

**MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

June 26, 2018

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:**

Candace Pearce – Chairwoman *	Justin Edwards X
Myron Caspar *	Chris Nunnally *
Mary Ellen Cole *	Bernard Schulz *
Jeremy Jordan *	Jordan Koonts *
Blake Belch *	Roger Kammerer *

The members present were denoted by an “\*” and those absent by an “X”.

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner; Domini Cunningham, Planner II; Gwendolyn Turnage, Administrative Assistant; Corinne Becker, Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Donald Phillips, Assistant City Attorney; and Kelvin Thomas, Communications Technician

**ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA:**

Ms. Cole asked that the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office, dated May 21, 2018, be added to the record since with no meeting in May, it is currently not on the record. A copy of the letter was handed out.

**Ms. Cole made a motion that the above referenced letter be added to the file. Mr. Nunnally seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Attorney Phillips advised that it be added to the agenda and discussed at that point. He then added that it will be ok to add it to the file as the motion did.

**MINUTES:**

**Motion was made by Ms. Cole to approve the April 24, 2018 minutes as presented. Mr. Jordan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

**SWEARING IN:**

Chairwoman Pearce asked that anyone wishing to speak on any item on the agenda tonight, come forward so that Gwen Turnage could swear them in. Ms. Turnage swore in staff and all of those speaking at this meeting.

Attorney Phillips stated pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 168-388 and Section 4-H of the Historic Preservation Commission Rules of Procedure:

Conflict of Interest. No member of the Historic Preservation Commission shall participate in either the discussion or vote on any certificate of appropriateness in any manner that would violate the affected persons' constitutional right to a fair and impartial decision maker. Prohibited conflicts include but are not limited to a member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter and not willing to consider changing his or her mind; undisclosed ex parte communications with the person before the Commission, any witnesses, staff or other Commission members; a close familial, business or other associational relationship with the affected person; or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter before the board. On any other matter before the Commission where such decision by the Commission shall be in an advisory capacity only, no member shall participate in the discussion or vote on such advisory matters where the outcome on the matter being considered is reasonable likely to have a direct, substantial, and readily identifiable financial impact on the member. Decisions on either a request for recusal by a member or objections by a person appearing before the board shall be decided by a simple majority vote. A member so disqualified will not be counted or included in the count to determine the appropriate voting majority for the issue before the Commission and will not negate a quorum of the Commission.

If a Commission member has had an ex parte communication that also needs to be disclosed at this time.

As a reminder, please keep in mind as members of the Commission, conversations among yourselves during the discussion periods of this meeting and your Committee meetings are not ex parte communications.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **1 Review ECU's Landscape Plan for the area where homes were demolished**

May 21, 2018 letter from SHPO was added to record. Landscape plan was received from ECU. Mr. Weitnauer stated that good photos were obtained in May to document the structures.

Mr. William Bagnell stated that the landscape plan was drawn by their landscape architect, John Gill. He pointed out the existing trees and showed that they're adding new 2" trees along with some smaller shrubs. All are naturally occurring materials within the region except for the triple-leaf plum, which is being used to hide some of the bamboo.

Mr. Schulz commented that he'd seen sod was put down and that it looked nice.

### **2 FIG 2917-0017: 401 Evans Street**

Chairwoman Pearce recused herself.

**Mr. Schulz made a motion to allow her to recuse herself. Mr. Caspar asked if it was required for Chairwoman Pearce to tell why she was recusing herself. Attorney Phillips said this is not required. Ms. Cole seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Mr. Weitnauer referenced the FIGs previously received by Tony Khoury and Morris Moyer and explained that the plan is changing to revise the north side entrance and showed new plan. The original door was too narrow to meet code, so a full door had to be installed. New windows were added where previous windows had been bricked in. Framing and brick was added so that everything would line up. Brick is now eight bricks high rather than five. Photos of what he described were shown. An encroachment agreement was received from the City Council and the matter is now back for design approval. He showed canopy sketch with notes from the DRC.

**Recommendations:**

**Design Review Committee:** Recommends approval of the revised design of the 4th Street entrance. The committee and applicants discussed ideas for the design that varied from the applicants' proposed design. The applicants decided to revise their design as recommended by the DRC.

**Staff:** Recommends approval of the revised design of the 4th Street entrance.

Mr. Weitnauer asked Mr. Kammerer to summarize the DRC discussion since Ms. Pearce was recused.

Mr. Kammerer stated he did not know about the brick changes other than the slight change in brick color and mortar joints that had been discussed. He stated that he didn't want anything to impact the landmark designation of the property.

Mr. Jordan noted that Mr. Reid Thomas of SHPO did not see this modification as a concern according to his June 22, 2018 email.

