

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

November 28, 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:

Candace Pearce – Chairwoman	Alice Arnold
Myron Caspar	Chris Nunnally
Mary Ellen Cole	Roger Kammerer
Bernard Schulz	

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Collette Kinane, Planner II and Amy Nunez, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Donald Phillips, Assistant City Attorney and Kelvin Thomas, Communications Technician

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Mr. Kammerer made a motion to accept the agenda as is, Ms. Arnold seconded, and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

Minor Works COAs

2017-0034: 211 S. Library Street; Replace in kind broken door panel - Approved

2017-0035: 309 S. Student Street; Scraping & painting exterior - Approved

Major Works COAs

COA 17-0032: 209 S. Eastern Street

Applicant: Assad Movehed, applicant

Project: Replace wood siding with vinyl/composite

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. This c. 1935 House is a small frame Colonial Revival style that is very modest in size and appearance. The one-story dwelling is simply fashioned in weatherboard with a front-gabled stoop. The stoop covers the principal entrance which has fluted Doric pilasters on either side. Large eight-over-eight sash windows flank the front door. The simply detailed dwellings, mostly Craftsman Bungalows, located along the 200 block of Eastern Street are good examples of less formally executed styles found particularly on the fringes of the district and usually date from the post-Depression era when houses of ambitious design were rarely constructed. This application is for the removal of wood siding and replacement with vinyl or composite material. Several areas around the structure have suffered some deterioration, especially around the chimney. The deterioration has resulted in moisture and water-related issues on the interior of the house. The applicant is seeking to preserve the house and would like the Commission to consider modern materials. The applicant is open to a discussion on various composite types currently available in the industry.

For this application, Design Guidelines 1-5, 7 and 9 of Chapter 2 Exterior Walls & Trim, pages 25-26, are applicable.

Staff findings:

There is evidence of deterioration around the parts of the house that are most readily exposed to moisture and weather elements. On November 9th, 2017 Staff conducted a site visit and though some areas of the structure are deteriorated, it does not appear to be widespread. On the south façade of the structure several weatherboards have been replaced previously and have a different texture/visual appearance than the original boards. This request should be considered through the applicable Design Guidelines of Exterior Walls and Trim, with close attention to numbers 2, 3, and 4. Per the Design Guidelines and general industry best practices, vinyl siding is not an appropriate or allowable material. As of this review, Staff has not received comment or determination from a "preservation professional," as specified and

directed in the Guidelines. Staff has encouraged the applicant to contact the SHPO to review the condition of the siding. If the SHPO finds the siding to be irreparably deteriorated and in need of replacement, only then may substitute material begin to be considered. Substitute materials should only be considered if the original materials are not technically feasible. Fiber cement siding 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. In the time since the Design Guidelines were written, the industry also recommends the use of Boral-poly ash siding as slightly superior to the effectiveness and appearance of fiber cement. Without comment from the SHPO and per Staff's inspection of the property, the current recommendation is to replace only those boards that are deteriorated with like-materials.

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on November 16, 2017 to discuss this application. The committee recommends that the application to replace the wood siding be denied. The existing siding should be repaired or replaced in kind.

Mr. Assad Movahed spoke in favor of his application. He wants to improve the house and make it look nicer like others in the neighborhood. Moisture is getting in making it unsafe.

Chairwoman Pearce stated this property has original high quality craftsmanship.

Mr. Kammerer stated they cannot make nearby homes take off their siding since they have been grandfathered for the work that was done previously.

Ms. Cole asked what the previous board replacement on the south façade was made from.

Mr. Movahed stated wood.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened board discussion. She stated that the Design Review Committee recommended denial of the request and that the existing wood siding be repaired or replaced in kind.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to accept the Design Review Committee recommendation. Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Finding of Facts for application #2017-0032 for 209 S. Eastern Street, parcel number 14484. The COA was completed and submitted on October 2, 2017. The COA application is for replacement of wood siding. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 11-13-2017 and 11-20-2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 11-09-2017. This hearing was held on 11-28-2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Assad

Movahed presented as the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-5, 7 and 9 of Chapter 2 Exterior Walls & Trim, pages 25-26, are applicable.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact, Ms. Cole seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Schulz made a motion to accept that the application in not congruent with applicable guidelines, Ms. Cole seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Arnold made a motion deny the application, Mr. Nunnally seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Attorney Phillips stated that any party not satisfied with the decision of the Commission may appeal to the Board of Adjustment. Such appeals are in the form of a petition form of certiorari and not a new hearing where new testimony will be permitted. The Board of Adjustment's decision will be based on whether the Commission complied with the Design Guidelines and City ordinances. All appeals with the appropriate filing fee must be filed with the Director of Community Development within five calendar days of the decision of the Commission.

