

## **GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES**

October 23, 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	N. Yaprak Savut
Greg Jarrell	Franceine Rees	Richard Weir
Jeremy Jordan, Chair	Dale Sauter	Chris Woelkers

### **COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Rick Smiley

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sandy Gale Edmundson, Secretary; Bill Little, Assistant City Attorney; Thom Moton, Assistant City Manager; and Tom Wisemiller, Planner

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Michael Barberio, Beverly Harris, and Webb Spilman

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2007**

Motion was made by Ms. Candace Pearce and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell to approve the September 25, 2007 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No public comments were made.

### **CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)**

#### **COA Application 07-08 (2909 Memorial Drive)**

Mr. Jordan: The first COA application is for 2909 Memorial Drive.

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

Mr. Wisemiller: COA Application 07-08 was submitted by Michael Barberio for 2909 Memorial Drive for previous window replacement. One of Greenville's better examples of twentieth century Colonial Revival architecture, the 2.3-acre Oakmont property is

representative of early exurban growth trends in the area, especially around the Greenville Country Club. Designed by the architectural firm of Benton & Benton of Wilson, NC, the two-story brick house, built in 1930, was the second home of Albion Dunn (1883 – 1968). Sited about 200-feet from the Memorial Drive, the house is screened behind the trees and shrubs of the well landscaped front lot.

In reference to the original windows, the Survey & Research Report commented: “All windows have brick sills, soldier arches, and double-hung sash, most with twelve-over-twelve lights. Louvered shutters incised with a single acorn motif flank each window on the west, south, and north elevations . . . [the] west elevation [of the sun porch] has distinctive paired casement windows flanking a central door opening onto the porch. All other sun room windows are twelve-light single casement ones surmounted by three-light transoms.”

Other architectural features mentioned in the Survey & Research Report include: “Georgian elements highlight the exterior of the dwelling with symmetrical fenestration. A gable roof protects the house’s five bay main block and hip roof . . . an impressive Georgian central entrance with fluted pilasters capped by Corinthian capitals, a broken ogee pediment, and a pineapple finial. Its recessed doorway has raised-panel soffits, transom with fanlight, and six-panel door.”

The subject property is located on the east side of Memorial Drive, within a short distance of the Greenville Country Club. Oakmont is a Local Landmark and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The applicant requests approval for previous replacement of original windows with vinyl replacement windows.

### Considerations

The original windows, which were mostly 12-over-12 divided light wood windows, were replaced by vinyl efficiency, hurricane-rated, double-hung, double-pane windows with 12-over-12 artificial muntins inside the panes (not true divided light). The applicant has preserved the original windows, which he keeps in storage on the property.

According to the applicant, the original windows had been painted shut, were warped & rotted from water damage, and that many of the panes were falling out as a result. The applicant was also concerned that the windows had once been coated with lead-based paint; that the condition of the windows contributed to exorbitantly high utility bills; and that they were a safety hazard to his family.

The applicant claims that, in general, when he purchased the property, the dwelling was in a serious state of disrepair. According to the Survey & Research Report (October 2000) for the property: “Oakmont stands in reasonably good condition but in need of extensive exterior and interior repairs due to moisture damage from roof and gutter

failures. Recent storms have compounded this damage to exterior cornices, balustrades, and interior plaster.” The applicant stated that upon moving into the dwelling, he initiated a series of emergency-type repairs to make the dwelling safe and habitable for his family, including replacement of windows, unaware that the property was a Local Landmark and that it was necessary to receive an approved COA prior to making the relevant changes. In the last year, the applicant has been granted MWCOA approval from staff to complete a number of historically appropriate repairs and/or improvements to the property, which have contributed to a sizable investment in the property.

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.
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.

### Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission *continue* the Certificate of Appropriateness for previous replacement of original windows with vinyl windows, at 2909 S. Memorial Drive, based on the following findings:

The feasibility of retaining and preserving the original windows and details by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated sections and/or replacing only those elements that are deteriorated should be explored in greater detail.

Even if replacement of the windows is found to be necessary, the replacement windows do not duplicate the original units in material and design and include the use of artificial muntins. The new windows diminish the original design of the building and damage the historic openings. The new windows are not compatible with existing units in terms of materials and details.

