

**GREENSBORO HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM  
MELVIN MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
JULY 27, 2016**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Wharton, Chair; David Arneke; Ann Stringfield;  
Linda Lane; Wayne Smith; and Tracy Pratt.

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

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

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Staff noted that the absences Ms. Adams, Ms. Graeber, and Mr. Hoggard were excused.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 29, 2016 REGULAR MEETING:**

Ms. Stringfield moved approval of the June 29, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Smith. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

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

- (a) **Location: 206 Leftwich Street**  
**Application Number 1988**  
**Applicant: Ashley and Hillary Meredith**  
**Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 7-11-16**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Exterior alterations due to fire damage and construction of dormer.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness. In the staff's opinion the proposed work, with conditions, is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Windows and Doors (page 55)*, and *Safety and Code requirements (page 69)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The property suffered severe fire damage; however, much of the original exterior is still intact. Repairs will be made with new materials that match the original.

**Fact:**

Original windows will be repaired. In locations such as the main façade where the windows were fire damaged and beyond repair, a wood window replacement to match the design, dimensions and muntin pattern will be used.

**Fact:**

A shed dormer will be added to the rear elevation to provide more interior space to the second story unit. The dormer will use wood materials and windows to match the existing house.

**Guidelines (page 57-58):**

1. Retain and preserve the pattern, arrangement, and dimensions of window and door openings on principal elevations. Often the placement of windows is an indicator of a particular architectural style, and therefore contributes to the building's significance. If necessary for technical reasons, locate new window or door openings on secondary elevations and introduce units that are compatible in proportion, location, shape, pattern, size, materials, and details to existing units.
3. When repair is not feasible as determined by City Staff, true divided light wood windows are an appropriate replacement product for original wood windows when designed to match the original in appearance, detail, material, profile, and overall size as closely as possible. Double paned glass may be considered when they are true divided and can accurately resemble the original window design.

**Guidelines (page 76):**

1. In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.
2. Locate, design and construct additions so that the character-defining features of historic structures are not obscured, destroyed, damaged, or radically changed.
3. Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.

**Fact:**

The stairs to the second story apartment will be replaced according to the design shown with a landing in the middle rather than a straight run as they are now. Rather than being less visible from the street and less conspicuous, they will be more prominent than they are now.

**Guidelines (page 70):**

1. Introduce fire exits, stairs, landings, and ramps on rear or inconspicuous side locations.
2. Construct fire exits, stairs, landings and ramps in such a manner that they do not damage historic materials and features. Construct them so that they can be removed in the future with minimal damage to the historic structure.

**Recommended Conditions:**

1. That the replacement windows are wood true or simulated divided light with a shadow bar between the glass.
2. That the stairs be re-designed so that they are less noticeable from the street.
3. That a double window be used in the new dormer instead of a single window.

**In Support:**

Ashley Meredith, 402 West Smith Street  
Ann Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1988 for work at 206 Leftwich Street. The applicants are Ashley and Hillary Meredith and the description of work is to repair fire damage to house, exterior alterations, and construction of dormer addition. City staff recommended in favor of granting this application and in their opinion, it is not incongruous with *Historic District Design Guidelines*. They cited *Guidelines 1 and 3* under *Windows and Doors* on pages 57-58 and in terms of materials, they cited *Guidelines 1 and 2* on page 76. Conditions suggested for the application are as follows: (1) That the replacement windows are wood true or simulated divided light with a shadow bar between the glass; (2) That the stairs be re-designed so that they are less noticeable from the street; and (3) That a double window be used in the new dormer instead of a single window.

Speaking in support of the application was Ashley Meredith, 402 West Smith Street, who noted the change in the stairs was primarily for safety. Most of the roof will have to be replaced and she had no objection to the double window. Also speaking in support was Anne Bowers, 402-B Fisher Park Circle, representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She said they were in support and liked the staircase. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Arneke stated his opinion that although it is a bit of a visual obstacle, the proposed staircase would be an improvement.

**Finding of Fact:**

Ms. Stringfield moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1988 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 *Guidelines 1 and 3 under Windows and Doors (page 55) and Guidelines 1 and 2 under Safety and Code Requirements (page 76)* are acceptable as findings of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Ms. Stringfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1988 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Ashley and Hillary Meredith for work at 206 Leftwich Street with the following conditions: (1) That the replacement windows are wood true or simulated divided light with muntins and a shadow bar between the glass; and (2) That a double window be used in the new dormer instead of a single window. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

**(b) Location: 819 Rankin Place**  
**Application Number 1989**  
**Applicant: Stephen Elrod**  
**Property Owner: Same**  
**Date Application Received: 7-18-16**  
**(APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS)**

**Description of Work:**

Construction of accessory building.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed work—with conditions—is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Accessory Structures and Garages (page 35)* for the following reasons:

**Fact:**

The accessory structure is a prefabricated unit that is 20' x 12'. It will be customized to meet historic district design guidelines to include deeper overhangs, knee brackets (corbels), corner boards, wood lap siding on exterior walls and cedar shingles in the gable ends. The roof pitch will match the roof pitch on the house. A steel roll-up door will be used.

