

## **GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES**

July 22, 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:**

Dennis Chestnut	Franceine Rees	Rick Smiley
Greg Jarrell, Vice-Chair	Dale Sauter	Ryan Webb
Candace Pearce, Chair	N. Yaprak Savut	

### **COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Jeremy Jordan

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sandy Gale Edmundson, Secretary; Jonathan Edwards, Cameraman; Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development; Nancy Harrington, Greenville Area Transit; Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney; Thom Moton, Assistant City Manager; and Tom Wisemiller, Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Paul Cuomo, Patrick Gogoel, Ginger Livingston, Derek Oliverio,

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

Motion was made by Mr. Greg Jarrell and seconded by N. Yaprak Savut to add an agenda item: Staff for the Historic Preservation Commission. Motion carried unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 24, 2008**

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to approve the June 24, 2008 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

The public did not comment.

## **SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

### **Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC): Thomas Moton, Assistant City Manager**

Mr. Thomas Moton, Assistant City Manager, gave a presentation on the proposed bus transfer center site recommended by the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) Steering Committee and approved by the City Council. The goal is to evaluate and provide a recommendation for a site for the new Bus Transfer Center consistent with economic, urban design and operational requirements. This will be accomplished in a collaborative manner with GREAT, the City, PATS, ECU, the County, Carolina/Greyhound Trailways, and the MMPA Design Team. Themes for the facility would be:

- Theme One – Accessibility;
- Theme Two – Safety and Security;
- Theme Three – Multipurpose;
- Theme Four – Inspiring; and
- Theme Five – Streamlined.

Mr. Moton: Several Site Selections have been considered. One site is in the downtown area, one site is in the Tobacco District, and one site is at East Carolina University.

Mrs. Nancy Harrington gave the history of the Greenville Area Transit system.

### **Imperial Warehouse – Les Everett, Chief Building Inspector**

Ms. Pearce: I would like to read Les Everett's e-mail pertaining to the Imperial Warehouse.

“On July 11<sup>th</sup>, our office received notification that the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services released the water tower for demolition only. The remainder of the site is still undergoing a survey review and has not been released for demolition. I have spoken with representatives of the warehouse and due to the methods and equipment needed along with cost factors, the owners have decided not to demolish the water tower separate from the remaining fire damaged structure. Due to the involvement with the NC Department of Health and Human Services and the nature of this matter, our office has agreed to await the survey and abatement findings before requiring further action on behalf of the owner. I will update Mr. Wisemiller of any development in this matter, so that it may be forwarded to the members of the Historic Preservation Commission.”

## **CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)**

### **COA 08-09: 400 South Summit Street**

Ms. Pearce: COA application 08-09 is for 400 South Summit Street. 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 fall 2007, the applicant replaced the original Craftsman-style four-over-one wood sash windows with vinyl tilt replacement windows (Ellison Windows & Doors, Series 1500 Replacement Windows) without receiving prior COA approval from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The applicant preserved the original wood window frames, but encapsulated the brick molding with PVC coated aluminum with a wood grain finish.

On November 27, 2008, the HPC heard the applicant's request for approval for the previously installed vinyl replacement windows (COA 07-12). 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. The applicant decided to submit an application back for review by the full Historic Preservation Commission.

**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.). 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.

**New Considerations**

The Certificate of Appropriateness now in question (COA 08-09) is a proposal to install new wood replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street as an alternative to the previously installed vinyl replacement windows. Rather than completing the project under the oversight of the HPC Design Review Committee and City staff, however, the applicant explicitly requested that the proposal and cost estimates contained herein be heard for the record.

The revised proposal is 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. Copies of selected pages of the product brochure for the Andersen 400 Series Woodright double-hung windows are enclosed with this report. For the full product brochure, see:  
[http://www.andersenwindows.com/PDFs/AW/AWDocs/apg\\_pdf/AW400Woodwright.pdf](http://www.andersenwindows.com/PDFs/AW/AWDocs/apg_pdf/AW400Woodwright.pdf).

According to the applicant, the preliminary estimate to replace the 30 windows is \$26,700, which includes installation/labor. The majority of windows are roughly 29 ½

inches by 61 inches; however, some of the window openings on the dwelling appear to vary in size, shape, and division. The base price for the standard size (as described above) is \$641 per window, according to materials provided by applicant, which were printed from the Andersen website. The applicant has estimated labor to cost about \$250 per window. The applicant has stated the he will present additional project details and more precise cost estimates at the COA hearing.

The applicant has 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 is concerned that these additional project costs will 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 has 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.

Nevertheless, the case does raise issues about the costs of repairing/restoring original windows and/or installing historically appropriate wood replacement windows.

Staff **research findings** indicate the following:

The preliminary cost estimate provided by the applicant does 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.

Chapter	Title	Pages
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.

