

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
MAY 25, 2016**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; Cindy Adams; David Arneke; Tracy Pratt;  
Ann Stringfield; Linda Lane and David Hoggard.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mike Cowhig and Stefan-Leih Geary, Planning Department. Also present  
was Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office.

Chair Wharton explained the procedures used at the Historic Preservation meetings.

Speakers were sworn or affirmed as to their testimony in the following matters.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that the absence of Wayne Smith was excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 30, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:**

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the April 27, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Adams, Arneke, Pratt, Stringfield, Hoggard, Lane. Nays: None.

**Historic District Violations**

Mike Cowhig submitted a listing of the current Historic District Violations as of 5/25/16. The listing also updated the progress of each violation. He stated that Ron Fields and Beth Benton, Code Compliance Office, are in attendance to answer questions from the Board members. He explained that the Historic District Program is a zoning overlay and it falls under the Zoning Ordinance and is enforced by the Zoning Enforcement Officers. He feels that good progress is being made in their efforts but there are always enforcement cases to be addressed.

Beth Benton, Compliance Coordinator, stated that she just wished to back up what Mike Cowhig has already stated. The cases on the list provided shows that actions have been taken on these and Notices of Violation(s) have been issued. These matters will go through the Minimum Housing Standards Commission for decisions to be made, if necessary. If cases are not in compliance, they must go through the proper process.

Mr. Hoggard stated it would be helpful if there were dates on each project on the list indicating when the work was started. Mike Cowhig responded that he would do that in the future.

**Public Hearings:**

**APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA) PUBLIC HEARING:**

- (a) **Location: 442 S. Mendenhall Street**  
**Application Number 1956**  
**Applicant: Parker Washburn**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 4-06-16**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace slate roof with asphalt shingles.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff has spoken with a roofer that specializes in this type of slate roofing and he did the repairs at 919 Spring Garden Street. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs* (pages 51-53) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing resource in the College Hill National Register Historic District. Originally it housed a fire station that served the West End section of the city. The building features a slate roof and decorative rafter tails. Although the slate roof is not necessarily a character defining feature, it is the original historic material and helps to define the building's overall historic character. Only a few of these fire stations from the 1920s and 1930s survive in Greensboro. Clearly, they were designed to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Slate was typically the roofing material.

**Guidelines (page 51-53):**

1. *Retain and preserve original roof form, pitch, overhang, and significant features such as chimneys, dormers, turrets, cornices, balustrades, and window's walks.*
2. *Preserve and maintain historic roofing materials that are essential in defining the architecture of a historic structure, such as clay "mission files" or patterned slate. If replacement is necessary, replace only the deteriorated material with new material to match the original..*
3. *Retain historic roofing materials such as asbestos shingles, metal shingles, and standing seam metal roofing. If replacement is necessary due to deterioration, substitute roofing materials such as composition shingles are appropriate. Sine historic roofing materials were traditionally dark in color, light colored composition shingles are not appropriate in the Historic Districts.*
4. *Preserve and maintain original roof details such as decorative rafter tails, crown moldings, soffit boards, or cresting. If replacement is necessary, the new detail should match the original.*
5. *Maintain traditional gutter and downspout systems. For example, repair concealed or built-in gutters rather than replacing them with exposed gutters.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

- (1) The copper flashing will be used in the new installation at the drip edge, the chimneys, the valleys, and the color of the asphalt shingles to be used will be dark gray.
- (2) The architectural ornamental design features on the ends of the peak of the roof at the gable ends will be retained.
- (3) The ridge detail will be maintained and the ridge cap will be retained.

**In Support:**

Parker Washburn, 1007 N. Elm Street  
Zack Meyers, 6402 McLeansville Road

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1956 for work at 442 S. Mendenhall Street. The applicant and owner is Parker Washburn. The description of work was to replace the slate roof with asphalt shingles. Staff does not recommend in favor of granting this COA and in their opinion, the work is incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Roofs*(pages 51-53) for the following reasons: *This is a contributing resource in the College Hill National Register Historic*

