

**SPECIAL MEETING  
GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
January 11, 2023**

**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, Stefanleih Geary, Russ Clegg; Planning Department, Brent Ducharme, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

There were no adjustments to the agenda.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

There were no commissioners absent.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

There were no minutes to approve.

Speakers were sworn in.

Chair Arnett asked to recuse himself for a conflict of interest regarding Item #3 and #4a. Jo Leimenstoll moved that Chair Arnett be recused from Item #3 and #4a due to a professional conflict. Seconded by Tracy Pratt. Approved unanimously.

**Request for Recommendation on Rezoning Application for 208 W Fisher Avenue from CD-RM-8 to CD-RM 18.**

Mr. Cowhig explained that this is in regards to the project that was approved at the November 17<sup>th</sup> special meeting where 2 structures would not be demolished. One would stay in the original location and the 2<sup>nd</sup> would be moved to a different area on the property. The historic structures would be rehabilitated for multi-family (the apartment is already 4 units) and would be a separate site from the new construction town home project that is being developed by D. Stone Builders. The rezoning request is needed to allow for the historic house to be moved to the site and accommodate the desired number of units, 6 in total. This is for a recommendation to the Zoning Commission and it should be based on whether the new zoning helps to meet the intent of the historic district. It will be limited to residential use only and no more than 6 units. The total acreage of the lot is 0.375.

20:40

Amanda Hodierne spoke on behalf of the project representing the property owner. She reiterated the points that Mike Cowhig made. She said this is a multi-step process. She said in order to preserve the current 4 quad unit and convert the white house there is a need to rezone and utilize the lot configuration shown on the site plan. The request includes a unit-count condition of no more than 6. The other reason is to detach this project from the Stone project and allow each property to have their own zoning and prescribed densities. She remarked on the current residential nature on the corridor and that this project restores an original residential use on the corner. This rezoning is only for this lot. A historic home was demolished on this corner. Mr. Vanderveen commented that apartments were in other areas of the corridor and that it would be a nice addition.

Cheryl Pratt from the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association spoke in favor of the project and said that the neighborhood board is in unanimous support of the project and rezoning.

David Wharton, from the Dunleath Historic District, said that this is a great example of the type of density that will help infill in downtown and to create car optional residences.

There was no one to speak in opposition.

David Arneke moved that the Historic Preservation Commission recommends approval of the rezoning request. Seconded by Deborah Kaufman. Approved Recommendation: Unanimously.

Chair Arnett rejoins the meeting.

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

**19:24**

- (a) **Application Number: 2651 APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 17, 2023 MEETING**  
**Location: 208 W. Fisher Avenue**  
**Applicant: Michael Fuco-Rlzo**  
**Owner: First Presbyterian Church**  
**Date Application Received: N/A**

#### **Description of Work:**

Request for a recommendation for a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment to Setback and Parking Requirements to support COA# 2651

#### **Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described that the Commission already made a recommendation for a special exception when the COA was approved however the details about what the exception requires was not available at that time. Today the dimensional information is available and a new request for the special exception is necessary to allow for the historic buildings to be placed on the new site with this new information. He discussed that the apartment building was built without parking and parking has been on the church's lot. Now, that space will be reused to allow for the historic house to be moved to the site. As drafted the site plan requires the reduction on two setbacks and the elimination of 1 required parking space as described:

BOA-23-06: **208 WEST FISHER AVENUE** First Presbyterian Church Corporation of Greensboro and E & V Properties LLC requests three special exceptions.

- i. To allow a relocated building to encroach 6 feet into a 20 foot required front setback. The building will be 14 feet from the property line along North Greene Street. Section 30-7-3.2 – Table 7-7.
- i. To allow a relocated building to encroach 24.1 feet into a 35 foot required thoroughfare setback. The building will be 10.9 feet from the property line along West Fisher Avenue. Section 30-7-3.2 – Table 7-7.
- i. To provide 7 parking spaces for a multifamily use when at least 8 spaces are required. Section 30-11-5 – Table 11-1.

The commission is to look at the plan and decide if the modifications are in keeping with the intent of the Historic District Standards. He remarked that the setback dimensions proposed are found throughout the district. And with the addition of the on-street parking this will not

have a negative impact. Staff supports a recommendation to support the special exception. Mike Kirkman, Planning Department, stated that on-street parking counts toward the total requirement. He stated that the intent is to take all three requests collectively but they can be taken independently if the commission feels that's necessary but a recommendation is needed on all three items for it to move forward.

**In Support:**

Amanda Hodierna, 804 Green Valley Rd., representing the property owner and developer. This is a fine tuning of the special exceptions discussed in November. We now know the exact requirements of how the house will be positioned on the lot and move forward in the process. She repeated the request as described in the staff presentation. She also stated that for each bedroom space you need 1.25 parking spaces. The white house will have 2 two bedroom units and will required 3 additional spaces and they are showing only 1 deficiency. She did say that the TRC has not reviewed this yet and there may be credits due to location near transit lines but they wanted to go ahead and get the special exception just in case. She also said this is a good location to support a car optional residence. We believe this is a reasonable request. She addressed the setbacks. The house will be oriented facing Greene Street and this becomes the front setback. It will be no more than a 14 foot setback. Otherwise it is 20 feet required. This is in keeping with other setbacks in the area and consistent with what was there originally. Along Fisher is much bigger because we are meeting thoroughfare setback requirements. This is a perfect methodology of what this ordinance allows for exceptions to fit into the surrounding areas and preserves the spirit and intent of the Historic District.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia. The Fisher Park Board supports the set back and the parking. The house that was there had much smaller setbacks because of the larger corridor. They are happy to see the reduction of parking which eliminates extra impervious surfaces.

Ms. Hodierna also mentioned that the neighbors are all collaborators on the project including the Church and Stone Builders. Ms. Pratt added that the Fisher Park neighborhood is a third neighbor and they are so happy to see this project go ahead. It is a perfect adaptive reuse project.

**In Opposition:**

No one spoke in opposition.

**Discussion:**

Mr Pratt asked if anyone had looked at moving the house closer to the north property line and moving the driveway to the south side so that it doesn't encroach so much. Mr. Fuco Rizo commented that it would be difficult to back out in that driveway configuration. Mr. Vanderveen agreed that what is proposed seems like the better approach. Mr. Fuco Rizo described some different ways to navigate the driveway. Mr Vanderveen suggested handling all 3 at one time.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that we recommend that this goes to the Board of Adjustment with our recommendation. I recommend that we allow the encroachment of 6 feet into a 20 foot setback, the relocated building to encroach 24 feet into a 35 foot thoroughfare setback. And to provide 7 parking spaces instead of the 8 required. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. Approved Unanimously.

Mr. Arnett rejoins the meeting. Moved by Pratt, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Kaufman and Vanderveen. Approved.

39:35

- (b) **Application Number: 2664 DENIED**  
**Location: 683 Percy Street**  
**Applicant: Marc Gabriel**  
**Owner: same**

**Date Application Received: 12/6/22**

**Description of Work:**

Exterior Repairs and alterations, After-the-Fact

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project stating that it is an after the fact application. This is a non-contributing structure in the Dunleath Historic District. On the front porch the existing railings have been replaced and the style is different from the original in design and in height to not be consistent with the Design Standards. The front door was a solid panel wood door and it has been replaced with a fiberglass or vinyl door. The opening has been reduced to accept a standard sized door. It appears that the original wood siding in the gable ends has been covered with fiber cement siding. The original siding was wood drop siding or cove siding. The original siding was called cove siding and typical of post war buildings. On the other side it appears that some windows have been covered over likely for interior alterations. He pointed to the windows opening that was being closed in. The unpainted brick walls have been partially painted. It wasn't uncommon to paint bricks of this buildings age. The chimney was also painted. However the standards recommend against painting masonry.

He cited the Guidelines under Exterior Materials and Finishes, Masonry and Stone, Porches, Entrances and Balconies, Windows and Doors, and Non-Contributing Structures. He remarked that we do recognize that properties change hands without the knowledge of being in a historic district however in this case the work that has been done does not meet the Design Standards. Commissioner remarked that this has so many problems with the Standards. The project was not permitted but it wasn't required for the exterior work. There could be a permit for interior work which does not trigger a building permit. There is a threshold in the project cost that triggers a building permit. It was clarified that the property is non-contributing in the National Register Historic District. It was built likely in the 1950s primarily because it is outside the period of significance and when we have referred the commissioners to the non-contributing standards which are supposed to be reviewed with the goal of maintaining the character of the structure to the extent possible. One reason for that is because it's a district so everything that is done impacts the character of the district and could potentially be updated with a change in the period of significance. Chair Arnett spoke about the Standards on page 10—

*For Greensboro's Historic Districts, non-contributing properties should follow those standards as set out under "Neighborhood Setting" and preserve the neighborhood spirit and character. The original architecture and style of the building should be evaluated for merit, and when architectural quality is noted, changes should strive to respect the character and features of the original structure. When making changes to the buildings themselves, standards in this document pertaining to "Exterior Changes" should be followed. However, considerable flexibility is warranted when making changes to non-contributing buildings. Decisions that make practical and aesthetic sense that may be contrary to specific standards are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the standards.*

Jo Leimenstoll pointed to Standards on page 67 that changes should do no harm.

48:38

**In Support:**

**Mark Brown, applicant**, sworn in, Concord North Carolina, spoke about his project and thanked the commission for the opportunity. They purchase 10-12 properties a month and they did not realize it was a historic district. The contractor was used to doing permits for interior changes. It is a duplex but they are turning it back into a single family structure and

trying to upgrade the property. He mentioned there was no stairs on the interior to get to the second floor unit. It had an opening on the back with a staircase that has been removed. It has been vacant for 7 years. They are opening the interior stairs and have permits to convert it back to a single family building. Commissioner Pratt asked if the realtor informed him of the designation and he said they were not and they work with many realtors that specialize in distressed properties. Commissioner Isreal asked why they decided to paint the house white. He responded that the mortar was deteriorated and they filled it in which left an inconsistent appearance so they decided to paint it. Commissioners discussed that they do not have the ability to regulate the color choice of the front door. He said that the front entrance was nailed shut because the entrance was at the back. The columns are the original columns. The original railings were shorter than 36 inches (actually 26 inches) and they were in a deteriorated condition. They were replaced to meet building code. However, the porch is not high enough to require it. Code requires that if you use a railing it should still meet the 36 inch requirement. The window has been removed because it is in the bathroom. Upstairs they removed a kitchen and changed it to a bedroom and bath. Downstairs the window is where a master bath is on the interior. He said he can provide details on the window which will be vinyl. Commissioners remarked that the plywood area would become brick and the open area would be a smaller window and this is correct. The original siding in discussion he was not certain if it was still there and covered over. They were told the original was removed due to missing areas. He said that they try to maintain as much as possible because it is less costly but they did have to replace components due to deterioration. On the railing it was done more like a deck railing and has no apron and the higher height. The new front door is a solid core aluminum door. The size of the opening was reduced because they couldn't find the right size door. A custom door company is 7 months out for orders. Commissioners suggested Architectural Salvage as an option for historic products and materials. Based on the google streetview it was observed that the front door was a simple 6 panel door. The original railing style was also noted. He remarked that the siding was replaced to have the same material all around. The new material is hardiplank and not wood. The original was asbestos. The siding is currently yellow because it is unpainted hardiboard.

### **In Opposition:**

David Wharton, 657 Percy Street, Dunleath NA president. It is always distressing when people come into the neighborhood and don't do their due diligence on researching the rules. In his recollection the condition does not match what he is hearing. It was owned by Tom Fiddler who was good at maintaining his properties. He does not consider it to be a distressed property and hadn't noticed any deterioration. He said that you hire someone to match the mortar not paint masonry. The board recommends that the front door should match the original in design, dimension and material. An investigation on if the original siding is still there its condition and if it can be repaired. That any original windows be put back or replaced with new wood windows or non-vinyl windows as the guidelines recommend against vinyl. On the painting that the red brick is not historically significant and houses were painted and we would recommend the removal of the paint on the chimney. On the railings should be replaced to match the original design and dimension as much as possible.

Jon Enos, 681 Percy Street which is next door. Sworn in. He didn't know if he supports it or is in opposition. He is pleased that it is being returned to single family. The points that David made and the guidelines we all try to live with and he's not sure how you can skip or miss those. Very specifically he said the siding on the side it was put over the original siding. He saw this. On the other side of the house he did not see that. He said that Tom Fiddler in 2021 did considerable work on that siding on the gable because it was rotted and in disrepair and did a lot of work on the siding. Ms. Leimenstoll asked if the siding that was used was wood and he said yes. He did not know if all of it was replaced but a significant amount and it was not hardi plank.

Mebane Ham, 675 Percy Street, sworn in. She lives 2 houses down and it has not been abandoned for 7 years but the interior was messy. People lived up stairs and he did his sculptures downstairs. She is happy its going to single family. It's not the best but it's far from the worst.