Recommended Motion: Continue request for approval of previously installed vinyl replacement windows until such time as applicant can repair and/or restore and then reinstall the original windows; or, upon a finding of the Historic Preservation Commission that the windows cannot be feasibly repaired and reinstalled, that the application be continued until such time as applicant proposes to install historically appropriate replacement windows.

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

Mr. Michael Barberio told the Commission that he had no idea he could not fix his house to make it suitable to live in. When I purchased the property, Larry Barber was the executor of the estate for Mrs. Dunn and he noticed there was a plaque in the house that had Greenville Historic Properties on the plaque. Mr. Barber would have been here tonight, but due to the recent shooting, he could not attend. It was brought to Mr. Nichols attention also. The Humber House was called and they said that since the house was not in the historic district, there was no obligation to do anything that would require approval from the Commission. I don't know David Nichols, but it is my understanding that he knew the property was designated under the selling of the house. I brought some pictures to share with the Commission. A lot of the slate roof shingles have blown off. I have had repairs done to it. The point I am making is I had no idea. The windows have been painted over and over again. I wanted to maintain the integrity of the house of perhaps how it once stood. Special molding was made for the outside. Even showing the house, they did not want to drive under the carport because of the danger of it. The house has not been too safe. It has been totally neglected. I kept the windows and they are in storage. I have spent \$60,000.00 in repairs and I have depleted all of my resources. I checked into the repairing the existing windows, but it would have cost me thousands of dollars.

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

Dr. Chestnut: Do you get tax breaks for the things that you have done?

Mr. Barberio: I did not take any tax breaks nor did I inquire about them. I purchased the house to put a roof over my family.

Ms. Pearce: Do you understand the historic significance of the house?

Mr. Barberio: I do now.

Ms. Pearce: It is a stand alone historic property.

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

Ms. Pearce: The Design Review Committee believes that vinyl windows contradict the Design Guidelines. There is no subjectivity.

Mr. Jordan: Is there a motion as to the Findings of Fact?

Motion was made by Ms. Franceine Rees and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell 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 Dr. Dennis Chestnut and seconded by Mr. Chris Woelkers to continue COA 07-08 for 2909 Memorial Drive submitted by Michael Barberio as recommended by Staff for applicant to continue the application for approval of previously installed vinyl replacement windows until such time as applicant can repair and/or restore and then reinstall the original windows; or, upon a finding of the Historic Preservation Commission that the windows cannot be feasibly repaired and reinstalled, that the application be continued until such time as the applicant proposes to install historically appropriate replacement windows. The applicant will come back in sixty days with some plan of action during such time penalties will cease. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jarrell: The applicant may want to look into the cost of unlisting the property as a Greenville Historic Property.

#### **COA Application 07-09 (407 Rotary Avenue)**

Mr. Jordan: The second COA application is for 407 Rotary Avenue.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Dr. Beverly Harris and Tom Wisemiller.

Mr. Wisemiller: COA Application 07-09 submitted by Dr. Beverly Harris for 407 Rotary Avenue to restore the porch and garage to be consistent with their original designs as illustrated in the architectural blueprints, to alter the roof pitch of the family room addition of the dwelling, to replace the iron posts on the rear porch of the family room addition with wooden posts, and to repair and/or replace the gutters. Located on the east side of Rotary Avenue about a half-block up from E. Fifth Street, the house at 407 Rotary Street was constructed in 1934 by Jack H. Spain. Spain was a prominent lawyer, mayor of Greenville (1939-1940), and political aide in Washington, DC. According to the National Register survey & research report, the house is a well-executed brick Craftsman Bungalow “distinguished primarily by a cross-gable roof, gable-roof stoop with an arched transom above the front door, and arched windows on a side sun porch.” A chimney on the front façade has decorative brickwork.

The applicant requests approval to restore the porch and garage to be consistent with their original designs as illustrated in the architectural blueprints; to alter the roof pitch of the family room addition of the dwelling; to replace the iron posts on the rear porch of the family room addition with wooden posts; and to repair and/or replace the gutters.

### Considerations

First, the applicant plans to restore the porch according to the specifications of the original blueprints for the dwelling by removing the three windows and the front door from the arches in the brick porch (currently a sun porch), which were originally designed to be open. The applicant proposes to remove the 1960s-era wood and glass door with transom as well as the arched, 20-pane, divided light windows. The applicant would remove the iron railing on the front steps; the applicant would then either install wood posts and railings for the steps, to be compatible with historic dwelling, or would not install railings. Within the three arched openings previously filled by the windows, the applicant would install six wood posts over a wood base to support wood railings as illustrated in the original blueprints.

