

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

November 27, 2007
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	Candace Pearce	Rick Smiley
Greg Jarrell	Franceine Rees	Chris Woelkers
Jeremy Jordan, Chair	Dale Sauter	

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

N. Yaprak Savut Richard Weir

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandy Gale Edmundson, Secretary; Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney; Carl Rees, Urban Development Senior Planner; and Tom Wisemiller, Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Pat Dunn, Mayor of the City of Greenville; Michael Gogoel and Leslie Morris

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Rick Smiley to delete Item D. Update on past Façade Improvement Grant projects and Item E. Update on non-compliant historic properties from the agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wisemiller said these items would be addressed at the January meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 23, 2007

Motion was made by Ms. Candace Pearce and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to approve the October 23, 2007 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comments were made.

CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)

COA Application 07-11 (205 South Library Street)

Mr. Jordan: The first COA application is for 205 South Library Street.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Christopher Morris and Tom Wisemiller.

Mr. Wisemiller: This modest Colonial Revival house is one-and-a-half-stories high and double pile in depth. Two dormers and a central chimney give the house a Cape Cod appearance. A well-detailed front door surround with a molded architrave also contributes to the Colonial Revival design. A large full-width dormer stretches across the rear elevation.

The subject property is located on the east side of Library Street in the College View Historic District.

The applicant requests approval to install exterior textured, vinyl, faux-wood shingle siding over the existing asbestos shingles.

Considerations

Applicant proposes to install exterior siding and insulation over the existing asbestos siding. According to the applicant, the existing asbestos siding has water damage and mold problems and has cracks between the asbestos shingles. The applicant is concerned about potential health risks from compromised asbestos shingles. After cleaning and repairing any exposed portions of the asbestos shingles, the applicant wishes to cover over the existing siding with a vinyl siding product and insulation to provide protection against future moisture, to reduce maintenance, and to significantly reduce energy costs.

The proposed faux-wood, dark gray, vinyl siding is textured and divided to mimic wood shingles. Produced by Certain Teed, this "cedar impressions" siding product would have artificial divisions, made to look like a coursed pattern of 5" wide wood shingles (with about a 7" reveal from the bottom of one course to the course above it). In contrast, the asbestos shingles have a coursed pattern made to look more like 18" wide wood shingles with about a 9.5" reveal. Like the proposed replacement product, asbestos siding was typically textured to imitate wood shingles; however, the asbestos siding is imitating a larger-type of wood shingle.

In addition to material and style, other issues to consider in this case: 1). the possible detrimental impacts from adding another layer of shingles/siding over the existing siding; the additional layer will alter how the siding interacts with the window, door, and other trim of the house; 2). wrapping vinyl material over the existing siding - if it does

have mold/moisture issues - could make any moisture/mold problems even worse.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Pages</u>
2	Exterior Walls and Trim	14-15

- **1.** Retain and preserve the original shape, form, height, materials, and details of historic walls.
- **3.** Retain and preserve historic wall materials whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new materials that match the historic materials in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute materials only if the original materials are not technically feasible.
- **4.** Protect and maintain historic walls in appropriate ways:
 1. Inspect walls regularly for signs of deterioration or moisture damage.
 2. Keep all joinery adequately sealed to avoid moisture damage.
 3. Maintain a sound paint film on an all elements that were traditionally painted.
 4. Eliminate any vegetation that may cause structural damage, or that may hinder ventilation and surface drainage thus inviting damage from moisture, mildew, fungi, or insects.
 5. Maintain gutters and downspouts to avoid moisture damage to walls.
- **5.** If replacement of a wall element or detail is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, shape, scale, proportion, material, texture, and detail.
- **7.** It is not appropriate to apply paint or other coatings to unpainted wall materials that were historically not coated.
- **9.** It is not appropriate to replace or cover wooden siding or trim with a substitute cladding material such as aluminum siding, vinyl siding, or brick veneer.