Ms. Pearce: Would the applicant like to speak?

Mr. Gogoel: The Andersen windows are all wood and are available with the three over one grille pattern. Since all sizes are about the same, I estimate an average price of \$640.00 material cost per each window. This does not include installation. The preliminary range was \$200 - \$300 per window.

Ms. Pearce: Did you price the four over one window?

Mr. Gogoel: No, I don't think so.

Mr. Wisemiller: The custom made window would be on the heftier side. \$45,000 would be the highest. The custom made windows would be between \$30,000 - \$40,000.

Dr. Chestnut: Did I understand you to say that custom made would be cheaper than replacement?

Mr. Wisemiller: The replacement window is going to be more expensive to repair than custom made but at least the replacement windows are standard items.

Mr. Smiley: Staff was able to inspect several of the original windows prior to the windows being removed from the property.

Mr. Wisemiller: I saw four or five windows on the side of the right-of-way.

Ms. Pearce: That does not matter anymore, because those windows are gone. Now the question is whether the wood replacement of 3 over 1 window is acceptable rather than the wood replacement of 4 over 1 window. The original windows are gone. It would be a good idea to check on the 4 over 1 window. The cost of the windows is not the responsibility of the Commission. The visual impact of a three over one window is not appropriate to this house.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Ms. Franceine Rees to continue COA 08-09 for 400 Summit Street.

Ms. Pearce: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Smiley: Where on the COA is it actually stating what is being requested?

Dr. Chestnut showed Mr. Smiley where the applicant is stating what is being requested on the application.

Ms. Pearce: There are really good windows being made that have grids with four divided light that fit on the outside of the windows and fit on the inside of the windows and a shadow line between the two pieces of glass. Those windows have never been discussed by our Commission and are not in the guidelines. However, it gives you the option of a window that looks exactly like the existing window but is an energy efficient window. These windows might provide the historic look and the energy efficiency for the applicant. Continuing the request would give the Commission time to determine if these windows could be used and determine if the windows could be in the guidelines.

Mr. Smiley: One way of doing this is to approve the COA with a stipulation. The applicant could look for a 4 over 1 window or communicate to Staff that if the manufacturers do not have the windows then the application could be conditionally approved by Staff.

Ms. Savut: The Commission is trying to make sure the original image of the house is preserved. The Design Review Committee could help the applicant with what is appropriate.

Ms. Pearce: The visual impact of a three over one window is not appropriate to this house.

Mr. Smiley: Do we have to continue it, is my question? Could an alternative motion be to approve the 4 over 1 window when the applicant receives the information, so the applicant does not have to come back before the Commission for a COA?

Mr. Little: The owner had purchased the house and replaced with the windows without prior approval of a COA.

Dr. Chestnut: I would like to call the question on the original motion.

Mr. Little: Let's make sure we have all of the facts as we understand them. The owner had purchased the house and he replaced the windows in the historic district without coming first to the Commission for the COA. He put in vinyl windows which were not acceptable. The Commission found that the vinyl windows were not congruent and therefore, were not appropriate. The next fact found was that the Commission allowed the applicant until November 28, 2008 to come up with an alternative program. Tonight prior to the one year deadline, the owner has now resubmitted and made a request that in lieu of four over one that three over one would be submitted. That summarizes where we are tonight. We heard some discussion about what 3 over 1 might look like and that it might change the historic look of the house. There has been discussion there might be a 4 over 1 window available by another manufacturer of a standard nature. Now what we are doing is telling the owner; however, you have to accomplish it you have to make the windows congruent with the guidelines for the historic district. Now the motion as I understand it is to continue the request of three over one to permit the owner to explore other manufacturers and to work with the Design Review Committee to see if there are other manufacturers for this standard four over one window or other options. Is that how the motion stands and that was seconded?

Dr. Chestnut: Yes.

Mr. Little: I wanted to make sure we had all of the facts. It is not an issue as to whether or not it is affordable. We have gone way past that. It is what can be made congruent with the guidelines.

Dr. Chestnut: The applicant has come back four months prior to the deadline issued by the Commission. I can add a timeline to my motion for the continuation.

Mr. Smiley: If we are pretty sure of what we know is what is compliant, why don't we simply approve a COA that would be compliant.

Dr. Chestnut: Because they have not submitted that COA.

Mr. Smiley: We can modify the one in front of us and simply say that we are approving this COA provided the windows are four over one.

Dr. Chestnut: I call the previous question.

Ms. Pearce: All those in favor of the motion made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Ms. Franceine Rees to continue COA 08-09 for 400 Summit Street. The continuance will allow the applicant to explore other manufacturers and meet with



the Design Review Committee to make sure the windows are congruent with the Design Guidelines. Motion passed with a vote of 7 (Chestnut, Rees, Jarrell, Pearce, Sauter, Savut, and Webb):1 (Smiley). Motion carried.

