

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

November 22, 2011

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
KERRY CARLIN
DENNIS CHESTNUT

JORDAN KEARNEY
SARA LARKIN
MAURY YORK
ROGER KAMMERER

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: CHRIS PADGETT, CHIEF PLANNER; VALERIE PAUL, SECRETARY; JONATHAN EDWARDS, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIAN; BILL LITTLE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Ryan Webb made a motion to approve the agenda as it was presented, Mr. Carlin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Chestnut made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, Ms. Larkin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Historic Preservation Loan Pilot Program application

Mr. Christopher Padgett presented the application for 409 S. Library Street to the Commission. He outlined the work that would be done and said that the estimate of repairs is for \$18,500, and he reminded the Commission that the maximum amount of the loan would be \$10,000. He said that the Design Review Committee spent a lot of time on the application and they had awarded the application a score of 20, which is the highest possible score.

Mr. Chestnut asked the Design Review Committee if they had any concerns about the application since they had thoroughly reviewed it?

Chairman Jordan answered that they had taken their time on it and they were very thorough. He said that it was a great application.

Mr. York said that they had checked two fields under Present Use of Structure for "Owner Occupied" and "Rental".

Mr. Webb said that he believed that they had selected both options because the owner's son was occupying the house.

Mr. Padgett said that the total amount that the Commission has to work with is \$90,000, so if they were to approve this application, that would leave \$80,000 in the program account.

Mr. Webb made a motion to approve the application, Ms. Larkin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Facade Improvement Grant Applications

Mr. Padgett presented the applications for the facades of 201/203 W. 9th Street, 906 S. Washington Street, 908 S. Washington Street, and 911 S. Washington Street to the Commission. He noted that there were 15 applications submitted, but they were for the facades of four buildings under common ownership. He said that the total amount requested was \$21,659.20, with there being a potential of \$43,318.40 worth of improvements to the structures. He said that he would follow the suggestion of the Design Review Committee and present the applications to the Commission on a structure-by-structure basis:

- 201/203 W. 9th Street (Applications 11-04 – 11-07)
 - Currently a salon
 - Applications submitted for all four facades
 - Application complete with two estimates
 - Estimates total was \$10,867.00
 - Requested amount was \$5,433.00

Mr. Chestnut said that he had gotten lost in the process and he was not clear on how the applications were being presented to the Commission.

Mr. Padgett said that the presentation format is certainly up to the Commission, so if they would like, then they can have discussion after each application, or they can get through all the applications and then give the Design Review Committee's recommendation.

Chairman Jordan said that it would be up to the Commission, but he felt that the way that the presentation was designed was to go through and look at all that had been requested, hear the Design Review Committee's recommendation and then have discussion.

Mr. Chestnut said he felt that with the current process he would be accepting whatever the Design Review Committee says.

Mr. Webb said that staff will still flip back and forth between screens, but the applications were grouped by address.

Mr. Chestnut said that it was still a lot because there are fifteen properties.

Mr. Webb clarified that it was four properties with fifteen facades.

Mr. Padgett continued with the presentation:

- 906 S. Washington Street (Applications 11-08 – 11-10)
 - Currently a church
 - Applications submitted for three facades
 - Application complete with two estimates
 - Estimates total was \$5,779.00
 - Requested amount was \$2,889.50

- 908 S. Washington Street (Applications 11-11 – 11-14)
 - Currently a tire store
 - Applications submitted for all four facades
 - Application complete with two estimates
 - Estimates total was \$15,986.38
 - Requested amount was \$7,993.19

- 911 S. Washington Street (Applications 11-15 – 11 -18)
 - Former Evans Seafood
 - Applications submitted for all four facades
 - Application complete with two estimates
 - Estimates total was \$10,686.00
 - Requested amount was \$5,343.00

Mr. Padgett asked that they note that the rear façade of this property is a completely enclosed area that is not really visible from the right of way or from an adjacent property. He presented the scores that were given to each property by the Design Review Committee and he said points were given on a 30-point scale, with 30 being the highest possible score:

- Applications 11-04 – 11-07 for 201/203 W. 9th Street
 - 20 points

- Applications 11-08 – 11-10 for 906 S. Washington Street
 - 19.8 points

- Applications 11-11 – 11-14 for 908 S. Washington Street

- 25 points
- Applications 11-15 – 11-18 for 911 S. Washington Street
 - 16.8 points

Mr. Padgett said that the Design Review Committee recommended approval of 14 of the applications with exception to the portions of the applications requesting signage. The Design Review Committee further recommended that the Commission not fund any portion of application 11-18, the rear façade of 911 S. Washington Street. The total of recommended grants was \$18,956.20.

Chairman Jordan said that the Design Review Committee was excited because this was the first time that the program would affect a whole area rather than just a façade here and there. They did not recommend funding Application 11-18 because it is the only façade that would not be visible from any street. They did not recommend funding signage because traditionally, they had never funded it with Façade Improvement Grants.