Second, the applicant also proposes to remove the windows and door from the rear garage finished office, restoring its original function as an auto garage, also to the specifications of the original blueprints for the garage.

Third, the applicant plans to convert the roof on the family room addition from a flat roof to a pitched roof to compliment the existing main roofline; and the applicant plans to replace the iron railings on the rear porch of the family room addition with (approximately) 4 x 4 white coated wood posts.

Fourth, the applicant proposes to repair and/or replace all of the gutters. The applicant will paint repaired gutters white to match the existing trim and gutters and/or will install new white gutters to replace deteriorated sections as needed.

One question to consider is whether the windows and/or doors on the existing sun porch and garage have acquired significance in their own right. Is it principally the arches that give the porch and garage their significance, or do the windows and doors add to the significance of those structures?

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2	Roofs	13

1. Retain and preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs.
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.

8. Generally, it is not appropriate to replace concealed, or built-in, gutters with exposed gutters.
9. It is not appropriate to introduce new roof features, such as skylights, vents, soffits vents, and dormers, if they would diminish the original design of the roof or damage historic roofing materials or features.
10. If new gutters and downspouts are necessary, install them so that no original architectural features of the structure are damaged or lost.
11. Coat replacement gutters and downspouts with paint or a baked-enamel finish in a color appropriate to the color of the house, unless they are made of copper. They shall match historic size and profile whenever possible.

<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.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2	Porches, Entrances, Balconies	23

1. Retain and preserve historic porches, entrances, and balconies.
2. Retain and preserve all architectural features that are character defining elements of porches, entrances, and balconies, including piers, columns, pilasters, balustrades, rails, steps, brackets, soffits, and trim.
9. It is not appropriate to enclose front porches or balconies.
11. It is not appropriate to add elements or details to a porch or an entrance in an attempt to create false historical appearance.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2	Garages and Outbuildings	25

1. Retain and preserve historic garages and outbuildings.
2. Retain and preserve all architectural features that are character defining elements of garages and outbuildings, including foundations, steps, roof form, windows, doors, architectural trim, and lattices.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other building, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historical significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

### Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission *approve* the Certificate of Appropriateness to restore the porch and garage to be consistent with their original designs as illustrated in the architectural blueprints; to alter the roof pitch of the family room addition of the dwelling; to replace the iron posts on the rear porch of the family room addition with wooden posts; and to repair and/or replace the gutters, at 407 Rotary Street, based on the following findings:

The windows and door in the arched openings of the existing sun porch have not acquired historical significance in their own right and therefore it is not necessary to retain and preserve these features. The brick arches, which are significant, character defining elements, will be retained and preserved in accordance with the original design intent. Based on the current *Design Guidelines*, it would not be considered appropriate to install the existing windows and door in the arched openings if they had not already been added in the past. The removal of these elements and/or details will not create a false historical appearance.

The windows and door of the garage have not acquired historical significance in their own right and therefore it is not necessary to retain and preserve these features, either. The character defining elements of the garage - the foundation, roof form, and architectural trim will be retained and preserved.

The roof on the family room addition is not historic and therefore it is not necessary to retain and preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of this roof as long as the new roof is compatible with the historic dwelling. Replacement of deteriorated gutters will not damage any of the original architectural features of the historic structure; the replacement gutters will be painted white - a color appropriate to the color of the house - and will match the size and profile of the gutters on the historic dwelling. The use of wooden posts on the rear porch of the family room addition will be compatible with historic dwelling and will not create a false historical appearance.

Recommended Motion: Approval of request to restore the porch and garage to be consistent with the original architectural blueprints, to alter the roof pitch of the family room addition of the dwelling, to replace the iron posts on the rear porch of the family room addition with wooden posts, and to replace the gutters on the family room addition.

Mr. Jordan: Would the applicant like to speak?



Dr. Harris: I would like to remove the existing windows and door on the front porch which were added to make a sunroom and restore to original front porch with railings. The driveway on the right side of the house with the garage converted to an office. Restore to an original garage by removing added windows, door, and brick below windows that does not match existing brick. The family room addition added to the back of the house years after the house was built will have its flat roof changed to a pitched roof that fits into the existing roofline. The iron posts will be changed to wooden posts. The existing trim will be painted and repaired and the gutters will be replaced.