Ms. Pearce: The motion carries to continue the application. Contact Tom Wisemiller, so the Design Review Committee can help find the appropriate window.

Dr. Chestnut: The present COA should be looked at in sixty days.

Mr. Little: There was not a date set in the motion. I would suggest that the owner get with Staff and start working and then Staff can contact the Design Review Committee. The motion has already been made and that door is closed.

Ms. Pearce thanked the applicant.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Design Review Committee**

The Design Review Committee met about an air conditioning unit being replaced in the same spot.

### **Selection Committee**

The Selection Committee did not meet.

### **Publicity Committee**

The Publicity Committee did not meet.

Ms. Pearce: I would like for each of the committees to meet by the September Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Application Submissions**

Mr. Wisemiller: There are thirteen Façade Improvement Grant applications submitted.

Ms. Pearce: The purpose of the Façade Improvement Grant Program is to provide an economic incentive to:

- 1) Complete substantial renovations to building facades within the core of the City's central business district ("façade" is defined as "the face of a building; that is, the front, side or rear elevation of a building;" first priority will be given to the street

and or public parking area fronts of buildings) and:

- 2) Encourage good design projects that capitalize on rehabilitation of the original fabric or design of existing properties; and
- 3) Preserve the unique character of Greenville's historic central business district.

Ms. Pearce: Usually the Design Review Committee looks over the FIG grant Information prior to submission for review by the Commission; however, the committee did not have a chance to do that this time. The Commission reviews each FIG application and makes a recommendation to the City Manager. Then the City Manager decides whether or not to approve each FIG application.

Dr. Chestnut: The Commission should follow the process.

Ms. Pearce: The Commission is way behind with the FIG program. These applications should have been brought before the Commission in February 2008.

Dr. Chestnut: I think the Commission should go through the grant applications individually.

Mr. Smiley: I think the Commission should go over the grants to make sure each one is complete and then go back through the grants to recommend or deny approval to the City Manager.

Ms. Pearce: Tom, would you like to begin with 330 Evans Street?

Application FIG #08-01 by Michael Glenn at the Blount Harvey Building for 330 Evans Street: Bricks need a waterproofing sealer to prevent water penetration into interior spaces. Cracks need to be caulked and sealed. The grant request is for \$2,500.00.

Mr. Wisemiller: The applicant is not in attendance tonight. I believe he is waiting on another estimate.

Ms. Pearce: Should the Commission review this application if it is not complete?

Dr. Chestnut: I believe if it is not a completed application, then it has to go in the incomplete pile.

Ms. Pearce: The next application is for 521 Cotanche Street.

Application FIG #08-02 by Michael Horton for 521 Cotanche Street: Replace modern style lights with historically appropriate Federal/Williamsburg carriage style lanterns. The grant request is for \$1,910.19.

Mr. Wisemiller: Chico's Restaurant is part of Georgetown Shops which was built around 1954. It is a contemporary colonial revival retail thrift development. Chico's added the front patio in 2002 using the same type of brick. The lighting at that time was more for safety than appearance. The lighting being proposed is a softer lighting that is close to the original lighting. It is a highly visible property. The applicant is present tonight.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Ms. Franceine Rees to place the grant in the application pile to be considered for funding. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Pearce: The next four applications are for 300 Pitt Street.

Application FIG #08-03 by A Curious Soup for 300 Pitt Street on the south side: Exterior of house is going to be restored. All windows repaired, reglazed and repainted. All masonry will be repointed as needed. Roof and front porch will be restored. Draining system repaired and landscaping redone. The grant request is for \$2,500.00.

Application FIG #08-04 by A Curious Soup for 300 Pitt Street on the east side: Exterior of house is going to be restored. All windows repaired, reglazed and repainted. All masonry will be repointed as needed. Roof and front porch will be restored. Draining system repaired and landscaping redone (to repair, reglaze, repaint 21 windows). The grant request is for \$2,500.00.

Application FIG #08-05 by A Curious Soup for 300 Pitt Street on the north side: Exterior of house is going to be restored. All windows repaired, reglazed and repainted. All masonry will be repointed as needed. Roof and front porch will be restored. Draining system repaired and landscaping redone (to repair, reglaze, repaint 20 windows). The grant request is for \$2,500.00.

Application FIG #08-06 by A Curious Soup for 300 Pitt Street on the west side: Exterior of house is going to be restored. All windows repaired, reglazed and repainted. All masonry will be repointed as needed. Roof and front porch will be restored. Draining system repaired and landscaping redone (to repair, reglaze, repaint 10 windows). The grant amount is for \$2,250.00.

Mr. Wisemiller: The applicant has asked that the boundaries be extended to include 300 Pitt Street.

