

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

May 28, 2013

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

RYAN WEBB, CHAIR
JEREMY JORDAN
ROGER KAMMERER

ALICE ARNOLD
SARA LARKIN

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: MERRILL FLOOD, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR; SETH LAUGHLIN, PLANNER II; ELIZABETH BLOUNT, STAFF SUPPORT SPECIALIST.

OTHERS PRESENT: BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY; JONATHAN EDWARDS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve the agenda as written, Ms Larkin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kammerer made a motion to approve the minutes, Mr. Jordan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Second Reading of Demolition by Neglect Resolution and Ordinance

Mr. Laughlin presented the resolution and the ordinance. He informed the Commission of their action to either adopt as written and forward to City Council, amend current language or table the item for further discussion.

Ms Larkin asked how the origin of the resolution and ordinance.

Attorney Little stated that the Commission asked staff to draft a resolution and proposed ordinance in 2008 or 2009. The draft was approved and forwarded by the Commission but never got to City Council for approval. Some of the situations in the College View district in the past years have caused this resolution to resurface. This ordinance will give Code Enforcement more authority.

Mr. Laughlin stated that it would be up to City Council to adopt. Staff is in favor for anything to preserve homes.

Mr. Kammerer asked if the City had its own neglect ordinance.

Attorney Little stated no and no variation. The closest ordinance would be the minimum housing code which impacts the interior and not the exterior.

Mr. Kammerer asked if the Commission could get with others to better understand the ordinance – to consider some things the Commission might not think about.

Attorney Little stated that the ordinance was drawn from the ordinances in New Bern, Bath and Belhaven historic areas.

Chairman Webb asked if it will only apply to College View.

Attorney Little stated correct and to designated landmarks. Outside those areas would be enforced by minimum housing criteria.

Mr. Kammerer asked what would happen if City Council approved it for city wide enforcement.

Attorney Little stated that the ordinance is written to apply to only Historic District.

Mr. Jordan stated that the resolution and ordinance had been discussed at great length and made a motion to ask City Council to adopt the proposed ordinance, seconded by Ms Larkin. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of Rear Yard Parking Regulations and Enforcement Options

Mr. Laughlin presented the existing standards and pictures concerning rear yard parking. The standards only exist in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Existing standards state that new parking areas should be located as unobtrusively as possible in rear yards whenever possible. It is not appropriate to create large off-street parking areas encompassing so much of the rear yard that the residential character of the site is lost. The City of Greenville's Zoning Ordinance currently does not address parking in rear yards. The proposed new standards for the Design Guidelines are as follows:

- New parking areas must be located as unobtrusively as possible in an area screened from public view
- Locating off-street parking in front yards is not permitted.
- Locating off-street parking in the side yard is not permitted if the area would be visible from the street or the front yard.
- All new parking areas must be screened from adjoining properties with fencing or shrubbery.

- Existing mature trees should be incorporated into new parking areas whenever possible, and new trees introduced to maintain the tree canopy.
- Large off-street parking areas encompassing so much of the rear yard that the residential character of the site is lost are not permitted.
- New driveways and parking areas may not directly abut the principal structure.

Mr. Laughlin also presented the University Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (UNRI) proposed onsite parking ordinance which states

- Single family dwellings and two family attached dwelling units shall be limited to the parking and/or storage of four vehicles, boats, trailers, campers and the like total per site. This requirement is not intended to limit the occasional parking of guest.
- When rear yard parking and/or rear yard storage of vehicles, boats, trailers, campers and the like is utilized and are visible from adjoining properties from ground level screening is required. Screening materials can either be a fence at least six (6) feet in height that creates a complete visual barrier from adjoining properties or evergreen vegetative materials that will reach a height of six (6) feet and create a complete visual barrier from adjoining properties within two (2) years of planting.
- Rear yard parking areas shall be connected to the front and/or side yard parking areas by a driveway constructed of an all-weather material such as asphalt, concrete, brick, CABC or any other approved materials
- Rear yard parking areas shall be contained and delineated by a barrier at least six (6) inches in height.

