

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
January 31, 2024**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Arlen Nicolls (College Hill), Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Adrienne Israel, Katherine Rowe, Deborah Kaufman.

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Jo Leimenstoll, Bert Vanderveen, Sharon Graeber

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The December 6, 2023 minutes were approved with no corrections.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2887 (APPROVED with conditions)**  
**Location: 668 Chestnut Street**  
**Applicant: Donna Anthony**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 12-29-2023**

**Description of Work:**

Replace front door.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project in that it is for the request to replace a non-original front door. The property is in the Dunleath Historic District and is a brick craftsman style house. The front current front door is a style that is more indicative of doors used after 1950 in minimal traditional and ranch style architecture. He noted that there is a second application in the packet for work at the back of the property that is approvable at staff level. The request today also includes the replacement of the front screened door. He described the proposed replacement door in that it is fiberglass and is more of a traditional craftsman style with an upper light pattern. Staff supports the application referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards that 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 District Standards, Windows and Doors* (pages 55-61) if conditions are met:

**Fact**

This brick bungalow is a contributing structure in the Summit Avenue NRHD. The style and detailing of the existing door suggests that it may not be original. The replacement door is similar to craftsman style doors and would be an appropriate replacement door.

### **WINDOWS AND DOORS (page 57)**

1. *The front door is usually the focal point of the house and a key architectural feature. Original doors found in Historic Districts typically are wood panel doors with a fixed pane of glass, often with a muntin pattern similar to that of the windows. Solid wood doors are also seen in the districts, and usually have sidelights and fanlights with fixed panes of clear, beveled, or stained glass surrounding the doorframe. Because of their strong link to and indication of the architecture and style of a building, original windows and doors should be maintained, repaired when necessary, and preserved as one of the defining elements of a historic structure.*

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.*

### **Recommended Condition**

That the door be smooth surface and painted and that it fit the opening without any blocking.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if the screen door is original as it is an unusual design. Mr. Cowhig stated he did not believe so and the preferred type of new storm doors is the full view style.

### **In Support:**

**Donna Anthony, property owner, Sworn in.** Ms. Anthony explained that the screen door is not original to the house. She is the third owner and the screen door was installed by the second owner about 25 years ago and not the original owner of 80 years. She said that she prefers a full view screen door and is happy to use that style if this is requested. Commissioners asked questions regarding the type of hardware on the screen door since that door will be most visible. She said that she does not know the type of hardware and door handle that will be on the door. She also stated she is willing to donate the doors to Architectural Salvage.

### **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 change. Ms. Rowe states that this is an update that fits within the standards and is a more appropriate style door for a craftsman house. Mr. Pratt requested that the storm door have a round knob handle rather than a modern push button style that is commonly seen. Commissioners discussed that the door material is acceptable if the finish is a smooth style as indicated in the recommended staff condition

***Commissioner Rowe moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2887, 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 58 Standards 1 and 2 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Pratt.***

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Israel, Pratt. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2887 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Donna Anthony for work at 668 Chestnut Street with the following conditions: That a full view storm door with no support bar is used, that the handle is a round knob style, and that the door be smooth surface and painted and that it fit the opening without any blocking. Seconded by Nicolls.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Israel, Pratt. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

**APPROVED, with conditions.**

- (b) **Application Number: 2882 (APPROVED with Conditions)**  
**Location: 606 Summit Avenue**  
**Applicant: Amanda Sumrall**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 12/13/23**

**Description of Work:**

Remove a catalpa tree and a locust tree from front yard.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project explaining that there are two trees that are volunteers and have outgrown the space that they are in which is causing damage to the hardscape features of the landscape areas. He stated that Judson Clinton the City Arborist has inspected them and they are healthy. However, they are not part of the landscape plan that was approved the Historic Preservation Commission in 2007. Based on google images it appears that the trees are less than 15 years old. They are close to the sidewalk and other hardscape features and are growing into the utility lines. It is an opportunity to plant new trees in a more suitable location.

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 view the proposed work is not incongruous with the Historic District Design Standards—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23) for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The trees are volunteers and were not included in the approved landscape plan for the property. They could eventually cause problems for the hardscape features in the front yard. Other tree varieties could be more in keeping with the character of the historic district.

### **Guidelines (page 23) under Trees and Landscaping**

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

**Recommended Condition:** That 2 new trees are started on the property in a location that will not interfere with hardscape improvements.

#### **In Support:**

**Amanda Sumrall, Property Owner, 2418 Regents Park Lane. Sworn in.** Ms. Sumrall stated that there are a few reasons for this request. The first is that they are volunteer trees that are not part of the approved landscape plan and garden design for the front yard. The second the front circle area is supposed to be a flower bed but the tree shade and roots won't allow flowers to grow. Third, the tree on the left is has roots that have caused thousands of dollars in damage to the pipes. And fourth, the bricks and other hardscape that are part of the plan are being damaged. She presented an image of the original landscape plan that did not indicate trees in the two areas. She also described that the property has been in the family for many years but owned by different family members who maintained it in different ways. She became the owner in 2021 and has since been working to make updates, repairs and maintain the landscaping.

#### **In Opposition:**

None.

#### **In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

#### **Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed their concerns over the removal of healthy trees and the definition of a "mature" tree. Mr. Cowhig explained that the trees are younger than 15 years and still considered young and growing. Typically "mature" refers to a tree that has reached its full size. Commissioner Israel referred to the standards that allows for the removal of healthy trees when they are causing damage and structural concerns. Staff showed images from google street view to show how the trees are close in proximity to hardscape and growing into the overhead utility lines. Ms. Israel emphasized the practical nature to this request and that the roots are causing damage to the property including the hardscape features and the underground utility pipes which recently had to be replaced. And questioned the practicality in keeping a tree or trees that are growing into a waterline. She doesn't see how the community character will be impacted negatively by the removal of the trees. Chair Arnett agreed and stated that the trees are volunteers and aren't featured in the landscape plan. They are less than 15 years old. Each tree has been problematic in its own way. Commissioner Nicolls commented that the standards encourage street trees close to the right of way but she does see the harm that the roots of the tree system have impacted the hardscape. She recommends that 2 trees are planted on the parcel.

***Commissioner Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2882, 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 Trees and Landscaping on page 23 #1 Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district are acceptable as finding of facts. Commissioners accepted an amendment to include Standard #2 When replacing trees that are causing***

structural problems carefully consider the new location so that the tree will be able to mature in a healthy manner. Seconded: Israel.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Nicolls, Rowe, Pratt, Kaufman, Israel. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2882 and approves a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mindy Sumrall for work at 606 Summit Avenue with the following condition: that 1 to 2 trees are planted on the property of a species and location in consultation with the City Arborist. Seconded by Israel.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Israel, Pratt. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

**APPROVED with Conditions**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Commissioner Rowe provided information on a new effort that would include both current and retired commissioners as a sub-committee to help with community education and outreach in the historic districts. Other activities could be addressed as well including the Design Review Committee concept that is in the Rules and Procedures and was an active sub-committee for many years providing design assistance to property owners. Commissioner Rowe along with Retired Commissioner Arneke and Adams will continue to work with staff to develop a proposal for review by the HPC members.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

On March 7<sup>th</sup> there will be a public meeting for Historic District Property Owners to discuss the Standards Update project.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Lisa Eustathiou, a property owner in College Hill, spoke about an existing issue with one of her properties regarding drainage and the roof configuration. It was suggested that a sub-committee could be created to help her determine the best approach. Since this is an outstanding violation staff will research the legalities of utilizing the sub-committee feature.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Mike Cowhig*

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
February 28, 2024**

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

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Jo Leimenstoll

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The January 31, 2024 minutes were approved with no corrections.

Speakers were sworn in.

A motion was made to recuse Commissioner Arnett for a conflict of interest for item 3a. Made by Tracy Pratt, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bert Vanderveen. Vice-Chair Graeber opened the first public hearing item.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2894 (APPROVED with conditions)**  
**Location: 210 W. Fisher Avenue**  
**Applicant: Pauravi B. Shippen-How**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 2-7-24**

**Description of Work:**

Changes to approved addition plans. Replacement of porch flooring.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project in that the HPC has approved two additions previously and this current proposal is significantly smaller in size. It eliminates making changes to a dormer on the rear elevation. The addition also includes a deck which has been approved as part of the previous designs. He mentioned the significance of the front porch and that it is a character defining feature of this Queen Anne Cottage style structure. The porch has what appears to be original wood tongue and groove flooring. The property was neglected for many years so there is deterioration of portions of the porch flooring. The porch balustrade is unique in that it is curved. The application requests the full replacement of the porch flooring with a synthetic material called timbertek. Mr. Cowhig referred to the Standards under Additions, page 75-76, Patios and decks page 42 and Porches, Entrances and Balconies page 64. Ms. Geary explained that staff recommended condition #4 is because there are other work items in the application that still need clarification on approach and material. Staff supports the application with conditions and referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards:

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 (page 42) and Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64) for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

The addition approved on February 22, 2023 has been scaled back and should have less of an impact on the historic structure than before. It should not compromise the integrity of the historic structure.

### **Facts**

Construction materials for new addition and deck will remain as approved: siding that matches the reveal of the original siding, corner boards, window casings, drip cap, that match the original as closely as possible; etc.; similar foundation brick, double-hung windows of matching design; deck railing similar to the front porch railing. Compatible but slightly different construction materials will help distinguish the addition from the house.

### **Facts**

Because the house is sited so close to the street the front porch is especially prominent. The difference between composite and true wood tongue and groove flooring would be noticeable. Wood of a good quality, properly installed should last indefinitely if it is kept painted and maintained properly.

### **Standards for Additions (page 76)**

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

### **Standards for Patios and Decks (page 42)**

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

### **Standards for Porches, Entrances and Balconies (page 64)**

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

deteriorated porch elements with incompatible materials, such as metal supports and railings for wooden columns and rails, or concrete for wooden steps.

### **Conditions**

That wood tongue-and-groove flooring be used to replace the front porch floor and that the curved railing be carefully repaired rather than replaced.

That original windows and doors are repaired and not replaced.

That Cementitious Siding (Hardiboard) material only be used on the addition and not to replace wood siding.