*District. Originally it housed a fire station that served the West End section of the city. The building features a slate roof and decorative rafter tails. Although the slate roof is not necessarily a character defining feature, it is the original historic material and helps to define the building's overall historic character. Only a few of these fire stations from the 1920s and 1930s survive in Greensboro. Clearly, they were designed to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Slate was typically for the roofing material.* Speaking in support was Parker Washburn, the applicant, who noted that she had done repairs last year in the amount of \$6,000 and had a bid to repair the slate roof for \$18,000 for slate and the cost for replacing with asphalt would be \$8,000. About 20 – 30% of the slate roof is failing in various places. There was no one speaking in opposition.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Arneke stated that he has seen the types of asphalt shingles presented by the applicant on another structure and they are very close looking to the original slate shingles. He would have no objection to these asphalt shingles being used on the subject property. Mr. Hoggard stated that he would be amenable to the use of these shingles if the flashing could be maintained with copper to maintain the original look as it would add to the authenticity of the repair. Zack Meyers, the roofing contractor, stated that they would re-do all the flashing in copper, the valleys around the chimneys and the peak pitch of the roof will be maintained without ridge vents on the front, but will be on the rear portion of the roof. The architectural wood detail on the roof will also be retained.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Hoggard moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1956 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments, discussions, and *Guideline 1, 2, and 3* on page 25 are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Hoggard moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1956 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Parker Washburn for work at 442 S. Mendenhall Street, to follow the guidelines as presented, with the condition that copper flashing will be used, and the architectural ridge detail at the ends of the roof will be kept and maintained, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**(b) Location: 218 South Park Drive  
Application Number 1972  
Applicant: Jennifer Weathersby  
Property Owner: Same  
Date Application Received: 4-28-16  
(APPROVED WITHOUT CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Rebuild chimneys that have been parged and stuccoed.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. This house is unusual because it was original built as a duplex so there are twin porches on the structure. The front chimney is exposed on the front wall of the house and is an original feature. When the house was renovated and the front porches were removed and the side of the porch was closed in they stuccoed these chimneys and parged them. In the past, this was a fairly common way to do renovation work on old houses. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys* (page 48) for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The chimneys help define the character of the house.

**Guidelines (page 48):**

1. *Preserve the shape, size, materials, and details of character-defining chimneys and foundations and other masonry/stone features. Significant chimney details include features such as brick corbelling, terra cotta chimney pots, and decorative caps.*
6. *It is not appropriate to shorten or remove original chimneys when they become deteriorated. Chimneys and furnace stacks that are not essential to the character of the structure, or that were added later, may be removed if it will not diminish the original design of the rood, or destroy historic details.*

**In Support:**

Jennifer Weathersby, 218 South Park Drive

Ann Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1972 for work at 218 South Park Drive. The applicant is Jennifer Weathersby and the description of work is to rebuild chimneys that have been parged and stuccoed. City staff recommended in support of the COA and in their opinion, the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)*, for the following reasons: *This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The chimneys help define the character of the house.* At some point in the history of the house, there had been alterations and the front porches removed and closed in and stucco applied to the foundation and front chimney. Rebuilding the chimneys would match the original design and the historic character of the house. Speaking in support of the application was Jennifer Weathersby, the applicant; and Ann Bowers, stating that the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association supports the request. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Adams moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1972 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under *Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page 48)*, #1 and #6, for the following reasons: *This is a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District. The chimneys help define the character of the house* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Adams moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1972 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jennifer Weathersby for work at 218 South Park Drive, seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

- (c) **Location:** 622-624 N. Elm Street  
**Application Number** 1971  
**Applicant:** Geri Petit  
**Property Owner:** Magnolia Place at Fisher Park Condominium Association, Inc.  
**Date Application Received:** 5-11-16  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Replace existing windows with simulated divided light, double-hung vinyl windows..

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. The windows installed have not held up well and are badly deteriorated. Staff feels that the windows were inferior quality of new growth wood products; this building was built without roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features that would help shed water so the windows don't get wet. Staff met with the Homeowner's Association and looked at what they are proposing and feel that the windows they are proposing, for a lot of reasons, will still meet the guidelines for new construction. This is a non-contributing structure and, in this case, the windows are somewhat recessed within the brick wall and the new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—New Construction (page 77)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

These buildings were constructed in 2005 so they are "non-contributing". The windows are wood and have not held up well for a number of reasons including the inferior quality of new growth wood products. There are no roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features designed to keep water away from the windows. Other window options such as aluminum or vinyl clad or fiberglass would be significantly more expensive than vinyl windows and would not have the look of original designed windows. The new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. Because the sashes are so large and there is such a high percentage of glass versus frame, the material itself should not be easily distinguishable. The sash will have muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass so the artificial look of interior muntins will be avoided. The visual impact of the new windows on the character of the building and the historic district should be negligible. The buildings should still meet the guidelines for new construction and a chronic maintenance problem will be resolved.

