

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

June 28, 2016

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JEREMY JORDAN-CHAIR

DAVID HURSH-VICE CHAIR

DAVID DENNARD

MYRON CASPAR

KERRY CARLIN

ELIZABETH WOOTEN

JAKE POSTMA

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

OTHERS PRESENT: BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY and KELVIN THOMAS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN

Chairman Jordan called the meeting to order in Room 337 as advertised. He stated that Council Chambers was available for the meeting.

Mr. Dennard made a motion to move the meeting to Council Chambers and reconvene in 5 minutes, seconded by Mr. Postma, and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jordan called the meeting back to order in Council Chambers.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Chairman Jordan requested to move item #3 under New Business to the end of New Business, COA #16-03 at 311 S. Eastern Street for applicant Dr. James Krukowski. The applicant is coming from New Bern and was not present yet.

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

Attorney Little stated that the Commission opened the meeting in Room 337 that had been designated to conduct the meeting because Council Chambers was not going to be available. A motion was made to adjourn and to reassemble in this location. No business was conducted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Postma made a motion to approve the May 19, 2016 and May 24, 2016 as written, Mr. Dennard seconded, and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works COA's

Staff reported two Certificates of Appropriateness issued:

#2016-07: 311 S. Eastern St., Dr. James Krukowski – Add gutters/downspouts. Approved.

#2016-08: 508 W. 5th St., Michael Moore – Painting/repair, storm door, roof repair, porch repair. Approved.

COA #16-02 – 801 E. 5th Street

Ms. Kinane presented the Staff report.

Background:

Historic Name: John B. Kittrell House. The house was built in 1923 for local merchant John B. Kittrell, a charter member of the Greenville Rotary Club. The original design of the house was 3 bays wide on the first floor and four bays on the second with a hipped roof and large decoratively sawn brackets located under the eaves. Two side additions were completed at some point— first the west, later the east. These additions are distinguished by large multi-paned picture windows. The house has been owned by Delta Zeta since 1964.

Previous COAs: 08/2004 – replace window sashes – Withdrawn

11/1997 – modification of design of terrace fence: Denied.

03/1996 – add exterior stair; restore garage; renovate west wing – install French doors as would have originally appeared; redesign front porch; renovate terrace fence; remove non-original canopy between house and garden: Approved.

Considerations:

The applicant proposes the replacement of all exterior doors and windows with wood doors and windows that exactly match the style of those that currently are on the property. The applicant also proposes the replacement of the exterior columns that support the front porch. The applicant is willing to replace with wood, but would like the Historic Preservation Commission to consider allowing the columns to be replaced with fiberglass.

There have been at least five documented substantial exterior renovations – each slightly altered the number and placement of columns, door openings, and window sizes (though all designs have retained the 6/1 window style). These alterations have greatly altered the original appearance of the house and some, especially the additions of the east and west wings and the front porch, have become historic in their own right. The front porch and windows add to the distinguishing character of the house and, following the *Design Guidelines*, replacement of any element or detail should only be considered in cases of severe deterioration as determined by a preservation professional. When replacement is necessary, the new piece must match the original piece in material, shape, texture, detail, and dimension. While some of the windows are original to the house, the columns are not. According to the *Guidelines*, is not appropriate to substitute a contemporary stock item that does not match the original element, or to eliminate a detail rather than repair or replace it.

In reviewing historic photos, it appears that the columns have been replaced and altered several times – most recently in 1996.

Ms. Kinane did research on fiberglass which is:

- A type of fiber-reinforced plastic where the reinforcement is specifically glass fiber. The plastic may be thermosetting plastic – most often epoxy, polyester resin – or vinylester, or a thermoplastic.
- A strong lightweight material and is used for many products.
- Also called glass-reinforced plastic (GRP), glass fiber reinforced plastic (GFRP) or GFK.