That any work listed in this application outside of the addition and the porch flooring project come back with more details.

### **In Support:**

**Brooks Shippen-How, property owner, Sworn in.** Ms. Shippen-How explained that the porch flooring needs to be replaced because water is seeping into her basement. She is proposing the timbertek material and showed the commission a sample of the product. She said the porch is over her basement and the timbertek will provide a better barrier to water getting into the basement. She prefers the composite material to wood. She said the porch is hidden by the landscaping. She said this same material was used at 808 Olive Street.

Commissioner Pratt stated that decking is not a waterproof membrane. Wood decking if installed properly can last 10 years. Commissioner Rowe and Pratt pointed out that in the case of 808 Olive Street it was only approved because this is an area that is an exposed section of the porch flooring and wood replacement materials had failed several times. Ms. Shippen-How stated that there will be a waterproof system underneath. Commissioner Vanderveen asked where the water is coming from because it is a covered porch. The roof and flooring is deteriorated and this is why. Ms. Shippen-How said she doesn't want to use wood because she doesn't want to repair it in 10 years. Mr. Cowhig asked if the front porch has a pitch to it. Traditionally, porches were constructed to shed water away from the house.

**Micheal Fuco-Rizo, project consultant, Sworn in.** Mr. Fuco-Rizo describe the product and that dimensionally it matches what is currently on the property. He and Ms. Shippen-How addressed Mr. Cowhig's question about the flooring pitch and stated that it no longer has a pitch but this will be corrected when the porch floor is installed. In response to commissioner questions, they stated that the finish will be the "cypress" color which is a brown color and there will be a grain to it. A product brochure was passed around. The product is 1 ¼ inch. Mr. Cowhig stated that currently available flooring is ¾ inch thick. They stated that the framing would also be of a composite material including the skirt board. Mr. Fuco-Rizo stated the composite is available but the railing and columns will be repaired. If they use a different material other than wood for elements other than the flooring they will come back to the commission. They are only asking to use the composite material for the porch flooring. Commissioner Vanderveen asked about the metal roof on the porch. The applicant responded first that it will be an asphalt composition roof material. Commissioners pointed out that the type of roof does not allow for that type of material because it is a flat roof. Mr. Fuco-Rizo stated that the metal roof will be replaced with a metal roof. Commissioners requested more information on the metal roof replacement material.

**Cheryl Pratt, Preservation Greensboro Development Fund, Sworn in.** Ms. Pratt stated that PGDF sold this property to the applicant and holds an architectural easement and renovation agreement on the property. She said they are in support of the application but brought up concerns to make sure that no original windows are replaced and concerns about a new driveway shown in the plans. She said the current driveway encroaches on the neighbor's property. She said there is



no easement to allow this encroachment. The new property owner's realstate agent did ask if they could provide one but PGDF does not have an easement or encroachment agreement for the driveway. She said they agree to the use of the Hardi-board material on the addition but do not consider the timbertek a compatible replacement material for wood porch flooring. She also stated the manufacturer recommends the use of a trim board to cover the ends and this is not a traditional porch floor treatment.

**Linda Lane, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association, Sworn in.** Ms. Lane said that the FPNA does support the application but that they object to the use of any synthetic materials and that the porch should be repaired with wood materials.

**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 project focusing on the acceptable nature of the use of hardiboard (cementitious siding) material on the addition. The commissioners discussed the appropriateness of the porch floor material change. There were questions about the different other items mentioned that did not have more information provided and that the recommended condition #4 should be expanded to require the property owner to come back with more specific materials and project details for these other items like walkways, driveway, and porch roof. Commissioners agreed that the synthetic materials suggested for the porch repairs on the flooring and wood materials and the roof is straying too far from historic preservation standards. Commissioner Pratt reiterated that the asphalt composition shingles would not be the correct roofing material to replace the flat metal roof.

***Commissioner Rowe moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2894, 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 76, 42 and 64 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Isreal.***

**The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Vanderveen, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Israel, Pratt. Nays: none. Abstain: Arnett.**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2894 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Brooks Shippen-How for work at 210 W. Fisher Avenue with the following conditions:**

That wood tongue-and-groove flooring be used to replace the front porch floor along with wood materials for any associated trim work and that the curved railing be carefully repaired rather than replaced.

That original windows and doors are repaired and not replaced.

That Cementitious Siding (Hardiboard) material only be used on the addition and not to replace wood siding.

That any work listed in this application outside of the addition and the porch flooring project come back with more details.

That a specific materials list be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Seconded by Vanderveen.

The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Israel, Pratt, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: Arnett.

APPROVED, with conditions.

Commissioners voted to have Commissioner Arnett return to the meeting.

- (b) **Application Number: 2890 (Denied)**  
**Location: 201 S. Tate Street**  
**Applicant: Don Cato**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 1/16/24**

**Description of Work:**

Replace front door. (After-the-fact)

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that the property owner has purchased several deteriorated properties within College Hill and has been working on renovating the properties over the last year. In this case, the property owner did obtain a salvaged door from Architectural Salvage but the door style does not match the original historic door that was removed. The property owner understands this and is working with staff to find an appropriate replacement. The original front door, shown in the staff presentation, is a typical Queen Anne Victorian door with the bottom half paneled and the top half as full glass. Staff recommends denying the application but allowing the property owner extra time to locate an appropriate door replacement. He explained that other work on the application can be approved at Staff Level. He said there are some changes to the back non-original façade that needs more research to make sure it can be done to meet code. Staff will work with the property owner on this. He also suggested that this property be considered for County Landmark Status.

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 against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the replacement door is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards: Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)*, for the following reasons:

**Facts**

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District

**Facts**

The front door that was recently replaced appeared to be the original front door. It was a style of door found commonly on late Victorian houses such as this with a single large pane of glass above wood panels. The replacement door is a solid wood paneled door without glass.

**WINDOWS AND DOORS (page 57)**

1. *The front door is usually the focal point of the house and a key architectural feature. Original doors found in Historic Districts typically are wood panel doors with a fixed*

*pane of glass, often with a muntin pattern similar to that of the windows. Solid wood doors are also seen in the districts, and usually have sidelights and fanlights with fixed panes of clear, beveled, or stained glass surrounding the doorframe. Because of their strong link to and indication of the architecture and style of a building, original windows and doors should be maintained, repaired when necessary, and preserved as one of the defining elements of a historic structure.*

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.*

**In Support:**

**Don Cato, 3513 Henderson, Sworn in.** Mr. Cato stated that he has purchased 9 properties in total located in College Hill all from a long time property owner estate. He wants to do the work right on these properties and has invited staff out to help guide him on the renovation. He said he made a mistake in purchasing the wrong salvaged door but will work with staff to find the best replacement. He said he asks for guidance as he works on these properties. In addition to the front door he is requesting the removal of the door on the back as it is not needed as an entrance to that unit. If the doors and any windows are removed he will replace with siding to match the original as closely as possible. The removal of the back door will help to eliminate the exterior staircase and create a less cluttered appearance. He reiterated that the current front door he is considering as temporary until a new door is found. It was discussed that Fire Code should be consulted to make sure the removal of the back second entrance is allowed.

**Samantha Smith, 211 Tate Street, sworn in.** Representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association she stated they are thrilled with the effort that Mr. Cato is putting into these properties. She stated that he is also doing these as both Federal and State Historic Tax Credit projects.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners asked questions in regards to how the tax credit review process overlaps with their review. Samantha Smith, who is a Historic Preservation Tax Credit consultant, explained the process and that she has documented the project and the proposed changes. They may move forward with changes and if needed make adjustments if the SHPO staff have any concerns. There was a question regarding the addition of handrails at the front steps.

The public hearing was reopened to allow the property owner to address those questions. Mr. Cato explained that he would like to add handrails to the front step area. It was discussed that metal railings are most compatible and that this can be approved at staff level.

***Commissioner Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2890, 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 Windows and Doors page 57 Standards 1 and 2 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Pratt.*

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

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2890 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Don Cato for work at 201 S. Tate Street. Seconded by Graeber.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Israel, Pratt, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

#### **DENIED**

- (c) **Application Number: 2891 (Denied)**  
**Location: 126 S. Tate Street**  
**Applicant: Don Cato**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 1/16/24**

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

Replace front door.

#### **Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that the property has already had the front door replaced by the previous owner and the current owner, Don Cato, would like to replace it with a more suitable front door however the one proposed in the application is not appropriate. He described the property as originally having a wrap around porch on both sides however it was closed in for interior space over time.

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 against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion, the replacement door is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards: Windows and Doors (pages 55-61)*, for the following reasons:

#### **Facts**

This is a contributing structure in the College Hill Historic District

#### **Facts**

The front door that was recently replaced appeared to be the original front door. It was a style of door found commonly on late Victorian houses such as this with a single large pane of glass above wood panels. The replacement door is a solid wood paneled door with two small lights at the top which is a Colonial Revival style..

#### **WINDOWS AND DOORS (page 57)**

1. *The front door is usually the focal point of the house and a key architectural feature. Original doors found in Historic Districts typically are wood panel doors with a fixed pane of*

glass, often with a muntin pattern similar to that of the windows. Solid wood doors are also seen in the districts, and usually have sidelights and fanlights with fixed panes of clear, beveled, or stained glass surrounding the doorframe. Because of their strong link to and indication of the architecture and style of a building, original windows and doors should be maintained, repaired when necessary, and preserved as one of the defining elements of a historic structure.

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.

**In Support:**

**Don Cato, 3513 Henderson, Sworn in.** Mr. Cato said he nothing else to add.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners agreed this was similar to the other case and the property owner understands what type of door is best and will work with staff.

***Commissioner Kaufman moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2891, 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 Windows and Doors page 57 Standards 1 and 2 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Rowe.***

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

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2891 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Don Cato for work at 126 S. Tate Street. Seconded by Pratt.**

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

**DENIED**

- (d) **Application Number: 2892 (APPROVED with conditions)**  
**Location: 614 S. Mendenhall Street**  
**Applicant: Don Cato**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 1/16/24**

**Description of Work:**

Remove Aluminum Siding.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that the property is considered as non-contributing on the National Register listing due to the aluminum siding and other alterations. The front entrance has changed, the siding has been covered. The roof form does appear to be original. He stated there was a fire in 1992 and this may have contributed to some of the changes. Staff is in favor of the application but suggests that a small test area may be helpful to understand what condition the original siding is in.