Dr. Chestnut asked Mr. Wisemiller to include in his FIG presentation whether or not properties have received past grants.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Ms. Candace Pearce to place application 08-03 for 300 Pitt Street in the not to consider pile for this round, because the property is outside of the boundary limits for the FIG. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Pearce: Should we make a motion for all of the applications pertaining to 300 Pitt Street?

Dr. Chestnut: I would prefer that the Commission act on the applications separately.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to place application 08-04 for 300 Pitt Street in the not to consider pile for this round. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to place application 08-05 for 300 Pitt Street in the not to consider pile for this round. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to place application 08-06 for 300 Pitt Street in the not to consider pile for this round. Motion carried unanimously.

The Commission recommended that Staff create a proposal for review to extend the boundary limits for FIG.

Ms. Pearce: The next application is for 213 East Fifth Street for the Stop Shop.

Application FIG #08-07 by Stop Shop, Jay Long, for 213 East Fifth Street on the front: Replace windows and front door. The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Mr. Wisemiller: The owner leased the building in 1973 and purchased it with a group in 1975. In the 1950s, the building was a Sunoco Service Station. In 1975, the next door addition was made. The application is complete and it is in the project area.

Ms. Savut: Should we accept the application with the condition that the applicant is also going to apply for a COA?

Mr. Smiley: I don't think the building is in a district that would require a COA. We certainly have the right to fund the grant based on the requirement that their windows be historically appropriate. We would have to do that now not wait for a COA.

Dr. Chestnut: Is the work being considered compatible with the historic character in that area?

Ms. Pearce: The substantial renovations are the purpose. As we have had several applications in the past in the commercial district. The windows are a maintenance item. We have considered the maintenance items rather than substantial façade restorations.

Mr. Smiley: I move that we consider the lack of documentation as to the historic nature of the building and the elements to be renovated that we not recommend this one for financing at this time.

Dr. Chestnut: I second it in order to get to the discussion of it.

Mr. Jarrell: It is within the district. It is not the building across the street from it, but neither is Chico's. I think that we need to put it in the pile to be considered, because it does meet the criteria to be considered. I think there needs to be more discussion on it.

Ms. Pearce: In the historic area, we have the 1910 turn of the century buildings on Evans Street. They have been changed, and they have been reworked. A lot of them on Dickinson Avenue are still there and some of them have been torn down. Just because it does not fall into that category doesn't make it not historical. The problem I am having which may be different from the problem that Greg is having with it is that we do not have any documentation to indicate what this building was like to start with therefore, we cannot decide whether it was historically appropriate.

Mr. Smiley: That is exactly what my motion was that the application simply lacks documentation. We are not able to evaluate the application within the purpose of the façade grants.

Dr. Chestnut: I think the building on the corner is certainly a gateway and an entrance. I think something needs to be done with it, so I am happy to see work being done on it. My only question is that I would like to see what is intended to be done is really going to increase the historical continuity downtown or is it just a maintenance and replacement. I do know of one place that we turned down for a façade grant, because what they were doing was not necessarily consistent. I would be concerned with this one that I would be given some information and is it going to be consistent with historical downtown. If there was an amendment that we could put in to consider with more information, I could live with that. The motion on the floor is that we just disapprove it. It could come up for the next cycle. I call the question on the motion.

Ms. Pearce: All in favor...

Those in favor of putting the application in the not in favor pile is Smiley, Chestnut, Pearce, Rees, Sauter, Savut, and Webb. Those opposed in putting the application in the not in favor pile is Jarrell. Motion carried 7:1 to place the application in the no pile.

Ms. Pearce: The next application is for 213-B East Fifth Street on the south side.

Application FIG #08-08 by Derek Oliverio for 213-B East Fifth Street on the south side: Power wash, prime, and paint, gas island as well as (full) aluminum shingles (classic red) new 1" thick windows, window frames, door frames, commercial door. Repair and re-bottom tier of façade. Install new 4 by 10 triple embossed, color interior light sign.

The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Mr. Wisemiller: The proposed work is for a non-historic structure within the FIG project area. If the work is considered compatible with the historic buildings in the National Register Commercial District, it should be considered to be qualifying work. This is the site of the Sup Dog Restaurant. Pictures in the application give more detail. Would the applicant like to speak?

