

ADOPTED MINUTES OF THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

April 27, 2021

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission met on the above date at 6:00 pm via Zoom.

Jeremy Jordan - Chairperson - *

Candace Pearce – Vice chair - *

Kerry Carlin - *

Myron Caspar – *

Roger Kammerer – X

Andrew Morehead - *

Israel Mueller -*

Justin Edwards - *

Scott Wells - *

Robert Wright - *

The members present are denoted by an “*” and the members absent are denoted by an “X”.

PLANNING STAFF: Thomas Barnett, Director of Planning and Development Services; Tony Parker, Planner I; Taylor Bland, Staff Support Specialist II

OTHERS PRESENT: Donald Phillips, Assistant City Attorney; Les Everett, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services

MINUTES:

Motion made by Ms. Pearce, seconded by Ms. Wells, to accept the March 23, 2021 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

City Attorney Donald Phillips read the following statement:

Pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 160A-388 and Section 4, H. of the Historic Preservation Commission’s Rules of Procedure:

H. 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 reasonably 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 needs to be disclosed at this time.

As a reminder, as members of the Commission conversations among yourselves during the discussion periods of this meeting and your committee meetings are NOT ex parte communications.

Chairman Jordan swore in presenting staff member - Tony Parker.

Chairman Jordan confirmed and swore in one speaker - Rob O'Connor.

Motion made by Mr. Caspar, seconded by Mr. Morehead, to find and conclude that Tony Parker and Rob O'Connor have standing to participate in the remote quasi-judicial proceeding because Mr. Parker represents the City and Mr. O'Connor is the applicant and that both received notice of the meeting and consent to the meeting being held in a remote platform. Motion passed unanimously.

New Business

1. Major Work COAs

2021-0012: 407 S. Jarvis Street

Applicant: Rob O'Connor

Project: Add handrails to front porch

Mr. Parker delineated and discussed the subject property and the architectural features. The applicant installed a handrail to the front porch to bring the porch up to current city code. He shared photos of the added handrails to the porch. Staff findings are that handrails are reversible features that do not diminish or damage the original design of the porch or entrance. The Design Review Committee unanimously approved the handrails as installed.

Robert O'Connor spoke in favor of the application. He stated the home is listed as a multi-family home. The three electric meters are for units A, B and C. The stairwell on the side of the home leads to unit C. He stated a visitor slipped and fell while walking down the steps so he installed the handrails for safety.

Mr. Morehead asked if there was a consideration to place rails between the columns on the porch.

Mr. Jordan stated at the DRC meeting they discussed the rails that were on the porch and the regulations that require rails if the porch is a certain height. The compromise was to leave the rails on the steps so people would have something to hold.

Ms. Pearce stated rails are required if the porch is higher than 30 inches, otherwise rails are not required.

Mr. Jordan closed the public hearing.

Motion made by Dr. Carlin, seconded by Ms. Wells, to adopt the Findings of Fact. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. Morehead, that the proposal is congruent with the special character of the Historic District and the *Design Guidelines* and that the Applicant's application for the Issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness should be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Jordan affirmed the COA was approved.

2021-0018: 601 / 605 E. Fifth Street

Applicant: Ricky Hill, East Carolina University

Project: At 601 E. Fifth Street, the request is to add a new concrete driveway off of Summit Street, connect to the existing driveway at 605 E. Fifth Street, to add pavers and sidewalk to connect to the existing

handicap ramp and rear entrance. At 605 E. Fifth Street, the request is to remove the damaged brick planter and bamboo and install native plants and vegetation.

Chairman Jordan confirmed and swore in one speaker - Ricky Hill.

Motion made by Mr. Mueller, seconded by Ms. Wells, that Ricky Hill has standing to participate in this remote quasi-judicial proceeding, that he has properly received notice of the remote proceeding, and that he consents to the remote proceeding. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Parker delineated and discussed the subject properties and the architectural features. The applicant wishes to create a new driveway, update the landscaping by removing the existing bamboo and planter and adding new native landscaping. The applicant also wishes to renovate the driveway and back entrance to conform to the American with Disabilities Act, as well as merge the two independent driveways together. He showed renderings submitted by the applicant showing the new driveways and landscaping. Staff recommends to allow the improvements to landscaping, parking, and ADA improvements to proceed as stated on the COA application and as approved unanimously by the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Wright asked if the proposed driveway is consistent with the permeability of the ground and if it is within the Historic standards.