Mr. Chestnut commended the Design Review Committee on their review process and recommendation, noting that he too did not think that funding the signs was appropriate. He said that he does concur about the area, but his feeling about Application of 11-18 is that it will stick out even more so if the rest of the facades are fixed. If they are trying to make a total impact on the area, then he feels that maybe they need to reconsider the recommendation for that façade.

Mr. Webb said that he went back to look at the property and it is slightly visible from 10th Street, so he would go back on what he said at the Design Review Committee and recommend that they fund it.

Mr. Carlin noted that their understanding was that it was not visible at all, but this would make a difference.

Mr. Webb said that it would possibly stand out more with the Evans Gateway Project.

Mr. Chestnut said it would emphasize what was not done.

Mr. York asked how much that façade would be.

Mr. Padgett answered that it would be \$1,356.00.

Chairman Webb said that with it being a matching grant program, the Commission's portion would be \$678.00.

Mr. York asked about if the existing balance would be what they would have to work with between now and June 30, 2012, the end of the fiscal year.

Chairman Jordan answered that was his understanding and he asked staff to confirm.

Mr. Padgett said the balance would roll over into the next year.

Chairman Jordan noted that they had been getting an annual contribution and they hope that it continues, but whatever they currently had would roll over.

Mr. Webb said that the annual contribution is usually \$25,000, but that is not a guaranteed contribution.

Mr. Webb asked if the City Council would make that decision during their Planning Session in January.

Mr. Padgett answered that program funding would be decided during the budgeting process.

Mr. Chestnut said the Commission should not make decisions on what is left in the account because it could be pulled back. He repeated that he was in favor of approving the rear façade for Application 11-18.

Mr. Webb noted that this is the largest amount that they've ever had to work with because some grants that were turned back in. He said that the amount is typically in the \$20,000 - \$30,000 range.

Mr. Kammerer made a motion to fund Application 11-18 and Ms. Larkin seconded it.

Chairman Jordan said that with that motion, only 11-18 would be funded.

Mr. Kammerer made another motion to fund the recommendations of the Design Review Committee along with Application 11-18, Mr. Webb seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Historic Preservation Pilot Loan Program Text Amendment

Mr. Padgett gave a history of this item and he explained that this item had come before them because of an applicant who was interested in making repairs to his slate roof. Under the current standards of the program, which were taken from the Façade Improvement Grant program, the repairs would not be allowed. Staff had consulted with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and they made the recommendation that the HPC make allowances for repairs to character-defining roofs and they advised on proposed language for that allowance. At their October 2011 meeting, the HPC had requested that staff come back with proposed program standards that would describe

specific roof types for consideration. If the Commission is comfortable with the proposed changes, the revised standards would become effective in January after two readings. Staff proposed that the Commission add Item H under

“Examples of projects eligible for funding”

- a. Repair replacement of wooden fascia.
- b. Painting
- c. Repair/replacement of non-historic doors and/or windows
- d. Re-pointing of bricks
- e. Structural repairs (porches, columns, etc.)
- f. Authentic reconstruction and replacement of original architectural details
- g. Cleaning of brick exterior (chemical stripping, water wash, scraping)
- h. Repair, replacement, initial installation of historically contributing roofs (metal, slate, tile, etc.)

Staff also recommended that they add Item E under

“Examples of projects that cannot be funded either in whole or in part by the loan program”

- a. Installation of vinyl replacement windows
- b. Installation of modern siding materials such as vinyl or fiber cement
- c. Sandblasting of exterior brick, which causes them to deteriorate
- d. Removal of historic features, and
- e. Repair, replacement, or initial installation of non-contributing roofing materials (modern composite shingles, commercial type metal, synthetic tile, etc.)

Mr. Padgett said that staff would still meet with each applicant and the Commission would be the ones to make the final decision on what would be deemed as appropriate for funding.

Mr. Chestnut said that he is concerned with the “etc.” used in both proposed items. He said that for the sake of clarity, it might be better to list materials that would be acceptable and deny applications that do not fall under those categories.

Mr. Carlin said that he had the same kind of concerns.

Chairman Jordan said that he agreed as well.

Mr. Carlin suggested that they leave out the “etc.”

Mr. Webb said that even Item E, under “Examples of projects eligible for funding”, uses the term “etc.” He felt that it may just be an example.

Mr. Chestnut said that he just wanted things to be clear.

Chairman Jordan asked if the term “etc.” was included in the language that SHPO recommended.

Mr. Padgett advised that he was receiving the information second-hand from staff, but he believed that they did.

Mr. Kearney asked if the materials would have to be included. He suggested that they take it out that the Commission could review it on an application-by-application basis.

Chairman Jordan agreed that they could leave out whatever is in the parentheses.

Mr. Chestnut said that he liked the idea because it would mean that they would review each one as a Commission.

