

## **GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES**

October 28, 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	Candace Pearce, Chair	Ryan Webb
Dennis Chestnut	Dale Sauter	
Greg Jarrell, Vice-Chair	Rick Smiley	

### **COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Jeremy Jordan	Franceine Rees	N. Yaprak Savut
---------------	----------------	-----------------

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sandy Gale Edmundson, Secretary; Jonathan Edwards, Cameraman; Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development; Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney; Carl Rees, Senior Planner; and Tom Wisemiller, Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Patrick Gogoel, Fred Mattox and William Wooten

### **ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA**

There were no additions/deletions to the agenda.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 23, 2008**

Motion was made by Mr. Greg Jarrell and seconded by Mr. Dale Sauter to approve the September 23, 2008 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Mr. Wisemiller shared the Public Comment Period guidelines with the Commission.

1. The Public Comment Period shall not exceed a total of thirty minutes, unless the Commission, by majority vote, extends this limit.
2. Each individual will be allowed no more than three minutes for comments, unless the Commission, by a majority vote, extends this time.
3. An individual wishing to address the Commission during the Public Comment Period shall register with the Secretary of the Commission prior to the opening of

the meeting by signing his or her name, address and short description of his or her topic on a sign up sheet provided by the Secretary to the Commission.

4. Any item which is the subject of a public hearing conducted at the same meeting shall not be discussed during the Public Comment Period.
5. If the thirty minutes allocated to the Public Comment Period has not expired after the individuals who have registered have spoken, individuals who have failed to register before the meeting may speak during this comment period and will speak following those who have registered in advance. If time remains, the Chair will ask if any other individuals desire to address the Commission during this comment period. An individual wishing to speak shall raise his or her hand to ask to be recognized by the Chair. After being recognized by the Chair, the individual shall state his or her name, address and the topic to be addressed. If permitted to speak, the individual shall limit his or her comments to the same three minutes limit.
6. The Chair shall act as official timekeeper. When an individual has thirty seconds left in their time to speak, the Chair will state "Thirty Seconds." The individual will need to bring their comments to a close. When time expires, the Chair will announce "Time Up." At that point, the individual must stop talking and return to their seat or leave the meeting room. No additional comments will be permitted or accepted once time has expired.
7. No action will be taken on matters raised during the Public Comment Period. If matters discussed require action by the Commission, the Chair will request staff to review and provide a recommendation at the next meeting.

There was no public comment.

## **CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

### **COA 08-10: 400 Summit Street**

Ms. Pearce: The application is for Certificate of Appropriateness 08-10 for 400 Summit Street submitted by Michael Gogoel.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Mr. Fred Mattox and Mr. Tom Wisemiller. Motion carried unanimously.

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 install artificial muntins in the previously installed vinyl replacement windows, which replaced the original 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.

### **New Proposal**

The applicant proposes to retain the existing vinyl replacement windows and underlying original wood window frames, but to remove the PVC coated aluminum with a wood grain finish. Leaving the current sashes in place, the applicant proposes to affix dividers, or artificial muntins, into the top sashes in an effort to replicate the look of the original 4-over-1 craftsman-style windows. The dividers would be rectangular, approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  inches wide and  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch thick, constructed of pine, primed and painted. They would be attached, using glue, by a professional contractor, to the outside of each of the top sashes of the existing vinyl replacement windows. According to the applicant, the muntins would be custom made for each window to ensure that all sections of divided light are equal.

<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 *deny* the Certificate of Appropriateness to install artificial muntins in the existing vinyl replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street, based on the following findings:

- The dwelling is located in the College View Historic District, a local historic zoning overlay district, as referenced in Ordinance no. 94-23 of the Greenville City Code, and appearing of record in the Pitt County Public Registry, book number 494, page 633.
- Vinyl “stock” replacement windows are inappropriate replacements for the original 4-over-1 wood craftsman windows. They do not appropriately fill the original openings and/or duplicate the original units in size, material, and design; they diminish the original design of the building; and they are incompatible with the original units in proportion, shape, pattern, materials, and details.
- Artificial muntins are inappropriate replacements for true divided-light window panes.
- Moreover, the proposal does not address how the artificial muntins would replicate the molding style and details of the original muntins.

Recommended Motion: Denial of request to install artificial muntins in the existing vinyl replacement windows.

Ms. Pearce: Would the applicant like to speak?

