

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

November 14, 2016 **SPECIAL MEETING**

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JEREMY JORDAN-CHAIR	KERRY CARLIN
ALICE ARNOLD	WILLIAM GEE
JAKE POSTMA	

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: COLLETTE KINANE, PLANNER II; AMY NUNEZ, SECRETARY AND BEN GRIFFITH, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

OTHERS PRESENT: DONALD PHILLIPS, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY AND KELVIN THOMAS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Chairman Jordan stated to switch items - #3 becomes #2 and item #2 becomes #3. The concept review of the Chancellor’s House comes before the Major COAs.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to accept the amended agenda, Mr. Carlin seconded and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Postma made a motion to accept the October 25, 2016 minutes as written, Mr. Carlin seconded and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works COAs

- 2016-21: 300 S. Eastern Street; Martin Investments; Mechanical change out – Approved
- 2016-22: 307 S. Eastern Street; Jeff Ginn; Mechanical change out – Approved
- 2016-23: 406 S. Library Street; Daniel Black; Mechanical change out – Approved

Concept Review – Chancellor’s House Presentation by ECU

Mr. Bill Bagnell, ECU Associate Vice Chancellor of Campus Operations and Mr. Albrecht McLawhorn, MHAworks Architecture, gave the presentation.

Mr. Bagnell stated they need to have approval from the State Historic Commission before proceeding, but wanted to provide the HPC with their ideas. By State law, the Chancellor’s

house has to hold public events. This older home provides very little privacy for the residential portion of the home. The concept plan would enclose the left porch.

Mr. McLawhorn showed pictures of the concept plan that included a parking lot with a service driveway and a separate private drive for the Chancellor with access to a three car garage on Jarvis Street.

Mr. Bagnell showed pictures of the first floor interior concept by removing the existing kitchen and adding public ADA bathrooms/routes. The rear addition would include a three car garage, add an elevator and a new catering kitchen. The left porch will be enclosed and add a covered porch at the left rear. The second floor would add a kitchen and private living space.

Mr. McLawhorn stated they will continue the Italian Renaissance Revival look on the exterior. The accessibility of the property will be greatly improved.

Mr. Bagnell stated they will go to the Planning and Zoning Commission to request a rezoning for the Proctor Young House.

Major Works COAs

2016-13: 402 S. Library Street. Applicant: Kevin Wiggins. After the Fact Exterior Door Enclosure

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The applicant proposes the removal of an exterior side door and replacement with siding, After the Fact. This circa 1940s one story brick and weatherboard siding house is an example of immediate pre-WWII housing built in Greenville. The house features a three bay front façade articulated by a chimney. The chimney balances the weight of the left gable bay projection. A small gable-roof wing projects from the left side of the front façade while a shallow appendage is located on the north elevation. This application is for the removal of a side door and stoop and the opening's replacement with siding that matches the current siding. Mr. Wiggins states that the door opening was partially enclosed when he purchased the property in March 2016 with the side door still attached to the partial enclosure. Mr. Wiggins viewed this as an unfinished improvement and completed the enclosure, removing the door and stoop and replacing the opening with siding and a small window.

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 16 and 17 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors (pages 35-36) are applicable.

Recommendation: The Design Review Committee recommends further discussion by the full Historic Preservation Commission given the specifications of the Design Guidelines. The house is fairly non-descript and the alteration does not diminish the historic character of the property. The alteration is not on the front façade and is not a prominent change.

Staff recommendation: As the house currently exists, this alteration does not meet the Design Guidelines. Specifically Guideline #2 and 10. Guideline #16 should also be considered. The removal of the door does not visually detract from the historic nature of the property, though it is likely that the door opening was original to the property. The window installed its place is slightly out of character in size and style. The applicant states that, though this was a problem he inherited, in his opinion the removal of the stoop and door seemed necessary to allow modern vehicles to utilize the driveway (which was historically intended for cars of a much smaller size). Though this application is after the fact, it should be considered as if the change has not yet occurred.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kevin Wiggins spoke in favor of the request. He purchased the property in March 2016 and the window was placed and the wall had sheetrock. The washer, dryer, and water heater were already placed in this area. The project was already started when he purchased the property and the stoop had been removed. There was an exterior door over the window. He removed the door and placed siding to match.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Mr. Gee stated the door had been removed already and was not historic in nature. The exterior work seems minor and it was done by the previous owner.

Mr. Postma said the work looks good and the applicant is willing to care for the property.

Chairman Jordan stated that per the Guidelines, the door should be put back but #16 states "*Existing window or door openings must not be filled or altered if it would diminish the historic character of the building.*" The Commission needs to make a decision.