**Rebuttal:** The applicant was given an opportunity for a rebuttal. He thanked everyone for the feed back and asked for suggestions. He said that they have removed several contractors from this job and they are looking for the next steps so they can finish the project. It was recommended that they get a set of the Standards. Chair Arnett said that they will give some guidance. Ms Geary and Mr. Ducharme explained that the rebuttal is an opportunity to ask questions of the commissioners and to respond to any testimony that was heard to correct or clarify that information. He said there was none and staff recommended to Chair Arnett that this would then be time to close the public hearing.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Arneke suggested that they deny it and direct staff to work with the applicant on how to correct the violations. It is a completely inadequate application and deny. Ms. Isreal appreciates that it is being remodeled. She would like to see a revision in consultation with staff. Mr. Arnette said that there are more issues than what was identified in the application. The applicant is searching for guidance. He noted the railing was replaced, the front door was replaced, the columns are original, the siding that was either replaced or covered, changes to the window on the right and the painting of the brick. He summarized the railing has already been replaced so the building code applies and it will be dimensionally different. The applicant could chose not to have a railing at all. The issue is the design which is a deck style. The front door has been changed in dimension, design and material. The siding needs further exploration to understand if it was covered or replaced and that it is, based on pictures, that it is not the same type of siding. Which has a cove. The work should be reviewed as if the changes had not been made. Mr. Pratt said the spacing is similar but the material and design is not. Ms. Geary pointed out that it is also the grain finish and the standards state the smooth finish. Mr. Vanderveen pointed out that profile has changed and now it is flush. Mr. Arnett continued that the window has been removed and the proposed replacement is vinyl and there is no information on the design. On the brick, from a practical matter, under the non-contributing structures changes can be considered that make practical sense and painted brick is something you would see in this era and he is interested to hear what the commissioners think. Mr. Vanderveen noted the 1920s on Park Avenue that was painted and this house is a 1950s. He does not consider the paint an issue. Ms. Isreal commented that the brick on a few buildings on campus have been painted. Mr. Arneke stated if we received a COA request for this, would we approve it? As a practical matter the paint may not be able to be removed. He expressed his frustration with the work. Ms. Geary noted that the Park Avenue property was an after-the-fact painting of the brick building. She mentioned we don't regulate color but do regulate the painting of masonry. Mr. Arneke stressed that staff has the expertise to work toward solutions on this. Ms. Isreal remarked that the list that Mr. Arneke is an agreement of the violations. It was clarified that the whole house is intended to be painted white. Ms. Geary reminded that we do not regulate the paint color on the front door. Ms. Graeber asked about the responsibility of agents to disclose that it is in a historic district. Mr. Cowhig mentioned that a buyer can have some recourse. Ms. Geary said that Mr. Cowhig noted at the last meeting the new notification system and we are hoping this will help. Mr. Cowhig remarked that we are happy to work with the property owner but we need to know what would be acceptable.

Mr. Arnett recommends that the front door matches the original in design, material and dimension, to investigate the original siding and evaluated for repair, that any windows removed should be replace with the original or one that is wood or aluminum clad in the

original design and divided light pattern, that the front porch railing are replaced to match the original design and the neighborhood board is ok with it being painted but the chimney paint be removed. Commissioners agreed to that list as guidance. Ms. Leimenstoll noted that the type of siding material is needed and with it being a non-contributing structure and the practicality of the painting needs to be considered. This discussion will help guide the next application.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2664, 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 as acceptable as findings of fact.

Seconded by Adrienne Isreal. The Commission voted 9-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt Nays: 0.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2664 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mark Gabriel for work at 683 Percy Street in Greensboro North Carolina.

Seconded: Arneke. The Commission voted 9-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufmann, Pratt, Nays: 0.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig said the January 25<sup>th</sup> is the regular HPC meeting and we will hear on the Downtown National Register update and public hearing. There is an information meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup>.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**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

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
January 25, 2023**

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

Item 4a was continued at the request of the applicant.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Sharon Graeber was excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The November 17, 2022 minutes were approved with corrections to page 6.

Speakers were sworn in.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON DOWNTOWN GREENSBORO HISTORIC DISTRICT NOMINATION**

Mike Cowhig explained the Certified Local Government (CLG) program and benefits with the National Parks Service and State Historic Preservation Office. This program provides grant opportunities to help fund projects like this.

Heather Slane, the architectural historian with HMW Preservation and author of the nomination report, presented on the findings pointing out key details to the update. The original district was established in 1982 with a period of significance of 1885-1930. The nomination was updated in 2005 to change the period of significance to 1950. The project has resulted in three areas of change: 1) Boundary Increase 2) Boundary Decrease and 3) Additional Documentation to provide greater inclusion and detail on the impact of Greensboro's Civil Rights History on Downtown Greensboro.

**Boundary Decrease:** In areas of the district a boundary decrease is necessary to account for building damage, deterioration or now vacant lots. The purpose is to increase the density of contributing structures in the district.

**Boundary Increase:** In 2018, the field work identified additional commercial and industrial areas dating through 1975. The increase also includes the large Governmental Center that includes the County, City and individually designated historic Courthouse.

The period of significance will be changed to include the Civil Rights events within the current boundary to 1963 and for the expanded boundary it will be 1893-1975 to include criteria under Politics/Government as well as Commerce and Architecture.

Commissioner Leimenstoll moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommends to the City Council that this nomination meets the criteria of the National Register and does an excellent job of updating the district. Seconded by: Katherine Rowe. Unanimous approval.  
1:33

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



- (b) **Application Number: 2669 APPROVED with Conditions**  
**Location: Fisher Park Historic District**  
**Applicant: Jenny Meissner**  
**Owner: North State Communication**  
**Date Application Received: 1/13/23**

**Description of Work:**

Install fiber optic cable underground throughout the Fisher Park Historic District.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project in that the majority of the work would be underground but that two above ground cabinets will need to be installed. Throughout the neighborhood underground cabinets will be installed and the covers will be at grade level.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Streets, Sidewalks and the Public Right-of-Way (page 20)*, for the following reasons:

**Facts**

This application is for installing fiber optic cable in conduit underground in the public right-of-way throughout the Fisher Park Historic District. The work will include hand holes at locations shown on the plans provided. A hand hole is a shallow metal box installed within a run of conduit or ducts that allows for easy access to pull in, splice and terminate wires or cables. The cover for the hand hole is usually flush with the ground surface. There will also be two metal cabinets as shown.

**Facts**

The preferred location for cabinets is out of view from the street. In the past, telecommunications cabinets have been placed on private property and behind buildings with easement agreements. The preferred location for hand holes is in the sidewalk to have the least visual impact on the historic district setting.

**Guidelines under Streets, Sidewalks, and the public right-of-way (page 20)**

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

**Conditions:**

That consideration be given to locations for the cabinets that are not visible from the street. If locations not visible from the street are not feasible, that the cabinets be screened with shrubbery.

That the hand holes be within the sidewalk and that any associated concrete work maintain the character and quality of the existing sidewalks in the historic district.

**In Support:**

Melissa Foley and Burk Wall, 111 N. Main Street High Point, North State Communications. Sworn in. Ms. Foley explained what the project is for in that it will provide the highest available internet speed to this area. The company is working toward filling in gaps in their service area. There are two size

boxes that will be installed. One is 24"x36" and the other is 17"x30". The buried hand hole boxes are typically in the grass or sidewalk.

Commissioner Pratt verified that there are only 2 above grade cabinets and this was confirmed. He asked about the location of the hand hole boxes and that there is not much space between the sidewalks and curbing and that they shouldn't be placed in front of driveways. He asked if they are able to use other utility company infrastructure. Ms. Foley replied that companies are not able to use each other's equipment. She said there will be 130 boxes buried throughout the Fisher Park system. Mr. Pratt asked if the cabinets could be painted with street art of black/green and she said she would have to ask about that.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association Board, who stated that the board has received a large number of in favor comments on this project. The board has some suggestions to include that they want them in public Right-of-Way and not on private property and to move them to on-street parking areas, to use screening, to not place in sidewalks and be mindful of shared driveways. Lastly, she requested that they could be painted with flowers and plants and suggested a specific artist named Laura Lashley.

**In Opposition:**

No one spoke in opposition.

**Discussion:**

Mr Pratt likes the idea of it being painted and there are only two boxes. Mr. Arneke said it's a good proposal and it's just a matter of specifics and that it will diminish the need for satellite dishes. Mr. Arnett stated it's well received by the neighborhood.

Mr. Pratt moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2669, 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 Standard #6 on page 20 are acceptable as findings of fact.**

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

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2669 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to North State Communications for work in the Fisher Park Historic District with the following conditions: that the hand hole boxes be located in sidewalks, no hand hole boxes be located in or in front of driveways, that all above ground boxes be screened and that North State explore the possibility of the above ground cabinets be painted with street art and that the associated concrete work to maintain the character and quality of the existing sidewalks in the historic district, and that the location of the cabinets be coordinated with staff to be preferably in and behind parking areas. 1:22

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

APPROVED with conditions. 1:23

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mike Cowhig stated that on February 2<sup>nd</sup> there will be a public meeting for Benbow/Clinton Hills National Register District project with Heather Slane and also the oral history project. The district will be the first African-American neighborhood in Greensboro to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
February 22, 2023**

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

Item 4a was continued at the request of the applicant.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Deborah Kaufman was excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The Jan. 11 and 25, 2023 minutes were moved to the March meeting for approval.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2656 APPROVED with Conditions**  
**Location: 515 Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Bobby Jones**  
**Owner: Individually owned condominiums**  
**Date Application Received: 11/10/22**

**Description of Work:**

A security light fixture on a pole behind the condos was replaced with a new fixture.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project as an after-the-fact application for a security light in the parking area of the Condo building. The light has been there for some time but the Cobra Head fixture has been changed to an LED light that is creating concerns for the surrounding property owners. It was also raised by a neighbor that a second fixture at Cedar Street has also been changed out. It was noted that according to Google Maps that earliest image dates to 2012 and the Cedar Street light is present and is a standard Duke Energy Cobra Head light fixture. This application and review pertains to only the Light that is in the parking area.

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—Lighting (page 31-32)* if conditions are met, for the following reasons:

**Facts**

A security light on a utility pole has existed behind the condos for some time. Recently the light fixture was changed to a new LED light fixture and the homeowner behind the property has complained about light spillage onto her property and glare.

**Facts**

The condominiums were built in 1982 on residual property from the construction of the Spring Garden thoroughfare through the neighborhood in the 1970s. When the condominium development was approved, it was standard procedure for the Historic Preservation Commission to review site lighting to ensure that it did not invade surrounding residential properties.

**Standards**

- 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 underground*

**Condition**

That the current security light fixture be replaced with a Duke Energy Pedestrian Shoebox LED fixture to reduce light spillage onto adjoining properties.

**In Support:**

Bobby Jones, 2417 Madison Avenue, President of the Condo Association. Sworn in. He stated the fixture has been there for as long as the building as been there but that Duke changed out the fixture over the summer to a brighter light because it is very dark out there in the corner. He said that the light on Cedar to his knowledge is the on the Condo property but he does not know when that was changed. He said that City came out and determined that the parking lot light is within the code for the brightness. He said that after the complaints Duke came and installed a lower brightness light and that there was no shield available. He has not spoken again with the neighbor to know if this made a difference.

Cindy Shepherd, 608 Morehead Avenue, sworn in. Ms. Shepherd explained how the light change is negatively impacting her property and that the lights are very bright from her back deck and that there is no difference after the change that was made to reduce brightness. The pole is right in her backyard and it definitely is light pollution. The Birds are not nesting anymore and Greensboro is a bird sanctuary. She requests a Sanibel light fixture like what is in the neighborhood and stated that the Cedar Street fixture used to be a light fixture. It was clarified that the speaker while speaking as in favor was speaking in opposition.

**In Opposition:**

No one spoke in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

Mr. Jones states in response to a question by Mr. Vanderveen that he did not know if the light was shifted when it was changed. He also commented that he did not know how to measure the impact on birds since it is winter.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed if the MSD funding for the neighborhood could be used and it was stated that the funds are for public right of way projects. Mr. Vanderveen suggested that the light fixture

perhaps could be shifted so the light is directed differently. Mr. Arneke said that the Sanibel fixtures direct the light down and he and Mr. Vanderveen questioned if that would work in this location. The commissioners determined that more information on what available light fixtures would work in this situation. Mr. Pratt suggested that the pole could be moved lower into the parking area because it is currently elevated while Ms. Rowe suggested that the fixture itself might be lowered. The shoebox style light mentioned by staff is a suggestion because of the use of this light fixture at the walk at Swann Middle. They visually disappear but are at a much lower height and line the walkway. Commissioners agreed this is a safety concern. Chair Arnette stated that the location does matter and cites Standards #2 and #3. It was clarified that in regards to the Cedar Street light that Google maps indicates that it was a standard Duke Energy Cobra head fixture in 2012 and through 2021 and not a Sanibel decorative fixture. It is not part of this application or evidence of any active change or disturbances. It is directionally turned toward the driveway. Staff will work with the property owner and Duke Energy to select a better fixture, height and location but it would ultimately be up to the property owner to select a proposal to be considered.

Mr. Arneke moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2656, 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 Standards under Lighting on pages 31 and 32 are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Pratt. Nays: 0.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2656 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bobby Jones for work at 515 Spring Garden Street with the following conditions: that the Condo Association owners work with Staff to replace the existing fixture with a new fixture that better controls the light and that they work to identify if a different location and height could be adjusted to minimize the impact. 48:39

Ms. Israel asked about approving something that is against the Standards and it was explained that we approve it with conditions that require changes that bring the work into compliance.

Seconded: Graeber. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Pratt. Nays: 0.

APPROVED with conditions. 49:33

- (b) **Application Number: 2670 APPROVED with Conditions**  
**Location: 203 Leftwich Street**  
**Applicant: John Rodenbough**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 1/17/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construct carport; remove 2 trees; extend fence.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that in October the HPC approved a COA for major renovation for this house that has been vacant for at least 20 years if not longer. The owner

would like to build a carport in the back yard that is of wood construction with fiber cement lap siding, Simulated Divided Light windows with muntins that are permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass. A decision on the doors has not been made. The wood shakes in the gable ends should be a wood shingle rather than a shake, which was handsplit and used on roofs. Shingles are machine cut and used in the late 1900s and on. The carport would be located at the back of the light where an original garage was once located. There are two trees that are located in the footprint and will need to be removed. There are many volunteer trees that have grown up due to the property being vacant. There are several good trees that should be avoided during construction. The property owner would also like to repair the privacy fence, extend it and drop it to a lower height past the house toward the front.

He cited the Staff Comments:

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 Standards—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-37), Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

The simple wood frame, gable front carport is similar in design and materials to historic car sheds in the historic districts. Siding material for the storage area will be fiber cement lap siding. The site is the location of a former garage. It will not be so large that it will compromise the integrity of the original structure on the lot.

### **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.*

### **Facts**

Removal of the trees is necessary in order to construct the driveway and carport. This house has been vacant for decades so the trees are volunteers. The 2 to be removed are hackberry trees, not considered to be as desirable as oaks, maples, elms and other trees found in the historic districts.

### **Standards (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*

### **Conditions**

That at least 2 canopy trees be started in suitable locations on the property.

