

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

January 24, 2017

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JEREMY JORDAN-CHAIR	TYRONE WALSTON
ALICE ARNOLD	WILLIAM GEE
MYRON CASPAR	CANDACE PEARCE

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

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

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Chairman Jordan stated to add item #4 under New Business for Election of Officers.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works COAs

2016-24: 401 S. Holly Street; Daniel Overby; Re-issue COA 15-08 – Approved
2016-25: 1007 E. 3rd Street; Sam Pollard & Son; Mechanical change out – Approved
2016-26: 301 S. Evans Street; Southwood Corp; Change out Self-help sign – Approved
2016-27: 605 E. Fourth Street; Pitt Heating & Air; Mechanical change out – Approved
2016-28: 800 E. 3rd Street; Daniel Overby; Re-issue COA 11-XX (not numbered) – Approved
2016-29: 310 S. Harding Street; Advanced Mechanical; Mechanical change out – Approved

Major Works COAs

2017-01: 803 E. Fifth Street. Applicant: Tipton Builders, Inc. Window/Door replacement

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The applicant proposes the replacement of windows and rotting wood and the removal of French doors and replacement with fixed simulated doors on the porch of the property. The property is in the College View District and is also a local landmark.

The Dr. L.C. Skinner House, built in 1927, is a Colonial Revival style red-brick 2 1/2 story house. The house is five bays wide with a side gabled, slate roof. The windows are typically five-ranked

and symmetrically balanced with a center door. Three pedimented gabled dormers are set along the roof facing Fifth Street. One dormer is set into the center of the rear roof. The rear roof line is extended to form double front gables. Originally, each gable had an arched window. One window has been replaced with a door to create a fire escape onto a two-story, flat roofed brick addition to the rear of the house. It appears that originally three sets of triple windows may have been set in the second story rear. Only the center set remains intact. Half fanlight windows flank the exterior, single shouldered brick chimney stack on each end of the house. Wooden shutters frame the front elevation windows. The sashes are typical double hung six over six. Two porches with Tuscan columns and decorative cornices flank the sides of the house. One porch is enclosed. The Skinner family (Dr. Skinner and his wife) resided in the house until their deaths. Their children sold the property to the Gamma Beta Chapter of Sigma Sigma Sigma in 1961. Few modifications have been made to the exterior of this property. At the time of its Local Landmark designation, the house was considered to

“represent one of the more architecturally ambitious residences in this neighborhood of predominantly bungalow type homes. It is one of the finest examples of Colonial Revival architecture in the city and remains important in the study of the College View neighborhood and in the study of early twentieth century neighborhood development in Greenville.” (Local Landmark Report, 7-8)

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1-3, 5-8, 12 and 13 of Chapter 2 Porches (pages 42-43); 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 16 and 17 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors (pages 35-36) are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee recommends that the application be approved with conditions. The Committee recommends that the rear (north façade) French doors may be replaced with windows above and paneling below as long as the windows are exactly like those present on the east façade of the porch. The French doors on the front of the porch (south façade) must be repaired or replaced with like-materials exactly as they appear. The French doors and elevation on the north façade should be documented in detail (photos, dimensioned drawings, etc.) and reserved in the property file in the Planning office. The doors and glass panes from the north façade should be saved and retained on the property for potential future reinstallation or use.

Staff recommendation: The wood rot present around the existing French doors on the north and south sides of the enclosed porch is substantial and presents an immediate threat to the integrity of the porch. Applicant proposes replacement in kind and Staff encourages that proposal. The French doors have contributed to the wood rot issue (by allowing water to seep in under and around the door frame) and present a security issue to the current occupants (allowing additional means of access that cannot be fully secured). It is unknown when the porch was enclosed or if the enclosed porch was part of the original design. Staff would encourage the applicant to pursue a design that more closely matches the existing French doors and sidelights.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Tipton spoke in favor of the request. He was hired to deal with the issue of rot and safety of the sunroom area. He will comply with the HPC and will save as much of the original as possible.

Ms. Pearce asked if the damage was past repair.

Mr. Tipton stated yes. Sitting water has caused moisture and damage.

No one spoke in opposition.

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

Ms. Pearce stated it is a good project as long as they save what they can and replace the original with similar materials.

Chairman Jordan stated the Design Review Committee compromised by allowing the front side to be fixed as is and allow windows on the back side.

Ms. Pearce stated she prefers to keep all the doors and make them more secure.

Mr. Gee stated windows instead of doors for the back porch is okay since it is not visible from the road.

Mr. Tipton stated their concern is cost since windows are less than doors and the use of the space.

Mr. Walston stated to keep the front as is and allow windows on the back.

Mr. Tipton stated the doors have not been opened in years and the area is to be used as a computer room.

Ms. Pearce stated that doors can be made just as solid as windows.

Mr. Caspar stated he prefers to keep the doors to keep the original design. If it is changed to windows, the patio area will be lost.