Design Guidelines. She stated that fiberglass is mentioned 0 times in the document. The following if you hold it comparable to fiber cement products:

- “Fiber cement may be considered in select situations if it matches the original wood exactly in dimensions and profile, however the use of wood is always preferred and must be considered first.”
- “New products are constantly being developed and other alternatives to fiber cement like wood composite may be considered if they match the original exactly in dimension and profile.” (pg. 24)

Ms. Kinane also researched if fiberglass was allowed by other Historic Commissions. In 2013, a report titled “Alternative Materials and Their Use in the Historic District” was prepared for the Columbus, OH Preservation Commission. The report stated that:

“Fiberglass columns are considered to be an acceptable material by several cities if the original columns are badly deteriorated, missing, or previously replaced. Austin, Jacksonville, El Paso and Indianapolis allow these types of porch columns on primary elevations if the dimensions, proportions and texture have the appearance of wood columns. Memphis does not allow fiberglass columns on primary elevations but does allow them on rear or non-readily visible side elevations. Nashville, Charlotte, and Boston do not approve these types of columns for historic rehabilitation projects on any elevation. In the other cities and smaller communities there is general acceptance of fiberglass columns for rear elevations and growing acceptance for primary elevations. Generally if the column has the correct proportions to resemble a historic wood column Commissions will grant approval. There is also the understanding that this material is relatively new for porch columns and the need to monitor how these columns will weather over time.”

The National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 16 – The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors states:

“Fiberglass is the most well-known of the FRP products generally produced as a thin rigid laminate shell formed by pouring a polyester or epoxy resin gelcoat into a mold. When tack-free, layers of chopped glass or glass fabric are added along with additional resins. Reinforcing rods and struts can be added if necessary; the gel coat can be pigmented or painted.

Application: Fiberglass, a non-load-bearing material attached to a separate structural frame, is frequently used as a replacement where a lightweight element is needed or an inaccessible location makes frequent maintenance of historic materials difficult. Its good molding ability and versatility to represent stone, wood, metal and terra cotta make it an alternative to ornate or carved building elements such as column capitals, bases, spandrel panels, beltcourses, balustrades, window hoods or parapets. Its ability to reproduce bright colors is a great advantage.

Advantages:

- lightweight, long spans available with a separate structural frame
- high ratio of strength to weight
- good molding ability
- integral color with exposed high quality pigmented gel-coat or takes paint well
- easily installed, can be cut, patched, sanded
- non-corrosive, rot-resistant

Disadvantages:

- requires separate anchorage system
- combustible (fire retardants can be added); fragile to impact.
- high coefficient of expansion and contraction requires frequently placed expansion joints
- ultraviolet sensitive unless surface is coated or pigments are in gelcoat
- vapor impermeability may require ventilation detail"

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1-18 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors and guidelines 2, 3, and 6 of Chapter 2 Porches, Entrances, and Balconies are applicable.

Due to zoning restrictions, the portion of the application and project description that mentions the garage conversion should be disregarded. This portion of the project will not be considered under this COA. The conversion as described does not meet current zoning requirements and will not be completed.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on June 13 to discuss this application. The committee determined that the project should be approved as submitted [with the garage alteration withdrawn], provided that the columns remain wood and the windows remain 6/1 divided light windows. The windows must match the original in every dimension and muntin profile exactly.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael Moore, applicant and owner of DesignCo, spoke in favor of the request. He stated he is putting in 33 windows, 8 doors and 8 columns. The windows are to be all wood Pella windows with simulated light and with the same 6/1 pane look to match the house.

Chairman Jordan asked if the dividers were snapped in.

Mr. Moore stated that they are permanently attached and the windows are wood.

Mr. Postma asked how much more would it cost for wood versus fiberglass.

Mr. Moore stated fiberglass is less expensive and looks nicer. Wood deteriorates faster.

Mr. Wooten stated the specks provided are for the crown colonial wood columns. She asked if there were specks available for the fiberglass columns.

Mr. Moore stated he didn't bring them.

Mr. Dennard asked in terms of historic memory if this would be a first for Greenville.

Chairman Jordan stated this is the first request since the new HPC Guidelines were adopted. They are more flexible now.

Mr. Hursh mentioned that the first available picture of the property matches the most recent by having double columns. He stated he would feel comfortable with the fiberglass since the columns there now are not original to the property.

Ms. Wooten asked if the fiberglass would match what is currently there.

Mr. Moore stated yes and they would be smooth and painted white.

Chairman Jordan stated that if the Commission does approve the fiberglass, they can have the applicant bring back the specifications to Ms. Kinane and she will make sure it matches.