Mr. Jordan: Is there anybody here to speak in favor or opposition to the request? What is the Design Review Committee's recommendation?

Ms. Pearce: The Design Review Committee believes that this is a wonderful project and the house should have a pitched roof.

Mr. Jordan: Is there a motion as to the Findings of Fact?

Motion was made by Ms. Franceine Rees and seconded by Ms. Candace Pearce that the Findings of Fact for COA application 07-09 is congruent with the Design Guidelines. Motion carried unanimously.

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

Motion was made by Ms. Franceine Rees and seconded by Dr. Dennis Chestnut to approve COA application 07-09 for 407 Rotary Avenue submitted by Dr. Beverly Harris. Motion carried unanimously.

The Commission commended Dr. Harris for her work in the district.

### **COA Application 07-10 (1001 E. Third Street)**

Mr. Jordan: The third COA application is for 1001 East Third Street.

The Notary Public, Sandy Gale Edmundson, swore in Webb Spilman and Tom Wisemiller.

Mr. Wisemiller: COA Application 07-10 submitted by A. Movahed for 1001 East Third Street for previous door replacement.

Reminiscent of the Cape Code style, this small frame house has a central chimney, gabled dormers and classical door surround on the front entry. The house is covered with asbestos shingles. A gable-end wing has had a door added to the front façade side to accommodate the apartment function of the house. A shed dormer traverses the rear elevation. The property lies at the northeast corner of E. Third Street and S. Rotary Avenue.

The applicant requests approval for previous replacement of non-original door with new door.

### Considerations

In April 2007, staff was informed that the front door at 1001 E. Third Street was being replaced. The owner of the property had not submitted a COA prior to beginning this work. During a site visit to the property, staff met with Webb Spilman, a carpenter who was in the process of making repairs to the door surround at 1001 E. Third Street. Staff approved a Minor Works COA to repair the exterior wood door surround using in-kind material. Staff also observed that the door that had been removed was in poor condition and that it was not likely to have been the original door (it consisted of light weight material and appeared to be of a relatively recent design). Subsequently, staff informed the applicant in writing that it was necessary to submit a COA prior to making exterior changes to properties in the local historic district. The applicant stated that he was unaware that he needed a COA to make this type of repair.

In completing the COA, the applicant stated that it had been his intention to replace the previous (non-original) six panel exterior door, which was approximately 12 years old, with a similar style door that would be more durable. According to him, the storm door had been destroyed by tenants and as a result the previous wood replacement door suffered gradual deterioration as well. The replacement door is a six panel faux-wood steel door. The door and Classical surround have been painted the same color - cocoa brown. Based on a 2005 photo of the property from the property inventory database, it appears that applicant has brought the new door closer up to the front of the classical door surround than it was previously, which now would make it difficult to install a storm door; apparently, the intention is for the steel door to be an "all in one," safer, low cost, solution to the above described problems.

Staff research suggests that, were the replacement door at 1001 E. Third Street an all wood door with recessed panels (rather than the faux-wood steel version), but that all other design elements were the same - paneling, shape, pattern, etc. – the replacement door would be characteristic of doors typically found on Cape Cod-inspired twentieth-century bungalows.

In addition to the issue of door material, another question that might be considered in this case is whether the door at 1001 E. Third Street should contrast with its door surround. Early Colonial-era Cape Cod dwellings, which were some of the first dwellings built in America, tended to have simple, narrow wood frames as door surrounds. On these modest Cape Cod houses, the dark, unpainted wood doors usually stood in stark contrast to the white-painted wood siding. However, some of the later "high style" Cape Cod residences of the well-to-do had more elaborate Classical or Adams-style door surrounds (often with transoms), and some of these were of the same color as the door. It is not uncommon for twentieth-century bungalows, like the one at 1001 E. Third

Street, to combine different architectural eras of the same general style in an eclectic manner – putting a “high style” Classical door surround on an otherwise simple Cape-Cod inspired dwelling.

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

1. Retain and preserve original windows and doors.
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.
12. It is not appropriate to replace transparent glazing in windows or doors with tinted glazing.
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 the existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, size, materials, and details.
16. It is not appropriate to paint front doors or matching storm or screen doors that were historically stained or varnished unless they have been substantially patched.

