

GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

August 26, 2008
Greenville, NC

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:

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Minnie Anderson | Franceine Rees | Rick Smiley |
| Dennis Chestnut | Dale Sauter | Ryan Webb |
| Jeremy Jordan | N. Yaprak Savut | |

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

Greg Jarrell, Vice-Chair Candace Pearce, Chair

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandy Gale Edmundson, Secretary; Jonathan Edwards, Cameraman; Harry Hamilton, Jr., Chief Planner; Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney; Carl Rees, Senior Planner; and Tom Wisemiller, Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Patrick Gogoel and William Wooten

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

Motion was made by Ms. N. Yaprak Savut and seconded by Mr. Ryan Webb to add two agenda items: Resolution of the Jones Lee House and information on the North Carolina Annual Conference. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 22, 2008

The Commission decided to act on the July 22, 2008 Historic Preservation Commission minutes at the September 23, 2008 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

The public did not comment.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Overview of Procedures for Downtown Local Historic District – Harry Hamilton, Chief Planner and Carl Rees, Urban Development Planner

Mr. Rees introduced Mr. Harry Hamilton as the Chief Planner for the City of Greenville. Mr. Hamilton will be making a presentation on the overview of procedures for the

Downtown Local Historic District.

Mr. Harry Hamilton, Chief Planner, gave a presentation on the Historic District (HD) Overlay. If zoned to HD, the underlying general purpose zoning (CD) Downtown Commercial will continue to apply in addition to the requirements of Chapter 10 (Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)) and associated Design Guidelines. There are three steps to the zoning process:

1. HD Overlay zoning process initiated by City Council per recommendation of the HPC.
2. Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) consideration at their regular meeting held the third Tuesday of each month at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers. The Planning Division staff sends first class mail notice of the request to all property owners within and adjacent to (minimum 100') the proposed HD district – 86 within and 60 adjacent. The notice can contain any information you deem appropriate, in addition to the meeting schedule and other information required by law. The Planning and Zoning Commission can not amend the original request, can not change the boundary of the district, etc. Interested persons may attend the meeting and will be given the opportunity to speak. The Planning and Zoning Commission may continue the request for further study; however, the Commission must take action within 60 days of the initial consideration. P&Z recommendation forwarded to City Council for consideration at the next available meeting date – typically the following month.
3. City Council holds a public hearing on the proposed zoning (2nd Thursday of the following month at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers). Planning Division staff again sends first class mail notice of the request to all property owners within and adjacent to (minimum 100') the proposed HD district. Staff posts notice of the public hearing in the local newspaper (city page). Staff also posts several signs throughout the proposed district (within the right-of-way). The public is invited to the meeting and given the opportunity to speak for or against the proposal. Following the public hearing City Council may:
 - a. approve the request as originally proposed or with amendment (reduced area);
 - b. continue the request to a later meeting; or
 - c. table the request (take no action at this time).

Property owners (adjacent to and within the proposed district) may file a zoning protest petition. A protest petition is qualified (valid) if signed by:

- a. the owners of 5% of the area with 100 feet of the external boundary of the proposed district; or
- b. the owners of 20% of the area within the proposed boundary.

If a valid protest petition is filed (72 hours prior to the public hearing date), the ordinance zoning the property must be approved by super majority vote of Council (5 of 6 votes in favor).

Once zoned as HD overlay, the requirements of Chapter 10 will apply as of the ordinance specified effective date – typically immediately.

The College View Historic District (HD overlay zone) was established in 1994.

The Commission thanked Mr. Hamilton for his presentation.

Mr. Rees recommended that the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission inform the Redevelopment Commission of their wishes to establish a Downtown Local Historic District.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Ms. Franceine Rees to have the Chair of the Commission, Candace Pearce, to address the Redevelopment Commission on this issue. Motion carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)

COA 08-09 (Continued): 400 South Summit Street

Mr. Jordan: At the July 22, 2008 meeting, COA application 08-09 for 400 South Summit Street was continued. The continuance was to allow the applicant to explore other manufacturers and to meet with the Design Review Committee to make sure the windows are congruent with the guidelines.. In the fall of 2007, the original Craftsman-style four-over-one wood sash windows were replaced with vinyl tilt replacement windows without receiving prior COA approval from the Commission. On November 27, 2008, the Commission reviewed the applicant's request for approval for the previously installed vinyl replacement windows. The Commission denied the applicant's request but decided to grant the applicant until November 28, 2008 to replace the vinyl replacement windows at 400 South Summit Street with historically appropriate replacement windows that could be approved by the City staff and the Commission's Design Review Committee. Tonight, Michael Gogoel is submitting an application to install all wooden windows with three over 1 grille pattern.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Mr. Michael Gogoel and Mr. Tom Wisemiller.