Mr. Parker stated it is within the City standards and *Design Guidelines*.

Ricky Hill spoke in favor of the application. He stated this project is the final stage for the Proctor-Yongue House. They have completed interior and exterior renovations. The driveway will be for ADA purposes and there will be limited parking for this facility. The people that will be in this facility will park on main campus and walk to the facility. The planter wall has been in disrepair for some time and removing it will help with access to the Dail House.

Mr. Caspar asked about city regulations to screen the parking areas.

Mr. Parker stated there are quite a bit of new plantings that will screen the parking area.

Mr. Caspar stated the city describes parking areas in great detail and it doesn't seem any of that detail is included in this parking area.

Ms. Pearce asked what area he is referring to and if he thinks there needs to be more plants on the left side.

Mr. Caspar stated there is no coverage on the left side and there should be more coverage between the Proctor-Yongue House and the Dail House.

Mr. Hill stated there is a landscape screen between the two properties.

Mr. Caspar asked if the city ordinance or the guidelines take priority.

Mr. Morehead stated both require screening for this. It is possible that the rendering does not show the landscape on the left side.

Mr. Hill stated all the landscape in the rendering is new except for two trees on Summit Street. There is currently a grass area to the left of the driveway and they have no issue installing additional landscaping to help screen the parking lot.

Mr. Morehead asked if there was a previous plan to place a fence or additional screening there.

Mr. Hill stated they will respond with what will be appropriate for that once the use for that area is determined by University Administration.

Mr. Jordan closed the public hearing.

Mr. Caspar stated he would like to add a stipulation that the parking area be consistent with the city ordinance, particularly the size and that additional landscaping be added.

Ms. Pearce asked Mr. Barnett what ordinance refers to landscaping.

Mr. Barnett stated that would be under the zoning ordinance, but since it is a State-owned property it is not reviewed by the City.

Mr. Edwards stated the guidelines comment on screening from adjacent property and according to the plans, the adjacent property is owned by ECU so that is something the board has no control over or can discuss.

Mr. Caspar stated he would like there to be trees planted along the driveway.

Mr. Hill stated he will consult with the landscape architect and the University will do the best they can to be a good partner with the city.

Motion made by Mr. Edwards, seconded by Ms. Pearce, to adopt the Findings of Fact. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Jordan, seconded by Ms. Pearce, that the proposal is congruent with the special character of the Historic District and the *Design Guidelines* and that the Applicant's application for the Issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness should be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Jordan affirmed the COA was approved.

2. Minor Work COAs

2021-17: 215 S. Library Street

Applicant: Robert O'Connor

Project: Replace dilapidated fence in-kind and style and paint front door white

3. Anti-Demolition by Neglect Ordinance- Consideration of the resolution

Thomas Barnett, Director of Planning and Development Services explained that the resolution will move forward and the ordinance will need to be vetted by the city attorneys before being presented to City Council. There may need to be additional staff to be sure the resolution is done effectively and appropriately.

Mr. Wright asked if this is limited to historic properties.

Mr. Barnett stated it is for properties in the local historic district, College View, and locally designated properties.

Mr. Wright asked if this will take a half or full time attorney.

Mr. Barnett stated it could depending on how many cases are brought because it is a court-like process.

Mr. Jordan asked if this is going to be case-by-case because a lot of people that buy these older properties work on them over time.

Mr. Barnett stated there would be a hearing held and a decision would be made. The homeowner would have a certain amount of time to have repairs completed if all repairs cannot be done at one time.

Mr. Morehead stated he thinks this is the correct resolution.

Motion made by Mr. Caspar, seconded by Ms. Pearce, to forward the resolution to City Council. Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment Period

Refer to page 3 of agenda for public comment guidelines. No Public Comments

Committee Reports

1. Design Review Committee – Recommended approval – COA 2021-0012 and 2021-0018
2. Publicity Committee – Did not meet
3. Selection Committee – Did not meet

Announcements / Other

No announcements.

Motion made by Ms. Pearce, seconded by Ms. Wells, to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Parker

Planner I