On the caption on page 19 of the section on Windows and Doors, the *Design Guidelines* state, “solid paneled wooden exterior doors are typical in the district.”

### Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission *continue* the Certificate of Appropriateness for previously installed replacement door at 1001 E. Third Street, based on the following findings:

The original door had already been replaced some years ago and therefore cannot be retained and preserved. The applicant and staff do not have visual evidence illustrating the design elements of the original door, so there is no means by which to match the replacement door to the original door in size, scale, proportion, pane or panel division, and detail. Nevertheless, the original door very likely would have been either a wood door, or wood and glass door, not a steel door. Although the overall style of the replacement door is compatible with the architecture of the house and the district, the steel material is not compatible and diminishes the original design of the building, in particular the historic Classical wood surround.

The replacement door is a stock item.

The applicant and staff have no way of knowing whether the original door had been stained or varnished; therefore, the fact that the door is painted is not necessarily in conflict with the *Design Guidelines*; however, the application of the same paint color to the replacement door as was applied to the Classical wood door surround, as a means of blending the two elements together, does not sufficiently mitigate the detrimental impact caused by the introduction of the incompatible replacement door.

Recommended Motion: Continuance of request for approval of previously installed replacement door until such time as applicant proposes to install a historically appropriate replacement door.

Mr. Jordan: Would the applicant like to speak?

Mr. Wisemiller: The applicant is not present, but his representative, Mr. Webb Spilman, is here to answer any questions.

Mr. Spilman: Dr. Movahed replaced a 6-panel exterior twelve year old door, 36" x 80", with an identical door and repainted the door and façade using the original color. There were no noticeable aesthetic changes.

Mr. Jordan: Are there any questions of the applicant? Would anybody like to speak in favor or opposition of the request?

Ms. Rees: There have always been two different doors on the front of the house.

Mr. Spilman: There were a lot of additions to the house and muddling to the house.

Mr. Jordan: Why was the door replaced?

Mr. Wisemiller: The tenants had damaged the door and the sun was exposed to excessive sun.

Mr. Spilman: I replaced the door and the owner did not specify a type of door for the replacement.

Mr. Jordan: If there is no more discussion, what does the Design Review Committee recommend?

Ms. Pearce: The Design Review Committee believes a wooden door is needed.

Mr. Jordan: Are the Findings of Fact congruent with the Design Guidelines?

Motion was made by Ms. Candace Pearce and seconded by Mr. Greg Jarrell that the

COA application for the steel door is not congruent with the Design Guidelines. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jordan: If there is no further discussion, is there a motion on the COA 07-10?

Motion was made by Ms. Candace Pearce and seconded by Mr. Richard Weir to amend COA 07-10 for 1001 East Third Street submitted by Dr. A. Movahed to allow the applicant to keep the door for 3 years then the applicant has to replace the door with a wooden door in three years or sooner. Motion carried unanimously.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Design Review Committee**

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

### **Selection Committee**

The Selection Committee met and recommended that Jeffersons and Globe Hardware be locally designated. The White's Theater moved down to the bottom of the list, because they had no interest in being locally designated.

### **Publicity Committee**

The Publicity Committee would like to work with Steve Hawley on a video featuring the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Woelkers: The Tar River/University Neighborhood (TRUNA) prepared a brochure that featured the College View Historic District.

The Commission praised the publication of the brochure.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Minor Works Certificate of Appropriateness (MWCOA) Report**

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

At 404 South Harding Street, replace underground water and sewer line.

At 404 South Harding Street, repair/replace asphalt shingles with in-kind material; repair/replace wood siding with in-kind material.

At 205 South Library Street, change out gas pack (same size unit).

## **Discussion of fall 2007 Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) Applications**

Mr. Wisemiller explained that no completed 2007 Façade Improvement Grants were submitted. Would the Commission like to extend the deadline for applications?

Ms. Pearce recommended that the deadline be extended to allow time for submission of applications. The Commission agreed to extend the deadline.

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

Mr. Wisemiller went over the list of Non-Compliant Historic Properties.

At 407 South Holly Street, cut new doorway prior to/without COA; COA denied; original condition of house must be restored, or applicant must amend COA. First offense fine issued. Staff met with property owner on site to discuss alternative COA proposal. The property owner must submit amended COA within 2 weeks of date of site visit or else additional fines will be issued, or until owner restores original condition.