Mr. Postma asked if the request was approved, would the property still be a contributing property to the historic district.

Ms. Kinane stated yes.

Mr. Hursh asked why the Design Review Committee recommended it be wood.

Ms. Kinane stated that the research regarding fiberglass was not complete.

Chairman Jordan stated that wood was required in the past.

Mr. Hursh asked if the difference in cost is substantial.

Mr. Moore stated that it cost about 20% more for wood but install and painting is the same. With wood, the columns could rot from the inside out.

Mr. Caspar asked if damaged fiberglass would require full replacement.

Mr. Moore stated both wood and fiberglass would require replacement if damaged.

Mr. Dennard asked for the reasoning behind using fiberglass versus wood.

Mr. Moore stated fiberglass has a longer life and simulates wood. Wood rots.

Mr. Dennard asked if Mr. Moore has done this before.

Mr. Moore stated yes. Fiberglass columns are typically used in new construction.

Mr. Carlin asked if the Commission went with fiberglass, would it set precedence.

Chairman Jordan stated yes but the new Guidelines have evolved to include new construction materials.

Mr. Moore stated that the wood windows are about three times the cost of a vinyl replacement.

No one spoke in opposition.

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

Mr. Dennard asked if the fiberglass would affect the aesthetics of the property.

Chairman Jordan stated he doesn't think it will have a negative impact.

Mr. Postma stated no because wood needs constant maintenance.

Chairman Jordan read the **Findings of Facts** for application #16-02 801 E. Fifth Street, parcel number 05865.

The COA application was completed and submitted on May 31, 2016. The COA application is for replacement of windows and doors and the replacement of columns. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on June 20 and June 27, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on June 10, 2016. This hearing was held on June 28, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the city and Michael Moore presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-18 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors and guidelines 2, 3 and 6 of Chapter 2 Porches, Entrances, and Balconies are applicable. The replacement of windows and doors and the replacement of columns are found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

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

Mr. Postma made a motion to approve the COA application and to allow fiberglass columns once Staff approves the specks/appearance, Mr. Dennard seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

COA #16-04 – 601 E. 5th Street and

COA #16-05 – 409-11 S. Summit Street and

COA #16-06 – 407 S. Summit Street and

COA #16-07 – 405 S. Summit Street and

COA #16-08 – 404 S. Jarvis Street. All have the same applicant: ECU/Scott Buck

Ms. Kinane stated that all five applications from East Carolina University/Scott Buck will be presented at the same time due to their location and request to either relocate or demolish.

Mr. Caspar asked if the requests are heard together, would they be voted on as a group or individually.

Chairman Jordan stated the intent is to group them but if they need to be separated they can.

Attorney Little stated Staff will present them together because the facts are the same for each. The findings of facts can be read once for all of them and then an individual vote per COA. If one COA has different facts, then it can be considered individually.

Ms. Kinane presented the Staff report on all five COAs.

601 E. Fifth Street

Background:

The Proctor-Yongue House, built in the Colonial Revival style in 1917, is said to have been a wedding present to Mr. and Mrs. J. Knott Proctor, who owned the Chevrolet dealership in the 1920s. The Proctors occupied the house until 1965, when they sold it to Dr. Alfred H. Yongue. The two-story frame house is five bays wide and three rooms deep. A central cross gable interruption highlights the façade and accents the hipped roof. Another gable accents a two-story, three-sided bay at the west elevation. The front façade is dominated by a hip-roof wrap-around porch with square tapered post-on-pier supports and a plain square balustrade. A shed and a hipped-roof, one-story kitchen ell are located in the rear. Consistent with other larger residences on East 5th Street, the interior of the house has nicely fashioned mantelpiece, door and window surrounds, and a center hall stair. The broad treated door, with its latticed transom, and the stained glass window in the dining room are features more typical of turn-of-the-century Victorian construction than 1920s construction.

A period garage is located at the rear of the house. Original double-leaf garage doors remained on one portal. The garage is covered with weatherboard siding and has a small shed addition to the south elevation.

