

August 25, 2009

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	Dennis Chestnut	Roger Kammerer
Ashley Wetherington	Bryan Patonay	Charlotte Cohen
Brad Ingalls	Ann Schwarzmann	Henry Doskey

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

Minnie Anderson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Seth Laughlin, Planner; Sarah Radcliff, Secretary; Jonathan Edwards, Communications Technician; Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney; Thom Moton, Assistant City Manager; Calvin Mercer, Councilmember

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Mr. Laughlin stated he would like to move item 3 "Process for Designation of Historic Areas" between items 1 and 2 under old business.

Chairman Webb said he wanted to add an update on FIG funds availability before the discussion of the FIG applications.

Motion was made by Mr. Chestnut, seconded by Mr. Patonay to approve the amended agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2009 AND JULY 15, 2009

Motion was made by Mr. Kammerer, seconded by Mr. Chestnut to approve the June 23, 2009 and July 15, 2009 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

NEW APPOINTMENTS

Chairman Webb had each of the new members introduce themselves to the Commission.

OLD BUSINESS

CLG Grant Application Follow Up and Process for Designation of Historic Areas

Mr. Scott Power from the State Historic Preservation Office said his office worked staff to staff with local preservation commissions. He said he was approached by the planner prior to Seth and they worked together to construct a project that Greenville needed and that would have a chance of being funded through the HPF grant, which is a federal grant that goes through the Raleigh office. He said it was a percentage grant around \$700,000 and they had to apply about ten percent of that to grants for Certified Local Governments. He said this was the third year that the city had submitted an application for the grant and the first year that it was funded. Mr. Power said they came up with a project to look at the remaining areas of Greenville that had not been given attention in years past and also areas that were getting close to being considered historic. Mr. Power said a lot of the neighborhoods had been covered recently. College View, Skinnerville and Dickinson Avenue had all been done within the last twenty years so they wanted to look at areas that had not had any coverage. He said the area they had the most interest in was the area east of College View and the University on Fifth Street from College View neighborhood to Forest Hill Drive. He said the area goes all the way down Fifth Street and trails off in either direction based on the dates of the properties in the area. He said the map was a preliminary map of what they think would be potentially eligible for the register. He said the area could be bigger or smaller than what is shown on the map, depending on what the consultants find when they start doing their research. He said the project was an intensive survey where the consultants will go in and do a building by building, property by property inventory and take photographs and do the history on each property. Other areas on the map will just get a "wind chill" survey where the consultants will identify a few properties, do research to determine when the properties were constructed, when the neighborhoods were laid out and that sort of information so that they will have that for future grant applications. Mr. Power said in addition to those neighborhoods they identified twenty to twenty-five additional properties not in those areas that might be properties worthy of being recorded and potentially eligible in the future. He said they had not received any bids from the RFP's that were sent out about three weeks ago. He said the next step would be to send out the RFP's again to a broader range of consultants.

Mr. Chestnut asked how districts are determined. He said he understood him to say two staff members, a local city staff and a SHPO got together to look at properties that might have potential for historic designation.

Mr. Power said that was correct.

Mr. Chestnut asked if there was any input from residents in the area.

Mr. Power said all they were doing at this point was gathering information. He said this was a survey, not a nomination to create a historic district. He said if they ever got to the point of doing a National Register nomination they would have lots of public input and neighborhood meetings. He said in order for something to be listed on the National Register, 51% of the property owners have to approve.

Mr. Chestnut said considering that the area may be condensed or broadened, he wondered where that dialogue would take place in that one problem he had was that it basically looks at the properties that are up against College View, back to Elm Street, then with a tail down Fifth Street to Forest Circle. He said it seemed to him if it is an East Fifth Street district it would be inclusive of all of East Fifth Street instead of stopping just about a mile short of the end, as well as not taking in certain things such as the cemetery. He said he just wanted input as to why it was called East Fifth Street and not be totally inclusive.

Mr. Power said the name was more descriptive than historical. He said College View encompasses a number of different platted areas but developers had to put a name on it to get it on the subdivision map. He said the name would likely change as this goes along. He said as far as the size, it would be easy to determine by looking at buildings built before 1960 and 1961. He said they didn't take it any further than Forest Hills because there's a lot of development in that area that occurred post fifty years ago. Mr. Power said when using the National Register as a benchmark for determining boundaries for districts it's pretty delineated about what you can and can't do.

Mr. Chestnut said his point was that there were some that were older that were not included and wanted to make sure they were reviewed for inclusion.

Chairman Webb asked if vacant lots were considered nonconforming.

Mr. Power said if you were looking at National Register Historic Districts they were just identified as a vacant lot and they don't do anything with them. He said they would only be an issue if there had been historic development on it and you were trying to jump over a bunch of vacant lots to pick up more development.