**Fact:**

The building is not located in the traditional sitting pattern for garages that would align with the driveway but it is located at the rear of the house and not easily visible from the street. The footprint of the proposed building does not dramatically alter the amount of open space on the lot.

**Guidelines (page 36):**

2. *Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example.*
3. *Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished.*
4. *New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.*
5. *Prefabricated wooden accessory structures are appropriate when they are designated to be compatible with the principal structure on the side, and with other outbuildings in the district.*
- A. *Accessory structures with gambrel style roofs are considered a modern outbuilding and therefore an inappropriate design for the Historic Districts.*
- B. *It is not appropriate to introduce prefabricated metal accessory structures in the Historic Districts.*

**Recommended Conditions:**

1. That tree preservation measures are taken so that significant trees on the property are not adversely impacted.
2. That a different style of door be used that better reflects the character of the historic districts.

**In Support:**

Stephen Elrod, 819 Rankin Place.

**In Opposition:**

None.

**Summary:**

Chair Wharton stated that this is application number 1989 for work at 819 Rankin Place. The applicant is Stephen Elrod. The description of work is construction of accessory building. City staff stated their opinion that the work is not incongruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines* and they recommended in favor of granting this COA. They cited *Guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5* on page 36 under *Accessory Structures and Garages*. They noted that the accessory structure is a prefabricated 12' x 20' unit and the applicant proposes to customize the unit to include deeper overhangs, knee brackets, corner boards, wood lap siding on the exterior walls and cedar shingles in the gable ends. The roof pitch will match the pitch on the house. The building is not located in the traditional siting pattern for garages that would align with the driveway. Staff recommended conditions that tree preservation measures are taken so that significant trees on the property are not adversely impacted and that a different style of door be used that better reflects the character of the historic districts. Speaking in support was Stephen Elrod of 819 Rankin Place. He stated that the shed is used for storing tools. He had not considered this siting for location of trees. He is open to suggestions about scale and detail and he will site the shed to avoid damaging trees. He preferred the metal roll-out door for purposes of security. There was no one speaking in opposition to the application.

**Discussion:**

Chair Wharton commented that members could continue this application or ask staff to approve details of the shed in terms of siting and architectural detail. Members felt that staff could approve details of the shed.

**Finding of Fact:**

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in application number 1989 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 and *Guidelines 2, 3, 4, and 5 A&B (page 36)* are acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arneke. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

**Motion:**

Therefore, Mr. Smith moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves application number 1989 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Stephen Elrod for work at 819 Rankin Street with the following conditions: (1) That he sites the building in such a way to preserve all the significant trees on the site; (2) That he works with staff for design detail approvals; (3) That his metal garage door will be positioned toward the brick wall on the neighbor's property; and (4) That all proper permits are obtained. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pratt. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON COLLEGE HILL STREET WALL PROGRAM MATCHING GRANT APPLICATION FOR 110 SOUTH MENDENHALL STREET:**

Ms. Geary stated that this is the first application under the College Hill Street Wall Program that is funded through the Municipal Service District funds. This is a very significant retaining wall in the College Hill Historic District that is in need of repair. Following the public hearing, the Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to City Council.

William Burckley, 701 Morehead Avenue, provided a brief history of the wall. Approximately a year and a half ago, the City determined that the wall had to be repaired or torn down because it is five inches out of plumb. There were insufficient funds to repair the wall so a COA was filed to tear the wall down to prevent the City from demolishing it. This strategy allowed for up to one year to figure out a way to pay for the repair of the wall. Subsequent to this, the neighborhood worked with the City and came up with a way to match funds for repairing granite walls in the neighborhood. He explained that there was a water line leak and a portion of the wall had to be taken down as a result of the emergency. The process for repairing the wall will be to take down the remaining wall, finish excavating soil to be able to pour a footing for a retaining wall to hold the soil back, and then the granite wall will be put back up against the retaining wall.

Mr. Burckley asked the Commission to make a recommendation to City Council that they approve the matching funds for the repair of the wall.

There was no one else present wishing to speak on this matter.

In regard to the application provided by Bill Burckley for wall repair at 110 South Mendenhall Street, Mr. Arneke moved that the Historic Preservation Commission recommends to City Council that that the funding comes from the College Hill Street Wall Program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lane. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wharton, Arneke, Stringfield, Lane, Smith, Pratt. Nays: None.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Mr. Cowhig stated that a Preservation North Carolina conference is scheduled for September, 2016. Additional details will be provided when they become available.

The next meeting of the Commission will be held on September 28, 2016.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary  
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC:sm/jd