Mr. Oliverio: I have been doing extensive remodeling to the interior as well as to the exterior since the middle to end of January. I was interested in the FIG program, since I heard about it. I did as much as I could before getting to the exterior remodeling. I demoed out the whole entire property as well as the signage on both sides of the property. I made extensive improvements to the façade itself. I did everything I could other than replacing it. I put forth a lot of effort in the work to make the place look nice. I think it is a centerfold between our downtown Greenville and the University. It is an important location to improve, because having 25,000 students living 500 feet from the location, I feel like having a nice place for the students to be able to transition from the University to downtown is very important for the City as well as the University. I did as much as I could to hold off for this meeting. I demoed out both of the signage. I added in a triple embossed four color internally lit sign. I have power washed. I spent my July 4<sup>th</sup> power washing and painting the whole entire facade. I spent twenty hours alone in power washing. Nothing in that place has been cleaned or fixed for a very long time. I paid for a contractor to power wash. He was out there for five to six hours, and he did not do it right. I had to do it and I spent another 12 and a half on it. I put forth a lot of improvements. Windows on that property are in shambles. If you look at the window just below the Stop Shop sign that is the window between the Stop Shop and my place, it is in shambles. A window is completely off of its track. I am losing a lot of energy. That quote includes all new framing, completely redoing all of the doors and all of the windows. That is a one inch thick insulated glass. We will use the same kind of design in the window and in the framing. I think it would add a lot to that property and make it look nice. Eventually, I am going to go with trying to get the island removed. That is something that I will do when I begin generating revenue. Dennis, I hope you will come in and get a good hot dog. Dennis, you had said you hoped it would be historically correct and we are not going to be changing anything just improving.

Dr. Chestnut: My question was not just whether it would be historically correct, but whether it would be historically consistent with the downtown which could be slightly different. I think there was a question that the Chair raised whether it was historically significant at any period in time. I am questioning whether it is going to add to the downtown's historic scape. That is my biggest concern. Do you follow the difference?

Mr. Oliverio: I follow. We picked the contractor with the lower of the two estimates. We are going with Carolina Glass of Greenville. We are going with the same kind of glass and aluminum frames and changing out the windows and stuff. I know there is a transition window glass from my restaurant to the Stop Shop and it is a Plexiglas taped

on silicone around the edges half on, half off, falling out and it looks really bad. Those kinds of things stand out to student. The framing has many holes in it from drilling. The island looks bad. These are good improvements for the property.

Mr. Sauter: Do we know when the island was installed?

Mr. Oliverio: No, I don't. I would really like to get rid of the island. I believe the gas tanks underneath the ground are partially under the decks. I would like to get the parking lot redone and get the parking lines drawn. I know you are not supposed to do any of the work prior to coming to the Commission, but I just could not wait any longer. I tried my hardest.

Ms. Pearce: Derek, we do know that the building looks a lot better, since you have started working on it. I think we have a similar problem with 08-08 and 08-09 but 08-10 like we did with the Stop Shop.

Mr. Smiley: I am excited to see someone who is enthusiastic and interested in that location and getting involved in it. I wish you all the success in the world. I'll bring my kids down there, and we will eat hot dogs. I worry about the prospect of funding something that has already been done just because of what that sets in future rounds. We could easily have people with completed projects to receive a grant for work they had done previously and the purpose of the grants is they are incentive grants, and they are designed to have a specific scope of work funded that is proposed ahead of time and approved ahead of time.

Mr. Wisemiller: What is the proportion of the work done versus work proposed?

Mr. Oliverio: Some of the deck work has to be done as well as the windows and doors and another coat on the façade itself.

Mr. Wisemiller: Has some of the \$1,900.00 work been done?

Mr. Oliverio: Yes, I waited as long as I could.

Mr. Jarrell: This building is not Jefferson's, it is not the Theatre, it is not even the Skate Park across the street, but to question whether or not it is improving or adding anything to the historical nature downtown is if it is improved it is. This building improved helps the building next door to improve, so I think if everything is in the application that needs to be in here, I think we should consider it.

Mr. Jarrell: I make a motion to place the application in the go with pile of applications.

Mr. Smiley: I second the motion for purposes of discussion.

Dr. Chestnut: I would not vote for the motion, because I backed myself into a strategic wall. I see these buildings as being connected: the Stop Shop and the Hot Dog Shop. If we voted not to consider the Stop Shop on the basis of I wanted to see if it was going to add or be consistent with the historic downtown. I can't separate the buildings. I just could not in good faith vote on that basis, because they are connected and they are relatively doing the same thing. I would want to see as I wanted to see with the Stop Shop the exploration of what was going to be done. I think the clarity for the grant would be to go in and pull out those things that you have already done which would make the grant clear for meeting that criterion that we do not approve things that have been done. That would be one logistical improvement on grant submission.

Mr. Jarrell: He did the work in July and this is the spring grant cycle. Maybe we need to step this process up a little bit and stay on track.

Dr. Chestnut: I am all for that.

Ms. Pearce: One of the differences in my opinion between the Stop Shop request which was to replace existing windows and doors with windows and doors that look just like those windows and doors and the complete substantial renovation of building facades within the core. I believe the work that is being proposed for Sup Dogs particularly on the north façade is a substantial change which falls under the purposes. It might be possible for us to take them separately like we have been doing. Doing the work on the rear of the building would be something we could approve outright, since it is a substantial renovation to that particular façade. The other two with encouraging good design projects and preserving the unique character of Greenville's historic central business district, the character of the area is where we need some pictures, because it does fall into the same pile on that issue. However, it is a more substantial restoration than the Stop Shop. Does anyone else have a comment?