Mr. Chestnut asked what the definition was for contributing and non-contributing structures.

Mr. Power said contributing properties are those that were over fifty years of age when the nomination was prepared and have maintained their physical and historical integrity from the period of significance. Non-contributing properties are any properties less than fifty years of age when the district was listed or any properties that have been altered so that they don't present their physical integrity from the period of significance. He said a property has to be contributing to get tax credits for it unless work is done that would bring it into a contributing status. He said for local designations they use the National Register documentation to determine whether something is contributing or not for the purposes of local designations as well. He said most of the time if you designate a district right after the nomination has been done the nomination itself serves as the designation report.

Mr. Chestnut asked what our policy was for non-contributing properties in, for example College View that has the local overlay.

Mr. Laughlin said he had not had to deal with any as of yet. He said if he did he would confer with the SHPO.

Mr. Chestnut said there were some before he came on board. He asked if they were held to the rules of the local designation.

Mr. Power said they were supposed to be, even if they were non-contributing.

Mr. Doskey asked about the non-inclusion of the area that runs down the middle of the block on Elm Street. He said he lived on Maple so he knew the area well and many of the properties were close to sixty years old. He asked specifically about the Hagwood House, located on Shady Lane.

Mr. Power said they were very preliminary boundaries that were created six or seven years ago. He said the issue with the National Register would be the newer properties and properties that have been altered that are located in between the other areas. He said they would certainly look into those other properties during the process of the survey.

Mr. Patonay asked how successful they had been in the past at getting the properties in the National Registry.

Mr. Power said at the end of the process the consultants would put together a list of properties they feel are eligible and present it at one of their meetings. He said once it gets on the study list there was a high percentage rate of getting them on the register.

Façade Improvement Grant Applications

Mr. Laughlin stated there was \$20,000 in funds available to go towards the nine complete applications received. He said the total amount requested was \$32,965.50.

Chairman Webb stated he asked Mr. Laughlin to add an update to the agenda each month with the amount of funds available for FIG's in order to keep the board aware of the ongoing balance and transactions. Chairman Webb stated there was an additional \$20,000 set aside for four FIGs awarded to George Saad, Jr. from the spring 2008 FIG Workshop.

Mr. Laughlin stated he had received a request via a former commission member to extend the deadline from September 29, 2009 for Mr. Saad. He said he was going to contact Mr. Saad within the next couple of days to request something in writing from him if he chooses to move forward.

Chairman Webb stated there would be another \$25,000 available for the fall 2009 and spring 2010 workshops.

Ms. Wetherington requested recusal from the FIG discussion due to a family member being associated with one of the applicants.

Motion was made by Mr. Chestnut, seconded by Mr. Patonay to approve her request. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Laughlin stated application 09-01 was requesting \$5,000 for the west façade of 414 S. Washington Street to repair brick and mortar, tuck point as necessary and apply lime-based stucco. The owner is J2 Holdings, LLC. He gave the background for the building and past FIG activity. Mr. Laughlin stated though work had already begun on this project, it would be allowed to be considered for a grant due to the delay in processing being no fault of the applicants. Applications 09-03 through 09-06 are from Mills and Economos, LLP for the property located at 200 W. Third Street. They have no previous FIG activity. The property is non-contributing and they wish to replace stucco and/or windows on each of the four facades. Application 09-03 is a request for \$3,313.72. 09-04 is for \$1,727.50, 09-05 for \$1,462.14 and 09-06 \$1,462.14. Applications 09-07 through 09-10 are from City Center, LLC for the property located at 631 B Dickinson Avenue. Application 09-07 is a request for \$5,000 and proposes to repair masonry, repaint and install windows on the south façade. Application 09-08 is for \$5,000 and proposes to repair foundation, repair, seal, and repaint masonry and remove tar & extraneous elements on the north façade. Application 09-09 is a request for \$4,400 and proposes to repair masonry, window trim, replace the non-original door, repaint and give new signage to the west façade. Application 09-10 is a request for \$5,000 to repair masonry, remove the bricked-in entrance and window, install a door, window and transom and a wrought iron rail to the east façade. Mr. Laughlin said they had been reimbursed \$4,867.84 for past FIGs. Mr. Laughlin said the Design Review Committee had met and reviewed each of the applications. He gave a handout to each member with the scores each application had received from the DRC members. The DRC ranked the properties on a point scale with 90 being a perfect score. Application 09-01 received 90 points with 09-08 receiving 89 points, 09-10 receiving 87 points, 09-09 receiving 82 points, 09-03 receiving 60 points, 09-06 receiving 51 points, 09-04 receiving 47 points and 09-05 with 45 points.

Mr. Chestnut asked what the previous amount given was for 414 S. Washington Street.

Mr. Laughlin said they had previously been reimbursed \$5,000.

Chairman Webb said that was to a previous property owner.