**Guidelines:**

4. *Design the spacing, pattern, proportion, size, and detailing of windows, doors, and vents to be compatible with existing historic examples within the district.*
5. *Incorporate architectural elements and details that provide human scale to proposed new buildings. Design new buildings using exterior materials typical of historic buildings in the districts including brick, wood, stucco, and stone. Materials such as steel, cast stone, fiber cement, and concrete are appropriate for new construction if they are used in a manner compatible with construction techniques and finishes used for historic buildings in the district. It is not appropriate to substitute vinyl or aluminum siding in place of traditional materials typical of the district.*

**Conditions:**

- 1) That the proposed Simulated Divided light windows also have a shadow bar between the glass.
- 2) That Commissioner Hoggard be involved with staff in the selection of the proposed windows.

**In Support:**

Jim Smothers, 5328 Groometown Road

Geri Petit, 622-A N. Elm Street

Ann Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, Fisher Park Neighborhood Association

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1971 for work at 622-624 N. Elm Street. The applicant is Geri Petit. The description of work is to replace existing windows with simulated divided light, double-hung vinyl windows. City staff recommends granting this COA. In their opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines— New Construction* (page 77) #4 and #5, for the following reasons: *These buildings were constructed in 2005 so they are “non-contributing”. The windows are wood and have not held up well for a number of reasons including the inferior quality of new growth wood products. There are no roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features designed to keep water away from the windows. Other window options such as aluminum or vinyl clad or fiberglass would be significantly more expensive than vinyl windows. The new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. Because the sashes are so large and there is such a high percentage of glass versus frame, the material itself should not be easily distinguishable. The sash will have muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass so the artificial look of interior muntins will be avoided. The visual impact of the new windows on the character of the building and the historic district should be negligible. The buildings should still meet the guidelines for new construction and a chronic maintenance problem will be resolved.* Speaking in support was Jim Smothers, Geri Petit and Ann Bowers. There was no one speaking in opposition.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Pratt stated that he would support the application if the Homeowner's Association could provide a full sample of the proposed window, including all of the paning systems, trim and accessories that go along with it. It sounds as if there may be cases where only the sashes are being replaced and other places where the frame and brick mold will be replaced. With that being the case he thinks whatever paning system the window unit has would need to match the profile of the brick mold. He also agrees that there needs to be a shadow bar between the glass, and staff can approve the actual window selection. Mr. Hoggard stated that he would like to be involved in the window selection by staff.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Arneke moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1971 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under Historic District Design Guidelines— *New Construction* (page 77) #4 and #5, for the following reasons: *These buildings were constructed in 2005 so they are “non-contributing”. The windows are wood and have not held up well for a number of reasons including the inferior quality of new growth wood products. There are no roof overhangs, drip caps or other construction features designed to keep water away from the windows. Other window options such as aluminum or vinyl clad or fiberglass would be significantly more expensive than vinyl windows. The new windows will maintain the design and dimensions of the existing windows. Because the sash are so large and there is such a high percentage of glass versus frame, the material itself should not be easily distinguishable. The sash will have muntins permanently attached to the interior and exterior of the glass so the artificial look of interior muntins will be avoided. The visual impact of the new windows on the character of the building and the historic district should be negligible. The buildings should still meet the guidelines for new construction and a chronic maintenance problem will be resolved* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1971 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Geri Petit for work at 622-624 N. Elm Street with the following conditions that the proposed simulated divided light windows with a shadow bar between the glass, and that the staff and Commissioner Hoggard will look at the sample window to ensure that they are in keeping with the guidelines, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Hoggard. Nays: Stringfield.)

- (d) **Location: 918 Carr Street**  
**Application Number 1967**  
**Applicant: Carl Robbins**  
**Date Application Received: 5-19-16**  
**(CONTINUED TO JUNE MEETING)**

**Description of Work:**

Foundation was parged (covered with cement)

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends against granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff received a report that the front foundation was parged and covered with cement. This is a contributing structure in the College Hill National Register of Historic Districts. The foundation had cement put on it from previous repointing jobs and the owner was trying to correct that issue. However, it is clearly stated in the guidelines that masonry and stone, painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry and can accelerate deterioration. There is no recommendation for an alternative treatment because once a foundation is parged, it is difficult to reverse the results. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Masonry and Stone: Foundations and Chimneys (page48) #4, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The brick foundation has been covered with cement.

