

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

June 23, 2015

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

MCLEAN GODLEY, CHAIR

DAVID HURSH

WILLIAM GEE

RYAN WEBB

JEREMY JORDAN

KERRY CARLIN

ROGER KAMMERER

BRITTNEY WHITNEY

DAVID DENNARD

Not present: Alice Arnold

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** COLLETTE KINANE, PLANNER II; THOMAS WEITNAUER, CHIEF PLANNER; and AMY NUNEZ, SECRETARY.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY AND JONATHAN EDWARDS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Preservation Day! July 30, 2015*

Ms. Kinane announced Preservation Day is July 30, 2015. She stated it would start with a session at 8am at City Hall, followed by other sessions during the day. She also mentioned a walking tour.

Mr. Kammerer stated he wanted to cancel the walking tour due to the heat.

Chairman Godley agreed and stated they will reschedule in the fall. He mentioned he spoke with Mr. Webb about the historic scavenger hunt. He stated they will partner with the Jarvis Church Boys and Girls Club in September and they will incorporate technology in the event.

**ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA**

Chairman Godley stated that ECU withdrew their five COA applications.

Ms. Kinane stated that to maintain compliance with GS 121.12.A that establishes a procedure for the review of state undertaking that affects historic properties, the NC Historic Commission Office (aka State Historic Preservation Office-SHPO) has their own review process for national register properties that must be completed before

completing the City's review process. ECU has withdrawn their applications until May of next year.

Ms. Kinane stated that there were no Façade improvement Grant applications to review.

Mr. Hursh asked if May of next year was because of time needed to complete the state review.

Ms. Kinane stated yes.

Attorney Little stated the changes include having the announcements as item three, followed by the additions/deletions to the agenda.

**Mr. Hursh made a motion to accept the agenda with the mentioned changes, Mr. Kammerer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Hursh asked for clarification of the motion on page four regarding the FIG application.

Ms. Kinane stated that funds granted would not include/cover costs for advertising.

**Mr. Kammerer made a motion to approve the minutes, Mr. Dennard seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Minor Works COA's**

Staff reported three Certificates of Appropriateness issued:

#2015-10: 402 S. Jarvis St., Eneco East/Joshua Seymour – Install heat pump.

Approved.

#2015-11: 510 W. 4<sup>th</sup> St., Ed Phillips Inc. – Install heat pump, condenser, handler.

Approved.

#2015-12: 805 S. Evans St., Rebuilding Together – Build accessible ramp at rear.

Approved.

#### **Review of FIG Guidelines-Awning standards/requirements for graphics**

Ms. Kinane stated she did research and found out of 128 FIGs approved, 49 had awnings that were on 33 properties. There have been 5 repeat properties for awnings.

The shortest reapplication was 2 years. Only 10 applications included the business name or some other wording/graphic. Five awnings have been removed completely and 3 buildings have been demolished. The current text in the FIG guidelines states: “6. Awnings should be related to the shape and color of the building. First floor awnings should terminate no higher than one (1) foot below the second floor windows. Metal canopies are strongly discouraged, and their removal and replacement with fabric awnings are strongly encouraged. If installed or retained, they should be designed or treated in a matter that adds to the visual quality of the building. All awnings must meet code requirements for size, materials, projections, etc.”

Design Guidelines Chapter 4, Signs states: “3. Graphics may be applied to windows or awnings of commercial structures.”

*Terms:*

Awning – “a sheet of canvas or other material stretched on a frame and used to keep the sun or rain off a storefront, window, doorway, or deck.”

Marquee/Architectural Awning – “a roof-like projection over an entrance”

Canopy – “an overhanging projection or covering, supported on poles or suspended”

Mr. Webb stated his main concern was funding awnings with the business name on it and then the business goes out of business. He would like to not fund awnings with names on it because it shortens the life of the awning.

Mr. Hursh stated it made sense and to be good stewards of funding and extend the life of the awning.

Chairman Godley stated he believes if the business wants to pay for the logo on the awning, they should have that right.

Mr. Hursh stated that the FIG funding would just not pay for it.

Mr. Webb stated that is one way of doing it but if a business was to pay for the logo on a City funded awning, then they have devalued the awning. HPC controls the funding of the grant and they are for historic preservation and not economic development.

Mr. Kammerer stated he does not like marquees. In the late 50’s and early 60’s there was a campaign to cover up brick or anything that looked old in Greenville and they used marquees to do that to look more modern. He likes the awnings with stripes.

Chairman Godley asked if they should or should not fund awnings that will have logos.

Mr. Webb stated no, they should not fund the logo.

Chairman Godley stated an awning does improve the façade and makes it esthetically pleasing to the Uptown Greenville area.

Mr. Hursh asked if the FIG could include painting that would cover a name.

Ms. Kinane stated painting could be included.

Mr. Jordan stated he never remembers funding painting over a sign or for just a sign.

Mr. Kammerer stated they should not be in the business of funding logos on buildings.