409-411 S. Summit Street

Background:

One of several duplex houses built in the district, this structure depicts the Craftsman style executed in a two-story, wood-shingled, side-gable house. The front façade denotes the dwelling's multiple family functions with two doors separated by a set of paired windows. The façade is covered by a hip-roof porch. A single car garage is attached to each side of the house.

Previous COAs for this structure include: the removal of metal gutters and replacement with vinyl (05/1996), and the installation of white vinyl storm windows and repainting of exterior wood shingles (08/1996).

407 S. Summit Street

Background:

This one-and-a-half-story brick structure was built in 1940. Its design is typical of structures built in the district during the 1940s and 1950s.

A large, modern, concrete, two-car garage is located in the rear of the house, built sometime after 1960.

Previous COAs for this property: removal/reinstallation of fiberglass shingles from front of the house (11/1995).

405 S. Summit Street

Description:

Also known as the A.B. Ellington House, this craftsman-style American Foursquare was constructed in 1923. The structure features a low hip roof, three bay front façade sheltered by a full-width hip-roof porch and two interior chimneys. This structure is characteristic of other houses in the district with additional craftsman-style details: exposed rafter ends, eight-over-one sash windows, and a multi-paned front door. A hip-roof ell projects from the rear elevation. The house was renovated to serve as a rental unit, currently it is a triplex.

404 S. Jarvis Street

Background:

Built in 1935, this Prairie-style Craftsman Bungalow has a wood shingled exterior and is defined by the extremely low pitch of its gabled roof, exposed construction joints, and squat double shouldered chimney on the north elevation, sheltered by the roof's deep eaves. The massive supporting piers on the front porch have recessed panels and decorative brick bands laid in a soldier pattern. A distinctive flare, or skirt, which covers the foundation wall, is also illustrative of the prairie style. This structure additionally illustrates the influence of Oriental design on bungalow construction. Also referred to as the J.K. Young House.

Previous COAs: Extensive roof repair, re-shingling, and installation of ridge vent (08/1995). Replacement of deteriorated shingles (09/2007).

Considerations:

East Carolina University plans to expand the property surrounding the Chancellor’s House (603 E. 5th Street) to “improve the security surrounding the residence and to prepare for a future expansion of the residence and grounds to make the property more suitable for a Chancellor’s residence.” (Quoted from the COA application description.) According to a survey conducted by F.A. Bartlett, a large dogwood, 12”DBH, and two large Pecan trees on the property should be preserved. Five large camellias located near the house could be transplanted. F.A. Bartlett also recommended that the two Darlington Oaks and a Southern Magnolia located along the street should be inspected by the city’s arborist.

The zoning ordinance, 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 all the applications, **Design Guidelines** 1 and 2 of Chapter 5 – Demolition, 1-5 of Chapter 5 – Relocation, and 2, 3, 8, and 14 of Chapter 4 – Landscaping are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met to review the application. Their recommendation is that this request constitutes an irreparable adverse effect upon the College View Historic District. As a highly visible structure on the main gateway into the district, the loss of the Proctor-Yongue House will create a void in the appearance of the district from 5th Street. For this reason, staff recommends that the HPC approve the application with the full 365 day delay and requests continued consultation with the applicant to find a means of maintaining the character of the district.

If relocated, the structure should be fully documented at the original site. If demolished, the HPC should require the applicant to fully document each structure and create a plan with staff for salvaging all repurposable features and materials.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Scott Buck, applicant/representative of ECU, spoke in favor of the request. He stated the plan is to enlarge the yard at the Chancellor's House. There have been problems with security. This request would expand the area around the Chancellor's House for security and possible future expansion. He stated they have worked with the City of Greenville, SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) and NCPreservation.org with hopes to work together to find someone to relocate the properties. The NC Department of Administration has policy/procedures that ECU, as a state agency, must follow. He stated they will advertise for competitive sealed bids to relocate the properties and will repeat the process. If unsuccessful, a third bid request will go out for relocation or demolition. He stated they want to do what is right and are doubling their efforts. He stated they have already extended the 365 day delay twice while working with the State before they submitted their application to the City.

Chairman Jordan asked if it gets to the point of demolition, will there be materials salvaged.

Attorney Little stated that reclamation of usable materials was a recommend condition by Staff in the Staff report.

