

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

September 25, 2012

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:**

JEREMY JORDAN, CHAIR  
RYAN WEBB  
SARA LARKIN  
DAVID HURSH

KERRY CARLIN  
MAURY YORK  
RICHARD WEIR

**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**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. York stated that "Historical Preservation Commission" on page 2 under announcements should be changed to "Historic Preservation Commission" and the next to the last paragraph should state that Mr. York pointed out that the motion required a second. Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, Mr. Webb seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Certificate of Appropriateness 12-01**

Mr. Seth Laughlin presented COA 12-01 submitted by Chris Mansfield and John Legette proposing installation of a gate between the homes located at 408 and 406 S. Harding Street. The Design Review Committee recommended approval. Staff stated that the application is in compliance with HPC Design Guidelines but that the guidelines do not specify criteria for gates. Applicable portion of design guidelines used for application was new construction of fences and walls. Notices were mailed to adjacent property owners on September 11, 2012 and an ad was published in the Daily Reflector on September 10 and 17, 2012. Staff recommends approval of application with conditions of plans and modifications complying with City of Greenville's Design Guidelines.

Mr. Chris Mansfield, applicant, spoke in favor of the application. He stated that the houses are close and both applicants would like to install a gate for security for their

homes. The gate would remain locked and both home owners would have keys. He also stated that he found a gate in Raleigh but was informed by staff that it may be too tall in accordance to Design Guidelines.

No one spoke in opposition of the application.

Mr. Webb gave the Design Review Committee report for the application. He stated that the four foot requirement for fences normally have taller gates such as the Chamber of Commerce fence; therefore, the Committee approved the application.

Mr. Mansfield stated that an existing gate on the other side of property is six foot in height and has been in existence for some time.

Mr. Hursh stated that the suggested gate's height would help with security and it is an attractive fence.

Attorney Little stated that the four foot height is the Design Guidelines for the front yard posts. The application can be approved with a variance or with the exemption that a gate by itself is not a fence.

Chairman Jordan stated that the guideline is three feet and not four feet. He suggested that the approval be based on the gate not being a fence versus approval with a variance.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing.

Mr. Webb asked if the Committee needed anything in writing from the other property owner.

Attorney Little stated that the other property owner signed the application.

**Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the application based on it being a gate and not a fence, Ms Larkin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

### **Certificate of Appropriateness 12-02**

Mr. Seth Laughlin presented COA 12-02 submitted by Dan Kinlaw proposing installation of a concrete walk from front porch to driveway at 205 S. Library St. The applicant removed and replaced a former walkway without COA approval and request that the alterations be allowed to remain as-is. The Design Review Committee recommended denial. Staff stated that the application is to be in compliance with HPC Design Guidelines. Applicable portion of design guidelines used for application was repairs and minor works. The conversion from brick to concrete would require a COA. Notices were mailed to adjacent property owners on September 11, 2012 and an ad was published in the Daily Reflector on September 10 and 17, 2012. Staff recommends

denial of application due to sidewalk guidelines referencing in kind material repairs or replacement.

Mr. York asked was sidewalk originally brick or replaced with brick.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he did not have that information.

Mr. Dan Kinlaw, applicant, spoke in favor of application. He stated that he did not know about COA's prior to the demolition of the sidewalk. They planted sod which produced ponding because it was higher than the sidewalk. They did some minor repairs before and did not realize a permit was required to repair the sidewalk the exact footprint of the existing. They suggested putting brick pavers on top of the concrete sidewalk or putting bricks on both side of the sidewalk. They were not satisfied with the existing concrete sidewalk and were willing to do whatever the Commission suggests.

Chairman Jordan asked Attorney Little what would be the best practice to work with the applicant and the existing COA.

Attorney Little stated that the applicant requested an amendment to the application and the Commission has to determine whether the amendment is within scope of the public notice. He advised that the Commission could approve the modified COA with the conditions that the final façade be agreed upon by the applicant, Staff, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Hursh asked for clarity concerning the proposal from the applicant.

Mr. Kinlaw stated that they are still doing research and will make sure that everything is level and looks nice.

Chairman Jordan asked if the bricks will be placed in its original design.

Mr. Kinlaw stated yes, same footprint.

Mr. Webb asked was the original brick in a herringbone pattern.

Mr. Kinlaw stated it was so broken that they could not tell.

Mr. Webb stated the broken part is the part being run over by cars.

Mrs. Kinlaw stated to the best of her knowledge that cars were not driving over the sidewalk and she will stress that to the tenants.

Mr. Webb stated that the Design Review Committee did talk about the same suggestion that the applicant made concerning the pavers.

Chairman Jordan asked if the Commission could approve the modified COA with the paver suggestion.

Attorney Little stated that the COA could be approved with the condition that the alterations must be approved by the applicant, staff, SHPO and Design Review Committee.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing.

Mr. York suggested that the Commission approve the existing concrete walk and allow the applicant to build up the sides with sod since the majority of the sidewalks in the neighborhood are concrete.

Chairman Jordan stated that the Commission would have to clearly state the conditions of the COA since the Design Guidelines does not address specifically brick sidewalks, if they decide to approve it.

Mr. Webb stated that the guidelines do state to replace with like material and the applicant was contacted prior to the pouring of the concrete. He suggested that the Commission stick with the guidelines as much as possible even though the repair has been completed.

Mr. Carlin stated that the pavers would be the best compromise and appreciated the applicant's interest in the home.

**Ms Larkin made a motion to permit the applicant to amend the COA to permit a brick paver of a design, size and application as approved by Design Review Committee, SHPO, Staff and applicant, Mr. Hursh seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

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

Staff reported one minor works issued: 707 E. 4<sup>th</sup> St. – roof and trim work repair.

Chairman Jordan asked what work was being done at the Horne House.

Mr. Laughlin stated that it was an old minor work being done to repair the roof of the rear porch.

Mr. Webb asked how long do minor works last.

Mr. Laughlin stated 180 days.

Mr. Webb asked is the work being done at Third Street School an old minor work also.

Mr. Laughlin stated he has been in discussion with them about some work.

No one spoke during public comment period.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Design Review Committee met concerning the two COA's.

Publicity Committee did not met.

Selection Committee met on September 20, 2012. They recommended moving the Cobb House, 300 S. Pitt Street, to the top of the designation priority list. Staff confirmed that the owners are still interested in the local designation and funding is available. Staff recommended that the designation be a possible agenda item for the October HPC meeting.

Chairman Jordan stated that the Committee did look at several properties on the list and suggested the Cobb House since it is a recent example of a good adaptive use.

Mr. Hursh made a motion to put the designation of the Cobb House for public hearing on October's HPC meeting agenda, Mr. Weir seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Laughlin stated the local landmark designation process.

Mr. Hursh asked if the property has to be handled a certain way.

Mr. Laughlin stated that the property owners have a 50% tax deferral benefit and the property must be maintained in accordance to design guidelines.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. York asked if the Commission could add an agenda item for next month concerning a workshop about tax credits available for renovations in the College View District.

Everyone agreed to the agenda addition for October.

**With there being no further discussion, Mr. Carlin made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Weir seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Seth Laughlin, Planner II