Mr. Wisemiller: This brick, eclectic foursquare house originally had four-over-one sash windows, with an eyebrow vent on the roof and engaged chimneys, in the Craftsman Bungalow style; while the front porch has half-timbering in its full-façade gable,

reminiscent of the Tudor Revival style. The first known occupant of the house was Mrs. Lydia T. Fleming.

The house is located on the southwest corner of E. Fourth Street and South Summit Street in the College View Historic District.

The applicant requests approval to replace previously installed vinyl replacement windows, which replaced the original windows, with wood replacement windows.

Case History

In the fall of 2007, staff was informed that the original Craftsman-style four-over-one wood sash windows at 400 S. Summit Street had been replaced with vinyl tilt replacement windows (Ellison Windows & Doors, Series 1500 Replacement Windows) without the owner receiving prior COA approval from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The applicant had preserved the original wood window frames but encapsulated the brick molding with PVC coated aluminum with a wood grain finish.

Staff informed the property owner that exterior changes to local historic properties require COA approval from the HPC. On November 27, 2008, the HPC heard the applicant's request for approval for the previously installed vinyl replacement windows (COA 07-12).

Previous Facts - A review of the facts presented in COA 07-12:

- According to the applicant and contractor, the original windows were beyond repair; that most of the mullions and sashes, as well as the frames, were rotted; that there was a degree of wood rot; and that there was a high probability that lead paint was present in the windows. Applicant also stated that many of the windows were painted shut and that sash cords were deteriorated; therefore, many of the windows could not be opened.
- Staff inspected the property when the work was nearing completion and observed several of the original windows, which had been removed from the dwelling but still remained on the property. These windows appeared to be in fair to good condition. Staff had no way of knowing, however, whether the condition of the remaining windows were typical of the original windows in general.
- Applicant claimed that, when he purchased the house in August 2007, he was not informed that the property was in a local historic district (that no such information appeared on the listing documents, closing documents, deed, etc.). However, City of Greenville Ordinance Number 94-22, § 1, 2-10-94 created the College View Historic District. Street signs in the district indicate which city blocks are part of the local historic district.

- Applicant also claimed that, at the time of purchase, the dwelling was in a bad state or repair. According to him, many of the windows were broken and the house could not be secured against unlawful entry. Applicant stated that none of the contractors who advised on replacement options for the windows mentioned that the property was a local historic property.

The HPC denied the applicant's request. In light of the circumstances pertaining to the case, however, the Commission decided to allow the applicant up to one year from the date of the meeting, or until **November 28, 2008**, to replace the non-congruent vinyl replacement windows previously installed on the dwelling at 400 S. Summit Street with historically appropriate replacement windows—to be approved at the discretion of City staff and the HPC Design Review Committee.

Revised Proposal #1 (presented at the July 22, 2008 HPC meeting)

On July 22, 2008, the HPC heard the applicant's request for approval (COA 08-09) to install new wood replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street as an alternative to the previously installed vinyl replacement windows. The revised proposal was to install Anderson 400 Series Woodright, pine wood (white on the exterior), double-hung, 3-over-1 Specified Equal Light/full divided light, double-pane replacement windows.