**Note:** The fence can be approved at the staff level.

Commissioners discussed that the carport will be far back on the property and not very visible from the street. A different panel configuration could be considered. The grade does slope down so the siting will be down and far back. The fencing can approve at staff level.

**In Support:**

John Rodenbough, 609 Magnolia Street, Sworn in. He said they want a secured area and a solid door that can be locked. He explained where the fence goes and that it will go to a hedge that goes to the road. They request to continue it along the property line and remove an old ulberry tree with a short zigzag around a drainage area and then bring it to the porch and then drop it down to 42" because of the apartment complex that has front stoops looking right on their porch. They request the removal of large tree that is a gum tree and is at the end of its life, losing large limbs and is posing a hazard. Another tree is requested for removal that is a volunteer and is in the footprint and a 3<sup>rd</sup> tree that is a type of softwood that is also a volunteer and one last tree that they don't plan to remove unless the construction impacts it. Commissioner Leimenstoll commented that the shingles on the gable ends of the carport be machine cut design. Mr. Rodenbough said that the siding and shingles will be similar to what is on the house with lap on the first story and the shingles on the second story.

Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer, sworn in, stated that the Fisher Park NA met with John and discussed the fence changes but they support the fence and are in support of the COA as written due to the apartment doors being so close to their porch.

**In Opposition:**

No one spoke in opposition.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed that the project is straightforward. Mr. Arneke noted for commissioners that the guidelines suggest that fences should not go past the midpoint of the house and if there are any zoning issues. Staff stated that the only rules are in regard to the street right-of-way. Zoning permits fences at 7 feet high. Mr. Vanderveen noted this is not at the street but further back. Mr. Arneke stated the recommended condition is to start 2 new trees. Mr. Pratt asked if a screening on the porch could be installed rather than changing the fence and has concern about setting precedence. Staff explained that precedence isn't a concern if the commission finds justification for approving it in this situation. And stated that adding the screening instead of the fence would have to come back as a new COA bc it is not part of this application. Mr. Arnett said he has no concerns about precedence because there are reasons for deviation and it is not a modification to the house. Ms. Leimenstoll said it will step down as well as it goes back.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2670, 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 Standards under page 36 Accessory Structures and Garage and page 23 under Trees and Landscaping are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by Isreal. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Pratt. Nays: 0.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2670 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to John Rodenbough for work at 203 Leftwich Street with the following conditions: that atleast 2 canopy trees be started in suitable locations on the property.



Seconded: Liemenstoll. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, , Pratt. Nays: 0.

APPROVED with conditions. 1:12

Jesse Arnett was recused from the discussion for a professional conflict of interest. Moved by Jo Leimenstoll. Vice-Chair Sharon Graeber proceeds to conduct the meeting for COA item #2674.

- (c) **Application Number: 2674**  
**Location: 210 W. Fisher Avenue**  
**Applicant: Brooks Shippen**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 1/31/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of addition, screened porch and deck at back of house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that an application came before the commission previously for some tree work in preparation for the renovation of this house. It has not been inhabited for some time and the new owner plans to construct a screened porch and addition and a deck at the back of the house. He described that the kitchen wing on the back of the house and the porch that has been closed in. An addition was built on this house allowing for use of the second story where the 4 windows and dormer are and approved by the commission. The center bay is part of the addition. The house has been neglected for a long time but is in good condition from a preservation stand point. The windows are original. 1:17 The addition will replace the kitchen wing. He explained details of the submitted elevations and site plan and showed examples of other additions that have been approved as examples of the two types of districts: The local district and Museum district and Greensboro's Commission and Standards are local and the purpose is to allow flexibility to allow people to use their property how they need and allow flexibility at the back of the house. Staff helps property owners work through the process.

He cited the Staff Comments:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Additions* (pages 75-76), *Patios and Decks* (pages 41-42), and *Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (28-30) for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The project consists of a 208 sq. ft. addition to the interior heated space of the house, a 425 sq. ft. screened porch addition, and a 400 sq. ft. deck/carport at the rear of the house. These additions will replace the kitchen wing and back porches.

**Facts**

The roof of the addition has been lowered from the original plan so that it will not be visible from the street. The west wall of the addition has been offset so that it will not be in the same

plane as the side wall of the house. These changes were at the recommendation of staff to help reduce the impact of the addition on the historic character of the house.

### **Facts**

Construction materials for the addition will be compatible with those of the house: siding with a matching reveal, corner boards, window casings, drip cap, etc. that match; similar foundation brick, double-hung windows of matching design. Compatible but slightly different construction materials will help distinguish the addition from the house.

### **Facts**

The two-story addition itself is not so large that it compromises the integrity of the historic structure. The screened porch and deck are only one story and located at the back of the house, and will not be easily visible from the street. Therefore, they should not compromise the integrity of principal elevations of the house or result in the removal of defining features or trees or historic landscape features.

### **Facts**

While the combined square footage of the addition, deck and screened porch is significant, the lot is unusually large for the historic district. Therefore there will still be ample green space and an acceptable ratio of green space to built area.

### **Facts**

The driveway will be extended and 2 parking spaces will be provided below the screened porch. It will be a single-width driveway and extend to the back of the house so that parked cars will not be visible from the street.

### **Standards**

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.*

### **Standards**

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.*

### **Standards**

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.*

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.*

### **Conditions**

That original construction materials of the principal elevations of the house be repaired and retained to the extent possible with only selective replacement of individual elements based on condition. The original porch railing should be repaired rather than replaced.

That windows and doors be repaired and refurbished rather than replaced.

That foundation and chimney brickwork should be carefully repointed following accepted preservation standards.

That details on materials and design for new windows, doors, roof, etc. are brought back to staff for approval.

That details on the design and materials for the screened porch are brought back to staff for approval prior to construction. Railings should be compatible with historic railings and avoid contemporary railing construction.

Ms. Geary added that staff spent a significant amount of time reviewing the application and meeting with the applicant because they had concerns about the impact. She broke it down in her mind into three changes. She noted that screened in porches and decks are allowed on rear elevations when designed using compatible materials and design components and so it then becomes a matter of the addition and the proposed changes to the historic rear elevation which had already been altered through a previous addition. For these reasons the recommendation is in favor.

### **In Support:**

Brooks Shippen, 210 W. Fisher Avenue, Sworn in. She explained that the livable square footage that she is proposing to add to the existing foot print is only 208 square feet. An image that illustrated through hatching the expanded footprint which is squaring off the corner. She is not extending past the existing side and rear walls. The entire front of the house will stay as is. She addressed keeping it in style of the Queen Anne. She has added another porch on the rear addition so that there are different angles and characteristics that support that style. She mentioned how she has examined the Standards and has selected materials from page 91 on New Construction materials. She explained that her application explains how she meets the standards. She is going from 13% coverage to 20% coverage with the new work. There will be a balance between the structure and the land. She also wanted to note that the first floor is designed so it will be CAP certified (aging in place and accessibility).

Katherine Rowe expressed appreciation for the thorough application. She asked a question about the railing on the front window. Ms. Shippen responded that the front railing she had originally proposed was removed because she was told that since it is not there now it should not be added. It was not clarified who told her that.

Mr. Pratt asked about the CAP features and she responded that much of those features will be on the interior in regards to things like grab bars and widening door openings and creating straight hallways on the interior. She has looked into adding a ramp but is not doing that at this time.

Ann Stringfield, 1005 N. Eugene Street, sworn in, stated that she supports the COA with conditions. She suggests the condition to have materials and trim approved by staff and stated that having

visited the property she was stunned at the length of the backyard. It goes behind 4 other houses so there is room for a project of this size.

Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer, sworn in, stated that the Fisher Park NA and some of the items in the application and drawings, the upper level balcony and the use of building materials and the roofing materials weren't clear. The size of the addition in relation to the lot size. After the discussion the FPNA voted to support the application.

**In Opposition:**

Ira Sheldon, 1704 Wimply Court, sworn in. He is the chairman of the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund and had not planned to speak but another member is unable to attend. He stated that PGDF is not entirely against this project. PGDF sold this property with deed/easement restrictions and placed various restrictions on changes and a rehabilitation agreement. He would like to make some clarifications or conditions so that our easement restrictions are consistent. He pointed out the principle to not have false historical details. However they would like to see the porch to be detailed in a way that matches the Queen Anne details of the house. He stated that he did not work directly with the applicant. 1:52

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia St., sworn in. She is vice-chair of PGDF. PGDF is a revolving fund that buys and sells historic properties. They sold the property to Ms. Shippen in August and easements are in place that it can not be torn down. We had multiple meetings and a rehabilitation agreement where the expectations are clearly outlined. They are concerned that the new work match in material and design and reflect the original house. She stated that the Secretary of the Interiors Standards should be compatible to protect the historic building. The HPC Standards states similar. We've looked at examples and they are all scaled and trimmed to match the original. They have concerns over the statement about false historical details because they want it to mirror the original. The second floor addition roof has been lowered. She asked a question to the architect of how tall will the ceilings be in the second floor bedrooms? She pointed out that the one elevation faces the new condos and the lack of windows. Page 76. On Page 64 she stated primary elevations is the first floor and references new porches. Ms. Geary stated that Primary elevations for the local districts are elevations visible from the street and that a rear elevation is considered secondary. Ms. Pratt continued to ask for clarification about materials for the siding, roofing and others. She stated that Ms. Shippen mentioned that she may apply for a tax credit project. What ends up happening with the roof may depend on what they find once work begins. They don't have an objection to standing seam roof material. It was designed by William Armfield in 1908. He was the first registered architect in NC. He and his son did 100 buildings in Greensboro with only a few still remaining. They want this house to still look like the William Armfield house which is the purpose of the easements. She did mention that the front balcony never had a railing based on the evidence they have found.

**Rebuttal:** Ms. Shippen stated that in order to address the rear roofline she pointed out what is original and that she is not extending into the original roof area. The tip of the addition connects with the original roof pitch and the shed dormer is an existing addition. In terms of materials she hasn't been able to answer some of those questions because she still needs to select a contractor and she is happy to refer back to the City for all approvals. She referenced page 91 and these are all materials that are approved for new construction. On page 51 references roofs. The front has a metal material that is damaged and it will need to be replaced because there is water damage from the tree that fell and caused the damage. Specific windows will stay. The railing, trims, porch aesthetics she will refer to the City, Standards and her contractor to make sure she is not replicating but reflecting those details. She believes she is in keeping the agreement with PGDF and the Standards. She is working on a tac recit application and keeping the floors, chimney, fireplaces and bathtub and stairwells in the original manner.

Ms. Geary explained that written letters of support cannot be submitted because the HPC is a quasi-judicial board and the information cannot be submitted as sworn testimony.

Mr. Vanderveen asked about the right side elevation and the lack of windows. He said this blank wall is not seen in the districts. Ms. Shippen stated that the tall condos and the apartments built next door is the reason for the solid wall. Her property goes down into a dip and both properties are higher than hers and it is designed for a solid wall for bedrooms. She wanted to focus openings on the back and is open to a window if need be but the spacing is very close and looking for privacy. She is keeping the original windows on that side. Mr. Pratt asked about the rear kitchen walls will any windows and materials be reused. The windows downstairs are wood and will be reused. But not all the windows are original. Mr. Pratt said that there are several windows on the second floor could be used. Ms. Shippen stated that the second floor windows are vinyl which is why they won't be reused. He asked about the idea that the screened porch may be used for solar panels in the future. Ms. Shippen stated that this is not part of her application.

### **Discussion:**

Vice Chair Graeber summarized and commissioners discussed the application. 2:19 Mr. Pratt commented that he believes that it does not meet the standards. That it is a Queen Anne Cottage which is different than a "Queen Anne". He stated the size of the addition compromises the character and referenced standards under Additions. Ms. Leimenstoll stated that the slope and depth of site allows for this additions. She appreciates the inset to distinguish the new from old, the enclosed square footage is only 208 square feet and putting the parking under the deck makes good sense. It is a complicated project with the 3 components from PGDF, Tax Credit and local HD seems to ensure that the detailing will be scrutinized in great detail. They struggle with the blank wall and privacy. Mr. Vanderveen stated that it is covered visually by the apartment building and new condos. Ms. Rowe agrees that the right elevation is blocky and could be reworked. Mr. Vanderveen said that he doesn't want to make that a condition because of the privacy aspect.

Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2674, 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 Standards under Additions page 75-76, Patios and Decks Pages 41-42 and Walkways Driveways and Parking Areas page 28-30 are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by Vanderveen. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll Nays: Pratt. Abstain: Arnett

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2674 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Brooks Shippen for work at 210 W. Fisher Avenue with the following conditions:

That the original materials of the house be repaired and retained to the extent possible with only selective replacement of individual elements based on condition. Attention to windows and railings.

That windows and doors be repaired and refurbished rather than replaced.

That foundation and chimney work should be carefully repointed following accepted preservation standards.

That details on materials and design for new windows, doors, roof, are brought back to staff for approval.

That details on the design and materials for the screened porch are brought back to staff for approval prior to construction. Railing should be compatible with historic railings and avoid contemporary railing construction.

Commissioners discussed and added an additional condition if the applicant pursues historic preservation tax credits through the State Historic Preservation Office that we defer review to the State Historic Preservation Office if changes are made as part of a State Historic Preservation Tax credit project.

Seconded: Rowe. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Arneke, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll. Nays: Pratt. Abstain: Arnette

APPROVED with conditions. 2:35

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Graeber mentioned the South Benbow Meeting met on February 2<sup>nd</sup>. It was well attended and Commissioners Israel and Rowe along with Staff Mike Cowhig attended. They are proceeding with the oral histories and UNCG will be scanning documents that community members will be provided. Community participation is still high. 2:40

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
March 29, 2023**

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, Rodney Long, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

There were no adjustments

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

There were no absences.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The January 11, January 25 and February 22, 2023 minutes were approved with no changes.

Speakers were sworn in.

New Commissioner Arlen Nichols was welcomed as the new representative for the College Hill Historic District. Commissioners and Staff expressed appreciation for David Arneke's service to the commission.