At 401 South Jarvis Street, installed inappropriate exterior ductwork without COA; after-the-fact February 2007 COA approved by the Commission to house ductwork; however, not yet completed. Letter sent. Staff met with property owner on site to discuss alternative COA proposal. The property owner must submit amended COA within 2 weeks or else additional fines will be issued, or until owner restores original condition.

At 1303 East Fifth Street, the extent of ongoing work all fall under February 2006 MWCOA. Staff discussed with property owner the work in progress. To date, staff has not been presented with evidence that the ongoing work falls outside of previously approved MWCOA. Any deviation from the MWCOA will result in enforcement steps.

At 405 South Summit Street, replaced windows without COA, so a COA was submitted for the November 27, 2007 Commission meeting.

Ms. Pearce mentioned that she believes the address is actually 400 South Summit Street instead of 405 South Summit Street.

Mr. Wisemiller said he would check the address.

At 805 Evans Street, exterior paint job incomplete: paint cracking and falling off; primer coat inappropriate if left exposed. MWCOA approved to repaint exterior in historically appropriate paint colors. Had planned to submit FIG application to help finance the improvements. While application was being reviewed, enforcement was on hold. Now, 30-day clock will resume.

At 1000 East Third Street, COA application approved with conditions; fence must be

removed or be altered to meet conditions of COA. Owner has 30-days from the date of the enforcement letter to alter fence according to conditions of approved COA or to remove the fence.

At 1101 Johnston Street, COA approved on condition that fence be painted; not yet completed. Letter to owner reminding him that August 2005 COA was approved under condition that fence be painted white to match trim; owner given 30-days from the date of letter to meet that condition; if the condition is not met by deadline, fines will be issued on escalating basis.

At 707 East Fourth Street, construction of porch railing and posts without COA were reported. Letter to owner explaining that change to porch required COA; owner given 30-days from the date of letter to submit COA or enforcement measures will be taken.

### **Update on Past Façade Improvement Grant Projects**

Mr. Wisemiller: At 110 West Fifth Street, there are four applications where the applicant has requested an extension.

Ms. Savut: What is the reason for the extension?

Mr. Wisemiller: Usually the applicant has not gotten their construction act together.

Ms. Pearce: I am not in favor of granting an extension without any legitimate reason.

Mr. Wisemiller: At 712 Dickinson Avenue, 714 Dickinson Avenue, and 716 Dickinson Avenue, an extension has been requested because the work had started and structural issues became a problem, so the owner sold the property. The current owner is interested in doing the work with the assistance of the Façade Improvement Grants.

Ms. Savut: Changing ownership is a reason for an extension.

Mr. Jarrell: What determines if we lose the funds?

Ms. Pearce: It is always best to use the grant funds that you have. There is no guarantee that the money will be lost, but money has been taken away before for not putting the money into use.

Dr. Chestnut: What is the process for asking for an extension?

Mr. Wisemiller: The City receives formal requests. The applicant calls into the office with the request and then the applicant is asked to write a letter to the City requesting the extension.

Dr. Chestnut: Is a reason given?

Mr. Wisemiller: Yes.

Dr. Chestnut: I would want to have some criteria for granting an extension.

Ms. Pearce: There needs to be a real reason.

Mr. Jarrell: Applicants can reapply. Perhaps on GTV a bulletin could be typed that funds are available for Façade Improvement Grants, so the public could be made aware.

Dr. Chestnut: Which committee of the Commission reviews the Façade Improvement Grant applications?

Mr. Jordan: The Design Review goes over the applications.

Dr. Chestnut: The Design Review Committee should review the requests for extensions and bring them back to the Commission for approval.

The Commission agreed that Staff should notify those applicants requesting an extension to write a letter stating why the extension is needed.

### **Discussion of “Work in Progress” Notice Placards for the College View Historic District**

Mr. Wisemiller: The recommendation would be to approve the concept and have the Publicity Committee to finalize the design of the “Work in Progress” Notice Placards for the College View Historic District.

The Commission approved the concept and asked that the color of the notice placards be a different color from a building permit notice. The Publicity Committee will finalize the design.

### **Discussion of 2007 Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Application**

Mr. Wisemiller: The Commission should be finalizing ideas for the CLG application.

Ms. Pearce: Could the Commission see a copy of the grant from the previous year?

Mr. Jordan: The Commission should go with whatever will be approved.

Mr. Wisemiller: Final discussions on the grant will be held next month.



**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