According to the applicant, the preliminary estimate to replace the 30 windows was \$26,700, which included installation/labor. The applicant had stated that he wished to enter into the record the high costs associated with installing wood replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street, and that he was concerned that these additional project costs would not allow him to realize a reasonable return on his investment in the property. However: the applicant previously installed the vinyl replacement windows without receiving prior COA approval; moreover, during the hearing for COA 07-12, the HPC explained to the applicant that the *Design Guidelines* explicitly forbid vinyl replacement windows. Therefore: 1). the applicant had brought onto himself the potential financial hardship associated with both previous and (new) proposed project costs; 2). Any costs associated with installation of the vinyl windows are irrelevant; 3). The *Design Guidelines* suggest that the applicant has had two viable options for treating the windows at 400 S. Summit Street – the first, preferred option was repair/restoration of the original windows; and the second option, only if necessary, was installation of historically appropriate replacement windows.

The original wooden window sashes were replaced without prior COA approval and the vinyl replacement windows are not congruent with the *Design Guidelines*. However, costs associated with corrective action did raise issues concerning repair/replacement and/or installing historically appropriate wooden windows.

Staff **research findings** indicated the following:

- The preliminary cost estimate provided by the applicant did fall within the range of expected costs to install 30 wood, double-hung, divided light replacement windows. The project might be completed for as little as about \$18,000; however, a low cost approach might involve use of an inferior product installed by a non-expert. On the other hand, it might cost as much as \$45,000 for an expert to install 30 custom made windows.
- If the applicant had repaired the original windows, the project costs would likely have been significantly lower than installing new wood replacement windows. If the windows had been in fair to good condition, the cost to strip, repair, and repaint those 30 original windows might have been as inexpensive as \$40-\$50 per window (do it yourself) to \$80-\$125 per window (local “handyman”). If the windows had been in fair to poor condition and required the attention of a specialist to repair and/or restore, or involved lead paint abatement, then the costs would have been higher – in the range of about \$6,000 to \$13,500 – but still less expensive than installing new wood replacement windows (vinyl costs about half as much as wood; but, again, the *Guidelines* explicitly discourage vinyl). Moreover, even if some of the windows could not have been restored, the costs of repair plus installation of a limited number of custom made replacement windows (to match the originals) would still have been less than installing all new windows unless more than about 10 custom made replacements had been needed.

At the July 22, 2008 meeting, the HPC continued applicant’s request for approval (COA 08-09) to install 3-over-1 wood replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street in order to give applicant time to complete a revised proposal to install 4-over-1 wood replacement windows to match the original 4-over-1 windows.

New Considerations: Revised Proposal(s) #2

The revised proposal now in question (COA 08-09, continued) is to install new 4-over-1 wood replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street as an alternative to the previously installed vinyl replacement windows.

Upon receiving quotes from two respective vendors Kolbe (option 1) and M&W (option 2), the applicant would like for the HPC to consider two different approaches to installing 4-over-1 wood replacement windows at 403 S. Summit Street:

Option 1 (Kolbe/Becker Builders Supply)

Entirely replace the windows - including the original wood frames, which currently are underneath the vinyl replacement windows and wrap-over frames – with wood replacement windows and frames made by Kolbe Windows & Doors: “traditional” double-hung, 4-over-1 wood replacement windows, single-wide unit, rectangle shape, 4-9/16” jamba, H-K LoE 270 insulated beveled glass, “true” divided-lights (using interior/exterior grills), with standard brickmould on the exterior, painted white. According to the price quote, the openings = roughly 38” x 65”; box/frame size = 37 1/2” x 64 7/16”; and unit dimension = 39 7/8” x 66 1/8.” However, the vendors have not visited the property at 403 Maple Street to make exact measurements. According to the applicant, stock items would generally fit exactly into most of the existing openings, after all materials have been removed. However, it is likely that some windows would have to be custom-made to fit variable openings. According to the applicant, the custom-made windows would have to be casement (non-opening), as he stated were the originals, to be feasible. The price quote from Kolbe/Becker to install 30 “stock item” windows as described above is \$27,857.71. Depending on the number of custom-made windows that would have to be installed, the final price might have to be adjusted. Also, the quote specifies that the above price does not include any necessary adjustments to framing or exterior siding.