Mr. Jordan asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Christopher Morris told the Commission that there are cracks in the asbestos shingles of the house, so we would like to replace the siding.

Mr. Jordan: What questions does the Commission have for the applicant? Is there anyone to speak in favor of the application? Is there anyone to speak in opposition of the application? What is the recommendation of the Design Review Committee?

Ms. Pearce: The Design Review Committee recommends denying this request, because this is vinyl siding. Item 10 under Exterior Walls and Trims says if 50% or more of the existing artificial siding on a structure, indicating yes this was probably not the original siding, it is asbestos siding. Element, porch, garage, balcony, entryway or combination thereof is deteriorated to the degree of needed replacement the artificial siding would be replaced with historically appropriate material which would be wood. It is not congruent with our guidelines.

Mr. Jarrell: Is the asbestos original to the house?

Ms. Pearce: We are not sure about that. According to the historic survey, the house was built in 1935. It could have been original to the building, but we have no way of knowing that. Replacing the asbestos shingles with existing asbestos shingles would be nearly impossible.

Mr. Jordan: What is staff's recommendation?

Mr. Wisemiller: Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission *deny* the Certificate of Appropriateness to install vinyl siding over the existing asbestos shingles at 205 S. Library Street, based on the following findings:

- It is inappropriate to cover existing asbestos shingles with a substitute cladding material – in this case, a faux-wood shingle, textured vinyl siding product.

Staff recommends that applicant pursue one of two options, either of which would be congruent with the *Design Guidelines*:

1. Retain and preserve the existing asbestos siding by power washing all exterior surfaces of the asbestos shingles and repairing any deteriorated sections. To retain and preserve the asbestos shingles in the future, applicant is encouraged to inspect walls regularly for signs of deterioration or moisture damage; keep all joinery adequately sealed to avoid moisture damage; maintain a sound paint film on the shingles (they were previously painted); eliminate vines or other vegetation on the exterior walls of the dwelling; and maintain gutters and downspouts to avoid moisture damage to walls.
2. Or, if applicant deems that it is necessary to replace the exterior asbestos shingles with an alternative (insulated) shingle product for purposes of safety, energy conservation, maintenance, aesthetics, or other reasons, then applicant should consider replacing the asbestos shingles with wood shingles that are appropriate for the district in terms of composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture.

Recommended Motion: Deny request for approval to install vinyl siding over existing asbestos shingles. Applicant will then have the option in the future to request a Minor Work COA to make repairs and/or paint the existing asbestos shingles, or to apply for a new COA to request approval for a more appropriate replacement product.

Mr. Jordan: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Jarrell: Everything the applicant is proposing to do will improve the exterior of the house. The Commission cannot say that the asbestos shingles are original to the

house and as they deteriorate, they create a biohazard.

Ms. Pearce: In my opinion and the Design Review Committee's opinion, the asbestos shingles have not deteriorated. It is a power wash situation. I

Mr. Smiley: Under the guidelines, there is no justification to use vinyl siding. It is not an approved material.

Mr. Jordan: Is there anymore discussion before moving on to the Findings of Fact?

Mr. Little: Please summarize the facts as presented by the staff, the applicant and the Commission.

Mr. Jordan: The applicant desires to install wood shingle imitation siding made of vinyl over existing asbestos shingles. The Design Review Committee and the staff report suggest that we not allow this. The Design Review Committee believes that while the asbestos shingles are dirty they are in pretty good shape.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Ms. Candace Pearce to accept the Findings of Fact. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Ms. Candace Pearce and seconded by Mr. Rick Smiley that the application is not congruent with the Design Guidelines. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jordan: Is there any further discussion? If not, is there motion as to the Certificate of Appropriateness application?

Motion was made by Ms. Franceine Rees and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to deny continue COA 07-11 for 205 South Library Street. Motion carried unanimously.