Chair Arnett was recused for a conflict of interest on item 3(a). Moved by Jo Leimenstoll and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bert Vanderveen.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2686 APPROVED with Conditions**  
**Location: 912 Olive Street**  
**Applicant: Eric Phillips**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 3/8/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construct accessory building; remove 3 trees.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project as a request to construct an accessory structure at the back of the property. For clarification, there was a request to remove trees but the applicant does not want to remove any trees unless necessary.

The staff comments state that 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 Standards—Accessory Structures and Garages (pages 35-37), Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The proposed accessory building is a 667 square foot, one story, wood frame structure with a front porch and open shed on the right side. The site is at the rear of the lot in a similar location of garages and other historic accessory structures in the neighborhood. Exterior walls will be covered with fiber cement lap siding with a reveal similar to the siding on the house. The roof features clipped gables similar to the house roof. Windows and doors will be simulated divided light with a muntin pattern similar to that of the house. The size of the structure is not so large that it would compromise the integrity of the house and the accessory structure should be in scale with the property.

**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.*

**Facts**

The trees to be removed appear to be relatively small volunteers. There are mature canopy trees that will remain.

**Standards (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*

Note: A Recommendation to the Board of Adjustment is needed for an encroachment to the side street setback. The required setback is 15 feet and the request is for 10 feet.

Commissioner Leimenstoll clarified that the siding will be smooth sided cementitious siding.

**In Support:**

Eric Phillips, 912 Olive Street. He stated that his mom bought the property in 1964 for \$12,000. It is a great location and has never had a storage shed or garage. He is a painter of houses and for art and this structure will serve as storage and a studio.

Anna Phillips, also of 912 Olive Street was present. The applicants explained that the purpose of the side lean too is to be a covered potting area. Ms. Nichols asked about the tree that is labeled 36" and that it appears to be at least a distance of 15-20 feet away from the work. Mr. Phillips described the trees and that he does not want to take any down and does not want the expense. He believes the trees can be avoided. There are a few trees that are smaller in size and will come out because they are in the footprint. Mr. Pratt asked about the setback and if they would reduce the size so that it wouldn't need a variance. Mr. Cowhig explained the difference between a variance and a special exception in that the special exception is for the purposes of the historic district to allow for adjustments to projects so that they best meet the special character of the historic district. It is a tool intended for this type of purpose.

Ms. Phillips was sworn in and explained that her preference is to keep it as proposed because they use the yard and they would like enough space to hide their items. Mr. Phillips stated they are a



corner lot and if it is moved it gets close to the backyard of another yard. Ms. Phillips said she considers it a hardship to not have a garage, in response to Mr. Pratt asking if she has a hardship.

Jesse Arnett, 3312 Winthrope, was sworn in and spoke as the architect of the project. He stated it is proportioned like a traditional garage and aligns with the existing driveway. In regards to the setback the East side of FP are 50 feet wide and this one is only 45 ft wide and a hardship. The design is well within the footprint of an acceptable size. They originally had the 15 feet setback but decided they wanted the side shed roof. Within the context of the neighborhood it fits. If they adhered to the 15 foot side street setback 33% of the lot would not be buildable.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, speaking for the FPNA stated that they felt the size and scale is appropriate for the lot. They had a discussion on setback and when the house was built there was not a setback and this is acceptable. Trees were not discussed. The Ivy should come down to help the trees.

**In Opposition:**

No one spoke in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the project. Ms. Rowe appreciate the features and the Bessemer side that has windows and she thinks this is well done. Ms. Nichols stated it is challenging when there is a smaller parcel. They've created a nice balance that also protects the look and design of the streetscape. She understands the purpose of the lean to and this would allow them to grow and change how they live in the district in a respectful way. She asked about the trees and if they will plant a new one.

Ms. Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2686, 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 Standards on pages 36 and 23 are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by Bert Vanderveen. The Commission voted 8-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman. Nays: Pratt.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2686 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to for work at 912 Olive Street with the following conditions: that if any trees so need to come out that 2 new trees be planted and that this is doen in consultation with the City arborist. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll.

The Commission voted 8-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman. Nays: Pratt.

APPROVED with conditions.

Mr. Vanderveen moved that the HPC recommends in favor of a Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment for the setback encroachment. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll.

The Commission voted 8-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman. Nays: Pratt.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

An update was given on the Standards update committee efforts to this point.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Graeber mentioned that the Scanning public meeting for the Benbow Road National Register designation process will be on April 6 from 2-7 at the Hayes Taylor YMCA.

Mike Cowhig presented on ex-partite communication and conflict of interest.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
April 26, 2023  
Draft**

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, Rodney Long, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

There were no adjustments

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

There were no absences.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The March 29, 2023 minutes were approved with a change to the streetname for Jesse Arnett to Windrift.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2689 APPROVED with Conditions**  
**Location: 833 N. Elm Street**  
**Applicant: Jack Wright**  
**Owner: Black Rhino Capitol Group,**  
**Date Application Received: 3/16/23**

**Description of Work:**

Gravel was dumped and spread in the back yard where there was lawn previously. The back stoop was rebuilt.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project pointing to images that show the gravel in the back yard. He explained this is a corner lot and the after-the-fact work is easily visible from the street. Staff showed google images from July 2022 that showed the yard as fully grass and the original back door set of exterior stairs which were removed. Mr. Cowhig also described that had this come before the commission prior to the work taking place a parking area would have required edging to contain the gravel and a landscaping plan that would be required to be installed. The following facts and standards were provided as the staff comments:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed changes are incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas (page 30)*, and *Porches Entrances and Balconies (page 64)* for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The gravel dumped and spread in the back yard effectively creates a parking area. Since this is a corner lot it is in full public view. There is no landscape screening.

The stoop at the rear entrance was replaced with very little change with the exception of the railing. A railing closer to the detailing of historic railings is desirable but since this is such a minor change and not on a principle elevation, the stoop as constructed does no harm to the historic character of the house and the district. .

### **Standards under Walkways, Driveway and Parking Areas (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.*

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

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

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

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

### **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*

### **In Support:**

Jack A. Wright, 200 E. Bessemer Avenue, sworn in. Mr. Wright described his project stating that water issues at the property revealed a sink hole. The gravel was put in place as a temporary way to manage the sink area while renovation was underway of the property. He said the gravel allows for the work trucks to park off of the street and allow more spaces for the residents. He described the renovation work that has taken place to the property to that point including fixing stucco, original windows and painting. They have also removed overgrown vegetation under 2" in size and pruned the trees and bushes. The back stairs were deteriorated and were replaced to match in the same location. He referenced the small accessory cottage on the site and that he plans to renovate that building as well. He also stated that the rear enclosed porch is not original and that he desires to do some research that would allow that to be opened back up. He reiterated that the gravel is only temporary and clarified that it is not a permanent parking area. When the project is complete he will come back and put greenery and landscaping in. He said that it is 3" standard "crush and run" which can be easily removed. He also pointed out some water damage at the corner of the main structure.

Commissioners asked questions of the property owner in regards to clarifying the structure that has water damage and that it is the main structure. The accessory cottage also needs renovation. Mr. Cowhig described that it is unclear how long the structure has been there but it has been quite a while. It is constructed of cement block and has knotty pine paneling on the interior. Ms. Nichols asked Mr. Wright if he will do research to determine the approach on the enclosed rear porch and he answered yes and that he can see signs that indicate it was open originally.

Russell Farlow, 1983 Ebenezer Church Rd, Archdale, NC. Sworn in. Speaking as the contractor for the project he stated that he rebuilt the steps to match what was there. Southern yellow pine. Used pressure treated wood. He said Ivy was overgrown and he put it all back the way he saw it.

**In Opposition:**

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, speaking for the FPNA stated that they really appreciate the work that Jack has done on a lot of houses in the neighborhood. They felt they didn't have enough information on the gravel and would refer back to staff hoping that it would not stay in place. They have concerns about the small "fairy house" and it's future. She spoke about the fairy house and legal staff clarified that this is not part of the this particular application and will likely be part of a future COA application. The railing on the porch back steps is visible from the street and it does not seem to be of a style that would match what is on other porch railings. They would like the railing design to be different with a top rail and a bottom rail and the pickets in between but the way they are nailed on the outside is not what you see. They want to see consistency in the new railings that are constructed in the districts. The photos she showed were taken in the past 2 days.

**In Rebuttal:**

Mr. Wright stated that the pictures are out of date and they should see what they look like now. The railings have been painted black and disappear. It was clarified that the images in the staff presentation were taken on the 20<sup>th</sup>.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the railings and that it was testified that the railing design is the same. They discussed that the gravel is a temporary construction solution that will be removed when the work to restore the house is complete. It is not a new parking lot. Mr. Vanderveen suggested that a landscaping COA could be submitted to address the gravel and be approved at staff level to deal with the sink hole. Mr. Cowhig stated that through the testimony today we have learned that the gravel is temporary and we don't generally need a COA for temporary changes. But the other work on the COA of removing the stucco, the steps and then several other items that would not require a COA are part of this application for the Commission to consider. Other work at the project will be in future COAs. Chair Arnett asked about the lack of reference to the gravel on the COA application. It is an after the fact application for work that would need a COA but if it's temporary does the commission need to consider the gravel? Ms. Geary stated that this COA is what was submitted for a formal notice of violation to the gravel and the steps. The debated the best way to proceed given that the work was already completed.

Next the commission addressed the steps. Ms. Graeber asked if the existing steps were in keeping with the standards. Mr. Cowhig stated in this case the entire stairs were removed so it wasn't just repair. The stairs that were removed were not original and if the new ones matched is that considered a violation? It was identified that the railing had changed slightly based on a google image that was found from several years ago. Mr. Cowhig spoke about the need for mitered pickets to be used and Mr. Arnett pointed to page 65 of the standards that shows appropriate picket styles. Ms. Kaufman stated that had the application be received prior to the work, then the appropriate picket style would have been advised. We have always allowed repair and replacement to match even when it is not the original or the most preferred design. Mr. Pratt stated he would like to see the pickets be of a more compatible design and this is the time to make this change. Mr. Arnett pointed out that since these are not the original stair case standard #3 may not be applied in this situation

because it is more about restoration than repair. He also reminded commissioners that for After-the-fact applications the commissioners should consider the application as if the work had not been completed yet. Ms. Geary stated that not to complicate this issue but the standards are written to allow for decks and deck railings at the rear opening. So this is an acceptable deck design however it is on a corner lot and easily visible from the street. She spoke about the importance of what we have seen in previous examples but the decision should focus on the testimony of today's hearing. Ms. Graeber asked about the COA requirements of an image of what is there originally. Ms. Geary pulled the google image that shows a different railing style to what was built in the new example. Mrs. Geary described that the original is a post, handrail and then a horizontal rail. Mr. Arnett pointed out again that Standard #3 refers to original railings. Ms. Nichols repeated some of the items she heard in testimony regarding the visibility and desire for consistency. Commissioners discussed that it would be a simple modification to change the railing to be more consistent. The drawings of railings on pg. 65 were referenced as options. Commissioners discussed that the stucco has been repaired and will not be replaced and the applicant has testified to this fact. Commissioners discussed the concept of approving applications with conditions and that testimony dictates in some cases that some portions of the application can be approved and those that are in conflict can be covered in the finding of fact and conditions to exclude those items that are contrary to the standards.59:27

***Ms. Graeber moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2689, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with conditions with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the Staff Comments and Standards under Walkways, Driveways and Parking areas (page 30) items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10***

*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.*

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

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

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

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

*She also added that based on testimony during the hearing that the gravel is temporary. Also under #6 on the application in regards to the stucco that the stucco has been repaired and will remain. Also 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*

are acceptable as findings of fact.

**Seconded by Katherine Rowe. The Commission voted 9-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: none**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2689 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to for work at 833 N. Elm Street to Mr. Jack Wright with the following conditions: That the stair rails be modified using the examples in the Standards on page 65 and in consultation with staff and that the gravel that is not in place for longer than 6 months. Per testimony given, the stucco has been repaired and painted and is to remain. Seconded by Adrienne Isreal.**

**The Commission voted 9-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: none.**

**APPROVED with conditions.**

- (b) **Application Number: 2688 (Denied)**  
**Location: 200 East Bessemer**  
**Applicant: Jack Wright**  
**Owner: Black Rhino Capitol Group,**  
**Date Application Received: 3/16/23**

**Description of Work:**

A vestibule Feature at the front entrance was removed exposing the front door which was replaced. Alterations were made to the area around the door.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and pointed to images of the property prior to the work being done that shows a vestibule at the front entrance. He said there are only 3 examples of this type of feature in the historic districts. He said the other are interior vestibules where this one is a structure on the exterior and a few feet deep with a French type style doors. He said it is an unusual feature and he can understand how it might be considered not an original feature. The images showed the front door that was revealed and a front door that does not appear to be the original per the more modern design. He next pointed to an image taken in 1924 as part of a publication that does show the vestibule in place along with the windows on the front not filling the arched window opening. This image does suggest that these are original if not early features. The removal is a change that requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. He referenced the Standards under Porches, Entrances and Balconies on page 64 and Windows and Doors on page 57. Chair Arnette added for clarification that this is an after-the fact application. Mrs. Geary walked around and showed a more current digital image of the changes that were made that was not part of the presentation. Commissioners commented that the vestibule has been there for atleast 90 years. Mrs. Geary stated that the new images shows that the changes have been painted versus the unpainted version in the presentation. Mr. Vanderveen asked when the vestibule was removed and Mr. Cowhig stated within the last year by this applicant. Ms. Leimenstoll discussed the list of items on the application including a stained glass window, back stairs and the driveway. The other items were repairs and not changes so do not require a COA. The following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards: Porches, Entrances and Balconies* (page 64), *Windows and Doors* (page 57), for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park Historic District. It is listed as the Mediterranean Foursquare architectural style on the National Register of Historic Places listing with a construction date of 1922.

### **Facts**

The front entrance featured an unusual vestibule design that appears in a picture from a publication in 1924. It has a double 10-light French door set.

### **Facts**

In removing the vestibule, a non-original front door was revealed. This non-original front door and the front entry surround has since also been altered and replaced.