Mr. Smiley: With regard to the timing issue, I certainly understand the challenges of any delays that the City may have had in getting this project set up may have not served you well, and I certainly regret that. A grant is assistance not an entitlement that people have a right to. It says very clearly in here that contracts must be signed before any work can begin.

Dr. Chestnut: Call the question.

Ms. Pearce: I call the question. There is a motion on the floor made by Mr. Greg Jarrell and seconded by Mr. Rick Smiley to place the application in the consider pile.

Jarrell, Pearce, Rees, Sauter, Savut, and Webb voted in favor of considering the application. Smiley and Chestnut voted not in favor of considering the application.

The motion passed with a vote of 6:2. Motion carried to consider the application.



Ms. Pearce: The next application is for 213-B East Fifth Street on the north side.

Application FIG #08-09 by Derek Oliverio for 213-B East Fifth Street on the north side: scrape, power wash exterior brick, block the exterior section on backside of building. Apply aluminum reinforced siding, new door and frame, apply silver reflecting color and seal to stop drippage on side. The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Ms. Pearce: Is there a motion?

Mr. Jarrell: I make a motion for the application to be placed in the consideration pile.

Mr. Sauter: I second it.

Jarrell, Sauter, Chestnut, Pearce, Rees, Savut, Webb voted in favor to consider the application. Smiley opposed placing the application in the consideration pile.

Ms. Pearce: The next application is for 213-B East Fifth Street on the east side.

Application FIG #08-10 by Derek Oliverio for 213-B East Fifth Street on the east side: power wash, prime, paint classic red on aluminum siding. Install new commercial door frame, new 1" thick windows and frames. Install new lattice, hand rails and decking boards. Install a 4 by 10 triple embossed sign with interior light. The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Ms. Pearce: For the FIG #08-10 application, we may have questions about this about the number of things that have already been done.

Ms. Savut: I only see one estimate for this application.

Mr. Oliverio: There is a second estimate. I got one quote from Professional Coatings, and he said he could not do the work for any less than \$5,700.00. I also received an estimate from Rainbow Paint Company.

Dr. Chestnut: Why are you going with the highest bid?

Mr. Oliverio: The guy from the Rainbow Paint Company did not seem very professional. He was cursing a lot. I believe he had been drinking. I am going with the higher quote.

Ms. Savut: The bids are not matching with the application forms.

Ms. Pearce: Do you have the original application?

Mr. Wisemiller: It starts with the budget. Painting exterior costs \$3,800; signage costs \$3,921; and window replacement costs \$3,818.

Ms. Pearce: Where was that?

Mr. Smiley: It is not in our packet, so please put it on the screen.

Mr. Wisemiller: 08-09 is in the presentation as the side of the building.

Mr. Smiley: We just approve 08-09 under the assumption that we are talking about the rear of the building.

Mr. Wisemiller: I am sorry....the rear of the building.

Mr. Smiley: Application 08-09 has a photo of the side of the building. The budget that you are showing here is for which application.

Mr. Wisemiller: It is for 08-09.

Mr. Smiley: The power point presentation does not match that. On your paper packets, 08-09 will be the east facade and the 08-10 will be named the north façade. The last motion we made was to take the north façade and to tentatively approve it for funding. We are now considering the east façade.

Mr. Wisemiller: The mistake was I mixed these two up.

Mr. Smiley: Now we are considering the east façade with the total budget of \$10,439.00.

Ms. Pearce: Tom, you said they were all the same, but they were switched.

Mr. Wisemiller: What I mixed up here is these two tables.

Mr. Smiley: The east façade is for \$10,439.00 for decking board and lattice. Madam Chair, we are now discussing the east façade which is the lower grid on the screen in front of you.

Mr. Jarrell: Motion moved that we place this application in the consider pile.

Mr. Sauter: I second it.

Mr. Smiley: I would like to discuss this. How much of this work is done?

Mr. Jarrell: He still has the windows and doors.

Mr. Smiley: We already refused to consider an application for windows and doors earlier. What apart from the windows and doors is something that we can fund?

Mr. Wisemiller: Isn't the question that the façade grant has to incorporate all of the work for reimbursement like if somebody does four things and only asks for a FIG for one of them.

Mr. Smiley: I see what you are saying. The painting itself is \$3,800, so that would be \$1,900 right there.

Mr. Wisemiller: You have to do a substantial rehabilitation, but you do not necessarily have to request reimbursement for all the work you have completed.