Mr. Laughlin said that was correct.

Mr. Chestnut asked about previous reimbursement for 631 B Dickinson Avenue.

Mr. Laughlin said \$17,367.84 had been approved; however, they had only used \$4,867.84.

Mr. Chestnut asked if they still had that money available.

Mr. Laughlin said those monies were released due to them expiring years ago.

Chairman Webb asked if the board wanted to give out the whole \$20,000 and how they wanted to split it up.

Motion was made by Mr. Doskey, seconded by Mr. Kammerer to spend all of the available funds. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Chestnut, seconded by Mr. Kammerer to grant application 09-01, 414 S. Washington Street for \$5,000. All except Mr. Patonay voted in favor. Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Doskey, seconded by Mr. Ingalls to grant application 09-08, 631 B Dickinson Avenue, north façade for \$5,000. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Chestnut, seconded by Mr. Doskey to grant application 09-07, 631 B Dickinson Avenue, south façade for \$5,000. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chestnut said he felt the grants were there to aid and assist, not to fund the entire project. He felt other properties should be viewed, even if they were non-contributing, because they are taxpayers too and their property is viewable from the historic district.

Ms. Cohen said for application 09-03, she didn't see where what they were proposing dramatically changed anything.

Mr. Laughlin showed the close-ups of the images and the proposed work. He said there were cracks throughout the façade and they wanted to replace the windows.

Motion was made by Mr. Kammerer, seconded by Mr. Chestnut to grant application 09-03, 200 W. Third Street, south façade for \$3,313.72. All voted in favor except Ms. Cohen and Mr. Doskey. Motion carried.

Mr. Chestnut said he knew there was a motion to spend all of the money but wanted to know what would happen if they didn't.

Mr. Doskey said he was considering amending his motion to say "spend it if we need to".

Mr. Laughlin stated any monies not spent would roll over into the next cycle.

Mr. Chestnut asked Mr. Doskey if he would consider amending his motion.

Motion was made by Mr. Doskey, seconded by Mr. Kammerer, to amend the original

motion to spend what the Commission sees fit and have any remaining balance carried over to the next cycle. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Chestnut, seconded by Mr. Patonay to deny applications 09-06, 09-04 and 09-05. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Chestnut, seconded by Mr. Ingalls to deny 09-10 and 09-09 to and carry the remaining money into the next cycle. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Webb stated the next FIG workshop would be October 1st with the deadline being November 2nd.

NEW BUSINESS

Staff Report: Minor Works COA's

Mr. Laughlin stated the first MWCOA was for 501 E. 5th Street to install a new HVAC system located on the roof. A MWCOA was issued for 406 E. 4th Street to repair and paint siding and trim, paint shutters and front door and front porch floor and ceiling. 202 S. Library Street had an application for minor works to repair and repaint wood siding as needed on the garage and to repair an existing fence in the rear yard. They also replaced the HVAC unit in the rear yard. A MWCOA was issued for 211 S. Library Street to install wood siding on the rear addition and paint, (all to match original portion of home) repair original windows as needed, repair fence in side yard, replace HVAC unit in rear yard, and replace front porch columns with like materials. At 407 S. Jarvis Street a MWCOA was issued to point brick and paint as needed, repair existing windows as needed, replace HVAC unit in rear yard, and repair rubber roof at rear of home. A MWCOA was issued for 705 E. 5th St. to repair molding around the column at the SW entrance of the house, replace the screens while preserving original frames on windows and doors as needed, and replace rotted sections of the front porch flooring as needed. 410 Student St. was issued a MWCOA to repair a rotted section of an exterior staircase railing.

Staff Report: Update on non-compliant historic properties

Mr. Laughlin stated there were not currently any non-compliant properties.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

Chairman Webb stated the new Design Review Committee consisted of himself, Ashley Wetherington, Roger Kammerer and Minnie Anderson, as well as Seth from the planning staff. The report from the DRC meeting was given during the update of the FIG applications.

Assignments to Publicity Committee and Selection Committee

Chairman Webb asked which of the old members were on either of these committees.

Mr. Chestnut stated he was on the Selection Committee.

Chairman Webb said he was on Publicity.

Mr. Laughlin stated the chairman had the authority to appoint members to the sub-committees if no one volunteered for them.

Mr. Ingalls, Ms. Cohen and Ms. Schwarzmans volunteered for the Publicity Committee. Mr. Patonay and Mr. Doskey volunteered for the Selection Committee.

Mr. Chestnut said he would be chairman of the Selection Committee. Mr. Ingalls took position of chairman for the Publicity Committee. Roger Kammerer is chairman of the Design Review Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER

Mr. Kammerer said January 1, 2011 is the 250th anniversary of Pitt County. He said the Historical Society was planning celebrations all next year and he wanted to let the public know and get people involved in the celebration.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth M. Laughlin
Planner II