### **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.*

### **Standards under Windows and Doors (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. For commercial and/or institutional buildings in need of a utility entrance on secondary elevations, select a location that meets the functions of the building, but is least visible from the street and causes the least amount of alteration to the building. It is not appropriate to introduce new window and/or door openings into the principal elevations of a contributing historic structure.*
2. *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided. That all repairs match the original in material and design.*

### **In Support:**

Jack A. Wright, 200 E. Bessemer Avenue, sworn in. Mr. Wright described his project stating that the vestibule is debatable if it was there or not after his research and speaking with elder Fisher Park neighbors. IT was non-operational and full of carpenter ants and loose wiring. It had not been used



for 5 years prior to his ownership and it could not be used as an escape route per the head fire marshal. If you look at the windows you would assume that the doors and archways would be the whole section and there is a new version of the stucco. He pointed to images as part of the staff presentation and issues with dryrot, leaks and 1950's clay tiles that were broken and leaking. He said the building was in disrepair when he bought it and he said that there used to be doors under the arches based on what they have found. They believe there were larger windows and that is what they would like to do. 1:24 He spoke about the door which is just a 1950's door and he is trying to figure out what to do with the door. It is an active office space with several businesses. He went on to explain the water intrusion. He said the stone alone is worth a million dollars after speaking with the Mount Airy Granite person. He spoke about the steps and wanting to replace steps with stone. He said the door has been painted dark grey and black. The opening based on his conversation with the door supplier that the door he is using is the best door based on the size and arch. He said he added the arch and the stain glass to allow light in. He would like to do the arch over the windows arches as well. He explained that the arch is a 12 inch archway to help with the water infiltration. He said there are other properties in the district that have this same feature over arches. It was clarified that the doors are from India and had been painted blue. The blue has now been painted grey. They are trying to find the appropriate bluestone to use on the patio. The image from 1925 was shown and Ms. Leimenstoll stated that she understands that he is trying to search for what he needs to do but this image is 90 years old and clearly shows what it looked like. She said they are looking for what was historically there and the HPC role is to make sure the historic integrity is maintained. Ms. Nichols said that it is evident that the property owner cares but did the property owner ever research what looks like a set of French doors. He said not in the vestibule. Ms. Nichols asked if the doors could be changed and he said that he would like to do all three arches the same. Mr. Arnett asked how long he owned it. Since 2018 and he began working on it since the day he owned it because it was a disaster. The vestibule was removed in 2019 and he tried different colors and he consulted multiple architects. Mr. Nichols asked if he owns more properties and aware of the COA process. He answered that he owns 13 properties and has gotten COAs before. Mr. Arnett stated his concern that when it is after the fact it makes it much more difficult because they want to collaborate and help with investment in the neighborhoods along with providing resources. Ms. Geary added that they have consulted with Mitch Wildes with the State Historic Preservation Office but have not heard back yet. She stated it is unusual and she did think it was not original but we now know it has been there for a long time and can gain significance. She said the SHPO staff would be helpful in determining when changes or features could be changed. And perhaps the architects at the SHPO can help guide this process in a way that is architecturally appropriate for the style of this house. We also want to make sure our commission doesn't approve work that would change the classification as contributing. That classification also provides for historic tax credits and we can help you explore that option. Commissioners stated they appreciate the intent and want to be a resource. Mr. Wright stated that he has invested millions in the district and he seems to be the only one buying in Fisher Park and no one else is doing this if they are so concerned. Mr. Arnett redirected that the conversation needs to stay on focus.

**In Opposition:**

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, speaking for the FPNA stated that they discuss this. She said that no one is thrilled with the vestibule but it was built this way by Shlosser for another member of the family. Shlosser did a lot of the stone work in Greensboro. She said that the vestibule needs to go back. The doors from India and stained glass from a church are not appropriate changes to an arts and craft style house. She said that we are almost all owners in here and we've all spend money on our buildings but we are the caretakers and we should make the buildings look they way they are historically not what we think would look best. She said they want French doors at the entry and the board voted to not support the application and want it to look like "that" (motioning to the 1925 picture). She said they are also requesting a second COA for the garage but discussion was not had because a COA is pending on that project.

Chair Arnett asked that everyone in the audience and speakers to please keep comments focused on the application before the commission.

**In Rebuttal:**

Mr. Wright stated that he has invested and that this is personal. Chair Arnett asked him to stay to new information.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Isreal asked how far back do they go for changes that are made. Mr. Arnett stated that there is not a particular date and there is a judgement call about the appropriateness. In this case there is an almost 100 year old photograph of the house showing that it looked the same up until 3 years ago. Ms. Isreal asked at what point would we allow a change even if there is damage. Ms. Nichol said that we have archival records and images in different forms and COAs are particular but we should review each application individually and it seems logical to go back to original photographs and sometimes that will be, like in College Hill, the 1800s and that's what we would go back to. Mr. Arnett said with this being an after the fact application we need to review it as if the work has not been done. So a request to remove the vestibule but also a 100 year old image showing the vestibule as original. We can consider safety issues but our task is to consider whether the vestibule being removed is historically appropriate. Ms. Nichols added as a historic homeowner that water infiltration is always an issue. Mr. Arnett stated the question before is if the removal of the vestibule and front door detailing in keeping with our design standards. 1:50:44

**Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2688, 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 under Porches, Entrances and Balconies page 64, Standards under Windows and Doors page 57.**

On 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.*

On 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. For commercial and/or institutional buildings in need of a utility entrance on secondary elevations, select a location that meets the functions of the building, but is least visible from the street and causes the least amount of alteration to the building. It is not appropriate to introduce new window and/or door openings into the principal elevations of a contributing historic structure.*
2. *Retain and preserve original windows and doors, including such elements as sash, glass, sills, lintels, casings, muntins, trim, frames, thresholds, hardware and shutters. If repair of an*

*original window or door element is necessary, repair only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, composition, material, dimension, and detail by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the deteriorated section. The removal of historic materials shall be avoided. That all repairs match the original in material and design.*

are acceptable as findings of fact.

Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll.

The Commission voted 9-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: none

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2688 for work at 200 E. Bessemer Street, Greensboro North Carolina.

Seconded by Deborah Kaufman.

The Commission voted 9-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: none.

**DENIED**

**2:06:32**

- (c) **Application Number: 2699 (APPROVED)**  
**Location: 1000 N. Eugene St.**  
**Applicant: Bruce Cantrell**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 4/5/23**

**Description of Work:**

Install solar panels on side porch roof.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project as an application to install solar panels. This is an excellent application that shows the location and the type of panels that are proposed and other useful information. There is also an overhead schematic of the location of the panels. They will be installed about 2 inches above the roof shingles. They will be black in color. Less than 2 inches thick and it is the only roof that faces south with required 4 hours of direct sunlight. This will provide power for 20-25% of the house. There are not a lot of direct information in the Standards so we have had to interpret from the Standards for Mechanical Equipment.

The following facts and standards were provided as staff comments:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38-40)* and *Roofs (page 52)* for the following reasons:

**Fact**

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

**Fact**

The solar panels will be installed on the roof of the side porch since it is the optimal location for the panels. The rear roof sloop would not be a practical location. The panels will be black and flush mounted. The pitch of the side porch roof is very low so the solar panels will not be easily noticeable. There will be no change to the roof itself and no character-defining features of the house will be affected. Consequently, there should be very little impact on the character of the historic structure or the historic district.

### **Fact**

The National Trust for Historic Preservation published a report in 2012 that presents standards for solar panels on historic structures. This proposal meets those standards.

The National Parks Service provides as part of their Technical Preservation Services information on Solar Panels on Historic Properties stating “Solar panels installed on a historic property in a location that cannot be seen from the ground will generally meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.” This information was last updated in 2022.

### **Guidelines under Utilities and Mechanical Equipment (page 38-40)**

*Introduction: Solar Panels are best located on rear elevations.*

1. *Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building.*

### **Guidelines under Roofs (page 52)**

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

He added that this is an area that we need to take a look at in the Standards Update. There has been a policy shift at the Federal level on Sustainability and energy efficiency and that Preservation should embrace these concepts so long as they do no hard. Staff supports this because of the low slope on the side porch. Ms. Geary pointed out some of the standards and publications that the National Trust and the National Parks Service have provided regarding solar panels and we utilize these in our review. She directed the presentation to the website for the National Parks Service. She said that in addition to allowing panels on low slope panels there are several different examples of applications that are now considered acceptable.

Commissioners asked about the location and this is a corner property and the porch is on the side. Mr. Pratt stated the house is elevated and the house is several feet above grade so it will not be easy to see them once installed. Ms. Nichols asked how many houses in the districts have solar panels. Staff responded that a guess would be 10 properties. Mr. Arnett asked that based on the standards provided by the National Parks Service that staff agrees with the application. Mr. Cowhig responded, yes.

### **In Support:**

Bruce Cantrell, 1000 North Eugene Street, sworn in. He first thanked commissioners for their service because it’s not easy work. He added to the information in his application that this is the only roof at his house that provides the needed sun exposure. He uses a City charger downtown and our vehicle is carbon neutral. It will be installed on a low slope roof on a side street and as you walk or drive its really hard to see the roof itself. There are 2 inch brackets and then the panels are on the brackets and they can be removed with no harm done to the shingles. Ms. Nichols stated that she knows that times change and we need to adapt but she has an concern about what the

effect will look like if it is allowed more and more in the historic districts. She asked if there are on ground locations instead of on the roof. Commissioners responded that it is a good point but a discussion for commissioners to have at another time. The applicant described a friend that has a large area where the panels are installed at ground level but they live outside of the City. That's not an option for most people in Fisher Park. The technology is changing very fast. He likes that the changes they have made over the years in additions show a slight change and the panels are not destroying anything history and tell the story of the house. Ms. Leimenstol said and these are reversible and referenced solar panels as an example. She stated that we are not a museum district like Old Salem where you would never see a solar panel. Ms. Geary stated that the information from the National Parks Services and the Department of the Interior which is our governing program authority. The statement on Solar Panels from the Technical Preservation Services information states "Solar panels installed on a historic property in a location that cannot be seen from the ground will generally meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. And these was updated in 2022. 2:22

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street, sworn in, speaking for the FPNA stated that they discuss this. She said that after site visit it would not be visible and they can be removed. It was a unanimous approval. She said there are 4 on her block and she forgets they are there because they are black on black roof. They disappear. We support this for those reasons.

**In Opposition:**

There were none in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Arnette referenced that staff cited the Utilities and Mechanical section and that technology has changed a lot in 100 years included heating and Air Conditioning and even cars. Thinking of this as a utility element is very useful and appropriate change. The application is sensitive and the least intrusive type of product.

**Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2699, 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 Standards under Utilities and Mechanical Equipment page 38-40 particularly Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building and Roofs (page 52) Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch overhang and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and window's walks. As well as the Technical Preservation Services from the National Parks Service that was read into the record.**

are acceptable as findings of fact.

Seconded by Sharon Graeber.

The Commission voted 8-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: Nichols

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2699 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bruce Cantrell for work at 1000 N. Eugene Street.

**Seconded by Sharon Graeber.**

**The Commission voted 8-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: Nichols.**

**DENIED**

### **3. Recommendation on Rezoning Application for 623 Summit Avenue**

Mr. Cowhig described the process that rezoning requests are reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission with a recommendation in favor or against that goes to the Planning and Zoning board for a decision. In some cases it goes to the City Council but the HPC is not the final decision maker on this. Commissioners should determine if the rezoning is consistent with the goals of the Historic District program and consider changes that take place to historic buildings in order to accommodate a viable use. At 623 Summit Avenue the property is zoned general office and in 2005 it was rezoned to neighborhood business for a coffee shop. The current owners are using it as residential but would like to rezone it back to office. As staff if the ultimate purpose is to reuse the house we see this as a positive outcome. The owners are here to speak.

#### **Speakers on the item:**

Jammie Hart, 7816 Renaissance Ct. Charlotte, NC. She stated she is the property owner but is no longer residing in the structure. She did confirm it was a coffee house prior to her ownership but she has used it as her residence since 2017. She does not have a specific plan for the property but wants to rezone it back to the office status. Ms. Nichols asked if it is still listed in the MLS and Ms. Hart stated no it is not. She re-explained it that it was office then neighborhood coffee house and now she wants it to go back to office. Mr. Pratt asked if the current zoning would allow for office but the staff advised that she would have been made aware of that prior to making the application only if needed. Staff remarked that the area is still generally an office zoned area. Ms. Hart said she lived in the Summit House for 5 years but has moved to Charlotte but she will continue to own the building. A member of the audience said that support the application. Mr. Vanderveen the Dunleath representative said that the property has been well maintained and that there are other businesses including Air BNBs in the area and this is helpful to keep the house alive.

Ms. Isreal moved that the HPC approves the application and recommend rezoning 623 Summit Avenue to office. Seconded by Vanderveen. Unanimous approval.

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

An update was given on the Standards update committee efforts to this point.

#### **ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Geary updated commissioners on the Standards and that based on an outline that Russ Clegg put together they will create an RFP. They will create a scope of work that can be accomplished with the funding that is available. She also mentioned that the scanning session for the Benbow Park nomination took place a few weeks ago. Ms. Graeber added that many people showed up after the rain and large notebooks that will be scanned at UNCG on larger equipment. It was heartwarming to hear stories that people came to share. She spoke on the type of materials she has provided. Everyone is very excited about the project. She also spoke about the influence growing up in this neighborhood had on her life and her aspirations to become a professional architect and others who also were inspired. And, many of us are moving back into our parent's home.

#### **SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
May 31, 2023  
Draft**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Arlen Nichols (College Hill), Adrienne Israel, Deborah Kaufman.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, Rodney Long, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

COA application #2705 at 404 Fisher Park Circle was removed from the agenda because the tree was reviewed by the Arborist and the tree was determined be a staff level removal. The applicants have agreed to plant a new tree in its place.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Jo Leimenstoll, Tracy Pratt and Katherine Rowe.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The April 26, 2023 minutes were approved with no changes.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2704 APPROVED**  
**Location: 706 Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Angela Arnold**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 5/1/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construct picket fence.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that it is in the College Hill Historic District. The fence will be wood with spaced pickets and 48 inches high painted white. He pointed out that the location of the fence is way back from the street. He stated that a number of houses were demolished for Spring Garden Street and this particular house was moved from Morehead which is why it is set back so far. Spring Garden is a major thoroughfare. The extra height from the recommendation of 42inches is reasonable because it is set so far back and is necessary for security purposes for nearby dogs. The following facts and standards were provided as the staff comments:

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 not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24-27)* for the following reasons:

**Fact**

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



**Fact**

The proposed fence is a spaced-picket fence made of wood, 48" high. The standards recommend 42" maximum height for front yard fences. The additional height is requested in order to provide protection for the residents.