Option 2 (M&W)

Remove the vinyl windows and frames and replace only the wood sashes, leaving the original wood frames intact. The wood replacement sashes would be double-hung, 4-over-1, single-wide unit, rectangle shape, Low E Glass, dual glazed (not tempered) glass, divided-lights (using interior/exterior grills), primed for painting (presumably, another vendor would paint white). Inside frame width = 32”; inside frame height = 66”. According to the applicant, new wood brick molding, painted white, would still have to be applied to the outside of the original wood frames because existing molding is not repairable. The applicant stated that the second option would cost approximately \$20,000.

| <u>Chapter</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Pages</u> |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 2 | Windows and Doors | 17-19 |

- **1.** Retain and preserve original windows and doors.
- **2.** Retain and preserve openings and details of windows and doors, such as trim, sash, glass, lintels, sills, thresholds, shutters, and hardware.
- **4.** Repair original windows, doors, and frames by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated sections.
- **5.** If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, pane or panel division, materials, and detail.

- **11.** It is not appropriate to replace windows and doors with stock items that do not fill the original openings or duplicate the unit in size, material, and design. Snap-in muntins are not appropriate replacements for true divided-light window panes.
- **14.** It is not appropriate to fill existing window or door openings if it would diminish the historic character of the building. It is not appropriate to replace or cover glazing with plywood.
- **15.** It is not appropriate to introduce new windows or doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Keep new windows and doors compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, size, materials, and details.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission *approve* the Certificate of Appropriateness to install 4-over-1 wood replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street, using either of the two options proposed by the applicant, based on the following findings:

- The proposed replacement window options approximately match the original windows in size, scale, proportion, materials, and detail.
- The proposed windows will not have artificial muntins.

Recommended Motion: Approval of request to install 4-over-1 wood replacement windows as described in [option 1, option 2, or both] of the proposal.

Mr. Jordan: Would the applicant like to speak?

Mr. Gogoel said he would answer any questions.

Mr. Jordan: Would anyone like to speak in favor or opposition to the request? Hearing none, the Historic Preservation Commission makes the following findings of fact concerning the property located at 400 South Summit Street, Greenville, North Carolina.

1. The house and grounds are located within the College View Historic District, which was established by Ordinance 94-22 of the City Council of the City of Greenville.
2. The house is a Craftsman bungalow style dwelling that had four-over-one sash windows. The first known occupant was Lydia T. Fleming.
3. The property is located on the corner of Fourth and South Summit Streets. The street sign at the corner notes the property is located within the College View Historic District.

4. In the fall, 2007, the original four-over-one sash windows were replaced with vinyl replacement windows.
5. At the time of the replacement, the owner Michael Gogoel, had neither sought or obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform the replacement of the windows.
6. The original windows were replaced with vinyl tilt replacement windows – Ellison Windows and Doors, Series 1500 Replacement Windows. The owner had preserved the original wood window frames but encapsulated the brick molding with PVC coated aluminum with a wood grain finish.
7. Staff personnel with the City of Greenville advised the owner that a Certificate of Appropriateness was required when exterior changes to historic properties are performed.
8. On June 21, 2008, the owner submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to ratify the previously performed window replacements.
9. On November 27, 2008, the Historic Preservation Commission heard the application request under COA 07-12.
10. The applicant stated that when he purchased the property the windows were in bad condition and beyond repair, that wood rot existed and many of the windows had been painted shut.
11. When staff was made aware of the work and conducted a site inspection, much of the work had been completed but did find several of the original windows still on the property. Staff observed the condition of the remaining windows indicated that they could have been repaired and reused.
12. Chapter 2 of the Design Guidelines under the title – Windows and Doors – provides that original windows and doors will be retained and preserved including sashes, glass, lintels, sills, trim and the like. The Design Guidelines state that windows shall be repaired where possible and the windows preserved. If a window requires replacement, then they shall match the original in size, scale, proportion, panel or panel division, materials and details. Stock items should not be used that do not duplicate the original size, material or design and that snap in muntins are not appropriate as a substitute for true divided light windows. And vinyl windows are not an appropriate replacement.
13. At the November 27, 2008 hearing, the Historic Preservation Commission denied the application but afforded the applicant a year to propose acceptable alternatives to the previously installed vinyl windows.