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 congruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Exterior Walls and Finishes (page 44-47)*, for the following reasons:

**Facts**

This is a non-contributing structure in the College Hill National Register Historic District. It was altered significantly when it was converted to apartments. It also suffered a severe fire in 1992.

**Facts**

Removal of the aluminum siding could help restore some of the historic character of the house. Since the exterior of the house has changed from the original arrangement of windows and doors it would be advisable to remove a test area at the back of the house first to assess the condition of the siding.

**Standards (page 47)**

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

**Recommended Condition**

That once the aluminum siding is removed any needed repairs be submitted for staff approval.

**In Support:**

**Don Cato, 3513 Henderson, Sworn in.** Mr. Cato stated this is for the removal of a product that does nothing to enhance the property.

**Samantha Smith, CHNA, Sworn in.** Ms. Smith explained that the project is planned in a way that will make the property a contributing structure in the National Register listing. She said this is done in the Part I section of the tax credit application. They will work with Mitch Wilds at the State office. They will remove the alterations and make repairs in a way that will restore the contributing status. The removal of the aluminum siding will hopefully reveal details that will assist in identifying original features and details.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners agreed this is a great project and are happy to approve the application. Commissioners agreed with the staff condition that was recommended.

***Commissioner Pratt moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2892, 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 Exterior Walls and Finishes (page 44-47) acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Nicolls.***

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

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2892 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Don Cato for work at 614 S. Mendenhall Street with the following conditions: That once the aluminum siding is removed any needed repairs be submitted for staff approval. Seconded by Israel.**

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

**APPROVED with conditions.**

**Public Hearing Portion was closed.**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Commissioner Graeber handed out notes that she took from her attendance at "CAMP" commissioner training presented by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. Ms. Graeber reviewed some of the highlights of the training and reflected on how thorough and helpful the training opportunity was.

Commissioner Rowe updated the commission on the "friends of HPC" efforts. She stated that a tax credit workshop is planned for May 11<sup>th</sup> from 10-12 and that they are working on revising the existing Historic District brochure.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

The GIS staff is working on a fillable application. Staff is using this as an opportunity to create a format that will require more direct and clearer information on the part of the applicant. This should help create a more efficient review process.

On March 7<sup>th</sup> there will be a public meeting for Historic District Property Owners to discuss the Standards Update project. This will be held at Greensboro College.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were no speakers from the audience.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG



**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
March 27, 2024**

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

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Jo Leimenstoll, Adrienne Isreal

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The February 28, 2024 minutes were approved with no corrections.

Speakers were sworn in.

A motion was made to recuse Commissioner Arnett for a conflict of interest for item 3a. Made by Tracy Pratt, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bert Vanderveen. Vice-Chair Graeber opened the first public hearing item.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2896 (APPROVED)**  
**Location: 307 Isabel Street**  
**Applicant: Andrea M. Whitney**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 2-16-24**

**Description of Work:**

Rear porch, deck and dormer additions; remove garage and construct new accessory building

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that this is a request to add a screened porch and deck, to remove an existing garage and construct a new accessory building. He described the proposed porch and deck project as all at the rear of the house and causing minimal changes to the original rear façade. He stated that the original shed/garage is contributing on the National Register District report however it has had the original door replaced. He further described that it is in sound condition for its age but that it was likely built on the ground. He can't say for certain though. He said it likely had access from an alley or shared drive. The size of the structure is more of a shed and that is how it currently is used. It would not fit a modern car. The new garage will be located in the same location. He also described that there is a small portion of the screened porch that encroaches on the side set back. The setback is 5 feet and the design places the porch 3 feet 7 inches from the property line. The projects requests a recommendation for a Special Exception to the 5 foot setback from the Board of Adjustment. He said the old garages and sheds were constructed prior to zoning and setback requirements being put in place by the City of Greensboro. This is one of those examples and why the Special Exception allowance exists.

Staff supports the application and referred the commissioners to the Staff Comments and the following facts and standards:

*Note: A Special Exception to the 5' setback requirement is needed for the porch addition. The Board of Adjustments can approve the Special Exception if it has first been recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission as needed to meet the intent of the Historic District Standards.*

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), *Garages and Accessory Structures* (pages 35-37), *Demolition* (page 73), *Roofs* (pages 51-54), *Patios and Decks* (Pages 41-42 for the following reasons:

### **Facts**

The dormer addition, screened porch addition, and deck addition will be located at the rear of the house and will not be visible from the street. They will not cause the removal of any character-defining features of the house. They will be recognizable as additions because of materials such as the double casement window on the back of the dormer addition. Construction materials will be compatible with those of the house including wood tongue-and-groove flooring for the screened porch, wood shingles for the walls of the dormer addition and deck railing that is similar in detail to front porch railings. The additions are relatively small and will not change the height of the structure and therefore should not compromise the integrity of the house.

### **Standards for Additions (pages 75-76)**

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.*

### **Standards for Patios and Decks**

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

### **Standards for Roofs (pages 51-54)**

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

### **Facts**

The garage is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The entrance appears to have been modified. Because modern automobiles are much larger than those of the 1920s, early garages are often considered obsolete.

**Standards for Demolition (page 73)**

*The demolition or removal of any structure in a Historic District requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The commission may not deny an application for demolition, but it may delay the effective date of the Certificate for up to 365 days in the case of a structure that contributes to the character of the Historic District.*

*Since the action cannot be reversed, the decision to demolish an historic structure should be carefully considered, and all alternatives to demolition should be explored.*

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

*Is there a well-developed proposal for the use of the site necessitating demolition?*

*Could another site serve the purpose just as well? • Could the existing structure be adapted to suit the owner's needs? • Could the property be sold to someone willing to preserve the building?*

*As a last resort, could the building be moved to another location?*

*Does the site have known or potential archaeological significance? • Is the structure of national, state or local significance?*

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

*Record the structure thoroughly with photographs and other documentation, including identifying and recording any special architectural features of the building, important landscape features, structures, and archeological significance of the site.*

*Protect any large trees or other important landscape features during demolition.*

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

**Facts**

The proposed accessory building has space for one car and an office. It is relatively small and will be in the same location as the original garage. Siding, doors, foundation and general form are consistent with historic outbuildings in the district. The proposed location is similar to the siting pattern of historic garages.

**Standards for Garages and Accessory Structures (page 37)**

- 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*

**In Support:**

**Andrea Whitney, property owner, Sworn in.** Ms. Whitney talked about her project and that they are moving to Greensboro and want to make changes that are respectful to the house and the district. She said the garage is more of a shed due to its size and that the floor is not dirt. She said that there is not anything very unique about it but it is in fine shape. She said the door is not original and seems to be plywood. She described the changes to the back of the house and that she reached out to neighbors. She does not know how the driveway is being used. She said they are using Pam Frye as the builder and that the project would happen at one time. She is agreeable to making the garage available to be moved to another location if someone is interested. It was also suggested that the garage could be salvaged. Commissioners described the idea of moving the structure with the applicant. She was agreeable to both moving and salvaging the old garage.

**Jesse Arnett, project architect, Sworn in.** Mr. Arnett spoke in regards to the changes in the garage and the old garage. The existing is 12x20 feet and the new is slightly larger at 14x24 feet in size. He described how the street and property lines are at odd angles and there is a slight encroachment due to how the house is situated on the lot. The screened porch is designed to not come out too far from the side of the house. The house is already encroaching on the side setback at the corner due to the angled property lines as shown in the site plan. He said the accessory structure will be at the allowable 3 foot setback. Commissioner Pratt asked about reducing the size of the screened porch to accommodate the setback. Mr. Arnett stated that a significant portion would have to be reduced because of the angle and then the porch roof crosses into the second story existing gable and dormer. He went on to explain that this configuration then misaligns the existing windows and doors so that they no longer line up properly with the porch. He said, however, the main reason is the roof and how it interacts with the dormer.

**Ann Stringfield, 1005 N. Eugene Street, Sworn in.** Ms. Stringfield said that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association unanimously vote to support the application. She said it is a complete application that takes the Standards into consideration. She said they also support the special exception because of the way the property lines and the distance to the house narrows towards the back of the lot.

**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 project and Commissioner Nicolls suggested a condition of a demolition delay on the garage so that relocation or salvage could be researched. Ms. Geary explained that the Commission does have the authority to delay the demolition for up to 365 days but they do not have the authority to require the structure be salvaged although it is perfectly acceptable to make that suggestion. Commissioner Rowe expressed that it seems appropriate for the commission to make a recommendation for the special exception to allow the appropriate location of the porch and to accommodate the angled property lines. She did express concern about fire safety as it pertains to providing appropriate setbacks and acknowledged this is for the BOA to consider. Commissioner Graeber thanked the applicant for the level of detail and said that the project is not observable from the street.

***Commissioner Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2896, 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 76, 42, 54 and 73 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Kaufman.***

**The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Vanderveen, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Pratt. Nays: none. Abstain: Arnett.**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2896 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Andrea Whitney for work at 307 Isabel Street. Seconded by Vanderveen.**

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

**APPROVED.**

**Commissioner Kaufman moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommend in favor of a special exception to the set back requirement at 307 Isabel Street because the project meets the intent of the Historic District Standards. Seconded: Vanderveen. The commission voted 5-1 in favor of the recommendation. Ayes: Graeber, Vanderveen, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman. Nays: Pratt. Abstain: Arnett.**

**Commissioners voted to have Commissioner Arnett return to the meeting.**

- (b) **Application Number: 2899 (Denied)**  
**Location: 925 Walker Avenue**  
**Applicant: Jeffrey Tate**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 3/1/24**

**Description of Work:**

Front porch floor and railing were replaced without a COA. The porch floor was replaced with 1 x 6 treated wood boards. (after-the-fact).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that the property is in the College Hill district. A Notice of Violation was sent because work was going on to replace the front porch railing and the porch flooring. The repairs used deck boards for the flooring where tongue and groove would have been the original material. He spoke about the purpose for tongue and groove flooring to have a tighter joint between boards and decrease the amount of water that can go under the foundation and house. Ms. Geary explained that in preparing for the meeting she did research on the site using historic photos from google maps and in their files. She determined, while showing, that the existing porch railing design has been in existence for almost 20 years with the 2007 being the last image in their files taken from a photographic inventory. The railing is not in violation. She indicated that while the railing appears to have not changed in design, the images do show that the flooring has been wood tongue and groove which is a violation. In the images, the smaller dimension of the board ends are visible. Mr Cowhig stated that Staff recommends denying the application

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

### **Facts**

The original front porch floor was constructed of traditional tongue-and-groove flooring lumber. The floor was replaced with 1 x 6 boards. The new boards do not match the distinctive character of tongue-and-groove flooring. T&G was used originally because it sheds water. Water can get through deck boards keeping the area below the porch wet.