The proposed fence will be well back from Spring Garden Street which is unusual for the historic district. However, this is an unusual lot resulting from the construction of Spring Garden Street through the neighborhood. Originally, the house was on Morehead Avenue. Residual property was added to the front of the lot. This resulted in a lot configuration that is out of the ordinary for the historic district. Bringing the fence up to the street would result in an unusual fence configuration.

**Standards: Fences, Walls and Site Features (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*

In response to a questions, Mr. Cowhig stated it is a standard fence like what is in the Standards with framing facing the interior. The maximum fence height outside of districts is 7 feet in some cases and 48 inches in other situations. There is also a height restriction for sight triangles. Mr. Arnett noted that the 48" is well within the normal requirements.

**In Support:**

The applicant was not present.

Rosemary DiGiorgio, College Hill representative. She stated that they did not review this application at their meeting.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Vanderveen stated that the height and project is reasonable. 23:41

***Ms. Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2704, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with conditions with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the Staff Comments and Standards under Fences Walls and Site features (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.*

*B. 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*

are acceptable as findings of fact.

Seconded by Sharon Graeber. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman. Nays: none

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2704 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Angela Arnold for work at 706 Spring Garden Street. Seconded by unclear in audio.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman. Nays: none.

**APPROVED**

- (b) **Application Number: 2707 (APPROVED)**  
**Location: 924 Carr Street**  
**Applicant: David and Lynn Hemm**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 5/10/23**

**Description of Work:**

Window changes as part of kitchen remodeling.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and the project is for exterior changes associated to some interior kitchen changes. There are several window and door changes. He showed images of the house and the plans. The following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

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 not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55-61)* for the following reasons:

**Fact**

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

**Facts**

The window on the back wall of the kitchen is not original and must be replaced with a shorter window to accommodate new cabinets. The new window will match the design of original windows on the house. The window on the side wall of the kitchen appears to be original but it is in an inconspicuous location. The replacement window would match the design of the original window. The casement window in the storage room is also in an inconspicuous location. The exterior door to the enclosed back porch is not original and will be replaced with a salvaged door of a design appropriate for the house.

**Standards: Windows and Doors**

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

**Note:** The tankless water heater can be approved at the staff level.

Mr. Arnett asked the location of the new door. Mr. Cowhig stated that it will be on the left. Ms. Isreal clarified that they are looking at just the windows and doors.

**In Support:**

David and Lynn Hamm, 924 Carr Street, sworn in. Mr. Hamm described the project and clarified that this is at the back half of the house and that the windows here were all redone as part of a remodel from the 1980s. They are trying to make all the windows congruent and consistent with the original windows. They would like to relocate one of the windows to where there is a damaged window. He thanked staff for meeting with them and making sure they stay on track. He pointed to an image to show some of the interior need for storage and organization. He pointed the area where the hot water heater work will be done.

Mr. Arnett clarified that the new kitchen window will be a double hung window.

Rosemarie Digiorgio 715 Walker Avenue, CHNA, voted to support because the character of the house will not be impacted and the changes are primarily not visible from the street.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**In Rebuttal:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Nicholls thanked them for the thorough application. Mr. Arnett stated it is a sensitive alteration.

**Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2707, 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 Standards pages 55-61.**

**Facts**

The window on the back wall of the kitchen is not original and must be replaced with a shorter window to accommodate new cabinets. The new window will match the design of original windows on the house. The window on the side wall of the kitchen appears to be original but it is in an inconspicuous location. The replacement window would match the design of the original window. The casement window in the storage room is also in an inconspicuous location. The exterior door to the enclosed back porch is not original and will be replaced with a salvaged door of a design appropriate for the house.

**Standards: Windows and Doors**

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

**are acceptable as findings of fact.**

Seconded by unclear.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman. Nays: none

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2David and Lynn Hemm for work at 924 Carr Street.

Seconded by Sharon Graeber.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman. Nays: none.

**APPROVED**

**41:00**

- (c) **Application Number: 2706 (APPROVED)**  
**Location: 812 Olive Street**  
**Applicant: Susan Hunt**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 5/8/23**

**Description of Work:**

Replace front door.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project as an application to replace the front door. Mr. Cowhig provided images of the property and the existing front door and what the proposed new door looks like. They are using a cabinet maker who would custom build the door in the craftsman style to match the house. It will not match the current door because they would like more privacy and less visibility into the house. They have tried to repair the existing door but house settling has made the frame out of square. Double Hung Windows worked on it but could not fix the problem. He said the applicants are on vacation and could not be here today. The current door would be classified as a "French" door and is very common.

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 not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55-61)* for the following reasons:

**Fact**

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

**Fact**

The front door appears to be original to the house. Because of house settling, the door framing is out of square leaving gaps resulting in heat loss. The owners have tried to correct the problem without success.

**Fact**

This house is a Foursquare with Craftsman features. The proposed new door is a custom wood door of a Craftsman design, although it does not match the light pattern of the original door. The purpose of the change in light pattern is to have less direct visibility into the home.

**Standards (page 57)**

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

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

The commissioners discussed the issue of security. Staff explained that the proposed door, while it does not match, is still architecturally compatible with the structure while also solving the security and privacy concerns.

**In Support:**

Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer. FPNA. Sworn in. They are in support of the project as it seems a reasonable request.

**In Opposition:**

There were none in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed that the French door may not even be the original. The proposed door still has a significant amount of glass.

**Ms. Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2706, 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 Standards on page 57 and the facts that *The front door appears to be original to the house. Because of house settling, the door framing is out of square leaving gaps resulting in heat loss. The owners have tried to correct the problem without success and this house is a Foursquare with Craftsman features. The proposed new door is a custom wood door of a Craftsman design, although it does not match the light pattern of the original door. The purpose of the change in light pattern is to have less direct visibility into the home. And guidelines on page 57 2 and 3, Retain and Preserve and When repair is not feasible, as determined by City staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows, when designed to match the original in appearance, detail, material, profile, and overall size as closely as possible.***

**are acceptable as findings of fact.**

**Seconded by Arlen Nichols.**

**The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman, Nichols. Nays: none**

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2706 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Susan Hunt and James Couch for work at 812 Olive Street.

Seconded by Bert Vanderveen.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman, Nichols. Nays: none.

**APPROVED**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig said that the College Hill decorative Street signs project is close to installation. He addressed some violation projects and provided updates. A house on Morehead where the chimney was removed was sold and the new owner completely restored the house and rebuilt the chimney. The application for the condominiums on Spring Garden Street with the light fixtures and Duke replaced the light and the neighbor is very happy with the results.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
June 28, 2023  
Draft**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sharon Graeber (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Arlen Nichols (College Hill), Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Adrienne Israel, Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll, Katherine Rowe.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

There are no adjustments.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Jesse Arnett

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The May 31, 2023 minutes were approved with no changes.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2712 APPROVED with condition**  
**Location: 912 N. Eugene Street**  
**Applicant: Nancy Torkewitz**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 5/24/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construct addition to house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that it is in the Fisher Park Historic District. He showed images of the property. It is a colonial revival style house. The addition will be on the rear of the structure. The application includes other repair work that can be approved at the staff level so there is no need for review by the commission. There are windows that will be reused in the addition. He showed the addition floor plans and elevations of the proposed addition. They intend to use wood siding that matches the dimensions and profile of the existing and window and door trims to match. The following facts and standards were provided as the staff comments:

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 will not be incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards-Additions* (pages 75-76), for the following reasons:

**Facts**

A small one story addition will be constructed at the rear of the house. The proposed addition will not be easily visible from the street and will not affect any character-defining features of

the house. Construction materials will match those of the house and existing windows will be relocated and reused in the addition. The addition will be distinguishable from the house by use of a trim board.

**Standards (page 76)**

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

**In Support:**

Nancy Torkewitz, property owner. She said that the addition mirrors the roof line of the existing roof but extends forward. The addition is currently this is a 2 bedroom house and she is adding a ground floor room and will eventually be a downstairs bedroom, bath and laundry room. She said the distinguish will be that it comes out and it clearly reads as an addition.

Keith Pratt (? Inaudible), contractor. They are trying to minimize how much original material is replaced so the distinguishing feature will be the new material. The new windows on the side will be fabricated to match the original. They will be insulated glass and simulated divided light are allowed in additions. The windows will be wood with an extra thick window sill. They will look like the existing windows.

Cheryl Pratt, Fisher Park representative. She stated that the neighborhood association was impressed with the project and they support it. She mentioned the placement of a corner board should be used to differentiate the addition.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Pratt stated he wants to see an offset of like 6 inches. Commissioner Leimenstoll stated that she said that it's at the rear so it won't be visible. Commissioner Pratt stated that if a trim board is used that it should be painted the same as the siding. Commissioner Vanderveen stated that he has several of contrasting colors on his property and it is perhaps a matter of taste. Commissioner Graeber read the standard. Commissioner Leimenstoll stated that commissioners all seemed to want a differentiation. It is a small space so it seems that the trim board would solve the issue. The project is a tax credit project and that SHPO will have to approve the project. Commissioners all agreed it's a great project.

***Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2712, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with conditions with the Historic Preservation***



**Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the Staff Comments and Standards under Additions page 75-76**

**Standards (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.*

are acceptable as findings of fact.

**Seconded by Tracy Pratt. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman, Leimenstoll, Pratt, Rowe. Nays: none**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2712 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to nancy Torkewitz for work at 921 N. Eugene Street with the following condition that a detailing of the stair railing be submitted to City staff for approval. Seconded by Nichols.**

**The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman, Leimenstoll, Pratt, Rowe. Nays: none.**

**APPROVED with condition 27:30**

- (b) **Application Number: 2713 (CONTINUED)**  
**Location: 301 S. Mendenhall St.**  
**Applicant: Lyudmila Dmitriyeva**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 5/23/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construct picket fence and retaining wall, remove chimney, install HVAC units.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and the project is for several work items including a picket fence in the front and back, a retaining wall along the side of Odell Place, remove a chimney at the back of the house and install individual HVAC Units for each apartment units. He showed images of the property and noted it is on the corner of Mendenhall and Odell Place close to the Greensboro College campus. He showed an illustration in terms of the fencing and duplicate the neighbors fence style. He said that he just received feedback from the traffic engineer in regards to the retaining wall and placement of the fence and HVAC. Sight obstruction triangles are used to determine sight clearance and safety for traffic visibility. Certain height objects are not allowed to be higher than 30 inches within the determined sight triangle. One of the transportation engineers reviewed the site and left a white marking on the curb that shows the point of the triangle so the fence would have to be that far back. This is

along the front. It would have to set back to that point and significantly back from the street more in line with the trees. Adding a fence on top of the bank creates something that is essentially 50 inches high. This is a regulatory requirement. Mike described where the retaining wall would be located and that the fence is only along the front of the property. The following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

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 project will not be incongruous with the Standards if certain conditions are met. *Historic District Design Standards: Fences, Walls and Site Features (pages 24-26), Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 49-50)* for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

Low concrete walls are found throughout the historic districts. The proposed wall is similar in material and placement as other walls in the historic districts.

### **Standards (page 26)**

*4. Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood.*

### **Fact**

The proposed picket fencing is wood fence that is similar in design, materials, height and placement to picket fences found in the historic districts.

### **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.*

### **Fact**

The chimney is located on a rear slope of the house and because the house is on a corner lot is easily seen from the street. It is not a fireplace chimney. It probably vented a cook stove originally. As such it contributes to the historic character of the house and its removal would diminish the historic character of the house to some degree.

### **Guidelines page 50**

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

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

### **Fact**

Individual HVAC units will be installed in several locations. One will be prominently located on the side of the house.

### **Standards (page 40)**

1. Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building.

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

Commissioners discussed the issues presented with the sight triangle restraints.

**In Support:**

Lyudmila Dmitriyeva, 301 S. Mendenhall Street, sworn in. She explained the project and that it is a Victorian House and she wants to use the same design as the neighbor and pointed out some other examples of what she would like to do. It was clarified that the front yard fence could be 30 inches and a rear property line privacy fence that would drop to 4 feet to stay outside of the sight triangle. Mike stated this could be approved at staff level. The purpose of the fence is front is for beautification and in the back it is for privacy. She described that her chimney was part of a big fire in the 1960s. But the chimney has a change of bricks and there is a chimney cap. It is a kitchen chimney, secondary chimney. There are two larger ones toward the front of the house. There are 6 fireplaces that are operational and coal burning. Commissioner Nichols mentioned the importance of significant chimneys and chimney caps and advised on the importance of a chimney cap. Commissioners suggested that the chimney could be repointed and that the flu should be filled in and a new cap. She would like to install the separate HVAC units for each apartment. She is using a standard unit and showed where she wants them installed on the site. This is a site not easily seen from the street and showed the areas that she could place them on the property. There would be an outside compressor for each unit and there is likely not enough room on the Odell side between the house and the sidewalk. On the other side there may be more room. They are typically 24x24 for this size need. Commissioner Leimenstoll stated that the Commission needs more specific information to make a determination. She stated that it is not the role of the commission to design this project and that the commission needs to suggest that the applicant work with staff and we continue the application. Mr. Pratt stated a site plan is needed showing all of the changes and locations of the proposed work. It would be helpful to have a GDOT staff person provide input and consider the relationship of the work to the trees on the property. Some work can be approved at the staff level.

There was no one else in support.

**In Opposition:**

Rosemarie DiGiorgio, College Hill. She said that the neighborhood association is in favor of the continuance. She thanked the applicant. CHNA seeks more information on the rest of the proposal and recommend repairing the chimney. Request more information on the materials for the wall. They recommend that the homeowner speak to a landscaper to address the wall. In regards to the HVAC the inside location is acceptable but the Odell location is too visible.