**Guidelines:**

4. Painting or applying coatings such as cement or stucco to exposed masonry/stone is not appropriate because it will change the historic appearance of the masonry/stone feature, and can accelerate deterioration. Previously painted surfaces may remain painted.

**In Support:**

Carl Robbins, 918 Carr Street

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Pratt stated that the work was done without a COA and is in violation of the guidelines and this work is something that cannot be un-done, he thought there should be some consequence. Counsel Jones stated that if the Commission approves the COA there would be no fine, however, if the Commission chooses to not approve the COA, a fine may be in order because they are in violation. The City could give the owner time to see if he could remove the parging. Mr. Arneke pointed out that even if he removes the parging that is still not going to address the deterioration to the foundation. There was a suggestion that maybe this matter should be continued to give the owner a chance to see if other alternatives could be used on this property.

Mr. Robbins stated that he bought this house over 40 years ago and this is the original foundation. He tried to get rid of the old and ugly foundation and this was the only thing he could think of to address the deterioration of the foundation. He would like input and advice from the Commission on better ideas for addressing this matter. Ms. Adams suggested that it may be possible for the foundation to be covered in an antique brick to make it look better.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Arneke moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission continue this application to allow the applicant an opportunity to investigate other means of covering the foundation and the paving and report back to staff with his results, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**(e) Location: 909 Morehead Avenue  
Application Number 1975  
Applicant: Ken Baucom  
Date Application Received: 5-11-16  
(APPROVED WITH NO CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

A concrete block retaining wall was constructed along the driveway.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. This is an after-the-fact application for a low wall constructed along the driveway of this property. This occurred during landscape renovations at the property and in trying to hold soil, they constructed this low wall. This is a non-contributing building in the College Hill Historic District and the property owner came before the Commission some time ago concerning the wall in front of the property at the sidewalk. Staff has been working with him since that time to try to come up with a solution to that issue. The Neighborhood Association would like for the tree to be saved, but the roots are causing the problem with the front wall. Staff has talked with the Field Operations Department about the idea of rebuilding that wall and moving it out slightly to give the tree a little more room. The new property owner is working with staff on that and a final determination is needed from Field Ops before they can move ahead with that idea. If that is accepted, staff would recommend a low wall of landscape blocks that sit directly on the sidewalk that would come down to meet the existing low wall at the driveway. In the staff's opinion the proposed work is not incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines—Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24) #4, for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

A low wall of landscape blocks was built along the driveway. While natural stone or brick is preferred for construction of retaining walls, landscape blocks of concrete can sometimes be an affordable option that is reasonably compatible with the character of the historic districts.

**Guidelines:**

4. Introduce new retaining walls constructed of brick, stone, or concrete in a design consistent with the property and the neighborhood. It is not appropriate to construct retaining walls of inappropriate materials such as landscape timbers, railroad ties, or concrete blocks where visible from the street.

**In Support:**

None.



**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1975 for work at 909 Morehead Avenue. The applicant is Ken Baucom. The description of work is that a concrete retaining wall was constructed along the driveway during landscape renovations. City staff recommends granting this COA. In their opinion, the proposed work is not incongruous with the Historic District Design Guidelines— Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24) #5 for the following reasons: A low wall of landscape blocks was built along the driveway. While natural stone or brick is preferred for construction of retaining walls, landscape blocks of concrete can sometimes be an affordable option that is reasonably compatible with the character of the historic districts.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Wharton pointed out that the applicant needs to be mindful of choosing materials that match so there aren't several different kinds of wall materials used, as well as the height of the wall construction should taper down to match the new wall construction. Ms. Stringfield stated that the applicant has done a good job on the new low wall. Mike Cowhig stated that Justin Clinton who is an engineer and an arborist is involved in this so he will be providing guidance on this project.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Lane moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1975 and the public hearing the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is not incongruous with the Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines and that staff comments as submitted and guidelines under Historic District Design Guidelines— Fences, Walls and Site Features (page 24) #4, for the following reasons: A low wall of landscape blocks was built along the driveway. While natural stone or brick is preferred for construction of retaining walls, landscape blocks of concrete can sometimes be an affordable option that is reasonably compatible with the character of the historic districts are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Lane moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1975 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ken Baucom for work at 909 Morehead Avenue, related to the after-the-fact low wall construction, seconded by Mr. Hoggard. The Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Lane, Arneke, Pratt, Adams, Stringfield, Hoggard. Nays: None.)