Ms. Arnold stated she would like to see the property restored to its original structure.

Chairman Jordan called for a vote for those in favor of doors in the front and windows at the back of the structure: Gee and Walston; and for all those in favor of doors at the front and back of the structure: Pearce, Casper, Arnold, and Jordan. Motion carried to recommend doors at the front and back of the structure.

Chairman Jordan read the **Finding of Facts** for application #2017-01 for 803 E. Fifth Street, parcel number 08146.

The COA application was completed and submitted on November 2, 2016. The application is for replacement of windows and rotting wood and removal of French doors and replacement with simulated doors on the east porch. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on January 16 and January 23, 2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on January 9, 2017. This hearing was held on January 24, 2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and John Tipton presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines Chapter 2: Porches, numbers 1-8, 12 and 13 and Chapter 2: Windows and Doors, numbers 1-6, 10, 16 and 17 are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines with the condition that the doors and sides be replaced or repaired with like materials exactly as they exist now.

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

Ms. Pearce made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the doors at front and back be replaced or repaired with like materials exactly as they exist now. Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kinane stated that Mr. Tipton has also proposed that the Commission give recommendations on the garage (also listed as a contributing structure in the College View Historic District) and three possible scenarios ranging from demolition to partial restoration (see attached letter dated January 7th). The garage is in poor condition and is close to collapsing. Only one door remains. The applicant feels he has three options: 1-complete demolition, 2-demolition of roof and restore/retile, and 3- demolition of roof and use alternative materials to restore.

Regarding the garage – an official decision on the garage was not included in the public hearing advertisement. Mr. Tipton has asked for suggestions and, based on these, will need to return to a future HPC meeting with a specific COA application. Staff finds demolition and re-roofing with an alternative material to be the least desired options. If done properly, a slate roof typically lasts between 80-100 years (sometimes longer). In the case of this property, both structures are about 88 years old. Standard roofing materials can last from as little as 15 to as many as 30 years. Though initially less cost-prohibitive, the cost for replacement every 30 years may meet or exceed the cost of re-slating once. Staff advises consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office.

For the garage, **Design Guidelines** 1-3 and 9 Chapter 2 Garages & Outbuildings (page 46) are applicable.

Ms. Pearce stated the in the past the HPC has required that structures not be torn down. She opposes the structure being torn down.

Mr. Tipton stated the structure is close to collapsing.

Mr. Walston suggested to not tear down the structure. He likes option #3 to maintain the look.

Ms. Pearce stated she would like to see the similar slate roof material before installing.

Chairman Jordan stated if the similar slate roof material looked like the original slate, it would be a good option.

Ms. Pearce asked about the garage door and how will the garage be used.

Mr. Tipton stated they will build a door to look similar. It will be used as storage.

Mr. Caspar asked if the slate from the roof could be saved and reused.

Mr. Tipton stated yes because it is very valuable. They can use it on the main house.

2017-02: 1001 E. Fourth Street. Applicant: Matthew Johnson/MHA Works. Addition.

Ms. Kinane stated that the applicant was not present.

Ms. Kinane stated he applicant proposes an exterior addition and replacement of windows. The property is in the College View Local Historic District but a non-contributing property in the College View National Register Historic District. Built during the mid-1950s, this brick office building was designed for a doctor's office. It is currently being used as a facility office for ECU. The structure has Colonial Revival elements surrounding the primary entrance. In the mid-1990s, windows were added on the west and south facades and a door was enclosed on the west façade. The addition would on the 4th Street side where they would enclose a jagged setback of the property to provide an interior office corridor. The addition will match the current building materials. The windows had been replaced previously, therefore they would replace replacement windows.

For this application, **Design Guidelines** 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 16 and 17 of Chapter 2 Windows and Doors (pages 35-36) and 1-9 of Chapter 3 Additions (pages 77-78) are applicable.

Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee recommends approval as submitted. The Committee feels that the continued, matching detail on the addition and the slight setback make the addition very compatible with the property.

Staff Recommendation: This largely non-descript structure is one of two office buildings included in the historic district. It is listed as non-contributing due to its age at the time of listing and lack of significant architectural characteristics. The proposed addition does not detract from

the integrity of the structure. Several of the windows are not original to the structure. Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

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

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

Ms. Pearce asked if the original wall was not being torn down and just adding another wall.

Ms. Kinane stated yes.

Mr. Caspar stated he would like to see the Japanese maple tree saved.

Chairman Jordan suggested adding a condition to relocate the tree. Commissioners were in census.

Mr. Gee expressed concern regarding Design Guidelines #3 of Chapter 3 Additions that states: *Additions must be located as inconspicuously as possible, on the rear or least character defining elevation of historic buildings.*

Ms. Pearce stated that the property faces both 4th Street and Johnston Street. A case could be made to what side is considered the rear.

Mr. Gee has no problem with the request. He wanted to make sure the guidelines were being followed.