Mr. Dennard stated this was a large project and asked Mr. Buck if he has seen other projects like this.

Mr. Buck stated he only has experience with one historic property on E. 9th Street. He has helped relocate non-historic properties outside of City limits and demolished a few properties.

Ms. Wooten asked to elaborate on the security concern.

Mr. Buck stated there have been problems with parties. Beer/other bottles get thrown over the fence and there have been knocks on doors/windows after 2am. He stated the Chancellor's House is a beautiful contributing historic district property. The desire is to improve the house, have separate living quarters from the main house, and improve/increase security.

Ms. Wooten asked if the expansion would encroach on the five COA properties.

Mr. Buck stated the plans are not created yet.

Chairman Jordan stated that comments had been made about moving the Chancellor's House off of Fifth Street. He stated it would be tragic if the five COA properties and the Chancellor's House were gone or moved.

Mr. Buck stated he is under oath and, to the best of his knowledge, the plan for the Chancellor's House is to stay on Fifth Street.

Ms. Wooten asked for the results of the work in the past year with PreservationNC.org.

Mr. Buck stated there was a leadership change and that the sale of the homes for relocation was not advertised as promised on the Preservation NC website. He stated it is not ECU's intent to make money from the relocation of these properties.

Chairman Jordan asked if the amount of money it would take to demolish the properties could be used to relocate them.

Mr. Buck stated when the time comes he will ask the State Surplus Office if it is permissible. He stated he personally would like to see the houses relocated.

Mr. Caspar asked for the size of the existing Chancellor's House property, the combined size of adding the five COA properties and the size of the expansion.

Mr. Buck stated he did not know. There is no expansion plan now. The five COA properties will be all part of the Chancellor's House property and expand the yard area.

Mr. Caspar asked if the applicant's proposal is based on a need of living and entertainment space or is it just empty space for a park.

Mr. Buck stated that in the future they would add to the house and create a bigger buffer.

Chairman Jordan asked how the properties will be treated in the interim, before expansion.

Mr. Buck stated they will be seeded, graded, and maintained.

Mr. Hursh asked if it would be a parking lot.

Mr. Buck stated no.

Ms. Kinane stated that any future changes to the Chancellor's House will come before the HPC.

Mr. Hursh stated that the homes are in decline and decay. Hopefully a relocation of the properties would include a repair to save them from their current condition.

Mr. Dennard asked, with the increase of security, will the property remain accessible.

Mr. Buck stated yes but with an increased level of security and a buffer at the rear and sides.

Mr. Ryan Webb spoke in opposition of the request. He stated he was previously a member of the HPC and during his time the Chancellor's House was on the agenda many times. He stated it is important to know what is going to happen to the properties because of what has happened in the past with the increase of properties converting to gravel lots around the university.

Although ECU does a lot for the City, it does not do well for historic preservation. It was mentioned that the condition of the properties are in decline. He stated that many times properties are bought by the university and just sit there and deteriorate over time. He doesn't want a precedence set of houses being bought up and then relocated or demolished.

Chairman Jordan asked Staff to repeat the Design Review Committee recommendation.

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommends that the Commission approve the application with the full 365 day delay and request continued consultation with the applicant to find means of maintaining the character of the district and strongly encourage relocation. If relocated, the structure should be fully documented at the original site. If demolished, the HPC should require the applicant to fully document each structure and create a plan with staff for salvaging all repurposable architectural features and materials.

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

Ms. Wooten asked about adding trees to the recommendation.

Ms. Kinane stated the included material regarding the tree survey was in the packet.

Mr. Hursh stated the trees should be included. He stated that the property at 601 E. Fifth Street is the most stunning of the five and faces Fifth Street. He would like to see ECU use that property. The other properties did not seem as impressive and not visible from Fifth Street.

Mr. Dennard stated it is hard for him to visualize what the site would like look without the five COA properties. He has concerns of what type of security or fortification will be used.

Mr. Hursh stated that fences and future changes to the property will have to come to the HPC.

Mr. Carlin stated that it would be best to go along with the 365 day delay since that is the only power the HPC has.

Mr. Hursh stated to preserve the trees/shrubs per the Bartlett Tree survey recommendation included in the packet.

Ms. Wooten agreed to include the tree survey recommendation.