Ms. Pearce: However, the lattice work, handrails and deck boards have already been done on this prior to contract, prior to application, prior to anything. We are sorry for the delay, but that is the fact.

Ms. Savut: The signage has also been done.

Ms. Pearce: You have already washed it.

Dr. Chestnut: We can consider the other work that has not been done.

Ms. Pearce: That is correct.

Dr. Chestnut: I'd like to call for the question.

Ms. Pearce: I call for the question.

Jarrell, Sauter, Chestnut, Pearce, Rees, Savut, Webb voted in favor to consider the application. Smiley opposed placing the application in the consideration pile.

Ms. Pearce: I would like to recuse myself from FIG applications 08-11, 08-12, and 08-13 pertaining to Rayn Enterprises, LLC, because I am the contractor.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to recuse Candace Pearce. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Webb: I would like to recuse myself from FIG applications 08-11, 08-12, and 08-13, pertaining to Rayn Enterprises, LLC, because I am the applicant.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to recuse Ryan Webb. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Smiley: Should I be recused as well, since I am related to the Chair?

Mr. Little: No, for you have no direct financial interest.

The Commission agreed that Mr. Smiley should not recuse himself.

Mr. Wisemiller: The next three applications are for three adjacent commercial buildings: 712 Dickinson Avenue, 714 Dickinson Avenue, and 716 Dickinson Avenue. They are in the Dickinson Avenue Historic District. One of the units will be the offices of Seven by Design/Greenville Times. There is a project to do a Sojourner Café and Provisions in two of the units. The units have undergone multiple renovations over the past few years and the properties have participated in the FIG program previously. The owner also claims to upgrade the rear portion of the property with an outdoor dining patio, some brick pavers to connect the sidewalks and the parking area and some other amenities including an artistic entrance.

Application FIG #08-11 by Rayn Enterprises, LLC for 712 Dickinson Avenue on the front: power wash the brick and paint the color of original brick. Install historically appropriate awning and paint lower wooden façade. The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Application FIG #08-12 by Rayn Enterprises, LLC for 714 Dickinson Avenue on the front: restore parapet wall and parapet cap to original, power wash brick, paint brick the color of original brick, repoint brick as needed, install historically appropriate awning, install doors and windows, and paint lower wooden façade. The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Application FIG #08-13 by Rayn Enterprises, LLC for 716 Dickinson Avenue on the front: restore parapet wall and parapet cap to original, power wash brick, paint brick the color of original brick, repoint brick as needed, install historically appropriate awning, install doors and windows, and paint lower wooden façade. The grant amount is for \$2,500.00.

Mr. Smiley: Mr. Webb, if I remember correctly, you joined the Commission on the 24<sup>th</sup> of June. Is that correct?

Mr. Webb: Yes.

Mr. Smiley: You applied for this on the 13<sup>th</sup> of June, so you applied for these façade grants prior to being appointed to this Commission.

Mr. Webb: Yes.

Ms. Savut: I remember we gave grants to the prior owner, and I believe when the building was sold to someone else the grants moved with the new owner.

Mr. Webb: We received \$2,500 per address. We ran into structural problems with 714 and 716 which made the original estimates for the façade grants unrealistic, so we carried it as far as we could and then came back to ask for more.

Mr. Smiley: As I recall you are certainly allowed to apply for grants in subsequent cycles, am I correct? Though at some point, you have to take a rest after being funded within certain cycles. Correct?

Mr. Wisemiller: Yes.

Dr. Chestnut: Am I understanding that all three of those properties that the grants were granted for \$2,500.00 in the spring of 2006 and then the fall of 2006 according to the applications?

Mr. Wisemiller: Yes.

Mr. Jarrell: You are allowed to apply in two cycles back to back. Then you have to take a break before you have to apply again.

Dr. Chestnut: Okay. In this situation just for information, the break did not result in any other work.

Mr. Webb: The original work was done after the extension was granted.

Dr. Chestnut: Outside of the grant money that was granted in 2006 no other work was subsequently done before you are back for another grant other than the work for which you were granted money.

Mr. Webb: On other facades or for that façade....

Mr. Smiley: Are your applications for the rear façade?

Mr. Webb: No.

Dr. Chestnut: Neither facades have gotten subsequent grants, correct?

Mr. Webb: Correct.

Dr. Chestnut: I read where you were going to paint the bricks their original color, and I just do not know were bricks originally painted.

Mr. Webb: Well happened with these buildings is the buildings eventually became red, white and blue. We are going to have paint the bricks to resemble the bricks at the back.

Ms. Pearce: We are painting the building because we can't remove the paint that is on the building, but we want it to look like the original brickwork.

Dr. Chestnut: Would the red, white and blue be historically significant?

Ms. Pearce: No, it is not historically significant.

Mr. Smiley: All of the work proposed on this was not part of the prior façade grants to your knowledge.