Ms. Kinane stated the property has a disadvantage of being surrounded by three sides of streets – 4th, Johnston, and Rotary.

Chairman Jordan read the **Finding of Facts** for application #2017-02 for 1001 E. Fourth Street, parcel number 00040.

The COA application was completed and submitted on December 12, 2016. The application is for a 100 square foot exterior addition. A notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on January 16 and January 23, 2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on January 9, 2017. This hearing was held on January 24, 2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and the applicant was not present. For this application, Design Guidelines Chapter 3: Additions, numbers 1-9 and Chapter 2: Windows and Doors, numbers 1-6, 10, 16 and 17 are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

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

Ms. Pearce made a motion to add a condition that the Japanese maple tree in front of the addition area be saved or relocated. Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the application with the stated condition, Mr. Walston seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

FIG Boundary Expansion

Ms. Kinane reviewed the Façade Improvement Grant. The Façade Improvement Grant (FIG), created in 1998, helps preserve and enhance the unique historic character and architectural quality of Greenville's central business district. FIG's encourage substantial, historically appropriate exterior building renovations. It is a matching grant program that grants \$1.00 for every \$2.00 on eligible costs not to exceed \$5,000.00 per façade.

Eligibility

- Owners or tenants of a building located within project area are eligible to apply for grants
- Commercial and non-profit
- Requires owner's permission
- One application per façade or business unit
- Must satisfy City code and other construction guidelines
- Follow US Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
- No more than 2 grants for same façade/unit within two consecutive fiscal years

The FIG is a competitive program

- Higher priority to projects that make highly visible positive contribution to Center City
- Examples of covered work items include:
 - Cleaning storefronts
 - Painting
 - Repair/replacement of non-historic doors and/or windows
 - Installation of approved awnings
 - Removal of false fronts
- Grant does not cover roof repairs, sandblasting, or the removal of historic features

She showed the proposed expansion area on a map which slightly reaches into the Skinnerville Historic District and includes the Dickinson Avenue Historic District. The average age of construction for properties in this area is the 1930's and 1940's. She listed the historic properties in the expansion area which include: Moye House, Clare-Baker House, former St. Andrews, Roxy Theatre, Nabisco Warehouse, Imperial Office Building, Greenville Machine Works, Barber Shop, and the Coca-Cola Bottling building. If the Commission is in agreement

with the FIG Expansion, a motion needs to be made to accept it and forward it to City Council for final approval.

Attorney Phillips stated the motion would be to expand the FIG boundary as recommended by Staff and forward it as a recommendation to City Council for final approval as proposed.

Chairman Jordan stated it was a great idea. Commissioners were in agreement.

Ms. Pearce asked if the Roxy and the Imperial office building could be considered for a local designated landmark.

Ms. Kinane stated a letter was sent out last year to the Roxy but she has received no response. No letter was sent for the Imperial office building.

Chairman Jordan stated they were advised to wait until the Brownfields was completed on the Imperial site.

Ms. Kinane stated she is currently writing the landmark report for former's St. Andrew's.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the expansion of the FIG boundary as recommended by Staff and forward it as a recommendation to City Council for final approval as proposed. Seconded by Mr. Gee and the motion passed unanimously.

Election of Officers

Attorney Phillips stated Chair and Vice-Chair are both one year terms with elections each January. The duties of the Chair is to conduct and preside over the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The duties of the Vice-Chair is to preside as Chair in the absence of the Chair. The procedure of the elections for both are: 1- Open for nominations. Nominations do not require a second. 2- If no further nominations made, close the nominations by declaration of the Chair or vote by the Commission. 3- Vote in order of the nominations given. The first nominee to receive a majority vote is elected.

Chairman Jordan asked for nominations for Chairperson.

Ms. Pearce nominated Tyrone Walston.

Ms. Arnold nominated Candace Pearce. Ms. Pearce declined nomination.

Mr. Walston nominated Alice Arnold. Ms. Arnold declined nomination.

Chairman Jordan closed nominations and called for a vote for Tyrone Walston as Chairman. All in favor. Mr. Walston was elected Chairman.

Chairman Jordan asked for nominations for Vice-Chair.

Mr. Caspar nominated Candace Pearce.

With no further nominations, Chairman Jordan closed nominations and called for a vote for Candace Pearce as Vice-Chair. All in favor. Ms. Pearce was elected Vice-Chair.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comment made.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

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

Publicity Committee

Ms. Arnold stated they did not meet.

Selection Committee

Chairman Jordan stated they did not meet.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Kinane stated that before the December holidays, postcards were sent out to all property owners in the historic district and of local landmarks. It was a reminder to apply for Certificate of Appropriateness and to contact Staff for questions or information. This was a result of the Publicity Committee.

Chairman Jordan welcomed new member Candace Pearce.

With there being no further discussion, Ms. Pearce made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Arnold seconded, and it motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:04 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II