COA Application 07-12 (400 South Summit Street)

Mr. Jordan: The first COA application is for 400 South Summit Street.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Michael Gogoel and 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 for previous replacement of the original windows with vinyl replacement windows.

Considerations

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). The applicant preserved the original wood window frames, but encapsulated the brick molding with PVC coated aluminum with a wood grain finish.

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 did a site inspection of 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. For an example, please see attached photograph, which is labeled, "Photo of Original Window." Staff has no way of knowing, however, whether the few remaining windows were typical of the condition 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.

In addition to replacing the windows, applicant also made a series of other repairs to the dwelling (see: Exhibit A).

<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.

Mr. Jordan asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Michael Gogoel told the Commission that we bought the house in August as is. It was in a bad state of repair, many windows were broken (both the sash as well as the glass) and the house could not be locked or secured. We called four local contractors to assess the situation with the windows, and all gave estimates to replace them, as they were in their opinion not repairable. None mentioned anything about an historic district and all recommended replacement as repair wasn't feasible. All recommended vinyl sashes as they would most closely match the original window configuration and exterior appearance, and were the only viable financial alternative given my budget as well as the housing and resale value in the neighborhood. We had no knowledge of any historic district. Listing documents, closing documents, zoning documents, deed, and City of Greenville online zoning map make no mention of the historic district. Neither the listing realtor nor our realtor ever mentioned anything about an historic district, and the seller, Dr. Thomas Rufolo, never disclosed that the home was in an historic district. So, we decided to go ahead and replace the window sashes in accordance with the recommendations of the contractors. We chose who we felt gave us the best overall bid, Good Guys Remodeling, and proceeded with the work. During installation, Tom Wisemiller visited the home and informed the contractor that the home was in an historic district and that we needed a certificate of appropriateness for the work. I was given Tom's name and met with him to discuss the situation, at which time, I received the application information.

Mr. Gogoel: The facts concerning the windows:

Several window sills and frames were rotted.

Some windows were not original, some were aluminum and vinyl.

Most windows were not able to be locked, because they would not fully close, so the house was not secure.

Most windows were painted shut, sash cords were rotted and the windows could not be opened.

Several windows were broken – glass and wood, and were not repairable.

Windows may have had lead paint – danger to occupants.

Paint was peeling, painters could not remove or scrape paint safely.
Recommended solution by all contractors was to leave wood frames and replace sashes with energy efficient sashes.
Single pane glass in originals were not energy efficient.
Neighbors are pleased with improvements.

Mr. Gogoel: Improvements made to date:

Replaced old sashes with vinyl welded wood-look double pane low E energy efficient sashes and left original wood window frames, but covered existing potentially dangerous frames with wood grain pvc coated aluminum coverings to prevent flaking.
Painted interior of frames since not peeling or flaking and did not appear to be a hazard.
Painted wood trim outside original color.
Caulked entire exterior of house.
Removed gutters that were falling down, installed new gutters and downspouts.
Replaced rotten fascia board.
Installed new row of shingles to match existing shingles with drip edge around house.
Power washed house to remove dirt and debris.
Repaired and replaced – 25 missing and loose bricks.
Repaired original broken front door.
Removed all existing ductwork and furnace dating from 1940s or 1950s and replaced with new 95% efficient gas furnace and air conditioner.
Painted entire interior.
Installed all new blinds.
Repaired many inoperable electrical switches and fixtures.
Trimmed bushes and keep grass cut and trash picked up outside property.

Mr. Gogoel: Investment costs:

\$10,000 for windows
\$10,000 for HVAC system
\$2,200 for gutters
\$4,000 for painting, caulking and to replace rotten fascia board
\$1,000 for new drip edge

Mr. Jordan: What questions does the Commission have for the applicant?

Ms. Pearce: Do you have the old windows that were replaced?

Mr. Gogoel: No, I do not.

Mr. Jordan: Is there anyone to speak in favor of the application? Is there anyone to speak in opposition of the application? What is the recommendation of the Design Review Committee?

