 705 N. Greene Street and 208 W. Fisher Avenue are not demolished. Seconded by Ms. Leimenstoll. Approved Unanimously, Arnett abstained.

Chair Arnett rejoins the meeting.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- (a) **Application Number: 2643 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**
Location: 703-709 N. Greene Street
Applicant: David Stone
Owner: First Presbyterian Church
Date Application Received: 9/6/22

Description of Work:

Construction of 6 townhomes

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Cowhig described the new construction project of 6 townhomes at the site and presented the staff comments. He noted that the landscape plan is not final and is from the previous plan submitted. He stated the siding lacks the profile of a beveled edge and that board and batten might work; and that a brick that resembles a mass-produced brick would look more like the other multi-family housing in the area.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed new construction is congruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—New Construction* (page 80) and *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (page 30) for the following reasons:

Facts

The project consists of two buildings with 3 townhome units in each building. The buildings are designed with a cornice and flat roof. Each unit is two stories with a third rooftop living space (penthouse) and open terrace. Since the penthouses will be recessed the buildings will read as two stories from the street. Each unit will have a screened porch on the rear elevation.

The buildings will face N. Greene Street and have front walks that lead directly from the public sidewalk to the front portico of each townhome. This is a typical site pattern in the historic district.

The setback of the front façade is 35 feet which is the minimum required for RM-8 zoning. This distance is consistent with siting patterns along this block of N. Greene Street. The prevailing estimated current setback is approximately 40 feet.

The design includes a single driveway opening on N. Greene Street, minimizing the impact on the historic character of the street. Parking for each unit is located in garages that are underneath the building, and additional surface parking is located to the rear of the townhomes. A central cluster mail box (CBU) will be located on the interior of the property.

Standards Page 80 New Construction

- 1) Site new buildings so that the setback, spacing and orientation to the street are consistent with the historic buildings within the district.
- 2) New construction should have a similar height and width of existing buildings within a block or street.
- 3) Relate the roof form, pitch, and overhang of new construction buildings to historic roofs within the district.

Standards Page 30 Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas

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

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

Facts

Several mature canopy trees will be removed as part of the project. However, the landscape plan includes multiple new canopy trees. Canopy trees should be planted along the street front as is the traditional planting approach in the historic districts.

Standards Page 80 New Construction

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.

Facts

The buildings will be constructed predominantly of brick with cementitious siding accents. The proposed window product is an aluminum clad wood casement window with simulated divided light muntins. The front door is a wood door. All other materials are consistent with the new construction materials list.

The fenestration pattern of the windows and doors on the main façade is consistent with fenestration patterns on historic buildings in the district. The front portico is enclosed with a recessed front door, beaded board ceiling and wood front door, which is in keeping with historic apartment buildings in the district.

Standards page 80 New Construction

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

5) Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic building 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 finished 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.

Recommended Conditions:

That a final landscape plan be submitted for staff approval prior to construction

That all new canopy trees be a minimum 2 inch caliper.

That any new trees and shrubbery that do not survive for 2 years should be replaced in kind.

The cementitious siding material should have a smooth finish.

That any trash receptacle areas be properly screened with landscaping or fencing.

That site lighting be approved by staff prior to installation.

Ms Rowe asked if the 3rd level is board and batten and if there are other examples in Fisher Park. This material is not widely use in the neighborhood but is historic and can be found on additions and out buildings. Chair Arnett asked if 24' is a minimum driveway width. Mr. Cowhig stated it is in keeping with other projects in the districts.

In Support:

David Stone, 2904 Lawndale Drive, sworn in. He stated that this was truly a collaborative effort with lots of helpful and insightful input from the FP committee. They have met with the FP committee a half a dozen times and it has been very helpful. They have developed several different versions to get where we are. They have moved away from the horizontal lap siding, changed fenestration patterns, added cornices, opened up the porches which had previously been closed in on the sides, added more details to the window and door casings and numerous other changes. He is very appreciative of the feedback he's been given and he is proud of the project that they are presenting. This project will be a big enhancement and a big improvement. Regarding the trees—he will have a landscape plan updated which will be different along the Fisher side and will mirror the other side that is proposed on the plan. He does want to preserve two trees that are outside the construction area. This is an Oak tree and a 20 inch Maple.