14. On July 22, 2008, the applicant was heard by the Historic Preservation Commission on a proposed alternative. The applicant suggested replacing the vinyl windows with pine wood, double hung, 3-over-1 specified equal light/full divided light, double-pane replacement windows.
15. The applicant complained of the cost of replacement; however, it was determined at the earlier hearing, the applicant had brought himself into the problem by not first seeking compliance and assistance through the city staff.
16. During the July 22, 2008, hearing the Commission continued the applicant's 3 over 1 window replacement request in order to give the applicant time to complete a revised proposal to install 4 over 1 wood replacement windows to match the original 4 over 1 wooden windows.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Ryan Webb that the Finding of Fact are congruent with the guidelines. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Ryan Webb to approve Certificate of Appropriateness 08-09 for 400 South Summit Street. The applicant may select either option. Motion carried unanimously.

COA 07-05 (Continued): 403 Maple Street

Mr. Jordan: The next application is for Certificate of Appropriateness 07-05 (Continued) for 403 Maple Street submitted by William I. Wooten.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Mr. Tom Wisemiller and Mr. William I. Wooten.

Mr. Wisemiller: Located at the corner of Maple and E. 4th streets, the Dr. William I. Wooten House is a Local Landmark. Built in 1934-35, the house is a handsomely detailed, representative example of the Colonial Revival style of the 1920s and 30s. One of a handful of buildings constructed in Greenville during the height of the Colonial Revival's development, the Wooten House successfully mixes the symmetry and formal design elements of the style taken from American Georgian, Federal and Greek Revival architecture with a relaxed plan formulated to meet the requirements of modern life.

Case History

On March 27, 2007, applicant was granted an emergency MWCOA on advice of Project Engineer Thomas Harwell, who stated that the chimney was failing and posed serious risk of harm to the dwelling. Applicant removed the false chimney and subsequently covered the original false chimney opening with in-kind slate tiles. In June 2007, the applicant requested COA approval for previous removal of false chimney on the south elevation of house. Applicant had preferred to keep the house in its current state without

erecting a replacement chimney in place of the original false chimney.

Previous Facts - A review of the facts presented in COA 07-12:

- According to the Project Engineer, replacement of the false chimney would have been unsafe and very expensive, and could not have been safely repaired, stabilized, and/or restored given its condition in March of 2007.
- In the opinion of staff, the false chimney was a significant, character-defining architectural feature of the dwelling in that it contributed to the symmetry and formal design elements of its style; the false chimney was designed to compliment the main chimney on the north elevation of the dwelling.
- The dwelling has been very well maintained over the years; the failure of the false chimney was not due to a pattern of neglect; rather, according to the Project Engineer, is the result of an original design weakness.

The HPC continued the COA “in order to obtain an opinion from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as to whether or not the chimney that was removed should be replaced.” In May of 2008, the Regional Supervisor of the Eastern Office of the State Historic Preservation Office, Scott Power stated that, in his opinion, “the removal of the chimney did have a negative impact on the overall design and integrity of the historic house.” Reid Thomas, a restoration specialist with the Eastern Office of the SHPO stated that the “chimney is an important character-defining element” and recommended that “the owner’s explore the possibilities and cost of having it [the chimney] rebuilt” (see: attached copies of SHPO opinions). The language of the SHPO opinions reflects their role, in this case, as an advisory body rather than as a reviewing authority: e.g., they did not weigh-in as to whether or not the owner “should” be required to replace the chimney, which is a matter of local policy. Their opinions are confined to historic significance and the recommendation mentioned above is directed at the property owner rather than the HPC.

New Considerations

The applicant has not submitted a revised COA proposal and has not taken any action to address the issues described above. Nevertheless, the HPC has been presented with evidence pertaining to whether or not the chimney *should* be replaced. Due to the loss of this particular character-defining element, is the property now out of compliance with the *Design Guidelines*? If this significant, character-defining architectural element had to be removed in the interest of safety, at no fault of the property owner, should the owner be required to replace that element?

Design Guidelines

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Chapter</u> 2 | <u>Title</u> Roofs | <u>Pages</u> 13 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

2. Retain and preserve all architectural features that are character-defining elements of the roof, such as cupolas, chimneys, dormers, cornices, brackets, and turrets.
3. Retain and preserve historic roofing materials whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new material that matches the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute materials only if the original material is not technically feasible.