Chairman Jordan read the **Findings of Facts** for application #16-04 601 E. Fifth St. parcel #26037; #16-05 409-11 S. Summit St., parcel #04904; #16-06 407 S. Summit St. parcel #04901; #16-07 405 S. Summit St. parcel #07745; and #16-08 404 S. Jarvis St. parcel #07746.

The COA applications were completed and submitted on June 1, 2016. The COA applications are for relocation or demolition. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on June

20 and June 27, 2016. Notices were mailed out to surrounding property owners on June 10, 2016. The hearings were held on June 28, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the city and Mr. Scott Buck presented for the applicant. For these applications, Design Guidelines 1 and 2 of Chapter 5 – Demolition, 1-5 of Chapter 5 – Relocation, and 2, 3, 8 and 14 of Chapter 4 - Landscaping are applicable. Relocation or demolition is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

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

Chairman Jordan asked if there were any conditions to be imposed on these COAs. He stated they could include the Bartlett Tree Plan.

Ms. Wooten made a motion to impose the condition to implement the Bartlett Tree Plan, Mr. Hursh seconded. In favor: Wooten, Hursh, Carlin, Jordan, Postma and Dennard. Oppose: Caspar. Motion carried.

Attorney Little stated that the Design Review Committee had added a condition that if the houses were not relocated, that materials be salvaged before demolition.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to impose a condition that if demolished, the HPC should require the applicant to fully document each structure and create a plan with staff for salvaging all repurposable architectural features and materials, seconded by Mr. Dennard. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Dennard made a motion to approve the five ECU COA applications with a 365 day delay and with the imposed conditions of the Bartlett Tree Plan, document each structure and create a plan for salvaging all repurposable architectural features and materials before demolition, Mr. Postma seconded.

Mr. Caspar wanted to discuss the motion. He suggested giving permission to ECU to demolish four properties in exchange to keeping, preserving and maintaining the property at 601 E. Fifth Street.

Chairman Jordan stated that the HPC's vote is only for what is applied for.

Attorney Little stated Mr. Caspar suggestion would be a different application. According to the statues if the application is for demolition, the only authority the HPC has is to delay the up to one year and cannot prevent it. It must be approved but conditions can be imposed.

Chairman Jordan repeated the motion to approve with a 365 day delay with the condition to follow the Bartlett Tree Plan, document the structure and salvage materials.

Mr. Buck stated they prefer to find someone to relocate the structures. The purpose of acquiring 601 E. Fifth Street was to rezone the property to Office and have it blend in like many other offices ECU has on Fifth Street. The efforts were previously rejected by the neighborhood. He is willing to make all efforts to save the property and hopefully have office space there.

Mr. Dennard asked what the neighborhood's reaction to the current request/application.

Mr. Buck stated he did not know.

Chairman Jordan stated that maybe knowing that the property will be demolished the neighborhood might be more receptive to rezone the property to Office. He asked Attorney Little if there is anything they HPC can do to about it.

Attorney Little stated the motion and conditions would not change. A resolution can be made to have the parties, the City and ECU, come together to talk about an alternative use.

Chairman Jordan stated that it would be better if at least the Fifth Street streetscape was preserved.

Attorney Little stated the resolution could be added and would be brought to the attention of the City Manager. He stated the HPC could vote on the motion already made. Then a resolution can be made after separately.

Mr. Buck stated he is not looking for a change but a vote. He prefers the 365 day delay so they have time to make more effort to have the properties relocated. He stated he will contact City Staff regarding the rezoning of the property at 601 E. Fifth Street.

Chairman Jordan stated that if a rezoning request was made to the Planning & Zoning Commission, he would speak in favor of the request on behalf of the HPC.

Mr. Dennard made a motion to approve the five ECU COA applications with a 365 day delay and with the imposed conditions of the Bartlett Tree Plan, document each structure and create a plan for salvaging all repurposable architectural features and materials before demolition, Mr. Postma seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

COA #16-03 – 311 S. Eastern Street

Ms. Kinane presented the Staff report. She stated this is an After the Fact COA. The applicant proposes the replacement of asphalt roof with metal seam roof.