Chair Arnett noted that driveway standards needs to meet 24 feet and asked about the driveway materials. The driveway has to be 24 feet for fire trucks. Mr. Stone stated the driveways will be asphalt with a concrete apron at the street. They are reducing 2 of the existing 3 curb cuts and will go back with curb and gutter and will probably not have curb and gutter on the interior. Permeable surfaces will be used in areas near the houses but no on the main driveway. Mr. Stone said that the site plan is required to have a community mailbox and parking near that.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, FPNA, supports the COA but would like a landscape plan to show the changes and they are still having conversations with Mr. Stone about the facades and porches. She said that their working committee still has changes they want to see.

Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer, for the neighborhood committee said that they appreciate the time that David Stone has spent working with them. He put in a lot of the requests that they asked for. There are 7 members and their committee has concerns over the trees (which they understand will be addressed in the new landscaping plan), she read a letter from the su- committee addressing that they still want some changes like a different material on the front façade, porch railings and larger porches. The window surrounds they want to be cast stone. The front walkways should be curved near existing trees and expanding the size of the landings. And should be shifted to reflect the front door placement. They want to have more than just brick on the front of the building. Jo Leimenstoll asked about the front walk at the base of the steps deferred to Tracy Pratt.

Linda Lane, 805 Magnolia Street in Fisher Park, sworn in. She is happy with the project and it deserves a full green light that it deserves.

Tracy Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, sworn in. Speaking as a neighborhood committee member and Fisher Park resident of the neighborhood. Mr. Pratt addressed the trees and asked for an updated landscape plan with the trees identified so they know what trees will come out and which ones will remain. He asked to continue work to refine the project. To answer Jo's question he said that the front landing should match the size of the porch, for example flair to avoid having 4 foot walk hit a 10 foot porch.

Ann Stringfield, 1005 N. Eugene, sworn in. Stated as a former commissioner she knows it is important to have details and she asked for an updated landscape plan that shows 3 mature trees that can be protected and update the site plan to show accurate front porches for homes 3 and 6 and asks that they can be in the finding so that staff can check for them.

Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church, sworn in. Said that he understands the neighborhood has concerns but he is confident David Stone can address them and is in support of the project.

104:19

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition.

David Stone was given the opportunity answer questions raised in the testimony stating that he plans to address concerns, showing changes to units 3 and 6 that accommodates the trees. There will be individual trash cans and the location of the mailboxes will be finalized. He showed the updated porch locations. He said that adding a flare makes sense and will have that brought up to the landscape designers.

Discussion:

Chair Arneke asked if there are any questions about the site plan and building design. Ms. Kaufman asked if the code requires a railing and at this time there was no answer. Adrienne Israel asked how to distinguish between historic features and consistency with personal aesthetics? How far can the commission go in mandating these details? Mr. Cowhig stated that the project needs to meet minimum congruity with the standards and that is where the obligation is to approve it. Mr. Vanderveen commended everyone that has been involved and that the project really picks up on details in the neighborhood. Chair Arnett agrees.

Ms. Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2643, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 8 #1-6 and page 30 #4 and 6 are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman. Nays: 0. Abstain: Pratt

Ms. Kaufman moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2643 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to D. Stone Builders for work at 703-709 N. Greene Street with the following conditions: 1) the final landscape and design plan be submitted 2) that all new canopy trees be a minimum of 2" caliper 3) that all new trees that do not survive 2 years from planting be replaced. 4) Cementitious siding will be smooth 5) trash receptacle areas should be properly screened with landscaping and 6) That staff be presented the final site plan Seconded: Isreal. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann. Nays: 0. Abstain: Pratt APPROVED with conditions.