Ms. Pearce: The Design Review Committee recommends denying this request, the original windows were replaced with vinyl replacement windows. Vinyl replacement windows are not allowed in the guidelines. The application is not congruent with our guidelines.

Mr. Jordan: What is staff's recommendation?

Mr. Wisemiller: Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission *deny* the Certificate of Appropriateness for previous replacement of original windows with vinyl replacement windows at 400 S. Summit Street, based on the following findings:

- Even if the evidence presented in this case substantiated a finding that replacement of *some of* the original windows was necessary, the applicant presented no evidence of an effort to replace only the deteriorated elements of the original windows;
- The replacement windows do not match the original windows in scale, proportion, pane or panel division, materials, and detail;
- It is not appropriate to replace windows with stock items that do not duplicate the unit in material and design.

Recommended Motion: Denial of request for approval for previous replacement of original windows with vinyl replacement windows. Request that applicant be granted 60-days from the date of this meeting to restore the original windows to their previous condition, or to propose historically appropriate replacement windows and molding.

Mr. Jordan: Is there anymore discussion before moving on to the Findings of Fact?

Mr. Jordan: The applicant would like to keep the vinyl replacement windows that he installed prior to submitting the COA application. The Design Review Committee and the staff report suggests that we not allow this and ask the applicant to restore the original windows to their previous condition, or to propose historically appropriate replacement windows and molding.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut 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 Dr. Dennis Chestnut that the application is not congruent with the Design Guidelines. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jordan: Is there any further discussion?

The Commission discussed granting the applicant a period of one year to install the original windows to the house.

Mr. Jordan: Is there a motion as to the Certificate of Appropriateness application?

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to deny 07-12 for 400 South Summit Street and to grant the applicant a one year timeframe to install the original windows back to the house. Motion carried with a vote of 5 (Smiley, Jarrell, Rees, Sauter and Woelkers):2 (Pearce and Chestnut).

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Review Committee

The Design Review Committee met and the Commission heard their recommendations.

Selection Committee

The Selection Committee did not meet.

Publicity Committee

Dr. Dennis Chestnut and Tom Wisemiller discussed with Steve Hawley, the Public Information Officer, about filming a walk around the College View Historic District in December.

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works Certificate of Appropriateness (MWCOA) Report

Mr. Wisemiller reported the following Minor Works Certificate of Appropriateness applications to the Commission.

At 901 East Fifth Street, install hard surface (concrete) over existing gravel parking lot and drive in same dimensions. The owner/applicant is East Carolina University – Facility Services.

Discussion of fall 2007 Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Applications

Mr. Wisemiller: Façade Improvement Grant application 07-08 submitted by Roger J. Blei/Horizon Alliance/DBA Wings to Go for the front façade of 114 East Fifth and application 07-09 submitted by Roger J. Blei/Horizon Alliance/DBA Wings to Go for the side façade of 114 East Fifth Street. The work on the front façade would include replacing awning and lighting and replacing the door. The requested grant funds for the front façade would be \$2,500.00. The work on the side façade would include replacing awning and the door to the courtyard. The requested grant funds for the side façade would be \$2,500.00.

The Commission agreed that the proposed work submitted by the applicant would not be historically appropriate.

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to deny the Façade Improvement Grant applications 07-08 and 07-09. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Candace Pearce asked to be recused from acting on Façade Improvement Grant application 07-10.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Chris Woelkers to recuse Ms. Candace Pearce from voting on this application. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wisemiller: Façade Improvement Grant application 07-10 submitted by Pat Swindell Tyson for 426 Evans Street. The work to the façade includes: removing non-original blonde brick; cleaning, repairing, restoring, and repointing original brick; removing canopy (non-original); and installing new awning. The total estimated cost of the improvements is \$7,900.00. The applicant is requesting \$2,500.00 for the grant.

Motion was made by Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Chris Woelkers to approve the Façade Improvement Grant application 07-10 for \$2,500.00. Motion carried unanimously.