Based on file photos the new railing is reasonably close to the look of the railing it replaced. It does not have the derailing of a traditional porch railing however and is not painted.

### **Standards (page 64)**

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

### **In Support:**

Mr. Cowhig stated the property owner lives out of State is not present.

### **In Opposition:**

**Samantha Smith, 211 Tate Street, sworn in.** Representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association she stated they are in agreement with the staff recommendation and also recommend tongue and groove flooring. She also added that the neighborhood and herself, specifically, are happy to speak with the property owner and help advise in any way they can.

**Ann Stringfield, 1005 N. Eugene St., sworn in.** Ms. Stringfield said she is representing Fisher Park and is commenting because it is important to all of the districts that the tongue and groove material for porch flooring is maintained.

**Haley Maloney, 6260 Ledbetter, Climax, sworn in.** Ms. Maloney introduced herself as the new executive director of Preservation Greensboro. She agreed that the tongue and groove flooring needs to be maintained. She did address the railing and had concerns that the wood is treated lumber and it's not recommended to be painted.

### **In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

### **Discussion:**

There was a discussion about the material and staff stated that while a clear grade wood is the preferred material there is nothing that prohibits the use of pressure treated wood. The images demonstrate that they have continually replaced this railing even as most recently shown in the google maps image from 2020 that shows new wood material. An opaque stain can be used that will have a solid finish that looks like paint and hopefully this railing will last longer. Commissioners

also agreed that the railing is not a change in design and would not constitute a violation however, it is clear that the flooring was tongue and groove and the Standards recommend in favor of replacing tongue and groove flooring to match.

***Commissioner Pratt moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2899, 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 (page 64)***

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

The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Rowe, Pratt, Kaufman, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2899 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jeffrey Tate for work at 925 Walker Avenue. Seconded by Nicolls.

The Commission voted 7-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Rowe, Kaufman, Pratt, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

## **DENIED**

- (c) **Application Number: 2900 (continued)**  
**Location: 307 Victoria Street**  
**Applicant: Carla and Michael Burns**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 3/5/24**

Mr. Cowhig explained that this application is continued to the next month to allow more time to research repair methods for the original chimney and slate roof.

**Commissioner Kaufman moved to continue item 3c to the April meeting to do more research on the slate roof. Seconded: Graeber. Unanimously approved.**

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

There was a brief discussion on the demolition of a National Register property in the Irving Park historic district.

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

Samantha Smith, Preservation Consultant for the Design Standards project gave an update on the project and the successful public meeting last month.

Mr. Cowhig announced that there will be another community scanning session for the East Greensboro/Benbow Park National Register and Oral History Project. The event will be on April 14 from 2-7.

Ms. Geary updated on the Dunleath Historic Retaining Wall Restoration program and that they have 4 grant applications that were submitted for review that would provide for the restoration of a wall that spans across 4 properties on Park Avenue.

Ms. Geary explained that there is a glitch with internet searches pertaining to the Greensboro COA application. The first search result is the Guilford County application and staff has received several applications on the wrong form. Staff is working with IT and the County staff to try to redirect this. IT has also set up a direct web address: [Greensboro-nc.gov/COA](http://Greensboro-nc.gov/COA) and neighborhood associations were asked to make residents aware of this direct address.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were no speakers from the audience.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG



**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
April 24, 2024  
Final**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice Chair), Arlen Nicolls (College Hill), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Jo Leimenstoll, Adrienne Israel.

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**  
None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**  
Tracy Pratt, Katherine Rowe, Deborah Kaufman,

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**  
The March 27, 2024 minutes were approved with two corrections.

Speakers were sworn in.

Commissioner Nicolls asked if she should recuse herself for item 3(a) because she was part of neighborhood discussions about the trees that were cut down. It was determined that the discussions took place prior to the submittal of the application and that a recusal was not necessary.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2912 (APPROVED with conditions)**  
**Location: Vicinity of 801 W. McGee Street, East of Greensboro College campus**  
**Applicant: Jason Geary, City of Greensboro Engineer**  
**Owner: City of Greensboro**  
**Date Application Received: 4-9-24**

**Description of Work:**  
Tree removal needed for stream restoration as part of the Downtown Greenway Project

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that the trees and underbrush were removed as part of a stream restoration project. The work realigns the stream and rebuilds the bank to help mitigate flooding. The work restores the natural habitat and removes the invasive vegetation and trees. He mentioned that the Greenway has had a positive impact to the historic districts and this is the last section that is being constructed. The overall work to the stream will help with flooding in the area as the historic Wafco Mills complex suffered heavy flooding about 10 years ago.

Procedurally, the Greenway Committee and the City of Greensboro did receive a COA for the Greenway project in this area however, as a significant time passed since the approval no one realized that the stream restoration portion was not covered under the COA until after the work was complete.

Staff comments were provided:

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—Neighborhood Setting; Trees and Landscaping (page 21-23) for the following reasons:

#### Facts

The eastern boundary of the College Hill Historic District follows the former railroad bed from W. McGee Street to W Market Street. The western leg of the Downtown Greenway will also follow the railroad bed. Stream flows from W. McGee Street on the west side of the railroad bed and then crosses under the railroad bed a short distance from W. McGee Street.

A Certificate of Appropriateness was approved for this section of the greenway in 2018 and it was understood that it was a major construction project and there would be substantial vegetation removal. The COA state that the Greenway project would come back if any significant trees were removed. Based on review of the College Hill Tree inventory, there were no trees on the inventory removed as part of the stream restoration process. The trees and vegetation removed were mainly invasive species not appropriate for the stream buffer.

Since this section of the greenway was approved, as a separate effort, private funds were secured for a stream restoration project that will help with stormwater capacity. In order to restore the stream heavy equipment must be brought in to remove silt and reshape the channel. Trees and other vegetation must be removed in order to restore the natural habitat and stream eco-system. Only a portion of the stream restoration project is within the Historic District boundary.

Landscaping will be installed part of the Greenway Project and landscape changes to the stream buffer will be made to support the environmental needs of the stream, mitigate flooding and support the establishment of a conservation easement.

Commissioners asked questions of staff regarding the project. Ms. Nicolls stated her shock at the work and that it completely removed all of the trees in this area. She continued to speak on the present condition and that it is a huge loss to the neighborhood. Ms. Geary stated that they considered the larger environmental concerns with the project and consulted with both the State Historic Preservation Office and with the Resiliency training that Jo Leimenstoll was involved with at the School of Government. Ultimately, staff decided to treat it as an amendment to the original COA. Chair Arnett directed the commission to first hear testimony on the project before stating their stance on the application. He said there are representatives here to explain the details on the project.

#### **In Support:**

##### **Jason Geary, City of Greensboro, Sworn in.**

Mr. Geary first apologized that they did not obtain a COA for this portion. He described the multi-million dollar phased project and that the stream restoration work to clear trees and vegetation was added to the approved work for the Greenway to help save on the preparation costs. He state the additional work for the restoration effort is being done through a Conservancy grant from the State of North Carolina. He described the work that is taking place to restore the Stream noting that the trees and vegetation were all volunteer vegetation that when growing within the stream and buffer causes environmental issues. The new work will allow new plantings to grow in an appropriate manner that helps the stream function efficiently. Mr. Geary stated that an extensive environmental report was done for the entire Greenway project. He can provide that to commission staff. He said the same contractor is doing the greenway and the restoration work and financially it makes sense to do the work at the same time and capitalize on that.

### **Dabney Sanders, Downtown Greenway Committee, Sworn in.**

Ms. Sanders introduced herself and said there were a few years that she was regularly in front of this group. She reiterated some of the points that Mr. Geary stated. She said this has been a long and complicated process. She spoke on the timeline of the project and that it is scheduled to be completed mid-late 2025. She said the funding is from the State for what is known as the College Branch Stream. She explained that while the restoration work was not originally planned as part of the Greenway, it was known that work was needed to rehabilitate the College Branch and when funding became available they applied and were awarded \$400,000 from a highly competitive NC Land and Water Fund grant. She stated they are happy to come back to show the final landscaping plans so the commission can see all of the trees and vegetation that will be going back in to this area. She said the Greenway work has to be completed first and this will take place in Summer 2024. The plantings for the greenway are minimal along the length of the greenway with more concentrated landscaping at the feature points, the restoration also has plantings but there is private funding set aside for additional plantings which will restore the tree canopy. She said that in preparation for the Greenway project they had conversations with residents from College Hill and Westerwood.

Mr. Vanderveen asked if the landscape architect had been hired and Ms. Dabney stated they will be done with a Landscape Architect but they will not engage that design process until the construction is complete because of the different obstacles that they face unexpectedly during the construction. She said it is the last step and we must wait for construction and then there will be a community engagement session.

Ms. Nicolls said it does not look good at all with the silt and the build up along the stream that makes it unsightly. She clarified that the landscaping won't happen until 2025. She said that regardless of what was recorded on the tree inventory this still removed 100s of years of tree growth. She said the marketing materials for the greenway did not look like this and showed a tree canopy. She suggests that Willow Trees and Oaks are planted back if nothing else to honor the trees that were removed.