Mr. Kammerer said he didn't want a door that was too decorative to impact the landmark designation.

Mr. Khoury introduced Mr. Moyer and stated that they are very appreciative of the grants and welcomes all input. An independent pharmacy is going in downstairs and will be named after the local Globe hardware store. He explained that the door had to be reconstructed due to rot and that Mr. Reid Thomas, whom they met with, said it will not hurt the landmark designation, particularly since it's not on a prominent street. Mr. Thomas felt the mortar joints were strong enough and didn't need to be repointed. Mr. Khoury and his wife plan to live on the second floor and the proposed canopy will cover most of the brick. They want to move in by mid-August. The pharmacy wants to change

the front façade so they want to come back at a later date to show that proposal. They looked at some old pictures and would like to do something similar. They'd like to strip and repaint the north face and change the color slightly. All this has been discussed with the DRC.

Mr. Kammerer stated that if Mr. Thomas approved the modifications, the HPC should be able to but he wants to be sure they keep the flavor of the building.

Mr. Khoury said he'd love to have any or all members of the HPC walk the site with them, because they would welcome any input. They're eager to do what is recommended.

Ms. Cole asked when the pharmacy would be moving in. Mr. Moyer said they're awaiting approval of the pharmacy board and are hoping around October. They've signed a lease and are paying a small amount while renovations are underway. They're working on inside plans.

**Mr. Nunnally made a motion to accept staff recommendation of approval of revised design even if not original pursuant to Chapter 6, noting that since historic plan wouldn't conform to modern code it would have been impossible. Mr. Caspar seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

**3 Review updated survey for White's Theater – Local Landmark: 110 W. 5<sup>th</sup> St.**

Mr. Weitnauer explained that this is an update on what the property owner has been doing in the past 1- 1½ years, since requesting this property be designated as a local landmark. The project has been taken over by Community Smith. It will be used for live theatre presentations once completed. The HPC could approve that it be submitted to the state for review as a local landmark tonight. It could then come back for joint or separate public hearings before the HPC and City Council.

Holton Wilkerson, president of Community Smith, said he is excited to restore this theatre and it is an honor to add it to his portfolio of projects. He is working hard to meet standards. In September 2016 they entered into a purchase agreement with the Redevelopment Commission and the City Of Greenville. They've been working hard to adhere to obligations associated with state and federal tax credits they've applied for.

Chairwoman Pearce explained that the next step in the process is for the HPC to approve that the project be sent to the state for approval.

Ms. Cole made reference to the last survey done in 2008 and questioned whether an updated survey should be conducted. Some things have changed such as \$101,000 appraised value at that time versus the current appraised value of \$280,000. The

Redevelopment Commission made note of the sale of the property, but this packet doesn't reflect that. Do we need an updated survey before we move forward?

Chairwoman Pearce said an updated survey would come from the SHPO in Raleigh. Ms. Cole said she thought the existing survey had come from Greenville.

Mr. Weitnauer said it was not prepared by Collette but may have come from the city and stated he will work with Mr. Wilkerson to cobble together an updated survey to send in. There are funds in the budget to write a survey and can hire a consultant if needed.

Ms. Cole referenced the Daily Reflector 1930, 1960 and 1971 articles in the survey, and speculated that there are likely to be more recent articles as well.

Chairwoman Pearce asked Mr. Wilkerson if he was required to submit a survey to obtain tax credits. He stated he is not.

Ms. Cole said she'd like something more current before it goes to the state.

Chairwoman Pearce told Mr. Wilkerson he will not need to make another presentation before it's forwarded to the state. She then made a motion to hold this item until further documentation is obtained.

Attorney Phillips said under 168-400.5 "it must be deemed and found by the Preservation Commission to be of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling and or association". Finding will have to be made by commission at some point, preferably before process gets started.

**Attorney Phillips clarified that the HPC could make a motion to deem and find that this property is found to be of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling and or association.**

**Mr. Schulz moved to make such a motion. Mr. Kammerer seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Minor Works COA**

2018-0010: 801/803 E. 4<sup>th</sup> St., College View Historic District, Contributing  
Project: Repair & re-paint rotten wood.

Mr. Weitnauer said previous paint has been scraped off and the buildings will be repainted in the same colors.

**Major Works COAs**

**2018-0011:** 402 S. Jarvis St., College View Historic District, Contributing

Applicant: Michael Voors, Owner

Project: Fence installation to complete gap left after the demolition of a neighboring property.

Mr. Weitnauer stated the project is to install fence to complete a 20’ gap left after the demolition of a shed that straddled the property line. Applicant wants to fill it in with the same wood as existing wood, same design and color. The fence is in the rear yard where six foot high fences are allowed as proposed.