Mr. Mattox: I am representing Mr. Michael Gogoel. The facts are before the board and you have been over them a number of times, so I am not going to go over them. Basically, my client is up here asking for mercy. First, the original windows are gone and it is impossible to put them back in place. My client has already installed the windows that are in place and good, bad or indifferent I recognize the historic district. The vinyl windows today are considerably more efficient than the old fashioned windows. I replaced the windows in my house that was built in 1961 last year. I am satisfied. I am sure the windows are saving me between \$150.00 - \$200.00 per month in utility expense. Sooner or later the board is going to have to deal with economics of the historical district. My client says it will cost \$18,000.00 to replace the windows that came up before you on an earlier hearing, and he is offering to you a compromise. The compromise is to if done properly for the board to condition your approval on the fact that it is done properly. From the street, you cannot tell the difference. From inside the house, the people who are living will have considerably lower utility bills. We would simply ask you to consider this compromise. If you cannot meet the needs of the

historic district to at least have the appearance of an older type of window, but the utility of a more modern window.

Ms. Pearce: Does anyone have any questions?

Mr. Smiley: Did you meet with the Design Review Committee about this project?

Mr. Mattox: Not that I know of.

Mr. Smiley: Is there any argument that you would like to make that the project is compliant with the *Design Guidelines*?

Mr. Mattox: I am deliberately presenting to this board a request to be considered outside of the *Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Pearce: I have one question. This does not give us a lot to go on.

Mr. Mattox: No it does not. The mullions that are in place could be conditionally approved as appropriately designed for this era that this house was constructed.

Ms. Pearce: I am going to try to summarize the Findings of Fact. The applicant, Michael Gogoel, submitted a new application for a Certificate of Appropriateness on September 28, 2008. The applicant was previously before the Commission as the result of removal of installed four over one true divided light windows in this craftsman style residence of the installation of vinyl tilt windows without an approved COA. The applicant had preserved the original window frames but encapsulated the brick molding with PVC coated aluminum with a wood grain finish. The applicant at the previous hearing stated that many of the type windows could not be repaired and had been painted shut. Staff conducted an inspection and found windows that the applicant had discarded that were repairable. The previous COA 07-12 had sought ratification of the unauthorized work and was denied, because the replacement windows were not congruent with the *Design Guidelines*. However, the owner was given until November 28, 2008 to provide alternatives to replace the non-congruent windows. Several times he was invited to come before the Design Review Committee to discuss his options with us in a less formal setting. Notice of the hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on October 20 and 27, 2008. The hearing was conducted on October 28, 2008 before the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Greenville. Tom Wisemiller, with the Community Development Department of the City, presented on behalf of the City of Greenville and Fred Mattox, Attorney, presented on behalf of the applicant. The property, 400 South Summit Street, is located within the College View Historic District. The district was established by Ordinance No. 94-23 by the City Council on February 10, 1994 and recorded in the Register of Deeds Office of Pitt County on February 18, 1994 and listed in deed book number 494, page 633. The applicant's COA proposes to keep the wooden window frames and trim in place and remove the aluminum coverings over them. The applicant further proposes to caulk and repaint the window frames to

match the current color of the house. The applicant further proposes to leave the sashes in place and to permanently affix dividers on to the top of the sashes on the outside of all of sashes to produce the 4 over 1 sash replicating the look of the original 4 over 1 true divided light windows. The dividers were be approximately 3/4" wide and 1/2 inch thick. They would be primed, painted and made from pine. The applicant further proposes to glue the faux muntins to the outside sash of the top window. The applicable portions of the *Design Guidelines* state and they are Chapter 2, Windows and Doors, pages 17-19. These will be adopted by reference, since the Commission has a copy of them. The applicant did not meet with the Design Review Committee regarding the proposed work. Could I have a motion on the Findings of Fact?

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to accept the Findings of Fact. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to deny Certificate of Appropriateness application 08-10 based on the fact that it is not compliant with the *Design Guidelines*. Motion carried unanimously.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **COA 07-05: 403 Maple Street**

The next application is for Certificate of Appropriateness 07-05 (Old Business) for 403 Maple Street (William I. Wooten House).

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

Mr. Wisemiller: Located at the corner of Maple and E. 4<sup>th</sup> 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.

The HPC discussed this case at its August 26, 2008 meeting, but did not decide whether or not the property owner should be required to replace the chimney at 403 Maple Street. At the HPC’s request, staff reported to the HPC at its September 23, 2008 on how communities have dealt with cases in which an architectural feature of a locally-designated historic property had to be removed, in the interest of public safety.