Mr. Jarrell: Is there a motion.

Dr. Chestnut: I move we put the applications in the approval pile.

Mr. Sauter: I second the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Smiley: Should Ms. Pearce and Mr. Webb remain recused, so we can act on their applications before returning to the Commission?

Dr. Chestnut: I think we should do the applications in sequential order.

Ms. Pearce and Mr. Webb returned to the Commission.

#### Façade Improvement Grant Applications Recommended to the City Manager for Approval

Ms. Pearce: The first application recommended for consideration is FIG 08-02 by Michael Horton for 521 Cotanche Street in the amount of \$1,910.19.

Motion was made by Mr. Greg Jarrell and seconded by Mr. Rick Smiley to recommend approval of FIG 08-02 to the City Manager for \$1,910.19. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Pearce: The next application recommended for consideration is FIG 08-08 by Derek Oliverio for 213-B East Fifth Street in the amount of \$1,000.00.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to recommend approval of FIG 08-08 to the City Manager for \$1,000.00. Motion carried with a vote of 7 (Smiley, Jarrell, Pearce, Rees, Sauter, Savut, and Webb):1 (Chestnut).

Ms. Pearce: The next application recommended for consideration is FIG East (08-10) by Derek Oliverio for 213-B East Fifth Street in the amount of \$1,000.00.

Motion was made by Mr. Greg Jarrell and seconded by Mr. Rick Smiley to recommend approval of FIG East (08-10) to the City Manager for \$1,000.00. Motion carried with a vote of 7 (Jarrell, Smiley, Pearce, Rees, Sauter, Savut, and Webb):1 (Chestnut).

Ms. Pearce: The next application recommended for consideration is FIG Rear (08-09) by Derek Oliverio for 213-B East Fifth Street in the amount of \$2,500.00.

Ms. Pearce: Derek, please tell us what has been done to the rear of the building.

Mr. Oliverio: The aluminum siding and the cool seal has been done.

Mr. Smiley: There is at least \$5,000.00 worth of work to do at the rear.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to recommend approval of FIG Rear (08-09) to the City Manager for \$2,500.00. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Pearce recused herself from FIG 08-11, FIG 08-12, and FIG 08-13.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and Mr. Greg Jarrell to recuse Ms. Candace Pearce. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Webb recused himself from FIG 08-11, FIG 08-12 and FIG 08-13.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and Mr. Greg Jarrell to recuse Mr. Ryan Webb. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jarrell: The next application recommended for consideration is FIG 08-11 by Rayn Enterprises, LLC for 712 Dickinson Avenue in the amount of \$2,500.00.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Rick Smiley to recommend approval of FIG 08-11 to the City Manager for \$2,500.00. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jarrell: The next application recommended for consideration is FIG 08-12 by Rayn Enterprises, LLC for 714 Dickinson Avenue in the amount of \$2,500.00.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to recommend approval of FIG 08-12 to the City Manager for \$2,500.00. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jarrell: The next application recommended for consideration is FIG 08-13 by Rayn Enterprises, LLC for 716 Dickinson Avenue in the amount of \$2,500.00.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to recommend approval of FIG 08-13 to the City Manager for \$2,500.00. Motion carried unanimously.

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

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

At 2909 Memorial Drive, Michael Barberio replaced windows without Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application. The COA application and the revised COA application were both denied by the Commission. Enforcement is in progress until the violation is remedied or an official appeal is submitted with a total of fines to date.

At 401 South Jarvis Street, Tim Ferruzzi submitted a revised COA application for a house with inappropriate ductwork. The revised COA application was approved, but the Commission requested that enforcement continue until project completion. Project completed according to approved COA application 08-04.

At 805 Evans Street, Jack Richardson had an exterior paint job that was incomplete. Paint was cracking and falling off. The primer coat was inappropriate if let exposed. Work not yet initiated. Owner has been issued a total of \$150 in fines. Owner has been issued a total of \$150 in fines. Owner has secured estimates for the job and plans to begin the work in July 2008.

At 110 South Harding Street, Charles O'Connor submitted a COA application in August 2006. The Commission continued the COA for a previously installed replacement door for a period not to exceed two years or until August 2008 to give the applicant time to propose a historically appropriate replacement door. The applicant must submit the COA for a historically appropriate replacement door no later than August 22, 2008.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER**

### **Report on Municipal Services District (MSD)**

Ms. Pearce: As stated in this month's minutes, a detailed report was to be given at tonight's meeting on the Municipal Services District (MSD). Please make sure that the presentation takes place at the August 26, 2008 Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Thank you.

### **Staff for the Historic Preservation Commission**

Mr. Wisemiller: Staff will be interviewing interested consultants. Staff should have made a selection of a consultant by the August Commission meeting.



**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Wisemiller  
Planner II