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Chapter</u> 2 | <u>Title</u> Masonry | <u>Pages</u> 26-27 |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|

2. Retain and preserve all masonry construction features that are character defining elements of historic buildings, including chimneys, arches, quoins, cornices, and pediments.
3. Retain and preserve historic masonry materials whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new material that matches the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute materials only if the original material is not technically feasible.
4. Protect and maintain historic masonry in appropriate ways:
 - Monitor masonry for cracks and signs of moisture damage.
 - Ensure that water does not collect at the base of a masonry foundation or chimney

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| <u>Chapter</u> 2 | <u>Title</u> Porches, Entrances, and Balconies | <u>Pages</u> 22-23 |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|

7. If a historic porch, entrance, or balcony is completely missing, replace it with either a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design compatible with the historic character of the building in height, proportion, roof shape, material, texture, scale, detail, and color.

| | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| <u>Chapter</u> 2 | <u>Title</u> Garages and Outbuildings | <u>Pages</u> 24-25 |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------|

6. If a historic garage or outbuilding is completely missing, replace it with either a reconstruction based on accurate documentation or a new design compatible with the historic character of the main building or historic outbuildings in the district.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission determine whether or not the applicant should be required to replace the chimney in order for the property at 403 Maple Street to be considered in compliance with the *Design Guidelines*. Prior to making that determination, the HPC might wish to consider how other communities in North Carolina and/or other states deal with similar cases, particularly as to whether or not they require owners of local historic properties to replace significant, character-defining architectural elements that have had to be removed for purposes of safety, at no fault of the owners. Staff will conduct a brief survey to ascertain how other communities have dealt with similar situations prior to the August 26, 2008 meeting, the findings of which will be available at the request of the HPC.

Mr. Jordan: Would the applicant like to speak?

Mr. Wooten: The chimney was torn down due to safety reasons. The cost of replacing the chimney would be \$175,000 for a brick chimney and \$45,000 for a wooden chimney with some brick. According to Tom Harwell, Project Engineer, replacement of the false chimney would be unsafe.

Mr. Jordan: Would anyone like to speak in favor or opposition to the application?

Dr. Chestnut: Since the survey is not complete on how other communities have dealt with similar situations, I think the application should be continued to let staff complete the survey.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Ms. N. Yaprak Savut to continue COA application 07-05 for 403 Maple Street. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

The Design Review Committee met about the Minor Work Certificate of Appropriateness applications and approval was given to the applicants.

Selection Committee

The Selection Committee did not meet.

Publicity Committee

The Publicity Committee did not meet.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion of Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Project Area Boundaries

Mr. Wisemiller: The Commission received a map to review extending the façade improvement grant project area boundaries. The current project area boundaries: the Uptown central business district including portions of Dickinson Avenue and Evans Street south of Reade. The project area boundaries were designed to incentivize building renovation in key areas: Uptown Greenville, Historic commercial corridors including Evans, Fifth and Dickinson, Downtown Historic District, and Dickinson Avenue Historic District. The current project area boundaries capture much of the traditional “Main Street” types of commercial and office uses. Most of the downtown business activity is still taking place within the current FIG boundaries. However, there is activity at the margins. The future land use plan anticipates the growth of the City’s Uptown commercial area.

The Commission agreed that the boundaries need to be extended. Commission members agreed to give City Staff their recommendations of the extension of those boundaries, so that revisions may be made to the map.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Ryan Webb for City Staff to present the Commission with a revised map of the extended boundaries for the FIG prior to the next round of FIG application submittal. Motion carried unanimously.

Update on Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Program Activity

Mr. Wisemiller: I have updated the FIG database for the Commission. This handout is for information purposes and requires no action.

Discussion of the Historic Preservation Commission’s Work Plan

Mr. Rees: The Historic Preservation Commission’s Annual Work Plan is helpful to staff. At the workshop on October 17, 2008 from 9:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m., the work plan will be reviewed. Commission members received a copy of this plan in this month’s agenda package.