Mr. Padgett said that the examples of eligible roof types would serve as a point of clarity not only for the Commission, but to the applicant as well. He said that staff would be comfortable going whichever way that the Commission wished with this.

Mr. Chestnut said that he would rather that the applicant contact staff if they had any questions.

Mr. York said that he was going to suggest that they include terra cotta tiles, but he thought that it may be better just to do away with all of the examples.

Chairman Jordan agreed.

Mr. Chestnut made a motion to that effect and that they add in parentheses, “If you have questions as to whether your roof is contributing, please contact staff.” Mr. Kearney seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jordan asked if they would leave the “etc.” in what is not fundable.

Mr. Chestnut said that he thought the intent of his motion was to take the examples out from both sections.

Chairman Jordan asked Counsel if that was understood.

Attorney Little said that was the understanding that it was an all-encompassing motion. He said that it would have to come back for another reading since they had made changes.

Landmark Repairs Update

There was discussion at the previous meeting in regards to hurricane damage to properties in the Locally Designated Historic District and in the National Register

Districts. The Commission had asked that staff come back with updates on the Federal Building and on the James Fleming House, which currently houses the Chamber of Commerce. Staff found that both properties are not locally designated landmarks. The Fleming House is owned by the City so the Engineering Division will be responsible for making repairs to it. The fence had been damaged and according to staff, there are no local companies that have a mold that would be able to replicate that cast iron fence. Staff was exploring other options to replace the fence with in-kind materials. The James Fleming House was on National Register and the only time that they would have to come before the Commission would be for a Façade Improvement Grant application; Mr. Padgett said that may have been where the confusion came from since the Chamber has come before the Commission for deck improvements under the Façade Improvement Grant program.

Mr. York said that he hopes that the City has not stopped searching because he feels that there should be someone out there who can reproduce the fence and it may not be cost-prohibitive.

Mr. Padgett said that the City has not stopped looking and cost is a relative factor that will be weighed by the Public Works Department and the City Manager's Office.

Mr. York suggested that Mr. Reid Thomas with the Humber House would be a good resource.

Mr. Webb said that the Commission does not have control over several of the larger, historic buildings.

Chairman Jordan asked how the Fleming House managed to slip through not being a landmark. He suggested that the Selection Committee look into it.

Mr. Chestnut said that he knows that it has been on the list because they do have city buildings, such as City Hall, that are locally designated. He said that as Chair of the Selection Committee, he would look into it.

Mr. Padgett said that staff is working on updated photographs of the city's Locally Designated Landmarks would be bringing something to the Commission. He offered to bring a list of the locally designated landmarks so that the group could have full documentation of it.

Mr. York asked if it was in their purview to contact the City and see if they would apply for a Façade Improvement Grant for the Fleming House.

Mr. Webb said that they had been awarded one six months prior, so that would make then ineligible. He voiced his concern that the City would take down the entire fence if

they would not be able to replace the damaged section like they did to the fence at Greenwood Cemetery.

Mr. Kammerer said that there are companies in New England that can replicate this type of fence.

Chairman Jordan agreed with Mr. York's statement that SHPO should have some resources that the City can use.

Mr. Chestnut suggested that they look into salvaged historic material.

Mr. Padgett said that it sounds like the Commission would like to recommend that the City exhaust all opportunities to replace it as it was and if that's not an option, then look at options to pull fence from other parts of the property to keep the character of the frontage the same and to minimize any adverse impact.

Mr. Webb said that he did not think that the fence wrapped around the entire property.

Chairman Jordan said that it does not. He said that it goes down the 3rd Street side and then it stops.

Mr. Chestnut asked that they include salvaged historic material.

STAFF REPORT: COA/MINOR WORKS

None to report.

STAFF REPORT: UPDATE ON NON-COMPLIAN PROPERTIES

- 403 S. Summit Street
 - As discussed at the last meeting, they had made some improvements to the structure and they had installed some unapproved columns
 - Staff met with the owners and they removed the round columns. There are some temporary supporting structures in place while they are making improvements, but they will be removed once the improvements are done, otherwise they will come before the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

Mr. Chestnut asked if they had been provided with a list of acceptable columns.

Mr. Padgett said that they had not because they had indicated that they would not have columns.

Chairman Jordan said that in the pictures that they took when they checked again, there were no columns.

- 807 E. 3rd Street
 - The porch and shutters had been painted a bright blue. There is also a sign hanging from the second story.
 - Staff has sent out a violation letter and they had spoken with SHPO to see what an appropriate color palette would be for that property, which staff will share when they receive a response from the letter.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one spoke during the Public Comment portion.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. Webb said that they had met to discuss the applications from the two programs.

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

Chairman Jordan said that their Chair, Ms. Cohen, had resigned, but they had not met.

SELECTION COMMITTEE

Mr. Chestnut said that they had not met, but they will be meeting to review the Priority List.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER

None.

With there being no further discussion, Mr. Webb made the motion to adjourn, Mr. Carlin seconded it and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Seth Laughlin, Planner II