**PROPOSED AYCOCK UPDATE: (RECOMMENDED)**

Stefan-Leih Geary stated that the 2016-2019 Plan for the Aycock Neighborhood and the Neighborhood Association and residents have been working very hard over the last 4 months to get to this point. They will go before City Council on June 7<sup>th</sup> with a recommendation for or against. This is a Plan that builds on a Plan that has been in place for about 13 years, the Strategic Plan for Aycock Neighborhood. That Plan was derived from some other planning work that had been done in the neighborhood and had some larger goals. They tried to stay in keeping with the spirit of that plan but there have been some new initiatives since that time. In this new Plan, there are 6 goals; enhance the neighborhood gateways; neighborhood identity; preserve historic architecture; preserve the historic neighborhood setting; neighborhood amenities; safety and security. One of the most changed initiatives is to preserve historic architecture. The goal of the previous plan was to preserve historic architecture, but in this new Plan, there is now a specific recommendation that a program be put in place that would allow some of the municipal service district dollars to be used to acquire property that could then have some easements or restrictive covenants put in place by 919 Spring Garden Street house as a model, and the City's Redevelopment Program, kind of looking back to

those earlier years. Aycock was never a redevelopment area like College Hill but with the use of Municipal Service District funds some more work could be done in a similar vein to redevelopment work. The other piece that is in this Plan is that the neighborhood has shown support for setting aside some MSD funding to look and potentially fund the ordinance to prevent the demolition by neglect order, which has been on the books for a number of years. There are also initiatives with Sternberger Park, under Neighborhood Amenities, which is a huge asset to the neighborhood, Safety and Security continues to be an on-going objective in the neighborhood. Over the years they have looked at signage, security camera types of installations; some things have come to fruition and some have not. Enhanced neighborhood gateways is part of the neighborhood branding effort, as that area is in a catch-22 right now with being able to move forward with branding and signage. There is a lot of discussion about the origins of the neighborhood's name; potentially Aycock Middle school's name may be changed in the future. The neighborhood is not directly named for Governor Aycock, it is named for the historic institution that's within the neighborhood boundaries. Preserve the Neighborhood Setting focuses on things like period street lights.

Mr. Arneke stated that they have worked very closely with Stefan-Leih in terms of understanding the new legislation and how that is working, and also the public process in making sure that everyone in the neighborhood has an opportunity to weigh in on the money that is being spent. There were two public meetings where every property owner was invited to attend and a lot of valuable feedback was obtained through those meetings.

Stefan-Leigh stated that the Planning Board will also hold an informational meeting and June 7<sup>th</sup> it will go before the City Council meeting. There has been a great effort to reach out to property owners and the Neighborhood Association also reaches out to residents that may not be property owners in the area.

The public was invited to speak on the Plan.

Patima Abelgasin stated that she is attending today's meeting as a class project. She wanted to know why there is no money for safety and security? Stefan-Leih stated that the neighborhood did not identify in this budget year, any specific needs in that particular area. So the Municipal Service Dollars have to be spent in ways that enhance the historic character of the district, so there is a constraint on the use of the funds.

Mr. Arneke stated that he would like to recognize the City's Planning Department for their work on the neighborhood plan.

Mr. Hoggard moved to recommend the proposed Aycock Neighborhood Plan, as presented by staff, seconded by Ms. Stringfield. The Commission voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Hoggard, Pratt, Arneke, Smith, Adams, Stringfield. Nays: None.

#### **ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIR:**

None.

#### **ITEMS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

#### **ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Hanna Cockburn said that the Southeast Building on the corner of Elm Street and Market Street has been beautifully restored after being vacant for close to 10 years. He indicated that the Planning Director is very interested in applying for an award under the American Planning Association's "Great Places Contest" in the category under Great Historic Renovations. This is a People's Choice award. A panel will narrow the finalists down to six and then the voting will begin for the award.

The project has been selected and will be recognized in the state legislature in June as part of Town Hall Day and there will be a local ceremony here and will also be included in the North Carolina Planning Association State Chapter Conference in September.

Mr. Cowhig asked for help from the Commission to get the word out about the People's Choice voting for the contest. Ms. Adams suggested engaging readers on the O'Henry Magazine's Facebook page for recognition of the award.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:jd