Ms. Kinane stated that the FIG program handout page 8 number 5 states: “Sign guidelines for the central business district have been developed to prevent visual clutter and to improve general visual quality. Within these guidelines, individuality and creativity are encouraged. Signs should relate to each other through quality, not necessarily through the use of uniform materials, lettering, or size. All signs are controlled by the City of Greenville’s sign ordinance. Good signs have the following characteristics: legibility, clarity, attractiveness, durability, and good placement. Most buildings are designed with a defined sign space. The location of signs of appropriate size in these spaces is strongly encouraged. Plastic, illuminated signs are strongly discouraged. Consider attached, flat, or hanging signs lit with outside direct lighting. All signs should meet code requirements for materials, size, projection, etc. Hanging or projecting signs or hand-painted window signs of good quality are encouraged. (Sign permit may be required – check with City zoning official).

Mr. Hursh stated he sees that the signs are to help make the area look good but is concerned if money should be funded to assist in logos. If a business closes and a new business arrives and applies for another FIG, then the issue is longevity.

Mr. Webb stated they are funding the building not the business. The awning should fit the owner’s needs and not necessarily the tenant’s and that would protect the grant.

Mr. Hursh asked if there are code and zoning requirements for design on the awning.

Mr. Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner, stated it is not prohibited.

Mr. Kinane stated that less than 10 out of 50 applications included text or graphics on the awning.

Mr. Jordan stated that graphics appeared over time on awnings. They need to decide what era they want to preserve to include or not graphics.

Mr. Webb stated in past years the HPC has steered toward striped awnings with flaps.

Chairman Godley stated that the guidelines specifically state that creativity is encouraged. He believes it should allow for logos.

Mr. Webb stated City funding should not be used for logos, but they still can have them.

Mr. Kammerer stated that current awnings with logos should be grandfathered.

Mr. Weitnauer stated if the recipient of the grant removes items under two years, then the grant needs to be paid back. For example, the Varsity Club went out of business 2.5 years into their contract.

Chairman Godley asked for comments on possible verbiage.

Mr. Hursh stated that they should meet in the middle and communicate language to the applicant to rethink text/graphics and possibly discourage it because it reduces the awning's longevity.

Mr. Kammerer stated that Mr. Weitnauer stated that longevity is built into the contract.

Chairman Godley stated the next step should be for the Design Review Committee to consider the language on this issue.

Mr. Jordan asked if a business folds less than the two years, does the City pursue the owner to recoup the FIG funds.

Mr. Weitnauer stated the language is not clear but believes they would pursue who signed the contract. The contract could be amended.

Mr. Hursh asked how it is enforced.

Mr. Weitnauer stated that staff would monitor any changes.

Chairman Godley asked if everyone was okay tabling the issue and sending it to the Design Review Committee for further consideration.

Attorney Little stated a motion needs to be made to refer the issue to the Design Review Committee for recommended language, modified application/contract and return to the HPC with specific options.

**Mr. Kammerer made a motion to refer the FIG guidelines on awnings to the Design Review Committee for recommended language and modified application/contract, Mr. Webb seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No one spoke for public comment.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### *Design Review Committee*

Chairman Godley stated they met and reviewed the ECU COA's.

#### *Publicity Committee*

Mr. Webb stated they met before today's meeting. They spoke about the historic marker program.

Ms. Kinane stated the City is considering implementing a historic marker program. Future public meetings will happen to discuss options for this program.

Mr. Dennard asked how the signs would be distinguished from the state markers.

Mr. Kinane stated there are 5 NC State Highway Markers: ECU, Plank Road, Humber House, Jarvis Church, and Cherry Cemetery.

Mr. Dennard stated these markers are history on a stick.

Mr. Webb stated the kiosk in the Five Points Plaza is a good example of a lot of information. He stated maybe they could have more kiosks around town.

Mr. Kammerer stated he would like to see these markers with more information. They could possibly have a QR barcode to scan for information.

*Selection Committee*

Ms. Kinane stated she is waiting to find a potential landmark. The bus station is not interested now but maybe in the future.

Chairman Godley mentioned the Johnston House and offered to contact the Chapter Consultant of the Sorority since he knows people that currently reside there. He recommended if they get no response in the next few months, to consider adding more names to the list so they can move forward.

Mr. Jordan stated they don't want to lose the funds due to delay.

Mr. Webb asked if Staff received a response from White's Theatre.

Ms. Kinane stated no.

Mr. Webb suggested adding the landmark request to the redevelopment package.

Mr. Jordan agreed stating it could be a tax incentive.

Ms. Kinane stated a survey was done in 2009 on the property. The owner of the property is the Redevelopment Commission.

Mr. Webb suggested an official request be made from the HPC to the RDC.

Ms. Kinane stated she included in a slide the schedule for the July 30<sup>th</sup> Preservation Day Workshop. There also will be a CLG (Certified Local Government) session in the afternoon from 1pm to 4pm.

**With there being no further discussion, Mr. Dennard made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Webb seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:48p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II