### **In Opposition:**

Patty \*\*\*\*, 972 Carr Street, sworn in. College Hill neighborhood association. She said that Arlen remarked on many of the concerns on the minds of College Hill. There was great concern was expressed over the loss of the trees and what she described as a park like setting. She said it was a shock for the neighborhood to see the removal of all of the vegetation. And that it will take quite some time to see that canopy restored. It is emotional for her and they would like to have it restored and replanted if possible. She said that from the plans it looks like it will be a manicured area and as a community they do not want that. They want what was there before the trees were removed with the bunnies and birds and even foxes and plans to "re-wild" that space. She said this stretch gets very hot during the summer so tree coverage is important which will be beneficial to the users of the greenway. They would like to be part of the process.

### **In Rebuttal:**

There was no rebuttal.

The public hearing was closed.

### **Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the project and Commissioner Arnett stated that this is an after the fact application and we are asked to review the project as if the work has not been completed. He said that Standard #1 speaks to retaining mature trees. He stated that while trees were removed the larger project is the stream restoration work which has environmental benefit and landscaping plans. Ms. Isreal asked if they are being asked to validate the work at this point? Mr. Arnett said this is an

addendum to the original COA for this portion and the stream restoration is just within the boundary and this work enlarged the boundaries of the project. Ms. Israel asked if they should ask for plantings? Mr. Cowhig explained that if commissioners want to place planting conditions they would need to approve it. The HPC can not place conditions on a denial. Commissioner Graeber stated that commissioners should look at the bigger picture. The City plans to come back and replace trees and vegetation under the guidance of a landscape architect. Those trees had to go to make way for the greater good of the project per the engineering drawings. She said that no longer how much we love trees sometimes they have to be removed. She said that residents all over the City have to deal with this for utility purposes. She said she understands the surprise but sees the larger benefit of the overall project. Ms. Nicolls said that the neighborhood wants the trees to be put back. Ms. Graeber stated that new trees of the correct species and in location will be planted. Mr. Arnett addressed the public process for the landscaping will take place. He spoke about the Standards and how or if they even fall under this purview as he sees this project as outside the concept of the "Neighborhood Setting". He considers the neighborhood setting the trees in the yards of the historic properties and along the streetscape. He said this project is different to him from the normal tree removal request. It's different from the neighborhood tree canopy. He said for his entire life this has been an overgrown ditch next to an abandoned railroad track. The project will put back something greater than what was there. He described a project on the NC State campus when he was in school that removed vegetation and trees for a stream restoration project. He visited recently and the canopy was mature and there are wetlands included. It was incredible—it was a very positive impact. It is startling the clear cutting. But he feels that the project is being judged on an unfinished project. He noted that while today it looks unsightly it is in the early stages of the project and it would be like judging the construction of a building when only the foundation has been built.

He directed Commissioners to consider the project as if the work has not been done yet. This is their charge when reviewing after-the-fact projects. He said that he feels given the environmental nature of the project he would have supported this work for all the reasons he has previously stated. Chair Leimenstoll commented that a condition should be placed on approval regarding plants and that the community should be involved in that process. She asked about the tree inventory. Ms. Geary stated that during the inventories for both Dunleath and College Hill that it was determined not to capture the areas along the railways because they were recognized as areas of just volunteer growth and vegetation. Commissioners clarified that a landscape plan was forthcoming. It could be a condition of approval. Staff stated that the commission could stipulate a certain size trees. We know from working with our arborists we have learned that there is a right size for optimum growth.

***Commissioner Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2912, 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 23 #s 1,2,3 and 5 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Jo Leimenstoll.***

**Staff addressed the commission in regards to a question from the applicant. She said that the applicant is concerned about not being able to replace in the same location and with the same species since the trees removed were mainly invasive. Mr. Arnett said it allows for a different location and more appropriate species.**

**The Commission voted 5-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Vanderveen, Arnett, Israel, Leimenstoll. Nays: Nicolls.**

**In regards to a question by Ms. Israel in applying the Standards, Ms. Geary stated that the trees could be considered as causing structural damage to the stream.**

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2912 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jason Geary with the City of Greensboro for work at the vicinity of 810 W. McGee Street with the following conditions: that the landscape plan to be developed is brought back to the commission for approval. Seconded by Graeber.

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

**APPROVED with conditions.**

1:04

- (b) **Application Number: 2900 (Denied)**  
**Location: 307 Victoria Street**  
**Applicant: Carla and Michael Burns**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 3/5/24**

**Description of Work:**

Remove Chimney above the roof; replace slate shingles with asphalt shingles

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig explained that the application is continued from last month's meeting. It is located in the Fisher Park historic district. He described that the application is for work at the chimney and roof. The chimney has been covered in stucco and that there are leaking issues likely due to the underlayment having reached its lifespan. The application describes 3 options which include repair the slate roof shingles and stone chimney covered in stucco, repair the slate tiles and remove the chimney to the roof line or remove the chimney to the roof line and replace slate with asphalt shingles.

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 against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Roofs (pages 51-54), Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (pages 48-50)* for the following reasons:

**Facts**

The existing chimney appears to have been covered with stucco many years ago. Water is getting into the structure possibly because of deteriorated flashing around the chimney. A possible solution might be to remove the stucco covering the flashing, repair or replace the flashing, and then repair the stucco.

**Standards (page 53)**

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.*

### **Facts**

The slate shingles appear to be in reasonably good condition considering that they were installed in the 1920s. The roof is leaking however. The slates may need to be removed, the underlayment and flashing repaired or replaced and then the slates reinstalled. If replacement is not feasible then replacement with asphalt composition shingles is an acceptable alternative.

### **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.*

### **In Support:**

**Michael Burns, 307 Victoria Street, Property owner, sworn in.** He explained that they have had several repairs made and have patched the stucco and shingles three times but it continues to leak. He said the slate is called Buckingham Slate and was told it is the best type but it is the underlayment that is the issue. All other work on the house must wait on the slate/roof work first. He spoke with Piedmont Stone on the chimney which is stucco over stone. He said that to remove the chimney and rebuild it the cost is \$9000. He also said that they slate is not in terrible condition but it is becoming more and more difficult to find craftsman that can do the repairs. There was a discussion on what is the more important feature, the slate roof or the chimney and Mr. Cowhig said he believes the chimney is more important because it is part of the form of the building. Mr. Arnett stated that it is the living room fireplace and has interior significance. Mr. Burns said that it is not stable in terms of water tight and that they repair work will not be warranted. Mr. Burns said that they have had scaffolding out for the chimney and roof repairs. He said the repair work is very complicated. Ms. Leimenstoll asked if they have worked with the State Historic Preservation Office yet to seek advice and analyze the possible causes. She said that the slate tiles can last 100 years but the underlayment only lasts for 70 years. The applicant indicated that they would be interested in contacting the State Office for guidance. Commissioner Graeber spoke about the resources that the State would have for finding contractors that are familiar with this work and can help with cost savings. Mr. Arnett said that it does seem like a two step problem where part of the work requires that the slate be removed in order to repair the underlayment and then relayed while also tying it in with the chimney work to flash it properly. And then there is the question of if the slate or a shingle should go back. The City attorney suggested that Commissioners may wish to continue the item to allow for this.

### **In Opposition:**

**Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street, Fisher Park NA. Sworn in.** The FP board discussed this last and this month and felt that there is not enough information on the applicants plans because there are three different options. They request additional details.

Speaking as herself, as a neighbor and form HPC member she stated she is grateful to hear the discussion today and feels that the front facing chimney and original slate roofs character defining features that should be retained and repaired not removed and replaced. She asked them to reference Roof Standards 1,2 and 3 and Masonry 1,2,3,4 and 6. She spoke about the stucco that

had been added and that it is not appropriate to apply layers of stucco which can accelerate deterioration. She feels that stucco should not go back and the slate should be repaired not replaced.

**Linda Lane, 805 Magnolia Street, sworn in.** Supporting the statement that Ann has made. She does not represent the board.

**In Rebuttal:**

Mr. Burns said that there seems to be concern over the three different proposals. He said that when they purchased the house they didn't know the stucco had been added and they've had difficulty finding masons. He will follow up further. He said that it seems the application will not pass and they will reapply with a different plan. He said that he agrees with Mike that the removal of the slate the replacement of it will still provide the same architectural appearance. He said there are only 3 houses he can think of where there is slate anymore. He said he doesn't know how sustainable it is to keep the slate going on. And a time will come where the shingles can't be reused and that this is not the norm in the neighborhood. City Attorney asked if the application is being withdrawn. Mr. Arnett said that he would rather go ahead with deliberations. There was a discussion on procedurally the next steps. A new application could come back with new information.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Arnett said there are two main questions one regarding the chimney and if it is character defining and the second question is if the slate roof is essential in defining the architecture of the home. Ms. Leimenstoll said that the chimney is character defining and the standards are clear about repairing. The stucco does not appear to be contributing to the problem and recognizes that there are challenges in finding masons. She does agree with the removal and several commissioners agreed. Several agreed that it is a character defining feature but that reconstruction is likely necessary to fix the water issues but more detailed specifications should be provided. Ms. Israel commented that the standards do not recommend the covering of stone with stucco. Mr. Arnett asked if the slate is essential to the house. Ms. Israel said the standards do allow for the replacement on page 53 and that substitute materials are allowed. Mr. Vanderveen said that the issue is if the slate is deteriorated to a point that it cannot be repaired anymore. Discussion centered around what information is available to make a decision and that their choice today is to look at the information in front of them. There was discussion on if the slate is original as it is not usual to see slate on a craftsman bungalow. Ms. Israel said that the commission does not know if it is deteriorated or not. Mr. Arnett said the underlayment may be the issue. Mr. Cowhig said they have the choice to continue. Ms. Geary asked if there is enough time to continue without the applicant's permission. Mr. Cowhig said that the application can be continued for 120 days under the new requirements. New information could be provided. The HPC could also deny the application. The City Attorney said that the new application would need to have more details. There is no time line requirement for when a new COA could come back before the commission. Ms. Leimenstoll stated that it appears that a clearer plan of what will be done and hopefully some additional information could be identified crafts people or clarity of what is causing the issues. Commissioners discussed choosing to deny this application so that the applicant can come back with a new and clearer project proposal.