Update on the Imperial Tobacco Warehouse

Mr. Jordan: According to Mr. Les Everett, Chief Building Inspector, the asbestos survey has been completed and the owners are awaiting bids to be received on the asbestos abatement. Once a contractor’s bid is accepted the State will have to review the abatement process outlined and verify the credentials of the abatement contractor. Mr. Everett is awaiting a copy of the survey. Bids should be completed by the beginning of next week.

Discussion of 2008 Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report

Mr. Wisemiller: It is time for North Carolina's Certified Local Governments (CLGs) to submit their annual report to the State Historic Preservation Office. Several application forms are required to be filled out and sent in annually. These forms were submitted in the Commission's agenda packet for informational purposes. The report covers the CLG's preservation activities during the period July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. It enables the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to evaluate each CLG to determine whether it continues to meet the standards of the CLG program and is eligible for continued certification and eligibility for grant funds.

Initial Discussion of 2008-09 CLG Grant Application

The Commission suggested that the application be worked on in phases with City Staff.

Update on Non-Compliant Historic Properties

Mr. Wisemiller: The list of non-compliant historic properties is shrinking.

Update on Non-compliant Historic Properties

Mr. Wisemiller gave an update on non-compliant properties.

At 2909 Memorial (Oakmont), enforcement is in progress until violation remedied or official appeal is submitted.

At 805 Evans Street, the house was repainted using historically appropriate paint colors consistent with previous Minor Works Certificate of Appropriateness.

At 400 South Summit Street, applicant submitted a revised Certificate of Appropriate proposal (4 over 1) for the August 26, 2008 HPC meeting.

Jones Lee House Resolution

Mr. Jordan presented the resolution to the Commission.

RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GREENVILLE REQUESTING PRESERVATION OF THE JONES LEE HOUSE

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission was established to act as both a historic district and historic landmarks commission for the City of Greenville;

WHEREAS, City Council of the City of Greenville by ordinance #1905, dated 20 October 1988, and appearing of record in Book 199, Page 72 of the Pitt County Public

Registry, designated that certain building and grounds known as the Jones Lee House located at 805 Evans Street, Greenville, North Carolina as a Historic Property;

WHEREAS, the Jones Lee House is one of the last known examples of Stick Design style of architecture and is the last remaining nineteenth century house that once lined Evans Street;

WHEREAS, the Jones Lee House has been completely restored using federal and North Carolina Tax Credits;

WHEREAS, the renovation of the Jones Lee House has modernized the interior including but not limited to wiring, HVAC, plumbing and cable and internet access;

WHEREAS, one of the proposed sites for the City of Greenville Multimodal Transportation Center includes the grounds where the Jones Lee House is located;

WHEREAS, the Multimodal Transportation Center will need office space and the current internal configuration and condition of the Jones Lee House would meet such needs; and

WHEREAS, the Jones Lee House has statewide historic significance as defined by the criteria set forth in the National Register of Historic Places.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Greenville that it does hereby request the City Council to direct Community Development and such other staff departments as be necessary to save the Jones Lee House from demolition to incorporate such building and grounds into the design and use of the Multimodal Transportation Center if that parcel is selected as the site of said center or to move the house to an appropriate location in the City of Greenville so that it will be preserved and an appropriate use made of this designated historic property.

This the _____ day of _____, 2008.

Candace Pearce, Chairperson
Historic Preservation Commission

ATTEST:

Tom Wisemiller, Secretary

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Ms. Franceine Rees to send this resolution to City Council. Motion carried unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER

Increase in Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Awards

Mr. Rees: City Council approved increased the FIG awards from \$2,500.00 per façade to \$5,000.00 per façade.

Historic Contractor Selected

Mr. Rees: Drucilla H. York has been hired as the Historic Contractor and she will be working closely with the Commission and City Staff.

New Appointment to the Historic Preservation Commission

Mr. Jordan introduced Ms. Minnie Anderson as the most recently appointed member of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Anderson has served on the Commission in years past. Her knowledge is an asset to the Commission.

Preservation North Carolina's 2008 Annual Conference

Preservation North Carolina's 2008 Annual Conference will be held in Winston-Salem, NC from October 9 – 11, 2008. If any Commission members would like to attend, please let City Staff know.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Wisemiller
Planner II