Mr. Caspar asked why so many motion and votes and is that standard in their manuals.

Ms. Kinane stated the information on the proceedings is in their handbooks.

Attorney Phillips stated that it is also part of the Rules of Procedures.

Chairwoman Pearce asked if a change of the Rules of Procedures could be initiated in a training session.

Attorney Phillips stated yes.

COA 17-0033: 123 W. Third Street

Applicant: Coastal Plains Realty, Inc. (Casey Huffin), applicant

Project: Replace metal roof with Asphalt Shingle

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. This application pertains to the east side and rear additions, not the main house. The Charles Greene House, (known locally as the Skinner-Moye House or the Skinner Building), is a two-story, three-bay, single-pile, frame Greek Revival house with a hipped roof. The dwelling's chimneys have been removed. The main block is stuccoed and scored to resemble stone blocks. It is unknown if the stucco is original to the house. A two-story, one-bay wide, pedimented portico supported by four square posts shelters an entry with sidelights and a transom. The portico is simply finished with flush boards in the pediment. Three drop pendants hang from the arcaded porch frieze. A nearly full facade portico appears

on the house on the 1885 Sanborn map and it is likely that this porch dates from a renovation undertaken by J. G. Moyer who owned the building between 1898 and 1917. The local landmark designation report cites an early-twentieth century photograph showing the present porch with an inserted second floor. Windows are one-over-one sash and are not original. However, the original three-part window surrounds remain. On the east side elevation is what may be an original detached office although it has now been incorporated into the main block. The one-story, hipped-roof, frame building is covered with weatherboards and displays cornerboards and a wide, plain frieze that matches that of the main block. One six-over-six-window sash remains on the rear elevation. Two one-story, hipped-roof additions and one-story, shed-roof addition have been constructed on the rear elevation of the Greene House. A one-story, hipped-roof porch connects these additions. It is unknown when the additions were constructed. Sanborn maps indicate that these rear additions were frequently reconfigured between the 1880s and the 1920s. The 1929 the Sanborn maps show a building footprint that matches the current plan. Interior woodwork dates from around the turn of the twentieth century. Although heavily altered, the house retains its original form and is the only antebellum structure remaining in the historic district. Deeds indicate that Charles Greene constructed the dwelling sometime between 1845, when he purchased the lot, and 1861 when he died. Greene's son Robert purchased the property from his father's estate. Harriett L. Dill, wife of David Dill agent for the Old Dominion steamship line, purchased the house in 1863. The family owned the house until they sold it to Harry Skinner, a lawyer and a developer of Greenville's Skinnerville subdivision in 1888. Skinner immediately sold the property to Dr. Frank Brown, Pitt County Superintendent of Health. Brown resided in the property until his death in 1898. Joseph George Moyer, mayor of Greenville from 1899 to 1900 and President of the Greenville Cotton Mill was perhaps the last person to reside in the house. Moyer lived there from 1898 through 1917 and it is likely that he is responsible for the current porch and Victorian interior woodwork. The Moyer family sold the property to Dr. Louis C. Skinner in 1917. Skinner used the house as an office. Skinner's heirs sold the building in 1968. Greenville City Directories indicate that the house has been used as office space since the sale to Louis C. Skinner. The ca. 1860 Charles Greene House is highly significant as the district's only example of Greek Revival architecture. This application is for the removal of a standing seam metal roof and replacement with asphalt shingles. The metal roof has already been removed to repair parts of the roofing system damaged by leaks. The sheathing and moisture barriers have been replaced, but a new roof has not yet been installed. The structure is protected while this COA is pending. The applicant selected asphalt shingles to match the main house; which has had an asphalt roof since at least 1984. In 2006, the property received a Minor Work COA to repair the metal roof and add a waterproof coating.

For this application, Design Guidelines 1 to 9 and 11 of Chapter 2 Roofs, pages 20-21, are applicable.

Staff findings:

The metal roof has already been removed due to deterioration and leaks. The main house has had asphalt shingles since at least 1984, when the Local Landmark report was written. Due to its construction in 1845, the main house would not have originally had an asphalt shingle roof (the forerunner of asphalt shingles, "asphalt prepared roofing," was not invented until 1893). However, as it is believed that the additions were constructed from the turn of the century through 1929, asphalt shingles were a product that was available at the time of construction and could be considered as a historically available material. While economic costs should not be considered as a primary decision-making factor, a historically appropriate standing-seam roof (**not** the commonly available 5V, corrugated, or R-Panel designs that are more commercial and modern in appearance) would be a sizable initial investment and is typically triple the cost of corrugated metal roofs [corrugated metal averages between \$300-\$400 per square foot, standing seam averages \$900-1000]. However, the life expectancy of a metal roof is typically 40 to 80 years; asphalt products roughly have a 12-20 year life expectancy.