***Commissioner Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2900, 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 Roofs page 53 standards 1 through 3 and Masonry: Foundations and Chimneys page 50 standards 1 and 6 and the facts that there is not a clear project proposal with several options and not a clear treatment. The Commissioners determined that the***

*chimney is a front facing character defining feature and there are some unknowns regarding the slate roof and flashing that needs more information for a plan of repair or replacement. Seconded: Israel 1:50*

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Vanderveen, Leimenstoll, Isreal Nays: none. Abstain: none.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission does not approve application #2900 and denies a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carla and Michael Burns for work at 307 Victoria Street. Seconded by Nicolls.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Israel, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: none.

## DENIED

- (c) **Application Number: 2907 (Approved with conditions)**  
**Location: 822 Spring Garden Street**  
**Applicant: Lisa Eustathiou**  
**Owner: same**  
**Date Application Received: 3/26/24**

### Description of Work:

Add pitched roofs as shown on drawing for better drainage.

### Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Cowhig explained that the application is for an after-the-fact change that occurred several years ago. The property owner has been trying to develop a roof design to help with drainage. Staff displayed before and after images to show what changes have been made and displayed the drawings for the proposed changes. The building was added on incrementally which has caused issues with the way the roofs drain. A new pitched roof will be added that will align with the existing porch roof. The idea is that this will correct the drainage issues. This review is for a conceptual approval and would require a condition that a complete set of design plans come back before the commission. He has concerns about how the pitched roof will look on the front elevation verses the original flat roof. He added that the property has been condemned by fire and Building code so this is an added issue that has to be complied with. Fire separation is an issue because there are commercial and residential uses. This work has to be completed before she can address the other items. The property owner has brought this in front of the commission before in a preliminary review but no decision was made by the commission. He stated that this review will give guidance so the property owner can move forward with more detailed plans and drawings.

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 work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Standards—Roofs (pages 51-54)*, *Commercial and/or Institutional (page 9)*, *Non-Contributing (page 10)* for the following reasons:

### Facts

This property is actually two turn-of-the-twentieth century houses that were connected with two infill structures when they were converted for use as a carpet business. Additions were constructed on the backs of the houses as the business grew. In the College Hill National



Register nomination this property is in the “non-contributing” category because of the many alterations. The additions and infill structures have flat roofs. The property housed several businesses and apartments.

**Facts**

The roof of the addition at the back with a 551 S. Mendenhall Street address was raised without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The owner would like to construct pitched roofs for better drainage.

**Facts**

Although it has been altered significantly, the house at 822 Spring Garden retains its original form and many of its historic features such as the wood clapboard siding and windows. The proposed changes to the roof form includes extending the pitched roof of the now-enclosed original front porch over the flat roof of the connecting structure, as well as removing the roof of the original kitchen wing at the back. This will further diminish the historic character of the original house.

**Guidelines (page 53)**

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

**Guidelines (page 9)**

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

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

*2) The architecture of the building should be valued and preserved in its own right, and any changes should respect the original contributing building on the property. Modifications that are consistent with the architectural style of the building are appropriate when required to meet a functional need. Often a balance between function and architectural appropriateness must be struck in order to meet the objectives of both the property owner and the intent of the standards.*

**Guidelines (page 10)**

*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.*

**Conditions:**

A condition should be that she come back with measured drawings showing the details of the roof construction--soffit, fascia, trim, siding, etc.  
That all work follows Fire and Building Codes.

1:58

**In Support:**

**Lisa Eustathiou, Sunset Hills , Property owner, sworn in.** Ms. Eustathiou explained that there are 3 to 4 different levels. This proposal creates one roof line and go back with a side gabled roof.

It will raise the wall and slope to the back of the building. On the Spring Garden side water pools. These are preliminary plans and the roofs are raised 2 or 3 feet and slope back to the back corner of 822. There will be a gutter or channel to move all of the water to the back of both wings. She explained the work that she has going on with the property and the issues overall with trying to bring the property into compliance.

### **In Opposition:**

**Joe Wheby, 405 Fulton Street. Sworn in.** Mr. Wheby said he is a CH resident of 19 years. He said that the changes are a violation going back to 2018. He said the change was made, the applicant applied and was denied. He said they could use a rubber barrier technology to keep the original roof form. He stated this has been going on for 6 years and nothing has been done. He referenced slide 6 that shows the structure in 2018 and the changes.

**Samantha Stewart, 211 S.Tate Street, CHNA. Sworn in.** Ms. Stewart stated that she is here to represent the neighborhood association and that they are not necessarily opposed to the project but are supportive of finding a solution that resolves the issue. She said they had a few questions: if an architect or contractor has been selected and if so who? What are the long term plans for the property? The neighborhood encourages the property owner to look into a rubber roof material. They also requested more detail. They feel like it is an odd solution to fix the water issue and that's why they do not support what is there. They would like to see the plywood removed and fixed more appropriately. The main concern is more detail on the final appearance including drawings.

Speaking on behalf of herself, Ms. Stewart stated that this is an interesting property and said there is a need for housing and commercial in this area and that this presents an interesting opportunity. She hopes the property owner would be open to utilizing historic preservation tax credits. She said that it would be neat to have it returned to the original uses of housing and commercial at each building and then use the tax credits. She believes it would be feasible if the properties were separated.

### **Rebuttal:**

**Lisa Eustathiou** She said that there are three (?) different levels and concrete block and spoke again on the benefits of raising the roof so that it is all on one level at the front to make it even. The changes were originally done in the 1950s or 60s but the roof needs to be one straight line across the back. She stated that she is working with an engineer and a roofing contractor.

Staff showed images of how each addition had a slightly pitched roof and they intersected each other. Ms. Geary asked about the height of how much the property owner wants to raise the wall/roof area. The property owner explained how the roofs shed water to the same area and it's not running off properly. Ms. Arlen stated that the changes will make the roof look more cohesive. Ms. Geary explains what gets removed and then a shed roof will be added across the width of the front of the building. These front walls will be raised and then sloped back. The property owner said the details will be in the next set of drawings. Ms. Israel asked if the middle addition will be removed and the property owner said yes. The property is a non-contributing building so there is opportunity to make changes that are not compatible. The property owner is working with a roofing contractor. Ms. Nicholls recommended due to the commercial and residential nature that a structural engineer be consulted.

The public hearing was closed.

2:19

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Arnett said this is a first phase approval and does the HPC feel that this approach is consistent with the standards and if so we can add a condition that detailed plans and materials come back to the HPC. HPC needs to confirm for her that she is on the right approach. Commissioners

discussed that the buildings are considered as historically non-contributing but the two houses could be separated and restored to contributing. Ms. Israel states she supports the idea as it is an improvement for the building. Ms. Nicolls said that this is a problematic property that is need of attention and she appreciates the College Hill residents that have spoken on this long standing problem. The tax credits would be helpful. She is inclined to agree that the uniform roof described in the testimony would be a significant improvement and improve the drainage. Commissioners stated they would not want to delay positive changes and that generally they agree with the recommended conditions. Mr. Arnett said the design is a pretty clean solution to a mix of rooflines. It could be a good anchor for this corner with more details provided on the plans.

***Commissioner Nicolls moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2907, 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 Roofs (page 51-54) and Commercial and/or Institutional (page 9) and Non-Contributing (page 10) “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 the specific standards are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the standards.” are acceptable as finding of fact.***

**Seconded: Graeber 2:33**

**The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Vanderveen, Leimenstoll, Isreal Nays: none. Abstain: none.**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2907 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Lisa Eustathiou for work at 822 Spring Garden Street with the following conditions: That she should come back with measured drawings showing the details of the roof construction including but not limited to soffit, fascia, trim, siding etc. And that all work follows Fire and Building Codes. And that the measured drawings should include exterior elevation drawings. Seconded by Israel.**

**The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Israel, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: none.**

**Approved with conditions.**

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DUNLEATH WALL RESTORATION GRANTS**

Ms. Geary explained the history on creating this program that was approved in the Fall of 2023. The HPC is asked to recommend in favor of 4 grant applications for the historic retaining wall on Park Avenue starting at the corner of Park Avenue and Charter Street. These retaining walls are significate features of the historic districts. She showed images o the deterioration that makes these walls an ideal candidate. She stated this is a matching grant program and the neighborhood has obligated up to \$75,000 towards this effort. The HPC is being asked to make a decision to recommend in favor or not in favor to the City Council. The funding is from the Municipal Service District Program. This is a one time expenditure for these particular properties and their grant request. Funding for future projects can be determined if there are additional property owners in the future that would like to utilize the program.

David Wharton, 657 Percy St., President of the Dunleath Neighborhood Association. He thanked Stefan-leih Geary and the residents for working to make this happen and he asks the commission to support this. He recognized two applicants in the audience who chose not to speak.

Ms. Geary stated that all four properties have selected the same contractor so that the wall can be done at the same time. Ms. Geary spoke on the conditions that are normal and happen over time due to hydrostatic pressure and not necessarily to neglect. The properties at 600-606 are participating. There is a fifth property that has had to make repairs under an emergency situation.

Margaret Reed-Lade, property owner of 604 Park Avenue, stated that the walls are in the Right-of-Way.

Ms. Israel moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommend in favor to the City Council approving the grant applications for 600, 602, 604 and 606 Park Avenue not to exceed \$75,000 in matching funds from the Dunleath Matching Grant program.

Seconded by Leimenstoll.

**The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Nicolls, Israel, Leimenstoll, Vanderveen. Nays: none. Abstain: none.**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Legal Staff, addressed that there is no existing authority to move the special exception authority from the Board of Adjustment to the HPC. The need is due to the timing of how the meetings fall which requires the special exception filing to take place prior to the commission hearing and thereby missing the deadline. Staff has discussed working with the BOA to allow that replace to come in late or create a placeholder pending the HPC decision so that applicants do not have to spend the \$400 application fee without knowing if the special exception is needed. Ms. Geary said there is some opportunity to tighten that process.

Ms. Nicolls spoke about 307 Victoria Street spoke on the shed that was discussed at the last meeting and she said that to move the shed it would have to be cut in half to fit down the narrow driveway and the cost is a minimum of \$20,000. There are some details that are worth salvaging.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Nothing from Staff.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

There were no speakers from the audience.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
June 26, 2024  
Final**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sharon Graeber (Vice Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Tracy Pratt (Fisher Park), Adrienne Israel, Katherine Rowe.