Updates to Façade Improvement Grant program guidelines: granting extensions to award recipients

Mr. Wisemiller: The Commission had asked about project completion for façade improvement grant recipients. In the Façade Improvement Grant Program, it states, "Upon project completion, copies of paid statements and canceled checks, etc. must be submitted to the City of Greenville to claim reimbursement. Failure to submit a reimbursement request along with paid statements and canceled checks, etc., within 6-months of the date of project completion may result in forfeiture of potential reimbursement funds."

Mr. Wisemiller: Requesting an extension to award recipients in the Façade Improvement Grant Program would read as follows:

REQUESTING AN EXTENSION

- 1) Applicants may be granted an extension, upon written request, if they have a compelling reason(s) based on extenuating circumstances for why they were unable to complete the work within the contracted period.
- 2) Upon transfer of a property or business from one party to another, the new property or business owner is eligible to assume an *active* façade grant award

attached to that property, upon written request indicating that said property or business owner understands the terms of the FIG contract and will assume any responsibilities pertaining therein. Transfer of ownership of a property or business is not sufficient grounds, by itself, for an extension to be granted; if the previous owner failed to complete the work within the contracted period and the new property or business owner cannot provide a compelling reason(s) based on extenuating circumstances for why the work was not completed, an extension will not be granted. However, the new property or business owner would be encouraged to resubmit a grant proposal for the facade.

- 3) In the event that an application is granted an extension, the façade associated with that application will be considered to have received a grant award in the same grant cycle in which the extension was granted for purposes of determining whether a façade is eligible for additional future grants. For example, if an application was originally awarded funding in spring 2007 and then was granted an extension through spring 2008, the façade associated with that award would be considered to have effectively received its Façade Improvement Grant award during the spring 2008 grant cycle. During the following Fiscal Year (which would begin July 1, 2008), the applicant who had received the extension would then be eligible to apply for another façade grant for the same façade, but it would be considered his second grant within two consecutive fiscal years (see above: Process for Receiving Grant, Item 10).

Motion was made by Mr. Rick Smiley and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to approve the Façade Improvement Grant program guidelines granting extensions to award recipients as stated above. Motion carried unanimously.

Vote on “Work in Progress” Notice placards for the College View Historic District

Mr. Wisemiller distributed the most recent version of the placards to the Commission.

Ms. Pearce: While you are passing this out, I would like to mention a couple of years ago, funds were encumbered for the district entry way signs.

Mr. Wisemiller: The signs were produced and shipped on November 26, 2007.

Mr. Wisemiller: The Housing Division and the Inspections Division were fine with the placards and the color selected. They are fine with the concept as well.

Discussion of 2007 CLG Grant application proposals

Mr. Wisemiller: I sent out an e-mail to Commission members sending the Strategic Historic Preservation Plan for Greenville, North Carolina as well as the 2006-2007 CLG Grant Application. Based on feedback, I would suggest a survey and research report for a district.

Dr. Chestnut: I am more interested in making sure the existing districts function as historic districts.

Ms. Pearce: How about we redid the last year's grant for a citywide survey only we added reasons that we thought identified a comprehensive preservation plan that would be good for the whole City. The plan would be like the North Carolina Preservation Plan but downsize it for the City of Greenville. The plan would include ethnicity, heritage and other things. There are some outlying parcels that also would be products that we could identify that may not be stand alone historic districts but would fall under a citywide preservation plan. Please let me know if I can assist in any way.

Dr. Chestnut: I like that idea.

The Commission agreed and asked Mr. Wisemiller to move forward with these directives for the 2007 CLG Grant application.

December HPC Meeting

Motion was made by Ms. Candace Pearce and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to cancel the December Historic Preservation Commission meeting due to the holidays. Motion carried unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER

Mr. Wisemiller: Greenville was selected for 2008 as one of the three cities for the State Historic Preservation Office's training sites.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Wisemiller
Planner