Mr. Merrill Flood, Community Development Director, presented the background information concerning the UNRI. The UNRI committee has recommended two parking recommendations to City Council concerning rear yard parking standards and resident only on street parking. The Commission is asked to provide input about the standards. The ordinance from UNRI has not been drafted. The UNRI would like to incorporate any suggestions from the Commission before presenting the ordinance to City Council in August.

Mr. Jordan asked if the overview of the UNRI exclude East Carolina University properties.

Mr. Flood stated yes.

Mr. Jordan stated that the UNRI recommendations directly contradict the existing standards. He asked which set of standards would override.

Mr. Flood stated that the district would override because they are more restrictive.

Mr. Jordan asked if the UNRI was larger than College View.

Mr. Flood stated yes.

Chairman Webb stated the area has more rear yard parking than originally thought so a decision will need to be made for the future and past properties.

Mr. Flood stated yes and the UNRI are aware of the College View standards but wanted a more definitive standard as to what is and is not acceptable.

Chairman Webb asked how enforcement would be handled.

Mr. Flood stated through zoning and parking enforcement. The details would need to be worked out.

Chairman Webb asked would there be a need for the entire back yard to be gravel.

Mr. Flood stated that parking would have to be considered case by case.

Mr. Jordan asked if the city is allowed to require existing property owners to change.

Attorney Little stated that the city can set up a grandfather provision to state a specified time to come into compliance.

Mr. Jordan asked if the UNRI committee considered changing existing properties.

Mr. Flood stated he did not know if UNRI committee rendered an opinion on unapproved surfaces.

Ms Larkin asked if the rear yard parking standards subject to interpretation.

Attorney Little stated that the new standards are defining the meaning of "unobtrusive".

Chairman Webb asked if visibility from street front will be addressed in the new standards.

Mr. Flood stated that the proposal discussed screening from the street view. Corner lots have two street frontages so they would both have to be screened.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the City has no legal right to enter a back yard. The determination of appropriate rear yard parking can only be established if visible from the street.

Mr. Jordan stated that the Design Guidelines are currently being updated so it is difficult to see how the two standards will mesh.

Chairman Webb asked if other ordinances from UNRI will affect Historic District.

Mr. Flood stated that the on street parking will affect the Historic District and it will be presented at the June City Council Meeting. UNRI would like for the on street and onsite parking to be set before school starts. The Design Review Committee may want to review the standards in order to provide input.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he received a draft of the updated Design Guideline.

Ms Larkin asked if the landlords or the renters be considered residents for the on street parking.

Mr. Flood stated the renters that signed the contract would be considered the residents and they would have to show proof of residency in order to receive an onsite parking permit.

Ms Larkin asked if the residents would be limited to one parking sticker.

Mr. Flood stated that he believed it was three but he would double check.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the tenants and the property owner would both have permits.

Ms Larkin asked would the permit require vehicle registration and proof of residency.

Mr. Flood stated yes.

Ms Larkin asked would a charge be applied to the permit.

Mr. Flood stated yes.

Minor Works COA's

Mr. Laughlin reported none for the month of May.

Chairman Webb asked if staff found any information about the purple doors.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the bulk of the doors are owned by one person. He talked to him and instructed him that he would probably need to change them back to a typical color for the area.

Mr. Jordan asked if the city still have a collection of paint chips that property owners could view for paint choices.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he had not seen them. They did exist but they are not being used currently.

Current COA's include the completion of 205 S. Library Street with the red brick sidewalk. The residents have no plans to extend the driveway.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Myron Casper, resident of College View area, spoke concerning the Commission speaking directly into the microphones, enforcement and parking. He suggested that the Commission enforce current guidelines before implementing new ones. He also reiterated the 30% front yard parking ordinance that has increased over the years at 803 E 3rd Street. The property also has railroad tires in the front yard which was addressed by the Commission a while back. Mr. Casper pleaded with the Commission to take action and enforce the current regulations.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

None of the committees met.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

With there being no further discussion, Ms Larkin made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Jordan seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Seth Laughlin, Planner II