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Arlen Nicolls, Jo Leimenstoll, Deborah Kaufman, Jesse Arnett

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The April 24, 2024 minutes were approved with no.

Speakers were sworn in.

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2927 (APPROVED with conditions)**  
**Location: 1119 Virginia Street**  
**Applicant: Robert Byrum**  
**Owner: Robert Byrum**  
**Date Application Received: 6-5-24**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of carport.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Mr. Cowhig described the project and that the driveway can be approved at staff level. Today the commissions are reviewing the construction of a new carport. He explained that carports are a popular alternative to garages in the historic districts and the HPC has approved several. Staff presented images of the property and examples of carports previously approved in the districts.

Staff comments were provided:

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 Standards—Accessory Structures and Garages (page 35)* for the following reasons:

**Fact**

The site of the proposed carport at the back corner of the lot will be consistent with historic siting patterns of original garages and sheds. It will be a simple wood, open-walled, gable roof structure with board-and-batten siding covering the storage space at the back. Board-and-

batten was used commonly for sheds and garages. The size and form of the structure will be similar to historic outbuildings. Colors will match those of the house.

**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.*

**Note: the driveway replacement can be approved at the staff level.**

There were no questions for staff.

**In Support:**

**Ann Stringfield, FPNA, 1005 N. Eugene Street, Sworn in.**

Ms. Stringfield stated that the Neighborhood Association positively supports with conditions. They would like clarification on 1 crepe myrtle tree and one short concrete wall that may be impacted and that the commission address any downhill drainage. Lastly they request that the siding be horizontal clapboard siding rather than the vertical board and batten proposed. She also thanked Vice-Chair Sharon Graeber for attending the last FPNA association meeting to discuss the commission with residents.

**Erica Byrum, 1119 Virginia Street, property owner, Sworn in.**

Ms. Byrum stated that the first concern of the contractor is that the drainage will be addressed. The short wall is a retaining wall that is deteriorated and will be rebuilt to match. She said that they are open to the horizontal siding. The crepe myrtle should not be an issue but may need to be trimmed. Its on the larger part of the backyard and if there is a need to remove it they will plant a new tree. However, they do not anticipate it needing removal.

Commissioner Pratt noted that it looks like the drainage slopes towards the back to the rear property line. Ms. Byrum replied that they will place gravel and raise the grade. There is already a raised area at the back with a berm in place. She reiterated the concrete wall will be repaired to match.

There was no further discussion.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

There was no further discussion.

***Commissioner Vanderveen moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2927, 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 #s 2,3 and 4 are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Adrienne Israel.***

The Commission voted 5-1 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Pratt. Nays: none.

Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2917 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Robert Byrum for work at 1119 Virginia Street with the following conditions: the siding can be wood or hardi board, that the crepe myrtle should come back to the HPC if it needs removed and that the retaining wall be submitted to staff for approval. Seconded by Pratt.

The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Graeber, Vanderveen, Israel, Rowe, Pratt. Nays: none.

**APPROVED with conditions.**

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Commissioner Graeber shared a brochure that she put together for her visit to the Fisher Park neighborhood association. She used information from her CAMP commissioner training. Ms. Geary said that this brochure is very helpful and will be updated and incorporated into the new Standards process.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig spoke about the after-the-fact property on East Bessemer. He updated that the work is still there but the zoning enforcement officer is on this and is issuing notices with fines. He spoke about the enforcement process: 1) Violation—zoning enforcement is notified 2) Notice of Violation is issued 3) Property may Submit a COA for review or reverse the project 4) If approved the violation is resolved If Denied there is a period of time to correct the violation and then fines begin. 5) After a certain dollar amount in fines it is turned over to the Collections office and they are pursuing it through their process. It could result in a decision to take the property owner to court. This is an enforcement of the zoning ordinance and property owners can not be arrested or have a lien placed on the property.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Ms. Stringfield spoke about the FPNA that has sent a letter to Guilford County Schools about 3 buildings and a parking lot that are on the edge of the district and GCS plans to sell. While not in the district boundaries the neighborhood is still concerned that about any changes that that may come with future development. The neighborhood seeks compatibility and a voice at the table.

She also spoke about other threatened properties in the district that are vulnerable. 1) she stated the Stone project will not be pursued and the property is for sale. 2) the house move that was part of that effort does not have a foundation and 3) Holy Trinity plans to demolish 603 Greene Street and 205 Fisher Avenue.

Hailey Mahoney from Preservation Greensboro Incorporated that she has reached out to ASG in hopes that they will be able to salvage the properties. She also said she has started a new process where they will do a house history for any demolitions that are salvaged.



**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
September 24, 2024  
Draft**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jesse Arnett (Chair), Sharon Graeber (Vice Chair), Bert Vanderveen (Dunleath), Arlen Nicolls (College Hill), Jo Leimenstoll, Katherine Rowe, Eric Woodard.

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Tracy Pratt, Deborah Kaufman

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

There were no minutes to approve.

Speakers were sworn in.

Commissioner Vanderveen was recused for a conflict of interest for item 3(a)

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

- (a) **Application Number: 2949 (APPROVED with conditions)**  
**Location: 510 N. Church Street**  
**Applicant: Keith Crabtree**  
**Owner: Matthew Benfield**  
**Date Application Received: 8/16/24**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of three accessory structures and installation of signage (after-the-fact)

**Staff Recommendation:**

Ms. Geary described the project explaining that this is an after-the-fact application for three accessory structures and two signs. Staff presented images of the property and examples of carports previously approved in the districts.

Staff comments were read into the record:

Based on information contained in the application, the staff supports this application with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project as presented is not incongruous with the *Historic Standards—Introduction (page 4)*, *Accessory Structures and Garages (page 36)* and *Signs (page 34)* for the following reasons:

**Facts**

This is a non-contributing structure in the Fisher Park Historic District. It is a commercial property.

Three accessory structures have been placed at the rear of the property in the existing parking area. The sizes of the structures in feet are 12 x 20, 12 x 16 and 8 x 8.

The structures are separated by 5 feet per City Zoning Code and the combined total square footage is within the allowable size per City Zoning Code. Accessory Structures cannot total more than 33% of the main structure square footage.

One unit is easily visible from the street and the door is painted red.

Two signs have been installed. The first sign is wood and is a freestanding sign located at the front of the property. This sign measures 4 feet by 5 feet. The second sign is attached to the building façade and is 4 feet by 4 feet in size. The signs are not internally illuminated.

#### **Standards (page 4)**

The guidelines allow for change when it is accomplished in a sensitive manner that maintains the special character of the Historic District, while meeting the practical needs of the residents and property owners....Buildings in the historic districts can be quite different from one another—yet they have a common denominator: they exist within a locally zoned historic district with the shared goal of maintaining and preserving the character and spirit of the historic neighborhood.

#### **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.*

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

#### **Standards (page 34)**

*1. Introduce unobtrusive, simple signage in the historic districts.*

*2. New signs should be no larger than necessary to identify the building they serve, and located so that they do not block pedestrian views along the street.*

*3. Select traditional materials for new signs including wood, metal, stone, and masonry. Carved or sandblasted signboards are generally not appropriate in the Historic Districts. Signs should be painted, and may be lighted with concealed spotlights.*

*4. An appropriate location for a freestanding sign in a residential area is close to the front walk and near the public sidewalk.*

*5. Billboards (outdoor advertising signs) and other tall freestanding signs, portable signs, flashing or lighted message signs, plastic signs, and signs with internally illuminated letters are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*

*6. It is not appropriate to attach signs to a building in any manner that conceals, damages, or causes the removal of architectural features or details.*

*7. Signage should be compatible with the original use of a building.*

*A. It is not historically appropriate to install signs directly on façades or porch roofs of residential buildings and those buildings originally intended for residential use. The installation of a freestanding sign is most appropriate, as it is less likely to detract from the architecture of the building.*

*B. Place signs for historic commercial buildings in locations originally intended for signage, such as at the top of the storefront or on windows, doors, or awnings.*

*C. Signage for new commercial buildings should reflect similar placement to that of historic commercial buildings in the neighborhood.*

**Conditions:**

That the Accessory Structures are painted in the same color scheme of the building or in a more neutral color pallet, particularly that the red door be painted to make it less noticeable from the street.

Staff was asked to zoom in closer on the signs. Staff stated she believes the free standing sign is a temporary sign. She spoke to the mansard style roof that reads as an office and non-contributing. Jesse Arnett stated he noted it is in the local but not the national district. Ms. Geary spoke about the desire of highest percentage of contributing structures for NR and this is the last building on the fringe that makes it easy to carve out. She stated that it would have predated the establishment of the districts but not original.

**In Support:**

**Brad Garner, 1904 Ray Alexander Dr., Sworn in.**

Ms. Garner stated he represents KC Construction who leases the building. Rebecca Logan from KC is also with him. He said they did not realize that they are in the district until they received the violation notice. They have been at this property a little over a year. He stated the material of the sign on the building is metal.

**Rebecca Logan, 3116 Spring Meadow Dr. Snowville Georgis, sworn in.** Ms. Logan explained that the wooden sign is not a permanent sign but it is tacked down. Ms. Geary asked if there is an intent to do a brick sign. She said at this time they are not planning until they receive approval. She said painting the door would not be an issue.

There was no further discussion.

**In Opposition:**

There was no one to speak in opposition.

The public hearing was closed.

**Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the signs and noted that the freestanding sign should come back as a staff approval for a permanent monument sign. Mr. Arnett stated it appears to have angle brackets. Ms. Geary stated we would normally see a masonry base. Mr. Woodard stated he would like to see something more substantial.

Regarding the accessory structures Ms. Leimenstoll stated that the siting is at the back of the house and at the back of the site and that the red door does draw attention. Ms. Graeber stated that we are not dictating the color just requiring a neutral color. Ms. Geary explained that at the staff level we do not require a COA however at the Commission level using color to help mitigate a situation does allow it to be back in your purview. Mr. Arnett said he does not find the door color a concern because we don't normally look at color and its at the fringe of the neighborhood.