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on November 16, 2017 to discuss this application. The committee recommends approval of the application. Though a metal roof would be more in keeping with the integrity of the structure, an asphalt roof is technically historically appropriate and will match the main house.

Ms. Casey Huffin, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. She had brought a sample of the shingle she would like to use. She stated a metal roof is not feasible due to the over \$50,000.00 price. The shingles would match the rest of the building that already has shingles. The metal roof was causing water damage and was leaking.

Ms. Cole asked if the gutters and downspouts were to be replaced.

Ms. Huffin stated they are functioning properly and will leave them as is.

Mr. Nunnally asked since this is an antebellum period home will asphalt shingles be conforming to the standards. He encouraged a discussion on historical appropriateness.

Mr. Caspar asked if Mr. Nunnally was suggesting the property needs to have a metal roof.

Mr. Nunnally cited #3 of chapter 2 of the Design Guidelines "*historic roofing materials must be preserved and retained whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, new material that matches the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture shall be used.*" His concern is to make sure that it conforms. He stated this is one of the oldest homes in Greenville and is an important structure.

Mr. Caspar agreed and stated that if this Commission allows shingles it should go on record so that a future Commission would not make a decision to go back to metal from the original 1845 structure.

Mr. Nunnally stated he would feel more comfortable having a finding of fact that stated asphalt architectural shingles are an appropriate substitute under the circumstances.

Mr. Schulz stated the staff findings show the history of the addition that allowed shingles.

Chairwoman Pearce stated this house should have retained all its original character. The Commission needs to maintain a record and consider that it is a local landmark. The applicant will take the property off the local landmark designation before having to put a metal roof.

Ms. Arnold stated that part of the property is already shingled. The continuity with shingles is an esthetic consideration.

Mr. Nunnally stated to be clear on the findings, he suggested to add that this period may or may not have used shingles and therefore is conforming.

Ms. Cole stated the project analysis states that asphalt shingles on the main house had been present since circa 1984. The proposed is a 30 year shingle. If what is proposed is similar to what was done in 1984, it would indicate that the main house roof needed to be replaced in 2014.

Ms. Huffin stated the main house roof was replaced about five years ago.

Attorney Phillips suggested to make motion regarding the findings of facts and the additional findings and summarize the motion.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to accept staff's findings of facts, Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Nunnally stated that because the additions were constructed at the turn of the century and in 1929 asphalt shingles would have been a conforming material, therefore asphalt shingles are conforming under these circumstances.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to the application is congruent with the guidelines. Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to approve the application. Ms. Arnold seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

(Not read: Finding of Facts for application #2017-0033 for 123 W. Third Street, parcel number 06560. The COA was completed and submitted on November 3, 2017. The COA application is for the metal roof replacement with asphalt shingles. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 11-13-2017 and 11-20-2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 11-09-2017. This hearing was held on 11-28-2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Casey Huffin present for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1 to 9 and 11 of Chapter 2 Roofs, pages 20-21, are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.)

Examples of After-the-Fact fees/fines & Policies

Ms. Kinane stated she brought information per the Commission's request regarding fees. She mentioned the after-the-fact fees for different jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions doubled their fees while other jurisdictions just had higher fees for major work COAs. About a year ago, she submitted a change request on COA fees. It was approved in July 2017. Now the fee for a major COA is \$20.00 and an after-the fact COA is \$75.00.

Update on Jones-Lee House

Ms. Kinane stated the City is looking for City owned lots to move the house to. It is still a work in progress. The City is dedicated to make sure the house is moved and not demolished.

2018 Meeting Schedule

Ms. Kinane stated the 2018 HPC schedule was included in their packets. The meetings are the fourth Tuesday of every month with the exception of December when the Commission does not meet. There are no holiday conflicts. She encouraged members to think about Preservation Month in May and the biennial awards.

2016-2017 Annual Report

Ms. Kinane stated a copy of the report was included in their packets. Chairwoman Pearce presented the annual report to City Council at the November 2017 meeting.

Public Comment Period

No public comments were provided.

Committee Reports

Design Review. Chairwoman Pearce stated they met for tonight's COAs.

Publicity. Ms. Arnold stated they did not meet.

Selection. Ms. Cole stated they did not meet.

Announcements/Other

Ms. Kinane stated there will be a Saturday Commission Training in January or February, date to be determined. She will be collecting available dates from members and topics of discussion.

Chairwoman Pearce thanked the outgoing members of the Commission and presented them with a certificate of appreciation. The members were: Kerry Carlin, Alice Arnold and William Gee.

With no further discussion, Mr. Kammerer made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Cole seconded, and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II