Mr. Postma, Mr. Carlin and Mr. Gee stated that the alteration does not diminish the historic character.

Chairman Jordan read the **Finding of Facts** for application #2016-13 for 402 S. Library Street, parcel number 11882.

The COA application was completed and submitted on October 14, 2016. The application is for after the fact enclosure of exterior door. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 31, 2016 and November 7, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on October 31, 2016. This hearing was held on November 14, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Kevin Wiggins presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines Chapter 2: Window and Doors pages 35-36, numbers 1, 2, 5, 6,

10, 11, 16, and 17 are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Postma made a motion to find the application congruent with the applicable guidelines, Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Postma made a motion to adopt the findings of facts, Mr. Carlin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the application, Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

2016-14: 311 S. Eastern Street. Applicant: James Krukowski. Exterior painting.

Ms. Kinane stated that the applicant was not present.

Ms. Kinane stated the applicant proposes exterior painting of the structure with new color scheme. This Spanish style Craftsman Bungalow is circa 1935. The house is an unusual one-story with a gabled two-arched loggia as a front porch. Recently a prominent curvilinear eyebrow dormer was removed and is in the process of being restored to the structure. This side-gable house has typical projecting roof beams and other than the stuccoed gabled porch and dormer, the house represents a typical Bungalow. This application is for the exterior painting of the primary structure in a gray color scheme. Mr. Krukowski states that the new roof has caused the property to appear too washed out with its current white on white trim with a light colored roof. Typical color schemes in the district repeat house trim colors on columns, balusters, and soffits. For porches it is typical for a medium gray is to be used on the floor and a light blue-green on the ceiling. Previously painted masonry and stucco should be repainted using compatible paint coatings specifically formulated for masonry after proper cleaning and preparation.

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1-4 of Chapter 2 Exterior Color (pages 67-68) are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee recommends approval of the proposed scheme.

Staff Recommendation: According to the description presented in the Guidelines, Craftsman Bungalows often combined exterior materials such as shingles, stucco, and brick (in this case, stucco and siding). Usually the brick was unpainted, the shingles were stained, and the stucco was painted a light neutral or buff color. Any trim or wood introduced was usually painted white, gray, or an earth tone. In this tradition, the proposed colors would satisfy and would also meet Guideline #3 showing variation in materials. The State Historic Preservation Office commented

on the proposed color scheme and felt they were adequate. They suggested a more appropriate scheme would utilize a light body color (light beige or off-white) with either a white trim or a dark trim (black or dark green). These are just their suggestions, the gray scheme is not incongruous. Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

The applicant was not present. No one spoke in favor or in opposition.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Chairman Jordan read the **Finding of Facts** for application #2016-14 for 311 S. Eastern Street, parcel number 21059.

The COA application was completed and submitted on October 27, 2016. The application is for exterior painting. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 31, 2016 and November 7, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on October 31, 2016. This hearing was held on November 14, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the City and the applicant was not present. For this application, Design Guidelines Chapter 2: Exterior Color, pages 67-68, numbers 1-4 are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to adopt the findings of facts, Ms. Postma seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the application, Mr. Postma seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

2016-15: 409-411 S. Summit, 407 S. Summit, 405 S. Summit and 404 S. Jarvis Streets. Applicant: East Carolina University. Waiver of Demolition Delay.

Ms. Kinane stated the applicant requests waiver of demolition delay provided in COAs 16-05 through 16-08. These structures are slated for relocation or demolition with a current COA stipulating a delay of action until June 28, 2017 to provide opportunity for advertisement, mediation, and options for an alternative design solution. This application is for the waiver of the current demolition delay to expedite the addition and alteration scheduled to occur at 605 East Fifth Street (the Dail House/Chancellor's Residence). According to the Historic Preservation Commission's ordinance and North Carolina state law:

Chapter 7, Section 9-7-17 (A), states: "*An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the relocation, demolition, or destruction of a designated landmark or a building, structure or site within a designated district may not be denied. However, the effective date of such certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of approval. The*

maximum period of delay authorized by this section shall be reduced by the Historic Preservation Commission where it finds the owner would suffer extreme hardship or be permanently deprived of all beneficial use of or return from the property by virtue of the delay. During this period the Historic Preservation Commission shall negotiate with the owner and with any other parties in an effort to find a means of preserving the site. If the Historic Preservation Commission finds that a building or site within a district has no special significance or value toward maintaining the character of the district, it shall waive all or part of the period and authorize earlier demolition, or removal.”

