

**DRAFT OF MINUTES PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION BY THE GREENVILLE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

April 23, 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  
JORDAN KEARNEY  
DAVID HURSH

ROGER KAMMERER  
KERRY CARLIN  
SARA LARKIN

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** 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, Mr. Carlin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

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

**NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Seth Laughlin stated that fourteen façade improvement grants (FIG) were submitted by two individuals for improvements in the FIG eligible area. The fourteen applications are grouped into two projects.

**FIG Applications 13-02 through 13-04: Submitted by Jeff Beaman and Kenneth Waldron**

Mr. Laughlin presented the façade improvement grant applications. The applications request installation/replacement of windows on the second floor of the 5<sup>th</sup> Street Distillery located at 120 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Applications 13-02 is the front of the building, 13-03 is the east side and 13-04 is the rear of the building. Each application request to remove the existing boarded up windows and replace with hung windows and bronze aluminum frames. Total estimated cost is \$6,522 and the total amount requested is \$3,261. The Design Review Committee (DRC) recommended to not fund portions of the application as submitted with regards to windows due to the modern nature of the proposed windows replacements. Staff, DRC and Staff Historic Preservation Office

(SHPO) support reopening the boarded windows but are bound by the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings. DRC did recommend funding the installation of an awning along E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street for a total grant of \$837.50

Mr. Hursh asked if anything would be done to the windows.

Mr. Laughlin stated the applicant would like to move forward but the improvements must be in compliance with the standards.

Mr. Jordan stated that the application stated the suggested improvement would be just a sheet of glass with no grids.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the bronze aluminum frames would be inconspicuous.

Mr. Kammerer asked if the applicant could come before the board and discuss their plans.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he did try to make contact with them but to no avail.

Chairman Webb stated that DRC was fine with the windows not being double hung but not with the color of the aluminum and the single sheet of glass.

Mr. Hursh asked if the windows were double hung would they be covered by the grant.

Chairman Webb stated that double hung meant the windows would be opened. DRC was not concerned with the windows being opened.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the proposed windows could not be opened.

Mr. Kammerer suggested that the Commission wait and hear back from the applicants concerning what they were willing to do.

Mr. Hursh made a motion to inform the applicant about the DRC recommendation and solicit a response.

Chairman Webb asked if the board should divide out the awning portion of the request.

Attorney Little stated that the sides were divided in the past so the request can be divided. The board could approve one side and continue another side dependent upon additional information.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the application is two tier – windows and awnings.

Attorney Little suggested that both portions be continued depending on the resolution of the window issue.

Chairman Webb stated that if the board approved the awning it would show support of the project.

Attorney Little stated as long as the windows and awnings are not collocated, then the decision of the board to approve one is fine.

Mr. Hursh restated his motion to approve the awnings but added that the applicant reconsider the windows based on what DRC recommended, Ms Larkin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

### **FIG Applications 13-05 through 13-15: Submitted by CommunitySmith, LLC, c/o Holton Wilkerson**

Mr. Laughlin presented the façade improvement grant applications. The applications request improvements for the Superblock Project and a separate location. All applications were submitted with two estimates. Applications 13-05 and 13-06 are the side and front of 201 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 13-07 is the front of 203 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 13-08 is the front of 205 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 13-09 is the front side of 207 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 13-10, 13-11, and 13-12 are the alley, south and street side of 417 Cotanche Street, respectively, 13-13, 13-14 and 13-15 are the front, rear and side of 703 Dickinson Ave, Remember When Antiques. Applications 13-05 & 13-06 request to extend the 5th St. storefront windows down to typical sill height of 12"-24" above floor level, extend Cotanche side windows down lower as above, provide new panel material below and above windows (more of a raised panel look rather than vertical siding), repaint façade to lighten accent areas per old photo, and provide new awnings. Application 13-07 requests to remove bay window roof and glass, redo storefront, extend transom area down to same height as 201/205 (see right side of photo), and depending on condition of brick once revealed the applicant may repaint façade. Application 13-08 requests to provide new sill material (raised panel look) below storefront and repaint façade if necessary. Application 13-09 requests to repair brick, prepare for sealer, remove and replace storefront windows and remove and replace awnings. Applications 13-10 through 13-12 request Cotanche Street façade to repaint/repair brick, repair/in-fill/ cut in Openings, remove existing infill (brick, CMU) and restore designated, original window openings as shown on Dunn & Dalton drawings, install new windows –new windows will be installed where openings were restored, re-attach sagging awning to wall, reinforce/reinstall hangers, repair/in-fill awning ceiling material, repaint storefront framing and doors. The side façade request includes removal of vines/vegetation and repaint/repair brick. The rear façade request includes repaint/repair brick. Application 13-13 request for front façade to include repaint/repair brick, repair/in-fill/repaint wood transom area, provide new flashing and make watertight, re-attach sagging awning to wall, reinforce/reinstall hangers, repair/in-fill awning ceiling material, and repaint storefront framing and doors. Application 13-14

request for rear façade to include repoint/repaint brick, repair roof edge condition to eliminate leaking, replace gutter, re-flash scupper boxes, extend downspouts to grade and direct away from building, repair/repaint historic doors, potentially excavate walls to 6" below floor level and provide 2 coats of thorseal waterproofing to 6" above grade because of complaints from tenants about significant water problems. Application 13-15 request for side façade to include remove vines/vegetation and repoint/repaint brick. The total requested amount is \$32,065.00. The DRC recommend funding applications 13-05 through 13-15 in their entirety with the understanding that all proposed work is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings and with renderings submitted with the applications.