**New Considerations**

Because the property owner would prefer not to replace the chimney, he has not submitted a revised COA proposal and has not taken any new action to address the issues described above. If the property owner were required to replace the chimney, the design proposal would likely require detailed architectural & engineering analysis and plans.

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***

Chapter	Title	Pages
2	Roofs	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.

Chapter	Title	Pages
2	Masonry	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

Chapter	Title	Pages
2	Porches, Entrances, and Balconies	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.

Chapter	Title	Pages
2	Garages and Outbuildings	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*.

Mr. Wisemiller: During the August 26, 2008 meeting, the Commission discussed the advisory opinion from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and requested additional information from staff concerning the positions taken by other communities with historical properties in districts. Staff reported last month that there was no consensus by other communities as to whether or not replacement of the false chimney would be required or not. It is somewhat of an unusual case. The cases we did find tended to be cases where people out of neglect allowed things to happen and then when a storm came through or some other compounding of the problem led to a significant character defining architectural feature having to be removed for public safety but it is sort of the root or cause was neglect. We were not able to find many cases where it was not due to neglect.

Dr. Wooten: The chimney was at a 45 degree angle. The only thing we could do is take it down which we did. That cost around \$10,000.00. The chimney got like that over a period of seventy years through the elements. We tried to keep the inside of the house in good condition. We actually had to replace some shutters on the front and conformed with the way they were with wooden shutters which were much more expensive than the plastic kind you can get. We just hope you can get to where you can help us. We appreciate it.

Ms. Pearce: When was the property designated to the Local Landmark List?

Dr. Wooten: The property has been designated for at least ten years.

Ms. Pearce: During that time, you were only required to pay ½ of the property taxes.

Dr. Wooten: That is right.

Ms. Pearce: Did you or anybody meet with the Design Review Committee?

Dr. Wooten: For what?

Ms. Pearce: To see if we could work something out with your chimney.

Dr. Wooten: No, I had a building contractor to do the work.

Ms. Pearce: We are not questioning the fact that the chimney had to be taken down. The question now is to put the chimney back.

Mr. Wisemiller: A couple of points of clarification I don't know what the thinking was but you might be waiting for this determination to decide before you go before the Design Review Committee as to whether you need to replace the chimney.

Mr. Wooten: We had to take the chimney down.

Mr. Wisemiller: The property was designated on February 11, 1993.

Mr. Jarrell: Has anyone given you an estimate on replacing the chimney?

Dr. Wooten: Yes, the last one I got was \$175,000.00. To put a prefabricated chimney up there would run about \$45,000.00. It would also have to be supported by steel beams attached to the ground in order to withstand hurricane winds of 110 miles per hour.

Mr. Jarrell: I am sorry that second one was for \$45,000.00.

Dr. Wooten: That is right and that is replacing with a prefabricated chimney made out of wood with a veneer over a wood frame.

Dr. Chestnut: It was designated in 1993. How much relief is that per taxes?

Mr. Smiley: I think we are getting ahead of ourselves here. Some of these issues would probably be considered in a COA. I think what we have before us is simply a question is, is this property out of compliance? My readings of the fact in front of us is that we can probably come to some sort of consensus on that and then if the ruling requires then that a proposal be made then maybe some of these other questions can be resolved when considering an actual proposal. Right now the question before us is simply is this simply out of compliance.

Dr. Chestnut: Wouldn't that take the Commission to the Findings of Fact?

Ms. Pearce: Yes.

Mr. Jarrell: Are there any other questions for Mr. Wooten?

Ms. Anderson: I have a question. Dr. Wooten, are you aware that the Design Review Committee would at least listen to you?

Dr. Wooten: I did not meet with them, but perhaps, the contractor did. What good would it do to meet with the Design Review Committee at this point?