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1 and 2 of Chapter 5 Demolition (pages 101-102) and 1-5 of Chapter 5 Relocation (page 103) are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee recommends delay on a case by case basis with staff approval as a minor work.

Ms. Kinane stated there was a conference call with Mr. Buck and City Attorney Staff. She stated new information was received. Any further movement of relocation of these properties is limited by the delay imposed. With the delay in place ECU cannot transfer ownership, cannot advertise nor follow through to find potential buyers for relocation.

New staff recommendation: Immediately waive the delay request for relocation or have the demolition delay in place until December 31, 2016 so that State ownership transfer can begin January 1, 2017. Also have volunteered conditions to include: 3-stage bidding process (two for relocation and one for relocation/demolition), publication and advertisement of these properties, and the potential revocation of the current COA of demolition or relocation of 601 E. 5th Street (Proctor-Young House) ensuring that the potential renovation process will move forward.

Chairman Jordan stated he spoke with Maggie Gregg with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). She told him that ECU cannot list the properties since they are in the foundation name and not the school name.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Scott Buck spoke in favor of the request. When he was before the Commission last, the Commission indicated their desire to save the Proctor-Young House at 601 E. 5th Street. He stated they are trying. The Real Estate Foundation owns these properties. They need the waiver of delay in order to transfer ownership. Then they will be able to advertise with the 3-stage bidding process. The new Chancellor is in temporary housing. If the waiver is not granted, there would only be time for one advertisement for relocation/demolition. They are offering \$5,000.00 for relocation assistance for these properties. This does not include the Proctor-Young House because that is going up for a rezoning request.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Ms. Arnold stated that there is no reason for a delay.

Chairman Jordan stated the Design Review Committee did meet but did not have the new information that was shared tonight.

Mr. Gee stated he understands the statute to say that the delay can be reduced if there is an extreme hardship.

Attorney Phillips stated a waiver may be 1 day to 365 days. A finding of facts that it is an extreme hardship or for the public interest can be found to waive or reduce the delay.

Chairman Jordan read the **Finding of Facts** for application #2016-15 for 409-411 S. Summit, 407 S. Summit, 405 S. Summit and 404 S. Jarvis Streets, parcel numbers 04904, 04901, 07745, and 07746.

The COA application was completed and submitted on October 26, 2016. The application is for waiver of demolition/relocation delay. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 31, 2016 and November 7, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on October 31, 2016. This hearing was held on November 14, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Scott Buck presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines Chapter 5: Demolition, pages 101-102, numbers 1 and 2; and Chapter 5: Relocation, page 103, numbers 1-5 are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Postma made a motion to adopt the findings of facts, Ms. Carlin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jordan stated he doesn't want the houses demolished but realizes that without the waiver the houses cannot be advertised for relocation.

Mr. Gee stated it is disconcerting with how they obsess over paint color but cannot stop a property from being demolished. He understands that it is law. It is sad to lose four houses in the historic district but the proposed design for the area is nice. The HPC can't stop this.

Ms. Arnold suggested waiving the remainder of the 365 days from the original request.

Attorney Phillips stated if waived, a specific day of effectiveness can be stated.

Chairman Jordan stated, although he doesn't want the houses demolished, the only way to move forward is to waive the delay completely.

Mr. Arnold made a motion to waive the 365 delay immediately, Mr. Carlin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

2016-16: 401 S. Library Street. Applicant: Graham Lashley. Exterior renovation.

Ms. Kinane stated the applicant proposes exterior renovation of the property. The Stanley M. Woolfolk House, circa 1928, is a Colonial Revival style two-story weather boarded house with Craftsman elements. The round-arched hood above the front door is supported by large knee braces. A flat-roof porch to the side of the front entrance projects from a south side wing marked by casement windows. A hipped-roof wing extends the full width of the rear elevation. Behind the house is a two-story pyramidal roofed garage. The garage (circa 1928) is one of the largest in the district with a double car garage on the ground floor with an apartment above. The building is sided in similar weatherboarding as the house and has six-over-six sash windows. An exterior stair on the north elevation provides access to the apartment. The applicant proposes electrical update, plumbing update, hvac update and chimney repair. Also the renovation includes painting, repair siding, repair front porch, installing low profile storm windows, repair driveway and roof, installing seamless gutters and landscaping. He will also install a fence no taller than six feet in height.