Mr. Kammerer asked about the differences in the illustration and the rendering for 205 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Holton Wilkerson, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. The renderings are a conceptual drawing of the project by a free lancer. There are inconsistencies in the drawings. The improvements may be tenant driven. They are also unsure what they might find once they get started. They are working with SHPO and using federal and state funding for the project.

Chairman Webb asked if SHPO will have to sign off on work.

Mr. Wilkerson stated yes.

Mr. Laughlin stated if elements of the project change and the applicant spends less money, then less will come out of the façade improvement account.

Ms Larkin asked if SHPO had given their approval.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he had not received any documentation.

Mr. Kammerer stated that the SHPO will inform the Commission if they have any problems with the project.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve applications 13-05 through 13-15 for Community Smith with the understanding that it is a tax credit project that will be following the Secretary of Interior's Standards, Mr. Kammerer seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Discussion of CSX Railroad office building**

Mr. Laughlin presented photos of the CSX Rail office.

Chairman Webb stated he received an email from Mr. Kammerer who works with the Village of Yesteryear. He asked Attorney Little to provide a synopsis of the City's involvement.

Attorney Little provided an update on the building. He stated that the City was posed a question about moving the building. The Railroad nor the Village of Yesteryear said they did not have the money to move the building. The building inspector said the building is covered inside and out with asbestos. The Department of Transportation might be able to move it except for the asbestos issue. The cost of transporting the building and making sure no spill or discharges is cost prohibited. There was some money that could have moved it but the asbestos stopped that project.

Mr. Kammerer asked if the building could be moved by rails to a vacant lot by the new bypass until it is finished. He suggested raising the money to rehabilitate the building and make it a museum.

Attorney Little stated that the condition of the building may cause asbestos spillage and a great deal of money to keep the building in tack so that it could be reestablished in another location.

Chairman Webb asked if there was a budget of \$35,000 for the building.

Attorney Little stated yes. It was the railroad money with DOT money to just move the building and it did not include any asbestos issues.

Chairman Webb asked if asbestos singles are required to be removed in the College District.

Attorney Little stated no but the problem will lie when the building is shaken. In the College District, a barrier is required and the new siding must be placed on top of the asbestos siding. The safest way to clear asbestos is to burn it.

Ms Larkin asked what the building is currently used for.

Chairman Webb stated that the railroad personnel work there.

Attorney Little said the building is a health hazard when it gets moved.

Chairman Webb asked why the building had to be moved.

Attorney Little stated the Railroad said the building had to be removed from that location. He was not sure why.

Chairman Webb stated that the Commission only hears about issues with historic buildings when it is time to be demolished.

Attorney Little stated that the City has been involved.

Chairman Webb stated that it is frustrating to the Commission that they are notified of historic property issues at the last minute.

Mr. Hursh asked what the proper way of demolishing the building is.

Attorney Little stated that usually water would be used to hold the dust down and bagged up and separately disposed.

Ms Larkin asked the date when the building was built.

Attorney Little stated he did not know a date.

Mr. Kammerer stated that history says the building began being built in 1880. The depot was built in 1890. The office was probably built in 1890.

Ms Larkin stated that the building does not appear to be a big building.

Attorney Little stated that he was not aware of all the efforts nor the timeline for the moving of the building.

Ms Larkin asked if the Railroad could move a building without coming to HPC.

Attorney Little stated that since the Railroad is a federal entity they could. The City and DOT have tried to come up with saving options. There is not enough money to cover all the issues.

Mr. Kammerer asked if it would cost a large sum of money to tear the building down, why that money could not be put into preserving the building.

Chairman Webb asked if this is the first time the moving of the building has been discussed in public how can it be stated that there are no other options.

Attorney Little stated that he was not saying there are no more options but that he is giving all the information he had up to date.

Chairman Webb read an email from the city engineer. The new office for the CSX railroad will be ready May 13. It will be around the end of May before they develop a plan for the existing building. The Commission should express interest in the building remaining an historic property.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the situation is in the hands of DOT.

Mr. Jordan asked if the property was a part of the 10<sup>th</sup> Street connector project.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he did not know.

Ms Larkin asked if the office was on federal property.

Mr. Laughlin stated it is in the railroad right of way.