**Design Guidelines:** (shortened to include only those that apply):

4 Fences and Walls 87-89

7. If a new fence or wall is to be constructed, the design must be based on accurate documentation of a historic fence or wall, or must be a new design compatible with the historic character of the building and the district.

9. Generally, new fences or walls should be constructed to follow property lines and not to abut existing structures.

12. Rear yard fences shall not exceed six (6) feet in height and may not extend forward of the rear wall of the structure.

**Recommendations:**

**Design Review Committee:**

Recommends approval.

**Staff:**

The application is congruent with applicable Design Guidelines. Recommends approval of this application based on DRC recommendations and alignment with Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, guideline numbers 7, 9 and 12.

Michael Voors said he’d just like to move forward.

Mr. Caspar asked why this wasn’t handled as a Minor Works COA. Chairwoman Pearce stated that she and Mr. Weitnauer felt it best if this come before the Commission and the public, because Mr. Voors would not be building a compliant fence since it’s only a 20’ gap created by the shed ECU removed and his existing fence is not compliant. This way it wasn’t only decided by staff and the HPC and public would be made aware of the project.

Attorney Phillips clarified that without anyone there to speak in opposition it would be up to anyone from the Commission, the city or state to speak, which there weren’t.

**Mr. Kammerer made a motion to approve. Mr. Nunnally seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

Attorney Phillips added that it must be stated that this is congruent with the guidelines. Chairwoman Pearce moved to accept the findings as fact as presented by staff as being congruent with the guidelines. Mr. Nunnally seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Chairwoman Pearce made a motion to approve this COA application 2018-001. Ms. Cole seconded. It passed unanimously.**

**2018-0012:** 1301 E. 5<sup>th</sup> St., College View Historic District, Contributing  
Applicant: Frank Cassiano  
Owner: 5<sup>th</sup> Street #2 Land Trust  
Project: Adjust the roofline on the rear of the house

Mr. Weitnauer described the proposal to put a sloped roof over the existing flat roof to stop water from leaking into the house. He noted that there was a COA #03-06 issued in October, 2013 to apply a rubber membrane to the same wing of the house.

**Design Guidelines:** (shortened to include only those that apply):

- 2 Roofs 20-21
1. The original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs must be retained.
2. All architectural features that are character-defining elements of the roof, such as cupolas, chimneys, donners, cornices, brackets, and turrets must be preserved and retained.
4. Roofing systems should be protected in appropriate ways:
  - Repair leaks promptly to limit related damage to the roof and building.
  - Provide temporary protection to a leaking roof before repairs.
8. New roof features, such as skylights and dormers must be installed on a discrete slope of the roof hidden from the public in a manner that avoids loss or damage to historic features and minimizes the impact on the historic character of the property.

**Recommendations:**

**Design Review Committee:**

Recommends approval.

**Staff:**

The application is congruent with applicable Design Guidelines # 4 and 8. Although it is not congruent with guideline #1, the flat roof system is continuing to fail. Repairing and modifying the roof complies with guideline #4 to help preserve the structure. Recommends approval of this application based on the recommendations made by the DRC and alignment with Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, guideline #4 and 8. Recommends the allowance of using Hardi-board for the siding of the wedge-shaped side of the sloped roof addition above the original flat roof.

Frank Cassiano stated that since speaking to the inspector and State Historic Preservation Office staff, he is proposing an alternate plan for the roof. He noted that there are four different rooflines on the property. An existing A-frame is only 5.5' from the area in need of a new roof. The old proposal would require bracing and a window would be right at the roof edge, the depth of which would interfere with the slope. The window wouldn't be an issue with an A-frame. He showed a sample of plank siding that he's using that will match existing siding, and said siding will only be needed in the triangle of an A-frame rather than both sides of a shed roof. Contractor says he can do A-frame or shed roof but A-frame is faster and easier. He will use two layers of felt paper and rolled roofing.

Ms. Cole asked if the roof will match the A-frame on back entrance and the answer was yes. Ms. Cole also asked if there will be gutters and whether the window ac unit would be covered. There will be a long gutter across roof above and ac's will be covered by overhang.

Mr. Cassiano asked if he could put a window in the wall under the roof.

Chairwoman Pearce said if one was proposed the HPC could consider it.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that due to structural span problems Mr. Cassiano is required to change the plan from a shed roof to a gabled roof, which will be more in keeping with the back of the house and believes he should still receive approval of staff's recommendations.