Background:

Historic Name: Rufus W. Stark House

Built around 1935, this side gable-roof, frame bungalow features a symmetrical façade broken by a two-bay stucco and brick loggia with broad arches yet balanced by the inclusion of a small curvilinear eyebrow window over the bay unenclosed by the porch. Like many of the houses in the district, this Bungalow is influenced by the popular-at-the-time, Spanish style. No photographs or notes earlier than the neighborhood's historic designation could be found, so the original characteristics and roofing materials of the home are unknown. Due to the obvious Spanish influence of the property, tile may have been the initial roof material; however this is speculation.

Previous COAs: No previous major works COA applications.

Considerations:

This COA is after-the-fact, meaning that the work has already been completed and requires retroactive HPC approval. The previously existing roofing material was asphalt shingles. This roofing system failed and, due to a series of leaks, required immediate replacement. A homeowner no longer needs a building permit to replace the roof of a residential structure and, due to this new change, the applicant was informed that no permits were required. It was under this impression that the applicant replaced the roof without first acquiring a COA. The roofer determined that the eyebrow window was severely deteriorated and lacked the skill and material to replace it, so it was removed to more rapidly advance replacement of the roof.

Without documentary evidence, it is unknown what type of original roofing materials were used on the house. Asphalt did exist as a roofing type in the 1930s, so it is possible that asphalt was the original material. Spanish tile is also a possibility, as is a standing seam or pressed metal roof. A relatively small number of Spanish tile and metal roofs, both standing seam and pressed-metal shingle survive within the historic district. The eyebrow dormer was a very unique feature to this property and may have been the only example of such a feature within the district.

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1-6, 10, and 11 of Chapter 2 – Roofs are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on June 13 to discuss this application. Using evidence from the *Design Guidelines*, where it states: "Substitute roofing materials may be considered if the original material is not technically feasible or if the roof was replaced with a non- historic material, such as asphalt shingle prior to designation of the district or individual landmark;" the committee determined that the project should receive retroactive approval, provided that the eyebrow window is replaced. From some basic research, it appears that it could be possible for the eyebrow dormer to be replaced using a faux dormer that rests on top of the new roof. This would potentially require that the window be specially fabricated for the house and should not result in any advanced deterioration of the window or roof. If this faux fabrication is not possible, a small section of the installed metal roof may have to be lifted to install an eyebrow window as part of the roof structure.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. James Krukowski, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. He did not know that his property was in the Historic District. He lives in New Bern and purchased this house for his daughter to live while attending ECU. He repaired the property and rewired it. He stated he was told the house was built in 1940 when he bought it. He likes metal roofs because of their efficiency. The roofer stated that the eyebrow window was rotted and unsalvageable. He feels that he has improved the roof and the aesthetic of the house. The eyebrow window will be very expensive to install. He stated he is an attentive landlord.

Mr. Postma asked what he thought of the Historic District and Historic Preservation.

Mr. Krukowski stated his property does not feel like a historic home. He supports historic preservation but his property seems to be cottage surrounded by a neighborhood of disrepair homes. The bones of the home and making it safe to live in are more important.

Mr. Hursh stated that he doesn't like the disrepair of the surrounding homes either. He stated that realtors aren't doing their job to inform buyers that the property is historic.

Mr. Carlin stated that the house is not just historic but is in the historic district. It doesn't matter what the houses look like because they are in the historic district.

Mr. Hursh stated that the historic district was created in 1994. Changes done before this could not be controlled but the HPC is now preserving the area.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing and opened Commission discussion.

Mr. Postma stated the metal roof does not resemble any metal roof seen in the district and does not look historic. Those who invest in the historic district need to conform to the guidelines. The HPC needs to be more serious against violators. He suggested a fine for not getting an approved COA. The look has been completely changed to the house.

Ms. Wooten stated that having to replace the eyebrow window after the fact is enough of a financial penalty.

Mr. Hursh stated the eyebrow window is a unique feature and probably the only one in the district. He stated it should come back in order to preserve history. He also stated the metal roof looks industrial.

Chairman Jordan stated that windows are one of the most important things in preserving a structure.

Mr. Dennard asked about the pattern followed in the past regarding After the Fact COAs.