Mr. Jordan stated if the office is not in the right of way of the road then it did not have to be torn down as soon as the staff moves out. The office is not a local landmark.

Ms Larkin asked if SHPO had an opinion about the office move.

Chairman Webb stated that DOT wrote along with SHPO a 35 page report which he could email it out to the board.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the Commission can make a motion for staff to do further investigation and present a report.

Chairman Webb asked for staff to also investigate whether the Intermodal Group considered looking at restoring the building.

Mr. Hursh stated that all the facts are not present and that costs and all options should be presented.

Mr. Laughlin stated he will try.

Mr. Hursh made a motion that city staff provides complete information on all options concerning the CSX office so the Commission can make an informed decision, Mr. Kammerer seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Discussion of Demolition by Neglect Ordinance**

Mr. Laughlin presented the Resolution written by the Commission in 2008 for City Council to enact an Anti-demolition by Neglect Ordinance. If the Commission decided to send a new version to Council then it would have to be advertised.

Chairman Webb asked the Commission to take a look at the resolution and be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting.

Mr. Jordan asked if the draft went to City Council and was not approved.

Attorney Little stated that the resolution never got to City Council.

Chairman Webb stated that the Commission did vote on the resolution as a board.

Mr. Hursh asked if the resolution addressed catching issues before they get too far gone.

Chairman Webb stated yes.

Mr. Laughlin stated the resolution is about not letting property deteriorate into nothingness.

Mr. Jordan asked if the Commission needed to vote on putting the resolution on next month's agenda.

Chairman Webb stated that he put the resolution on the agenda in hopes it would be in the package.

Attorney Little stated even if the resolution was in the package it would have been a discussion item. Next month the Commission would decide on the format and make a motion on the resolution and the proposed ordinance.

### **Minor Works COA's**

Mr. Laughlin reported the following Minor Works:

- 1) 201 W. 5<sup>th</sup> St. 201 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street (City of Greenville Municipal Building): replacement of HVAC unit and removal of former communication tower located on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor.
- 2) 1201 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street (ECU property): landscape improvements

Chairman Webb asked if the Commission approved a major works COA for Municipal.

Mr. Laughlin stated yes and presented the current COA's listing. He stated that the major works COA for the Municipal building had expired and they had to come back to the Commission. There was a funding issue. COA's are good for six months.

Mr. Hursh asked if the owner at 408 S. Harding Street with the COA concerning the gate had to come back to the Commission.

Mr. Laughlin stated if they want to install the gate they would.



Attorney Little stated that staff is required to send notification of the expired COA and resubmit if they wanted to continue the work.

Ms Larkin talked to the owner and he said the gate they were going to buy was no longer available and the other gate that was comparable was extremely expensive. The owner stated they probably would not install a gate because of the cost.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the ordinance gives provision if the owner is working on the project then the six months deadline is not as stringent. He stated that the owner at 205 S. Library is working on getting a contractor for his COA and waiting for information concerning the tree for repairs to the driveway.

Mr. Hursh asked if the driveway repair required a separate COA.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the original request was for brick on top of the walkway so the driveway is a separate COA.

Chairman Webb asked if the work would be completed by May.

Mr. Laughlin stated the owners wanted to wait until school was out to get a tree cut down. He has not received an application for the driveway and it will not be done without the Commission's approval.

Ms Larkin asked if the applicant was informed that a separate COA would need to be filled out.

Mr. Laughlin stated they did.

Chairman Webb asked how the repairs to the driveway were added to the sidewalk COA.

Mr. Laughlin stated that it first had to be determined if Public Works would take care of the situation.

Chairman Webb stated that if Public Works decide to remove trees from the right of way then the Commission should receive a report.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the tree was a split trunk that came up in an existing driveway.

Mr. Hursh asked what the tree had to do with the walkway and that it appeared that the owners were planning to do the driveway without coming to the Commission.

Attorney Little suggested that staff look at the COA and send a reminder about what was approved.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the driveway repair was not an effort to circumvent the process.

Chairman Webb stated that the Commission was trying to make sure the applicant is clear on the process.

Chairman Webb asked if any amount of painting required a minor work.

Mr. Laughlin stated any repairs require a minor work.

Chairman Webb stated that four homes in the College District had their doors painted purple.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he was not aware of the purple doors and the painting doors or installing a screen door requires a minor work. Any exterior repairs or improvements require a minor work COA. He would canvass the neighborhood for the painting jobs.

Chairman Webb opened and closed the public comment period due to no one being present.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Design Review Committee did meet to discuss the FIG.

Publicity Committee had not met.

Selection Committee had not met.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Jordan asked for the status of the Cobb House landmark designation.

Mr. Laughlin stated that SHPO has the package for comments and hopefully the results will be in the package next month.

Mr. Kammerer announced the Pitt County Annual Historical Tour on Sunday from 3-5 at the Five Point parking lot if it does not rain.

**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 8:07 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Seth Laughlin, Planner II