**In Rebuttal:**

Ms. Dmitriyeva spoke about the different locations. Ms. Graeber explained that a site plan is needed to provide more detail about the project and what she would like to do given the new information from GDOT.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners stated that based on the previous discussion that the item should be continued.

**Commisisoner Pratt made a motion to continue application #2713 to the July 26 Commission meeting for the applicant to work with staff on a new proposal. Seconded by Commissioner Leimenstoll.**

**The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Israel, Kaufman, Pratt, Rowe, Leimenstoll. Nays: none**

**CONTINUED.**

**1:30:26**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig shared a presentation on enforcement and slides of some enforcement efforts in the districts. He highlighted some after-the-fact COA projects and the efforts to resolve those issues. This includes 705 Morehead Avenue where a chimney was removed. The Commission denied the application to remove the chimney and it has now been rebuilt. The next one is a mid-century house that was being renovated and the issue is parking. The next is in Dunleath. He spoke about the many investors and these are often investor purchased and we have discussion but the work is done without approval. The property then changes hands and the new owners agree to replace the unapproved changes. A second Dunleath example on Percy Street. Another example of out of town investors who immediately began work that was not consistent with the standards. This did come before the HPC and the majority of the work was corrected. It is a non-contributing brick structure that was painted that is irreversible. It has been completely renovated and returned to single-family use. They also used salvaged windows. This is the parking light that was installed and then brought before the commission and a resolution was found that helps eliminate the light trespass and glare for the neighboring properties. He showed an example that the siding is slowly being replaced with appropriate siding. The last example is a mailbox that was installed which is not required in National Register Historic Districts. Ms. Graeber asked about the proposed South Benbow Road district and if street boxes could be avoided. Mr. Cowhig said that this is referred to the NC State Historic Preservation Office who coordinates with the Post Master General. Mike thanked our code enforcement office who are very good to work with. Mr. Cowhig provided an update on some outstanding violation cases.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Mike Cowhig*

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
August 30, 2023  
Draft**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice-Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Arlen Nichols (College Hill), Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Deborah Kaufman, Jo Leimenstoll, Katherine Rowe.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

Item 3b is being continued at the request of the applicant.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Adrienne Israel.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The June 28, 2023 minutes were approved with no changes.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2713 (continued) APPROVED with conditions**  
**Location: 301 S. Mendenhall Street**  
**Applicant: Lyudmila Dmitriyeva**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 5/23/23**

**Description of Work:**

Construct addition to house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that this is a continued application from the June meeting where the HPC requested additional information. Staff received a site plan yesterday and offered to have the application continued to allow for more review time however the applicant wishes to have the project heard at today's meeting. This property is in the College Hill historic district. It includes several projects including a fence, HVAC placement, the removal of the chimney and a low retaining wall. It is a corner lot and in reviewing the fence request the City's transportation department stated that the proposed height does not meet safety standards. The applicant has removed the fence request at this time. Mr. Cowhig stated that the fence could be approved at the staff level if it is a lower height picket fence. He said that in the Staff's review they could not support the application because of the chimney removal request. The chimney is original and in a visible location. It was noted that the site plan does not indicate the location of the HVAC units. It was clarified that the proposed retaining wall is less than 2 feet in height. Staff presented the site plan and referred the commissioners to the provided Staff Comments.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the project, as submitted, will be

incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards: Fences, Walls and Site Features* (pages 24-26), *Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys* (pages 49-50) and Utilities and Mechanical Equipment for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

Low concrete walls are found throughout the historic districts. The proposed wall is similar in material and placement as other walls in the historic districts.

### **Standards**

*4. Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood.*

### **Facts**

The proposed picket fencing is wood fence that is similar in design, materials, height and placement to picket fences found in the historic districts. However, the fence does not meet the City's traffic sight obstruction rules.

### **Standards**

*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.*

### **Facts**

The chimney is located on a rear slope of the house and because the house is on a corner lot is easily seen from the street. It is not a fireplace chimney. It probably vented a cook stove originally. As such it contributes to the historic character of the house and its removal would diminish the historic character of the house to some degree.

### **Standards (page 50)**

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

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

### **Fact**

Individual HVAC units will be installed in several locations. One will be prominently located on the side of the house.

### **Standards (page 40)**

*1. Install utilities and mechanical equipment in areas and spaces that will require minimal alteration to the building.*

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

**In Support:**

Lyudmila Dmitriyeva, property owner. 1005 Montpelier Dr. Ms. Dmitriyeva explained that she is removing the fence from the application at this time. She also explained that she can either remove or keep the chimney. She described that the HVAC units proposed location has been moved to the side yard not facing the street and will not be easily visible. She said at this time she is only installing one unit. This project can now be approved at staff level. She said her primary concern is the retaining wall which will be similar to the low wall at the property across the street. It will vary in height from 8 inches up to somewhere around 20 inches but that will likely be determined in the construction process.

Mr. Arnett verified that the chimney is removed from the application and she stated yes. Ms. Nichols stated that she had a brief conversation with the applicant and she directed her to contact staff with any questions to avoid outside discussion.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

None.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Vanderveen stated the wall will be just like the one on Odell Street and the material will be poured concrete. Commissioner Nichols relayed that the grade required a variation in height and Commissioner Leimenstoll reiterated the height that was stated in the testimony. Commissioners agreed that the wall is low and following the grade. They clarified that 1 items, the chimney is withdrawn and 2 items the fence and HVAC placement can be approved at staff level.

***Mr. Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2713, and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with conditions with the Historic Preservation Commission Program Manual and Design Standards and that the Staff Comments and Standards under Fences, Walls and Site Features (pg 24-26) are acceptable as finding of fact:***

**Standards**

*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.*

**are acceptable as findings of fact.**

**Seconded by Katherine Rowe. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Leimenstoll, Pratt, Rowe. Nays: none**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2713 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lyudmila Dmitriyeva for work at 301 S. Mendenhall Street with the following conditions that the details of the wall is compatible in material, design, scale, location and size of original walls in the historic district. That, the fencing and HVAC work will be submitted for staff approval**

with changes and that the applicant has withdrawn the request to remove the chimney. Seconded by Graeber.

The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Leimenstoll, Pratt, Rowe. Nays: none.

**APPROVED with conditions**

Commissioner Leimenstoll moved that Chair Arnett be recused from items 2 c and d. Seconded by Bert and unanimously approved.

- (c) **Application Number: 2724 APPROVED**  
**Location: 421 Hendrix Street, 1103-1105 Yanceyville Street (Fleetwood Apartments)**  
**Applicant: Sachin Anchan**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 8/9/23**

**Description of Work:**

Alterations at back of buildings as part of renovation of apartment buildings.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that the property is a non-contributing property in the Dunleath Historic District. The property was in total disrepair and the landscaping was overgrown. They have cleaned up the landscaping and are doing a sensitive renovation. This application is for a change to the railings that are currently metal and will be changed to treated lumber. It also includes a small addition at the back of one of the buildings. He referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

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 not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards-Changes To Non-Contributing Structures* (page 10), *Additions* (page 51) and *Roofs* (page 53) for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The Fleetwood Apartments is a 3 building apartment complex constructed in 1969 on property that was part of a nineteenth century estate or farm on the outskirts of Greensboro. Parking areas are located behind the buildings. They are considered non-contributing structures. The new owner is totally renovating the apartments and repairing the decks at the rear entrances and would like to construct roofs over the decks to make them more functional and livable. The decks are at the rear of the structures not visible from any street in the historic district. The effect on the character of the buildings and the district should be negligible.

**Standards**

*For Greensboro's Historic Districts, non-contributing properties should follow those guidelines as set out under "Neighborhood Setting" and preserve the neighborhood spirit and character. The original architecture and style of the building should be evaluated for merit, and when architectural quality is noted, changes should strive to respect the character and features of the original structure. When making changes to the buildings themselves, guidelines in this document pertaining to "Exterior Changes" should be followed. However, considerable flexibility is warranted when making changes to non-contributing buildings. Decisions that make practical and aesthetic sense that may be contrary to specific guidelines are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the guidelines*



**Facts**

The additions will be very small and will not be visible from any street. Materials compatible with the apartment buildings and the neighborhood will be used.

**Standards**

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

**Facts**

The proposed roofs over the decks are a simple shed design not unlike historic roofs in the neighborhood. The roofing material will be standing seam metal which is a compatible material. The supports will be wood. The deck railings will be wood.

**Standards**

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

*2. Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission tiles" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original.*

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

*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.*

Commissioners and staff reviewed images and the orientation of the buildings. The building behind faces the back of the other buildings and there is 1 building at each address.

**In Support:**

Sachin Anchan, 610 Isabel Street, sworn in. Described that 421 faces Hendrix Street with the back facing the courtyard. 1105 faces the school with the back facing the courtyard and 1103 faces the courtyard. He described that he is making repairs only due to deterioration. He plans to pave the parking in the future. He described the railing project in that the existing steel will be encased in wood and the hand rail will be in front of the metal by adding wood facing. He also said that the doors will be replace to match the others as some of the front doors are actually interior. They will be using birch hardwood doors. All of the windows will be repaired rather than replaced. Commissioner Pratt stated that the railing should be a 2 piece handrail with pickets in between.

There was no one else in support.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners expressed that they have no concerns with the garage addition. It looks like an extension of an existing garage that is under the building. Commissioner Leimenstoll stated that for a non-contributing building this will be a big improvement and that the changes are on the rear and not visible. She is less concerned with the railing style because it is non-contributing. Commissioner Vanderveen stated he is in support of the proposal.

***Ms. Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2724, 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 Standards under Changes to Non-Contributing Structures and Additions and Roofs are acceptable as finding of facts.***

**The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Pratt, Rowe, Leimenstoll. Nays: none**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2724 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sachin Anchan for work at 421 Hendrix Street and 1103/1105 Yanceyville Street. Seconded by Vanderveen.**

**The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Leimenstoll, Pratt, Rowe. Nays: none.**

**APPROVED**

**At the request of the applicant, Sachin Anchin, item 3d for work at 210 Isabel Street application #2725 was withdrawn.**

**Vice Chair Graeber asked for a motion for Chair Arnett to rejoin. Commissioner Vanderveen made a motion for Chair Arnett to rejoin. Seconded by Jo Leimenstoll. Unanimously approved.**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Geary from the Historic District Program presented on the Establishment of the Dunelath Historic Retaining wall Restoration Program. She described that the project is part of the Dunelath Municipal Service District program where property owners pay \$.05 more per \$100 of property value. The funds are used to enhance the special character of the Historic Districts. She said this is

a required public hearing and the Commission is being asked to either recommend in favor or against the establishment of the program to City Council who had the final approval. She shared the following points in regards to the process and program:

- The MSD Program was established to enhance and maintain the special characteristics of the Historic Districts
- Property owners in the Dunleath Municipal Service District contribute \$.05 per \$100 of property tax valuation.
- The Greensboro Historic District Design Standards addresses the significance of Historic Retaining Walls on page 24-27. Standard #3 on page 26 states:
- *Retain fences and walls that contribute to the historic character of the property and the district where possible. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in dimension, proportion, material, texture and detail.*
- The Historic Dunleath Wall Restoration Program falls under the category of “Preserve Historic Streetscape and Environment” in the neighborhood’s Municipal Service District plan.
- The Historic Dunleath Neighborhood Association has allocated \$75,000 in funds for the 3 year Municipal Planning period of 2022-2025 for the purposes of repairing historic retaining walls that contribute to the character of the historic streetscape.
- This program is being established to help property owners offset the cost of the repair and maintenance of these character defining streetscape features.
- The program is a matching grant in the form of a reimbursement.
- The property owner will obtain 3 bids and include any vendors identified by the City’s MWBE office.
- City staff and neighborhood representatives will advise and the property owner will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness Application prior to work.
- A Grant Reimbursement Agreement will be signed between the property owner and the City of Greensboro. This agreement will hold a public hearing at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting and then will be approved at a City Council meeting.
- The property owner submits a request for reimbursement at 50% completion and 100% completion.

Commissioners and staff discussed the merits of the program and asked for speakers for the public hearing. There was no one present to speak on the public hearing item. Ms. Geary stated that the Dunleath Neighborhood Association Vice-President was supposed to attend in person but has had a conflict. He has sent a statement which she said the public hearing is not a quasi-judicial hearing and that the statement is allowed to be submitted. City Attorney Dusharme agreed. Ms. Geary read into the record:

*Dear Commissioners,*

*The Dunleath board has unanimously approved the Retaining Wall Program. The program is a long time coming. We are very excited for our neighbors to use this program to maintain the special characteristics of the historic district.*

*Thank you, Brian J Gillies, Vice President*

**Commissioner Vanderveen moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommends in favor to the City Council of the establishment of the Dunleath Historic Wall Restoration Program. Seconded by Deborah Kaufman.**

**The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Vanderveen, Kaufman, Leimenstoll, Pratt, Rowe. Nays: none.**

**Approved.**

Ms. Geary addressed the commission stating that they were asked by the family to make the Commission aware of the sad and unfortunate news of the passing of a long time preservation advocate in Greensboro, Julie Curry. She said that Julie has worked for over 25 years for preservation in Greensboro. She was the staff person to the Guilford County Historic Properties Commission for many years. In more recent years she was a lead volunteer for the Preservation Greensboro Development Fund. She said staff will provide information on memorial services when they are made aware of any plans.

**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

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
September 27, 2023**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice-Chair), Arlen Nichols (College Hill), Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Jo Leimenstoll, Katherine Rowe.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Brent Ducharme, City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

none

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Adrienne Israel, Deborah Kaufman, Bert Vanderveen

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The August 30, 2023 minutes were approved with one change to the project description for 301 S. Mendenhall.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2726 (continued)**  
**Location: Fisher Park Historic District**  
**Applicant: City of Greensboro**  
**Owner:**  
**Date Application Received:**

**Description of Work:**

Replace decorative street lamp heads around the park (North Park Drive, South Park Drive, Fisher Park Circle) (continued from August 30 meeting)

Mr. Cowhig stated that the Greensboro Transportation Department has requested a continuance as they work through details of the project in regards to the lighting level.