**Chairwoman Pearce moved to approve staff's recommendations and the findings are in congruence with our guidelines. Mr. Koontz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Chairwoman Pearce moved to approve the COA 2018-0012 with the modification of the proposed A-frame roof line. Mr. Nunnally seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

**2018-0013:** 402 S. Library St., College View Historic District, Contributing  
Applicant: Kevin C. Wiggins  
Owner: Shallow Walk, LLC  
Project: Construct an addition to the rear of the house

Mr. Domini Cunningham introduced himself as the new Historic Preservation Planner and staff liaison. He then summarized the bathroom and bedroom addition proposed for the rear of the house and delineated the property with pictures. He believes siding was added prior to establishment of Historic District. This c. 1940 house is a nondescript example of the type of immediate pre-WWII housing built in the district, this one-story house has both brick and weatherboard siding. A chimney articulates the three bay front façade. A small gable-roof wing projects from the left side of the front façade while a shallow appendage is located on the north elevation.

**Design Guidelines:**

1. Additions must be constructed so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric. Character-defining features of the historic building must not be obscured, damaged, or destroyed.
2. The size and the scale of additions must be limited so that they do not visually overpower historic buildings.
3. Additions must be located as inconspicuously as possible, on the rear or least character defining elevation of historic buildings.
4. Additions must be designed so that they are differentiated from the historic building. It is not appropriate to duplicate the form, the material, the style, and the detail of the historic building so closely that the integrity of the original building is lost, confused or compromised.
5. Additions must be designed so that they are compatible with the historic building in mass, materials, color, and proportion and spacing of windows and doors. Either reference design motifs from the historic building, or introduce a contemporary design that is compatible with the historic building.
6. For the predominant material of the addition, a material that is visually compatible with the historic materials of the original building, such as brick, stone, stucco, or wooden siding, must be used. Imitation masonry, vinyl and aluminum sidings are prohibited, but fiber cement or other composite siding may be considered.
7. The roof form must be compatible with the historic building and consistent with contributing roof forms in the historic district.
8. The foundation height and the eave lines of additions to residential structures must generally align with those of the historic building.
9. Additions must be designed and installed to minimize damage to the historic fabric and make future removal possible.
10. Additions to residential structures must not be taller than the original building.

**Recommendations:****Design Review Committee:**

Recommends that the applicant use wood for the siding with same reveal as the vinyl on the existing home, use hardie plank to trim the corners where the new wood siding meets the existing vinyl siding, slightly increase the overhang of the roof at the addition, and reuse one of the existing windows if wood is used to trim the windows. Approval is recommended with these modifications.

**Staff:**

Recommends approval of this application based on the recommendations made by the DRC and alignment with the design guidelines.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that this is the dream of the HPC – that someone will come in and make an appropriate addition to a house so that more people will move into the district.

Kevin Wiggins who has rental properties in the area, described how he's seeing more applications from young professionals moving into the neighborhood than students. The house currently has three bedrooms and one bath. One bedroom is very small and he plans to turn that bedroom into a hallway with a bathroom and add a larger bedroom and a bathroom. It will ultimately be a three bedroom, three bathroom house.

Ms. Cole asked about the timeframe. Mr. Wiggins said it will take about 1 ½ months, weather permitting.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public comment period. There were no speakers and she closed the public comment period.

**Chairwoman Pearce moved to accept the findings of fact and that they are congruent with guidelines. Mr. Belch seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**Chairwoman Pearce moved to approve COA 2018-0013. Ms. Cole seconded. The motions passed unanimously.**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public comment period. No one spoke. Chairwoman Pearce closed the public comment period.

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Design Review:** Chairwoman Pearce stated that the DRC report was incorporated with the staff report.

**Publicity:** Chairwoman Pearce stated the Publicity Committee was unable to meet due to too many things going on and not enough people to have a meeting

**Selection:** Chairwoman Pearce stated the Selection Committee was unable to meet due to too many things going on and not enough people to have a meeting.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER**

Chairwoman Pearce said the HPC is happy to have Mr. Cunningham but will miss Mr. Weitnauer.

Ms. Cole commended Mr. Weitnauer, Attorney Phillips and Ms. Kinane when she was here on getting the updated FIGs before the City Council and getting them approved.

Chairwoman Pearce said there was a tremendous response to the reception in May and many people were there. She appreciates everyone's work. It was a demonstration of what the HPC can do and what they've done since 1988.

Mr. Caspar pointed out that there's a problem with the way the word "congruent" and "incongruent" are being used. Chairwoman Pearce speculated whether it might be better to use the word "compliance". Attorney Phillips explained that the use of "congruent" is a statutory requirement.

**With no further discussion, Mr. Kammerer made a motion to adjourn, Mr. Caspar seconded, and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner  
Interim Historic Preservation Planner