Mr Garner added that the lease expires in 2025 and they asked that if there is a condition to require a permanent sign that it would take into account the lease. Ms. Geary suggested that they come back for a COA once their lease is determine. At this time Mr. Garner said that they do not know at this time if they will renew and he said that would not be a problem at all to paint the door. If they vacate the property the accessory structures will be removed. Commissioners agreed that the lease is a good indicator to determine if the permanent sign is needed. Katherine stated that they should support the standards on the red door, Arlen agreed. Mr. Garner stated the lease expires July 31, 2025. Ms. Geary cited the introduction section on page 4 that is called the application of the

standards and this was written to take into account the special needs of commercial buildings while also staying in keeping with the district. She said that the red door really calls out attention on a prefabricated building that might not otherwise be permitted.

***Commissioner Leimenstoll moved that based on the facts presented in application # 2949, 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 4, 36 #2 and 4, 34 #1-7 and that it is a non-contributing structure, the buildings are cited appropriately and the signs meet the standards are acceptable as finding of facts. Seconded: Sharon Graeber.***

**The Commission voted 5-1 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Nicolls, Woodard. Nays: none Abstain: Vanderveen.**

**Therefore, I move that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application #2949 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Keith Crabtree for work at 510 N. Church Street with the following conditions: the color of the red door that is visible from the street be painted a neutral color in consultation with staff and second that if the lease is renewed on July 31, 2025 that the applicant construct a more permanent base for the sign on the front yard. Seconded by Graeber.**

**The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Nicolls, Woodard. Nays: none Abstain: Vanderveen.**

**APPROVED with conditions.**

**Commissioner Vanderveen returned to the meeting.**

- (a) Application Number: 2941 (continued)**
- Location: 621 Walker Avenue (Wafco Mills Condominiums)**
- Applicant: Leighsa Windsor**
- Owner: Wafco Mills Condominium Association, Inc**
- Date Application Received: 7/25/24**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of dumpster enclosure (continued)

**Staff Recommendation:**

Ms. Geary described the project explaining that this is continued from last month's meeting for the applicant to provide more information on the alternative locations and approaches that were considered. She presented staff comments and the additional documentation that was provided. She explained that the enclosure may not have a dumpster but may be used to hide individual trash cans. She said that the three complexes are now separate. We heard testimony last month of the other locations however for this month they have provided a map that better shows where they considered alternative places. She said the proposed site utilizes 2 parking spaces and a landscaping hedge is already in place. She showed images of the proposed site. She said after the lengthy discussion at last month's meeting we discussed what is in the purview of the commission—the commission is looking at the siting, the materials and design, what is visible from the public right of way and how the residents interact with where this is located. She then went over the additional locations. The first location would remove 5 parking spaces and issues with the type of pavement that would deteriorate the

pavement. Again, this was all in testimony last month but now provided on a map to better illustrate this. She then provided images of examples of a non-contributing multi-family with a dumpster and then historic Canon Court Apartments where a dumpster is visible from Hendrix Street. She also showed Winbourne Court where individual cans are off of Edgar Alley where it is off the street and not visible. Commissioner Nicolls said there are also dumpsters for that complex. Ms. Geary stated that finding a workable solution is a very complex situation. She said staff is supportive of the application

Staff comments were read into the record:

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

### **Facts**

A dumpster and trash can enclosure is proposed for Wafco Mills Condominiums as shown. The enclosure will be constructed out of brick with doors that will fully enclose the receptacles.

The proposed location is at the end of an existing parking area that abuts Cedar Street. However, the dumpster enclosure will not be in a rear yard or behind a building and will be visible from the street. Existing hedges and additional screening should be maintained and added to buffer visibility from Cedar Street and neighboring residential buildings.

### **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.*

2. *Trash receptacle and dumpster areas must be adequately screened from view of the public right-of-way and adjoining residences with shrubs and/or fencing.*

### **Conditions:**

That landscape hedging is installed/maintained on 3 sides of the structure to block the view from the street and residential units.

Commissioners discussed the proposed location. Commissioner Nicolls explained that the site is a green space currently with a substantial hedge. Ms. Geary said that "the public right of way visibility is part of the Commission's purview". Mr. Arnett spoke about the standards as they relate to visibility however the standards are worded more for residential properties. The proposed site is at the rear of the units but also in a very visible area from the public right of way. Commissioners discussed this is a challenge and the applicant has been thorough and diligent in preparing the proposal. Ms. Nicolls expressed concerns about lighting and the activity of bringing the trash to the site and if it will be disruptive.

### **In Support:**

**Joy Watson, 909 W. Wendover Ave., Wafco Mills Condominium Association, Sworn in.**

Ms. Watson explained that she owns a first floor unit adjacent to the proposed site. She walked the commission through the color coded drawing and explained Wafco Lane had limits because of trucks causing damage to the asphalt parking. She said there is also a window at the end of the building. She said that at the proposed site it will be set back from where the building begins. The Wafco Lane site was the first choice but because of the loss of parking spaces it was agreed it was too great an issue. 4 out of the 5 board members voted in favor of the proposed site over the Wafco Lane site. Commissioner Nicolls spoke about the front stoop at the front of the units but that the

back entrances have more of a courtyard and gated space. Joy continued that there was a public meeting and they received positive feedback. They will add landscaping and lighting. She did express concern about the unsightly appearance of the Historic Wafco dumpster site but it is outside the district. Many units have had to look out on those dumpsters. It was clarified that the enclosure will not be brick but wooden with iron gates with a mural. There will be swinging doors and a pedestrian door.

### **In Opposition:**

**Zane Kuseybi, Windsor Road, Summerfield. Sworn in.** Mr. Kuseybi stated he is the property owner of 620 B. Wafco which is adjacent to the proposed site. He spoke in opposition at the August meeting and still has concerns with the proposed project. He wants to see more community discussion on this topic. He stated the complex is currently using individual cans and a location that is within the center of the complex. He is concerned about the height and scale of the enclosure, safety issues, and that a dumpster doesn't represent what we want to achieve in the historic districts.

**Samantha Stewart, 211 S. Tate Street, College Hill NA, sworn in.** Ms. Stewart stated the CHNA does not believe that this fits the standards because of the visibility from the public right of way. There is a slope and topography coming down Walker that makes this the end point of the view shed looking down Walker. She encouraged a continuance.

**Lana Kuseybi, Windsor Road, Summerfield. Sworn in.** Ms. Kuseybi explained 3 points: 1) Safety because of the hedging that will encourage transient individuals to hide in the bushes, 2) The gate for the walkway was closed off because of too many people walking through the hedges and we can't control what people do at night and the enclosure is a much higher height that will aid in hiding 3) She had a question if the new information was made available.

### **Rebuttal**

**Joy Watson, Sworn in.** She stated a significant amount of time was spent evaluating and developing the proposal. No one wants trash. He said they considered a valet service where it is moved from the front door to a location off site but this is a very costly option. They need a more permanent solution. She said the other locations will be more visible. They want residents to feel safe and 4 out of 5 board members voted in favor.

The public hearing was closed.

### **Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the details of the project asking the applicant additional questions including that they currently have cans at the end of a building with a side window and an easement. There are 66 trash and 66 recycling cans. Neighbors are maintaining the area. This is the interim solution. Commissioners expressed interest in if the current cans could be screened or a different configuration be used. Commissioner Arnett asked: Do we have enough information to make a decision and if so does it conform with the standards? Commissioner Vanderveen stated the current location is much worse because of the visibility. They discussed that it is nearly impossible to completely screen any location and she has concerns over the scale and height. There was discussion of it needing a landscape plan. Katherine stated: 1) no landscape plan 2) should fit in better with the architecture of the site 3) Acknowledged it is a very constrained site and that 4) there are positives and negatives to the proposed plan. Commissioners discussed that there is likely no perfect solution. Commissioner Arnett reread the standards and addressed that it should be screened from the public right of way except for access to the gates. Commissioner Leimenstoll analyzed that she does not have a concern due to the existing screening but wants to know if the interior screening could be best addressed through landscaping. She said there is an overall volume to this that needs to be minimized. The current view is parking. Key elements missing is

more information on refining the scale/volume, the design should be more compatible with the complex utilizing brick, and there should be a landscape plan for the purposes of screening. Commissioners discussed continuing the item again and creating a design sub-committee. Commissioner Arnett stated he believes the proposed site appears to be the only location. Other Commissioners wanted to learn more about alternative sites. Ms. Watson addressed the idea of turning the enclosure so it opens on Cedar and that is not feasible due to utilities and easements.

Commissioners agreed that there are too many outstanding questions and it should be continued and that this is an opportunity to create something that works well with the site. Commissioners decided to create a sub-committee of 3 HPC members to meet with the applicant and residents to discuss design concepts. In the meantime, the COA is not on the agenda. It is not a binding decision but is a customer service offering. Commissioners also discussed if the design could look more like an historic accessory dwelling. Brick and wood is most desired. Continuance has 180 days from the date of receipt of the application and this application was received 7/25/24. Ms. Geary said that we should check with the applicant to see if they are interested in working with the sub-committee and Ms. Watson agreed. Ms. Geary stated that there should be a date for when the proposal should come back from the sub-committee and there is not likely enough time to meet ahead of the October meeting but the next is December 4<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Arnett stated that there is a desire to continue it because there is not enough information: 1) Landscape plan 2) Scale and height of enclosure 3) design and materials 4) Easement and Utility issues and it is apparent this may be the only location.

***Commissioner Vanderveen moved that we continue application 2941 until the December Meeting. Seconded by Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Nicolls, Woodard. Nays: none***

***Commissioner Leimenstoll made a second motion to create a sub-committee of the applicant, staff and residents. Commissioners Vanderveen, Nicolls and Graeber volunteered. Seconded by Woodard. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor. Ayes: Arnett, Graeber, Vanderveen, Rowe, Leimenstoll, Nicolls, Woodard. Nays: none***

***Continued with the creation of a sub-committee.***

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

Commissioner Graeber stated she attended a training session that was very valuable. Commissioners spoke highly of the PGI annual meeting.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Brent Dusharme, legal went over the process of recusal and absences.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Stefan-leih Geary, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/SLG