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1-3, 11 of Chapter 2 Roofs (pages 20-21); 9-11 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors (pages 35-36); 1-3, 5-8, 12, 13 of Chapter 2 Porches (pages 42-43); 1-3, 9 of Chapter 2 Garages and Outbuildings (page 46); 1-11 of Chapter 2 Exterior Color (pages 67-68) ; 1-7 of Chapter 2 Utilities and Energy Retrofit (pages 69-70); 7-17 of Chapter 4 Fences and Walls (pages 88-89); 1, 4-7, 11-15 of Chapter 4 Driveways and Off-street Parking (pages 91-92) and 1-9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of Chapter 4 Landscaping (pages 93-94) are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee recommends approval as proposed. The committee requests Commission review of the proposed garage door replacement wall (inoperable faux door), but indicates that the support of the SHPO should lead to the creation of an appropriate, historically sensitive replacement.

Staff Recommendation: The applicant is working very closely with the State Historic Preservation Office and pursuing historic tax credits. The process for obtaining these credits are strict in their requirements to adhere to the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Historic Rehabilitation. Due to these requirements and the attention provided by the State Historic Preservation Office, staff recommends approval.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Graham Lashley spoke in favor of the request. This is a big project to repair the neglected property. It is a corner lot and they want to improve the area with the renovation. It will take about 9-12 months to complete.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Chairman Jordan read the **Finding of Facts** for application #2016-16 for 401 S. Library Street, parcel number 25559.

The COA application was completed and submitted on October 25, 2016. The application is for exterior restoration. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 31, 2016 and November 7, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on October 31, 2016. This hearing was held on November 14, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Graham Lashley presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-3, 11 of Chapter 2 Roofs (pages 20-21); 9-11 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors (pages 35-36); 1-3, 5-8, 12, 13 of Chapter 2 Porches (pages 42-43); 1-3, 9 of Chapter 2 Garages and Outbuildings (page 46); 1-11 of Chapter 2 Exterior Color (pages 67-68) ; 1-7 of Chapter 2 Utilities and Energy Retrofit (pages 69-70); 7-17 of Chapter 4 Fences and Walls (pages 88-89); 1, 4-7, 11-15 of Chapter 4 Driveways and Off-street Parking (pages 91-92) and 1-9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of Chapter 4 Landscaping (pages 93-94) are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to adopt the findings of facts, Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the application, Mr. Gee seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Facade Improvement Grants

Facade Improvement Grant #16-02, #16-03, #16-04, #16-05, Applicant: Ms. Elizabeth Wooten

Ms. Kinane stated the applicant proposes complete restoration of the store fronts to their original configuration with brick pointing and paint. The Design Review Committee did meet to discuss the applications and recommended approval. Their recommendation as to the grant amounts:

2016-02: 801 Dickinson, front: \$5,000.00. Applicant: Elizabeth Wooten
2016-03: 801 Dickinson, side: \$3,948.50. Applicant: Elizabeth Wooten
2016-04: 801 Dickinson, rear: \$4,043.00. Applicant: Elizabeth Wooten
2016-05: 805 Dickinson, front: \$5,000.00. Applicant: Elizabeth Wooten

Ms. Wooten spoke on her request. She stated she recently resigned from the HPC because as a Commissioner should would not be eligible to receive a grant. She purchased the property in June 2016. The interior of 801 Dickinson Avenue will be a shell until she finds a tenant. There is a church at 805 Dickinson Avenue which will remain for one more year. She will not be doing any interior work at this time. She is applying for tax credits through the State Historic Preservation Office.

Mr. Postma made a motion to approve the application with the grant amounts recommended by the Design Review Committee, Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comment made.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they met to consider the applications on tonight's agenda.

Publicity Committee

Mr. Postma stated they did not meet.

Selection Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they did not meet.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Kinane stated she included a copy of the 2017 HPC Meeting schedule in the Commissioners' packets.

Mr. Postma stated in the new Comprehensive Plan there is a section for the Historic District. He asked what was involved and when do they start.

Ms. Kinane stated a preservation plan can be put together by a municipality that outlines goals and policies. If there is interest, a matching grant (60/40) can be applied for with the State Historic Preservation Office that will help prepare/write a preservation plan. It would require City budget approval. Grants are open to the entire State and SHPO makes the final decision where funds are granted.

Chairman Jordan stated the Design Guidelines were prepared under the same type of grant.

Mr. Postma suggested they should apply.

Chairman Jordan suggested they could direct Staff to pursue details regarding a grant for a preservation plan. All members in attendance were in agreement.

Mr. Postma provided a handout with 60 pictures of trash cans not stored properly in the historic district. He has stated he has seen no improvement over the last six months.

Mr. Gee suggested Mr. Postma stop talking about trash cans at their meetings since it out of their purview. He encouraged him to report it to Code Enforcement.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Carlin made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Arnold seconded, and it motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II