Chairman Jordan stated there have been cases where all windows were removed, they got found out by the HPC and had to replace them all according to the HPC guidelines.

Attorney Little stated it depends on how damaging or unique the feature was and if it changes the character of the property. It is unknown of what material the original roof was regarding this application. The Design Guidelines is not specific of the type of metal to be used. It is possible that the eyebrow window was the only one in the district. It is character defining and unique to the house and neighborhood. The metal roof could remain, however the applicant could be required to install a new eyebrow window that would be consistent with the appearance of the old window. The options are to replace the roof with asphalt or tin or leave the roof as is and put the eyebrow back in as a window or dormer. If it was approved as a condition, then the HPC could direct the Design Review Committee and Staff to review it with the roofing contractors.

Ms. Kinane stated the Guidelines do not specifically describe what type of metal roof.

Mr. Dennard asked how the applicant proposes to resolve the issue.

Mr. Krukowski stated he is biased financially. If he needs to install the eyebrow window, he will but he doesn't even know where to start and asked for guidance.

Mr. Caspar stated this house catches his attention because of the front porch and not the eyebrow window. A dummy window will not look right. The homeowner is not to blame. The house looks nice and let's just stick with that.

Mr. Dennard asked to what extent this destroys the integrity of the historic district that action needs to be taken or can we just look away.

Chairman Jordan stated he is willing to accept this was a mistake and that the homeowner did not know. The HPC is to operate within the Design Guidelines. The guidelines say you are not to remove character defining elements. They do not state the specific metal to be used on roofs. Therefore, the metal roof is okay but the removal of the window is not.

Ms. Wooten agreed with Chairman Jordan that the metal roof is okay but the window needs to go back.

Chairman Jordan read the **Findings of Facts** for application #16-03 311 S. Eastern Street, parcel number 21059.

The after-the-fact COA application was completed and submitted on June 1, 2016. The COA

application is for asphalt roof replacement with metal, removal of eyebrow window. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on June 20 and June 27, 2016. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on June 10, 2016. This hearing was held on June 28, 2016. Collette Kinane presented for the city and James Krukowski presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-6, 10, and 11 of Chapter 2 - Roofs are applicable. The roof replacement of is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines. The removal of the eyebrow window is found to be not congruent with the applicable guidelines.

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

Chairman Jordan asked if there were any conditions to be imposed on this COA. He stated they to include that the eyebrow window needs to be reconstructed based on the documentary photograph and that Staff help the homeowner find someone qualified to do the work.

Ms. Wooten recommended the condition to also have Staff and the Design Review Committee give final approval.

Mr. Hursh made a motion to approve the after-the-fact COA with the imposed conditions that the eyebrow window needs to be reconstructed based on the documentary photograph, Staff will help the homeowner find a qualified contractor, and Staff and the Design Review Committee will have final approval of the work, Ms. Wooten seconded. In favor: Wooten, Hursh, Carlin, Jordan, Postma and Dennard. Oppose: Caspar. Motion carried.

Ms. Kinane stated that a COA is good for six months.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No one spoke for public comment.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they met regarding tonight's COA applications.

Publicity Committee

Mr. Postma stated they met and spoke about educating property owners in the College View District. He stated that there are no funds available for post cards or brochures.

Mr. Hursh stated that it needs to start with education of the realtors.

Ms. Kinane stated she contacted the local association of realtors about speaking about historic preservation at their regular meetings and was told they would be in touch with her soon.

Mr. Postma stated the problem is lack of education and being proactive. He stated that includes the trash cans which he counted 77 that were left out and trash was yesterday (Tuesday).

Mr. Caspar asked if the City knows or could inform owners of the historic district when properties are sold or transferred.

Attorney Little stated the ordinance established of the historic district was recorded in the Register of Deeds. When a proper title search is done, it should show up. Every deed description should note that the property is subject to those ordinances, easements, and restrictive covenants of the historic district.

Chairman Jordan recommended that the subject of funding to educate should be an item on the next Publicity meeting.

Selection Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they did not met.

Chairman Jordan asked if there was an update on the local landmark designation.

Ms. Kinane stated she is still working on it.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Kinane stated that the July 2016 HPC will meet in Room 337 of City Hall.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Dennard made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Hursh, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II