Ms. Pearce: At some point in time over the last year if you had met with the Design Review Committee, it would have been possible for us to help figure out what would be the best thing to do about the chimney. The William I. Wooten House is at 403 Maple Street and it was built in 1934-1935. On March 27, 2007, the applicant was granted an emergency MWCO to remove a false chimney. The original false chimney was covered with in-kind slate tiles. In June 2007, the applicant requested COA (07-05) approval for previous removal of false chimney on the south elevation of the house. The applicant had preferred to keep the house in its current state without erecting a replacement chimney in place of the original false chimney. The dwelling was well maintained over the years; the failure of the false chimney was not due to a pattern of neglect. It is the result of an original design flaw as related by the applicant's project engineer. 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 Colonial Revival style; the false chimney was designed to compliment the main chimney on the north elevation of the dwelling. The Commission continued the COA to receive an opinion from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as to whether or not the chimney should be replaced. Scott Powers, Regional Supervisor and Reid Thomas, Restoration Specialist stated that the removal of the chimney did have a negative impact on the overall design and integrity of the house, the chimney was an important character defining element and the owner should consider rebuilding it. During the August 26, 2008 meeting, the Commission discussed the advisory opinion from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and requested additional information from staff concerning the positions taken by other communities with historical properties in districts. Staff reported there was no consensus by other communities as to whether or not replacement of the false chimney would be required or not. 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*. Notice was advertised in the Daily Reflector on October 20 and 27, 2008. The applicable portions of the *Design Guidelines* state and they are Chapter 2, Roofs, page 13; Masonry, page 26-27; Porches, Entrances, and Balconies, page 22-23; and Garages and Outbuildings, page 24-25. These will be adopted by reference, since the Commission has a copy of them.

Mr. Smiley: The Commission has a continued COA that needs action. The Commission needs to decide whether or not to require the chimney to be replaced.

Dr. Chestnut: I thought the next step was to act on the Findings of Fact.

Ms. Pearce: Dr. Wooten is asking to be allowed not to replace the chimney.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to accept the Findings of Fact. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to deny the COA on the grounds that it is not compliant and the action of the COA would not bring the property in compliance. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jarrell: This house is not in the historic district, but it is a locally designated landmark. There is a clear option that these property owners have and that is unlisting their property.

Dr. Chestnut: There are some remedies for this.

Dr. Wooten: We do not have any choice. We will have to try to get it removed from the list.

Mr. Little: An application is made to City Council to have the property removed as a designated local property. The Tax Office has the option of sending back to the applicant a notice of recapture of deferred taxes according to what the Tax Office thinks is appropriate. By law, it could go up to ten years. This is the responsibility of the applicant.

Ms. Pearce: Meeting with the Design Review Committee might bring forth a good option before taking the property off of the list.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Design Review Committee**

The Design Review Committee met on October 17, 2008 and members will take turns monitoring the historic district. The committee is available every 48 hours for Minor Works Certificate of Appropriateness applications.

### **Selection Committee**

Mr. Sauter: The Selection Committee met on October 17, 2008. A decision was made to initiate interface with owners of historic properties in the Skinnerville National Register District and adjoining neighborhoods. Owners of significant properties in the National Register Survey will be contacted in hopes to start an open dialogue with them regarding their property and district. The committee plans to meet again next month to further discuss their mission.

### **Publicity Committee**

Mr. Webb: The Publicity Committee met on October 17, 2008. We are going to try to accomplish several priorities with one being increase promotion of the Façade Improvement Grant program to sending out releases on the local designation landmark photographs. The committee will meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month at lunch.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Update on the Imperial Warehouse Site – Les Everett, Chief Building Inspector**

Ms. Pearce: According to Mr. Les Everett, Chief Building Inspector, to date the state has released the site for asbestos abatement to proceed. The owner of the property has hired contractors and they have begun the detailed process of asbestos abatement. This process will likely take about 30 days due to the amount of collapsed debris they will have to work through. After the abatement is completed, the demolition permit from the Inspections Division office will be issued and they will complete the needed demolition work. The demolition work will include the water tower and the smoke stack according to the owner.

### **Review of Historic Preservation Commission Workshop**

Mr. Rees: On October 17, 2008, the Historic Preservation Commission held a workshop. Notes will be compiled and presented to the Commission as a summation of that workshop. Dru York, consultant, is creating a work plan from the workshop. A good quality draft should be available at the November meeting. The work plan should be streamlined into an easy to read document and adopted by the Commission in November if at all possible.

### **Anti-Demolition by Neglect Ordinance – Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney**

Mr. Little prepared a draft and it is circulating among Staff. There is a meeting scheduled to discuss this ordinance next week.

### **Update on Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Program**

Ms. Pearce: Dru York gave an informative presentation at the Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) workshop. The Commission should review the FIG applications at the November meeting. At 424 and 426 Evans Street, FIG funds will be released back into the budget pool until both properties can get on board to work together.

### **Update on Non-compliant Historic Properties**

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

At 400 South Summit Street, remedy noncompliance until November.

At 405 Eastern Street, a letter was sent to the property owner that a Certificate of Appropriateness application is necessary for the installed crushed brick driveway. The property has been given until November 14, 2008 to submit an application.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER**

The Commission requested a Staff report as to what is status of the Jones Lee House pertaining to the Intermodal Transportation Center.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Wisemiller  
Planner II