Jo Leimenstoll moved to recuse commissioner Jesse Arnett for a professional conflict of interest. Seconded by David Arneke. Approved unanimously with Vice Chair Sharon Graeber leading the meeting. 1:20

- (b) **Application Number: 2651 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**
Location: NW Corner W. Fisher Ave and N. Greene Street (701 N. Greene St.)
Applicant: Michael Fuko-Rizzo
Owner: same
Date Application Received: 11/2/22

Description of Work:

Move house from 705 N. Greene Street to lot at NW corner of N. Greene Street and W. Fisher Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that the house is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park historic district. The project will relocate this house to the corner of the block. It will likely be 701 North Greene Street. We are very pleased to have this application before today. This proposal preserves this historic house as well as the apartment building and allows D. Stone Builders to build on the remaining land. He showed the new site plan and images of the house that will be moved, the lot where it will be moved. New parking will be needed and it could be reduced by a space and farther from the street with more landscaping.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards- Building Relocation* (page 71-72) for the following reasons:

Facts

The house to be moved is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. A COA has been approved for its demolition. The proposed site plan shows that it will be placed in a manner that is consistent with siting patterns in the historic district. It is a circa 1910 house that is similar in design and materials to the house that once occupied this site.

Guidelines

1. *Review site selection for compatibility of the relocated building to the architectural styles, materials, and scale of existing historic buildings along the street.*
2. *Review the compatibility of site selection and proposed siting for a relocated building in terms of building spacing, setback, orientation, height, scale, and massing according to pertinent new construction guidelines.*

Conditions

- That the driveway be extended as far as possible.
- That a landscape plan be submitted for staff approval and it should include at least two canopy trees.
- That a COA application be submitted for staff approval for any proposed exterior work.

In questions for staff it was noted that the parking bay could be reduce by a staff it could be farther from the street and more landscaping could be added. It would move the cars away from the line of site. The parking is for the apartments and the new building. The existing apartments has 4 units.

In Support:

Michael Fuco-Rizo, applicant, sworn in, 301 Fisher Park Circle, spoke about his project addressing the suggestion about the parking that the number of spaces is required by code. Mr. Cowhig added that the HPC can recommend a special exception for parking and set backs. Mr. Fuco-Rizo added they they will need to go to the Board of Adjustment for that and that he is not sure that the tree can be saved.

Linda Lane, 805 Magnolia Street, sworn in, from the Fisher Park neighborhood spoke wholeheartedly in support of the project and in appreciation for all the work that was put in by everyone involved.

David Stone, 2904 Lawndale Drive, sworn in, speaking on the record in support of the project as the developer of the townhome project and thanked Mr. Fuco-Rizo for stepping up to save the properties and help the project move forward.

Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street, sworn in, is happy to speak in support of the project. She thanked Mr. Fuco-Rizo and Mr. Stone for working to this solution and reminded everyone what can happen when preservationist are able to be engaged in the process.

Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer, sworn in, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association who is in support and thanked the applicants.

Tim Millisor, First Presbyterian Church said they support the project.

In Opposition: There was no one to speak in opposition

The public hearing portion was closed.

Discussion:

Mr. Vanderveen asked about the setback which can be done after the COA motion.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2651, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the **Staff Comments and the Standards on page 71 and 72 are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by David Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman Nays: 0. Abstain: Arnette, Pratt **1:37:36**

Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2651 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Michael Fuco-Rizo for work at 701 N. Greene Street with the following conditions: 1) That the driveway be extended as far as possible. 2) That a landscape plan be submitted for staff approval and it should include at least two canopy trees. 3) That a COA application be submitted for staff approval for any proposed exterior work. And recommends in favor of a special exception for the parking at this property.

Seconded: Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann, Nays: 0. Abstain: Arnette, Pratt
APPROVED With Conditions.

Vice Chair Graeber commended everyone on the project. Jo Leimenstoll moved that Commissioner Arnette rejoin the meeting. Seconded by inaudible. Approved. Chair Arnette for a motion for Commissioner Pratt rejoin the meeting. Moved by Jo Leimenstoll, seconded by Jesse Arnette. Unanimously approved.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:

Chair Arnett spoke about the Strong Towns movement. He and former commissioner David Wharton have been discussing bringing this effort to Greensboro to help shape developments just like the one HPC reviewed today.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Cowhig said that the GIS staff have received property tax data every week and one of the staff members created a program that flags changes in property ownership and will be recognized when properties have been sold in the historic districts. Staff hopes to use this to notify property owners. It has not been tried yet but he is hopeful that this will work.

Attorney Buensi stated that this is his last meeting and that it was an honor to work with everyone and their willingness to volunteer.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG