

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

October 27, 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:

DAVID HURSH-VICE CHAIR	RYAN WEBB
JEREMY JORDAN	ALICE ARNOLD
KERRY CARLIN	WILLIAM GEE
DAVID DENNARD	

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: COLLETTE KINANE, PLANNER II and AMY NUNEZ, SECRETARY

OTHERS PRESENT: MERRILL FLOOD, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER; BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY; JEWEL JONES, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN AND KELVIN THOMAS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Mr. Jordan made a motion to accept the agenda as written, Mr. Webb seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the August 25, 2015 minutes as written, Mr. Carlin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works COA's

Staff reported three Certificates of Appropriateness issued:

#2015-20: 205 S. Library St., Dan Kinlaw – Install AC on rear of building. Approved.

#2015-21: 312 Rotary Ave., Melissa Rees – Install satellite dish on west side of property. Approved.

#2015-22: 411 E. 4th St., Scott Johnson – Replace HVAC. Approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness

#2015-07: 510 W. 4th St., Michael Butler – Install fence. (Approved)

Those speaking in favor or against the application were sworn in.

Ms. Collette Kinane presented the application for the City. The property is a local landmark; it is not within a historic district but is part of the Skinnerville neighborhood. It is known as the Glenn Pender Moore House. The proposed fence would be a white three foot tall fence, with pointed pickets and flat posts, within the front yard of the property. It would extend to Elizabeth Street and run along 4th Street (corner lot). She stated the application fits the guidelines. The Design Guidelines for fences are in Chapter 4, Fences and Walls, numbers 7-17. Number 10 states: *Fences along the right-of-ways shall be setback three (3) feet from the interior edge of the sidewalk or three (3) feet from the interior edge of the right-of-way, whichever is greater.* There is no right-of-way along this property with the exception of the sidewalk. A fence setback three feet from the sidewalk would greatly reduce the space being fenced in. She stated consideration should be considered to put the fence along the sidewalk like the applicant proposed. There is precedence for this in the Skinnerville neighborhood. She showed a picture from 1954 with a similar fence design and placement which was at the corner of W 4th Street and Contentnea Street. She also showed another picture of a current fence at 4th and Latham Streets in the Skinnerville neighborhood.

Chairman Hursh opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael Butler, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He stated it is a very busy street and he has a small dog. He wants to safely let the dog outside and also prevent people crossing through his property. Placing the fence along the sidewalk would provide more room.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

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

Mr. Webb stated that the Design Review Committee met regarding this application and did recommend approval with the fence closer to the sidewalk.

Chairman Hursh stated the request seemed appropriate and would not create a distraction.

Chairman Hursh read the Findings of Facts for application #15-07 for 510 W. 4th Street, parcel number 06728.

The COA application was completed and submitted September 21, 2015. The COA application is for the installation of a three foot tall white picket fence around the front yard of the property up to the sidewalk. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 5, 2015 and October 12, 2015. The public hearing was held on October 27, 2015. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Michael Butler presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines Chapter 4, 7-17 are applicable. The installation of a fence is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines and with precedence of similar fences allowed up to the sidewalk.

Attorney Little stated the Committee could grant an exception to the recommendation of a three foot setback based on the size of the yard, the needs of the applicant and the precedence for similar fences in the neighborhood.

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

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the COA application without restrictions, Mr. Carlin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kinane stated that Preservation North Carolina does have an easement on this property and they also approved the application.

#2015-07: 401 S. Holly St., Daniel Overby – New 2 story construction. (Approved)

Those speaking in favor or against the application were sworn in.

Ms. Collette Kinane presented the application for the City. The property is a vacant lot in the College View Historic District. The application is to construct a new two story residence. The location of the proposed structure will be within the same footprint as the previous structure. Since the property will be new, the approval would be for the feeling of the property with the allowance of non-traditional/historic materials within the guidelines. The proposed elevation is under thirty-five feet, which is the height limit in the guidelines. The Design Guidelines that apply are all of chapter three. The proposed blue color palette is similar to that in the historic district. The proposed has a Victorian feel, as the neighborhood has more of a craftsman/bungalow style. The use of hardy cedar shakes on the front will fit into the district. It was discussed in the Design Review meeting the view of the proposed from the street. The applicant has stated that a retaining wall might be necessary, and if so, it will match the retaining wall next door. The landscaping plan that was provided showed vegetation similar to that in the district. There is also a proposed fence that will be at the back of the property.

Ms. Arnold asked if any of the trees will be saved.

Ms. Kinane stated she did not know.

Mr. Hursh suggested Dogwoods as part of similar landscaping in the district.

Ms. Kinane stated the plans stated Crape Myrtles.

Chairman Hursh opened the public hearing.

Mr. Daniel Overby, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He stated in January 2015 he met with Thomas Weitnauer who suggested that the property would need to be torn down due to its poor condition and its difficulty to rebuild it. The property was just a shell with no floor. He was encouraged by the words on the City of Greenville's website: *The City of Greenville recognizes that historic preservation is a vital tool for protecting the city's heritage, revitalizing its neighborhoods, enhancing quality of life in Greenville, and stimulating economic development in the region. Local Historic District designation encourages the purchase and rehabilitation of properties because the investment is protected from trends that might otherwise harm the character and vitality of a neighborhood.* His plan is to have something that matches the neighborhood. His desire is to keep and preserve two existing Dogwood trees on the property. The original stairs will remain with the retaining wall being built around it. An original driveway and a Crape Myrtle tree both at the back of the property will also remain. He will use Benjamin Moore's historic color palette both inside and outside of the structure. His plan is to highlight the Victorian feel side of craftsman style homes in the area since they are from the same time period.

Mr. George Hamilton, property owner next door to the proposed, spoke in favor of the request. He approves the design and it will be a good addition to the neighborhood.

No one spoke in opposition of the request.

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

Chairman Hursh asked the Commissioners if there were any requests to make the property more craftsman-like.

No comments were made.

Ms. Kinane stated that SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) commented on the request being more Victorian than craftsman, but otherwise approved the request.

Chairman Hursh read the Findings of Facts for application #15-08 for 401 South Holly Street, parcel number 17969.

The COA application was completed and submitted September 29, 2015. The COA application is for the construction of a two story residence and landscaping. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 5, 2015 and October 12, 2015. A hearing notice was mailed to the adjacent property owners on October 2, 2015. The public hearing was held on October 27, 2015. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Daniel Overby presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines in Chapter 3 are applicable. The construction of a two story residence and landscaping is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Jordan stated this was a good project. He asked if there were any specific rules for height of fences.

Attorney Little stated it is in the guidelines as six feet for the backyard.

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

Ms. Dennard made a motion to approve the COA application, Mr. Jordan seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Presentation of Street and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Bond

Mr. Flood presented the Street and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Bond. The City of Greenville will have one bond question related to Street and Pedestrian Transportation on the November 3, 2015 ballot. The question will ask voters if they want to spend \$16 million to improve streets, provide sidewalks, and other improvements and transportation projects. A bond is an issuance of debt, similar to a home mortgage. This is a General Obligation bond which means that the City will use its taxing powers if necessary. The City will have seven years to issue the bond. The City has a legal debt capacity of \$444 million. Currently, outstanding debt is about \$41.1 million. Annual debt payments per year are about \$5 million. The last bond referendum was in 2004 and included \$20.8 million for street improvements, the West Greenville revitalization plan, the Center City revitalization program, and storm water improvements. The bond rating for the City is AA. This is an excellent rating. The Five Capital Projects for this bond are: *Street Improvements: \$10,000,000, West 5th Street Streetscape: \$1,950,000, 10th*

Street Connector Enhancements: \$1,750,000, Sidewalks: \$1,400,000 and East Side Greenway: \$750,000.

Under North Carolina law, a local government holding a referendum for the purpose of issuing general obligation (G.O.) bonds must specify general categories of capital projects for which bond proceeds may be used. Within these categories, a local government may identify specific projects that are intended to be funded by the bond proceeds. However, due to the lengthy process involved with identifying, designing, and implementing projects, as well as the lack of detailed cost and other project information available at the time of the bond referendum, the specific projects identified in the bond package may change over time. The question that the actual bond referendum therefore asks of voters is whether the local government is authorized to use the G.O. bonds as a financing tool for the general category of projects up to the amount specified in the question.

Mr. Dennard asked if sidewalk and street maintenance is paid forward, then what would the life span be of the work done.

Mr. Flood stated the Public Works Department reviews the streets. The City has a normal maintenance schedule in place. Normal infrastructure can be about 10-15 years.

Mr. Webb asked if there was an update on the tiger grant.

Mr. Flood stated they are still waiting. He stated it is a grant from the Federal Department of Transportation.

Mr. Dennard stated there is an increase in pedestrian accidents. He asked if there was anything about that in the Bond.

Mr. Flood stated the City is in discussions with DOT to improve intersections/crossings. The Bond will include sidewalk improvements.

Review of FIG Guidelines-Awning standards/requirements for graphics (Second Reading)

Ms. Kinane provided the revisions based on suggestions from last month's meeting. They are:

Add the following under Eligibility #5 Examples of projects eligible for funding include: - *"d) Installation of approved awnings"* AND under Examples of projects that cannot be funded, either in whole or part by the grant program – *"Personalized awnings (the graphics or wording advertising a business"*

Add the following under Façade Improvement Design Guidelines, Construction Methods and Materials of the Community Development Department #6 – “*Business related graphics or wording on awnings will be ineligible for funding. Business related graphics or wording located on a detachable valance or removable patch are allowed but are not eligible for funding*”

Mr. Webb made a motion to approve the Façade Improvement Grant Guidelines, seconded by Mr. Dennard and the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Time Alteration (Second Reading)

Chairman Hursh stated proposal is for 6pm.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the new meeting time of 6pm, seconded by Mr. Carlin and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kinane stated the new time would start January 2016. She will prepare the amendment, sign it, and have the Chair sign it as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No one spoke for public comment.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

Mr. Webb stated they met to consider the COA's at 510 W. 4th St and 401 S. Holly St.

Publicity Committee

No reports. Did not meet.

Selection Committee

No reports. Did not meet.

Mr. Webb asked when the next local designation process is to begin.

Ms. Kinane stated when the Selection Committee meets to discuss it.

Mr. Jordan stated they met and asked if any of the chosen properties were interested.

Mr. Kinane stated possibly one but she is waiting to hear back.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Kinane provided an update of the NC Preservation Conference Workshop she attended. She stated the Governor signed into effect the new North Carolina Tax Credit Program. She stated full details were not available, but it will begin January 1, 2016.

Mr. Dennard asked for information comparing North Carolina to other states regarding historic preservation tax credits.

Ms. Kinane stated that Pitt County is a Tier 2 county and more tax credits will be available to Tier 3 counties due to lower incomes.

Ms. Kinane provided an update of the Bus Station at 310 W. 5th Street. The Board of Adjustment approved a request for new development at this site. There was no change in zoning at this site and the request was only for the use of four bedrooms. The Bus Station is not a historic landmark and not on the national register. A request that homage be made with the use of photographs.

Ms. Kinane stated that better education regarding historic landmarks is needed.

Mr. Hursh suggested letters highlighting successful businesses that maintain historic properties.

Mr. Webb asked if the Historic Preservation Committee was ever under the Economic Development Division.

Mr. Flood stated that it has always been under the Planning Division. He stated that the end decision to have a designated historic property is up to the property owner.

Mr. Webb asked about the status of the downtown theatre being a landmark.

Mr. Flood stated that the intention is to do so and the developer is looking into using historic preservation tax credits.

Mr. Webb asked about the Imperial Tobacco Warehouse Office Building which is currently under the control of the City.

Mr. Flood stated the intention is to preserve the building as condition of sale and the new parking lots and transportation building will not touch it.

Mr. Dennard asked for Mr. Flood to share his perspective regarding where the City

stands currently on Historic Preservation.

Mr. Flood stated Economic Development and Historic Preservation in the non-residential area go hand in hand. This is important in core area of the City, downtown and the West Greenville Revitalization area. There are residential areas that are ripe for historic districts like the Skinnerville neighborhood. The right formula needs to be found to preserve buildings and residences.

Ms. Kinane mentioned that Roger Kammerer requested to cancel the October 3rd historic tour since he would not be able to lead it due to his schedule.

Mr. Webb stated that the Village of Yesteryear open house was rescheduled to November 14, 2015.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Dennard made the motion to adjourn, Ms. Arnold seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II