Moved by Tracy Pratt and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Jo Leimenstoll. Approved.

Jo Leimenstoll made a motion to recuse Chair Arnett for a conflict of interest for item 3(b).  
Seconded by Katherine Rowe. Approved.

- (b) **Application Number: 2734 APPROVED**  
**Location: 700 Magnolia Street**  
**Applicant: Mitchell Kamphuis**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received:**

**Description of Work:**

Remove shed and construct accessory building; request for recommendation for Special Exception to setback requirement

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that the existing accessory building was not recorded as part of the National Register nomination report but it does look to be older. It is not in good structural condition and does not have a substantial foundation. The window will be salvaged and used in the new building. There is a change in the siding material from what was originally submitted. The siding will be board and batten and not lap siding. Board and batten is found in the historic neighborhoods and is an example of siding for outbuildings. A design change is required to meet the fire code on the side setback for safety and the window will be removed. They are now adding a skylight which will not be easily visible. Images of other accessory buildings that have been previously approved were provided as examples. Mr. Cowhig stated that a significant tree was being considered in the construction as the project using piers instead of a foundation to not damage the Oak tree. He made the point that it is a practical need in replacing an earlier smaller scale garage when the design meets the standards.

He referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

### **Description of Work**

Replace existing outbuilding with new accessory structure

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 not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards Accessory Structures and Garages* (page 36) and *Demolition* (page 73) for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

The existing structure appears to be an early garage that was modified for a studio space. It is not documented as a contributing structure in the National Register Historic District. It is not in good structural condition. The owner has indicated a willingness to allow someone to move the structure.

### **Standards under Demolition**

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

### **Facts**

The proposed new structure will be sited in the same location as the existing structure which is consistent with siting patterns for garages in the historic district. The new structure will be constructed of cementitious board and batten with exposed rafter roof construction similar to the existing structure. One of the windows will be salvaged and reused.

### **Standards**

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

Note: A special exception from the Board of Adjustment is required to encroach within the 3 feet side yard setback, only if first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Staff verified that as designed the accessory structure does not have the components to be considered as an accessory dwelling unit. Based on the analysis of the zoning staff. The proposed railing and reuse of the window is a positive approach.

**In Support:**

**Jesse Arnett, 3312 Windrift Dr. Sworn in.** Mr. Arnett stated he is the architect for the project and the property owner is out of town. He spoke to the condition of the existing accessory building stating that it is not in good condition. It sits directly on the ground and because of the way it was built it can't be used the way that the property owner would like. He said that there is no full bath and no full kitchen which keeps it from being an accessory dwelling unit. The primary use is for indoor/outdoor recreation. The proposed location is to stay in keeping with the original outbuilding location and because it is a very small lot and with the constraints of the setbacks there was no other good location. The structure will be built on piers to protect the tree. He consulted with a landscape architect on the approach—auger holes for cylindrical footing which will have the least impact on the trees. There is no concrete on grade and the storage area will have a paver flooring to protect the tree roots.

Commissioner Pratt asked about the location and siting it on the property line. Mr. Arnett responded that there are several setback requirements including a 5 foot distance between the buildings and the location was determined to respect the 3 ft side setbacks the rear setback the structure distance and to preserve the existing patio space. He said that the new building encroaches 3 inches less into the setback than the existing building. Commissioner Rowe asked about the board and batten siding and why the material was changed. Mr. Arnett responded that it is a choice by the applicant and a material that is allowed under the standards. Commissioner Arlen spoke in favor of the tree protection measures and reiterated her understanding of the encroachment specifics. Mr. Arnett stated that overall there will be no greater impact from what is there already. Commissioner Pratt stated that he felt the siting is too tight and forced in and again asked for the reasoning behind the location. Mr. Arnett stated that many properties in the districts are in this situation due to the small lot sizes when you apply the modern setback requirements.

**Keisha Hadden, 404 W. Bessemer Avenue, sworn in** and speaking on behalf of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. Ms. Hadden stated that the property owner met with the board and presented their project. The FPNA voted in support. She said there is an Air BNB next door so no permanent resident will be impacted. She did say that they were not aware of the material change from lap siding to board and batten siding.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the appropriateness of the use of the board and batten siding. Acting Chair Graeber stated that in the Standards Board and Batten siding is an acceptable material for new construction accessory structures. Mr. Cowhig stated the primary structure is fully covered in aluminum siding including areas of the gambrel roof that should have shingles. Some commissioners felt that the new building should pay homage to the original accessory structure and mimic the original structure more closely. It was stated again that either material is in keeping with the standards. Commissioner Leimenstoll added that in her experience, having written Historic Guidelines and Standards for several communities, it is important to understand that we (the commission) are not being asked what we prefer. We are asked to apply the standards.

Legal Counsel Mr. Ducharme added 2 points. 1) that the relative factor of the size of the lot dimensions creates the hardships when modern zoning requirements are applied and 2) when discussing the idea of paying “homage” to a previous design there is a risk to cherry pick when you replicate and when you don’t which created an inconsistency in the application of the standards.

***Commissioner Rowe moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2734, 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 Standards on page 36 standards 2, 3, and 4 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded, Jo Leimenstoll.***

**The Commission voted 4-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Rowe, Leimenstoll. Nays: Pratt. Abstain: Arnett**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2734 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mitchell Kampuis for work at 700 Magnolia Street. Seconded by Nicholls.**

**The Commission voted 4-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Leimenstoll, Rowe. Nays: Pratt. Abstain: Arnett.**

#### **APPROVED**

**Commissioner Leimenstoll moved to recommend in favor to the Board of Adjustment for a special exception for 700 Magnolia Street for an encroachment with in the 3 foot setback. Seconded by Katherine Rowe.**

**The Commission voted 4-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nichols, Leimenstoll, Rowe. Nays: Pratt. Abstain: Arnett.**

**Katherine Rowe made a motion to bring Chair Arnett back to the discussion. Seconded by Arlen Nicholls. Approved.**

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

None.

#### **ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Ms. Geary from the Historic District Program discussed the training requirements for Greensboro’s participation in the Certified Local Government program through the State Historic Preservation Office and relayed those training opportunities that commissioners have participated in. She also mentioned the Benbow Road and Civil Right Oral Historic project Public Update meeting last week. She stated that the Oral Historian and Architectural historian both spoke of their portions of the project and that The archivist at the UNCG library spoke about the collection that is being created with the information collected. The oral histories will be held at the State Archives collection.

#### **SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Keisha Hadden asked about the decision and discussion regarding the change in material for the new construction project and procedurally how that is handled. Staff advised that both materials are acceptable and the property owner selected one over the other and that is what the commissioners make their decision on. If the applicant had been present, part of the discussion may have resulted



in a condition that would have allowed both materials. As it is approved, if the property owner changed their mind and selects lap siding, that would require a change in the approval.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
October 25, 2023**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice-Chair), Arlen Nichols (College Hill), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Adrienne Israel, Jo Leimenstoll, Katherine Rowe, Deborah Kaufman.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig, Stefan Geary, Russ Clegg, Planning Department; Opata Kwame City Attorney's Office.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

Item 3d. to be continued. Moved by Bert Vanderveen and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Katherine Rowe. Approved.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Tracy Pratt

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The September 27, 2023 minutes were approved as submitted.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2738 (APPROVED)**  
**Location: 311 E. Hendrix Street**  
**Applicant: Madison Allen**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 10-4-2023**

**Description of Work:**

Replace garage door with entry door.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project in that this is a non contributing two story accessory structure with a single car bay opening. The applicants would like to utilize the garage space for recreation space. The current garage door is older and difficult to open and close. He explained that in some cases this is the type of project that would be approved at staff level because it is not easily visible from the street. However, he and Mrs. Geary reviewed and discussed the proposal and each had concerns. Mr. Cowhig had concerns over the substitute material of the door product which was fiberglass with insulated glass that requires trim that is not consistent with historic doors and Mrs. Geary was concerned that the door with sidelights was a more formal primary entrance door that would not have been used on an accessory structure. Mrs. Geary showed a zoomed in street image to demonstrate what of the structure is visible from behind the privacy fence.

He referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

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

not incongruous with the *Historic Standards—Accessory Structures and Garages* (pages 35-36) and *Non-contributing Structures* (page 67-68) for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The garage is a non-contributing structure on the National Register listing. It has a single one car garage opening that the project proposed to convert to a pedestrian entrance.

**Facts**

The proposed door design is indicative of a formal primary entrance with sidelights that would traditionally not be used on an accessory structure. The material of the door is a substitute material.

**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.*

**Guidelines page 68**

- 1. Every effort should be made to maintain the architectural integrity of non-contributing structures. Replacement materials should be carefully evaluated to ensure that they maintain the character of the building and the district. For example, covering of wood trim with vinyl on brick building is not recommended.*
- 2. It is not appropriate to add historic ornamentation to create the illusion of an historic structure.*
- 3. For additions and alterations, choose materials and treatments that maintain the character of the building's architectural style.*

*Recommended Condition:*

*That a different style door that is more indicative of an accessory dwelling unit is utilized with approval at the staff level. That if substitute materials are used they have the appearance and qualities of traditional materials.*

**In Support:**

**Madison Allen, 311 E. Hendrix Street, property owner, Sworn in.** Ms. Allen explained that they will be using the bottom for extra space for a TV room and then storage. It is not used for cards. The current door is deteriorated and they are looking for a door that is more functional and lets in light. Mr. Vanderveen asked if it is a custom door and she replied that it is and that they selected a window divider pattern to match the windows on the building.

**Linda Lane, 805 Magnolia St., FPNA, sworn in.** Ms. Lane stated that the FPNA voted to support the application as presented.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Leimenstoll commented that the glass meets a functional need and can't be easily seen from the public right of way. The design is fancier than desired but could be in the realm of

acceptability. Commissioner Vanderveen stated he would like to see something more compatible that matches the house but the door does match the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows and the structure is non-contributing.

**Commissioner Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2738, 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 Standards on page 36 standards 2, and Standards on pg. 68 1, 2 and 3 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Bert Vanderveen.**

**The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Vanderveen, Israel. Nays: none. Abstain: none.**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2738 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Madison Allen for work at 311 E. Hendrix. Seconded by Graeber.**

**Chair Arnett asked if commissioners wanted to add a condition regarding the design of the door and material of the door. Commissioner did not feel that a condition was necessary because they want the windows for light.**

**The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Vanderveen, Israel. Nays: none. Abstain: none.**

**APPROVED, with no conditions**

- (a) **Application Number: 3739 (APPROVED)**  
**Location: 500 Summit Avenue**  
**Applicant: Sherwin Williams**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 10-5-2023**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of dumpster enclosure.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project explaining that this is an existing set of dumpsters that serves the Sherwin Williams Paint Company building on Summit Avenue. They recently installed an screening enclosure around the existing dumpsters. The changes have been approved by Building Inspections. It was an oversight that a change like this would require a COA. Mr. Cowhig added that there is some question as to whether there is an abandoned alley running along the back property line. The area is already paved and used for Parking to serve the commercial properties that run along this block.

He referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards were provided as the Staff Comments:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic Standards—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24-27)* for the following reasons:

**Facts**

An dumpster enclosure was installed in 2021 in the rear corner of the parking lot of the Sherwin-Williams store at 500 Summit Avenue. It is a fairly common type with closely spaced vertical wood pickets. A Certificate of Appropriateness was not obtained for the enclosure. The Sherwin-Williams store is a non-contributing structure located at the entrance to the Dunleath Historic District.

**Standards (page 26)**

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

**In Support:**

**David Wharton, 667 Percy Street, Dunleath Neighborhood Association, Sworn in.** Mr. Wharton stated that the neighborhood association is in favor of the application and would like a condition that it is acceptable as long as it does not block the alley, if the alley is still in use.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the issue of the alley and concerns that a property owner had raised at the neighborhood meeting. There was no evidence that an alley exists because of the improvement that have been made on the properties that would abut the possible alley. Ms. Geary explained that the alley would be recorded on each individual property deed. In some cases, property owners have researched this and unused alleys have been reopened but this is a civil matter that would not be under the authority of the HPC. She explained that any improvements removed or added in regards to the alley, for example relocating a fence would require a COA or any work to, for example, pave a reopened alley would also require a COA. But, the matter of opening or closing the alley would not.

Staff explained that there is a solid system in place that makes the permitting office aware of projects that are in the districts but that due to the nature of this project they likely didn't realize a COA would be required for a modern commercial property. It was noted on the building permit form that the line that states Historic District is marked as no. Staff stated it was likely filled out by the Sherwin Williams headquarters that are out of state. Staff explained the reasons for creating an improved notification system and that it has been working well for the last 2-3 years. Mr. Cowhig stated that staff receives calls from the Building Inspections office on a regular basis to obtain more information when a property is flagged as historic.

Commissioner Rowe cited language on page 10 of the Standards pertaining to Non-Contributing structures that reads: Decisions that make practical and aesthetic sense that may be contrary to specific standards are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the guidelines.

Commissioner Nichols had further questions on the Building Inspections approval. Further discussion on the coordination with Building Inspections was put on hold to finish the project review.

***Commissioner Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2739, 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 Standards on page 24 and 27 Standard #1 and the statement on page 10 read by Commissioner Rowe are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Jo Leimenstoll.***

The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Vanderveen, Israel. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2739 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Sherwin Williams for work at 500 Summit Avenue. Seconded by Kaufman.

The Commission voted 8-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nichols, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Kaufman, Vanderveen, Israel. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

**APPROVED, with no conditions**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Clegg, Planning Department, provided an update on the Historic District Design Standards project and that Samantha Smith of Gate City Preservation was selected from the Proposal process.

The upcoming training opportunity on November 14 was discussed regarding the Resiliency Workshop that will be held at Revolution Mills with the School of Government and Jo Leimenstoll will be a presenter. It addresses water, wind and natural disaster protection.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

David Wharton spoke on an upcoming event that he is hosting on November 9 at 7:00 at 667 Percy Street in regards to the Strong Town Movement which strives to encourage reuse and sustainable development. He invited commissioners to attend this kick off meeting. Mrs. Geary stated that she will provide details for the two mentioned events to commissioners so they can RSVP.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG