

Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission
Regular Public Meeting
John McAdoo Room, 3rd Floor, Truist Building
201 W. Market St., Greensboro, NC 27401
June 18, 2024
6:00 p.m.

AGENDA

A. Call to Order

Chair Jane Payne called the meeting to order and asked staff person Justin Snyder to call the roll.

B. Roll Call

Members Present were Jane Payne, Chair; Sean Dowell, Vice Chair; David Millsaps; David Horth; Abigaile Pittman; Jerry Nix.

Members Absent: Terry Hammond; Keisha Hadden; Justin Cundall; Raul Cardona-Torres; Louis Gallien.

C. Agenda Amendments

Justin Snyder stated that he had two amendments to the agenda, but he would like to introduce Avery Tew as another planner in the department, and he is interested in potentially learning the rules of the HPC and possibly providing some backup staff in the future.

D. Approval of the April 16, 2024, Minutes

Ms. Pittman stated that under Item "C", the Agenda Amendments, the 3rd line down, the word "request" is separated and needs to be closed up. Sean Dowell also stated that he had a couple of small text changes - Section "C", one line underneath the "request" should read, "The Planning Director spoke with the County Attorney's Office and advised that they are not quite ready for that to come before the Commission", remove "for that". On the last page, 2nd paragraph, "Mr. Dowell stated that the larger areas are seeing the HPC as one of many branches of historic preservation of 107 sites that they protect with special significance." That should say, "107 sites of special significance."

Mr. Horth moved to approve the minutes with the changes noted, seconded by Mr. Millsaps. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Millsaps, Nix. Nays: None.)

E. Old Business:

- a. Consideration of Rules of Procedure Changes (recommendation to County BOCC for adoption – tabled from the April 16, 2024, meeting) **(APPROVED)**

Justin Snyder stated that these changes have been vetted by the County Attorney's Office. The goal is to both streamline and also to align all of the procedures amongst all of the quasi-judicial Boards in the County. The Planning Board will also have these changes because they hear Special Use Permit applications, which are quasi-judicial, and the Board of Adjustment would also have similar changes made to their procedures. Staff recommends approval of this item, and if approved, it will go to the Board of Commissioners for final approval.

Justin Snyder added that if *Robert's Rules* doesn't address an issue, or if there is no access to *Robert's Rules*, then there are other options available.

Mr. Dowell moved to recommend approval of the Rules of Procedure Changes, seconded by Mr. Horth. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Millsaps, Nix. Nays: None.)

David Millsaps stated that he would recuse himself from the following item as he is involved in the renovation of this property. He was seated in the audience.

New Business:

- a. Certificate of Appropriateness request for numerous interior and exterior changes to Grimsley House, located at 408 Fisher Park Circle in Greensboro, NC, including a kitchen renovation, major landscaping, a garage relocation, and several exterior additions.

Justin Snyder stated that the applicants have requested that this be referred to as the Grimsley House and to drop the "Fry" from the name. The original designation was, in fact, as Grimsley House, so it is a correct name.

He continued by saying that the property is located at 408 Fisher Park Circle in Greensboro. The applicants are Alan and Lovelle Overbey. The current owners are requesting several interior and exterior changes to the house. They will go into more detail when they do their presentation. There are three (3) one-story additions, which would expand the living space on the main level of the home. There is a relocation of the existing detached garage to a new location on the property. There is the installation of new guardrails on the front porch to meet building code safety requirements, and those details are found on the elevations. There is extensive landscaping and

hardscaping proposed around the property, and there is a landscaping plan included with the application.

Regarding interior changes proposed, there is a full renovation of the kitchen in the same location where it currently is, as well as several interior changes to the tile, changes to closets, new walls, and other smaller changes. Those can be seen in bold on the attached floor plan in the application.

For background on the project, the landmark designation does include the interior and exterior of the home, as well as the lot. It was designated as a landmark in September of 1984. The architecture is Colonial Revival, and the home dates to approximately 1915. There have been numerous interior renovations made to the property, including an interior bathroom remodel with modern materials, as well as a pending bathroom remodel. There has also been provided photographic evidence of the former outbuilding location to the rear of the house. This is the applicant's attempt to demonstrate compatibility and reasonableness of the proposed location on the lot. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation is included in the packet with the staff report. This information was also provided to the applicant. Staff would recommend taking this application in four (4) parts. They would recommend those parts to be the interior changes; the exterior changes of the additions, as well as the guardrails; the relocation of the existing garage along with the new garage doors; and finally, the landscaping and the hardscaping.

Chair Payne asked if the applicant or their representative would like to speak at this time.

Lovelle Overbey came forward and was sworn in and stated that she and her husband purchased this home in December. They are very excited about this house, and they feel that they have collected a team of people, including Jesse and David, to be a "dream team" for historic renovations on this property. They have put a lot of thought into this, and a lot of people have come out and looked at it, and their plans have been the same since they first decided to purchase the house. They feel that this will be their forever home, and that it will benefit the neighborhood by raising home values within the neighborhood. It is an important home, especially because it is on the circle, and those seem to be the biggest and grandest representatives of the neighborhood. They want this house to be loved and lived in by people that come after them and by everybody else that will occupy the house in the future.

Jesse Arnett, representing the applicants, 3312 Windrift Drive, Greensboro, NC, was sworn in and stated that his firm is the designer of all the proposed work to be done on this house. He will give an overview of the proposed work to be done.

Regarding the additions and exterior changes, they have made a sincere effort to respect the existing house and its landmark status. They want to create a project that honors that original architecture and doesn't distract from it, but rather, complements it. There is a need for additions, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation says that additions should only be considered if the proposed uses cannot be accommodated within the existing spaces. So, the reason for the proposed additions is they applicants desire to have all of their daily living functions on the main level of the home. The portion of the home that is lacking is the bedroom suite on the main floor, which does not have enough room. They also want it in conjunction with the kitchen renovation to have more of a casual family space at the rear of the house. The main level currently consists of four (4) public rooms, plus the kitchen. To try to put a bedroom suite in those existing spaces would have required completely altering the floor plan, closing those rooms off, and changing the character and nature of the house. They felt the proposed additions were an appropriate course of action. They consulted with several people about what the important elements and considerations would be in designing the proposed additions. They did not want the additions to cover any of the corners of the existing massing of the house, and they wanted the original features to be clearly visible even after the additions are put on.

Along the driveway side, there is a side entry along the garage with a deck that is clearly a later addition and is not original. They propose to remove that deck and replace it with a one-story addition of roughly the same footprint, and that addition will contain a small mud room with a side entry opening towards the driveway and garage. There will also be pantry space in that addition.

The kitchen will remain in its current location. The current kitchen was redone in about 1984, and they propose to add a family room onto the rear of that kitchen and open up what is currently an exterior wall on the rear with a large, cased opening, so that those two (2) spaces will be open to each other. The cased opening is the most substantial modification to the existing structure. That particular part of the wall has already been heavily modified in the previous renovations. Currently, there is a large picture window over the kitchen sink that is clearly not historic, and there is no documentation of what that part of the elevation looked like originally. They feel that this addition and the alteration is appropriate. Whatever historic character was there has already been lost. This is a one-story addition that will not affect the 2nd story windows above, which are original.

The final addition, which is the largest one to the south side of the house, which would be the left side as you look at it from the street, contains the primary suite with a bedroom, bathroom, closet, and a small laundry room. The goal with all the additions was to keep them clearly subordinate in scale to the main house to take cues from the design elements of the main house so that the new design is harmonious. The

proportions of the addition of the family room and the primary suite are designed to be similar to the proportions of the front porch and the porte cochere, which has a low, sloped roof and roughly the same widths, so they will be very similar in height when they are constructed. The house has a main mass with a hipped roof on it, and then it has a gabled wing off the rear of it. So, this new addition on the side comes off of that rear gable wing and does not touch the main two-story volume of the house.

Some other modifications to the existing house are to install minimal wrought iron guard railings, painted either black or a very dark gray, on the front porch for safety reasons. The front porch is anywhere from about 44" above grade to approximately six (6) feet down to the concrete driveway.

The only other changes that are occurring to the existing exterior of the house are a couple of areas where they are relocating doorways. Currently, there is a passageway from the existing kitchen to the back stair hall and it passes by the stairs to the basement. For the sake of the kitchen design, they are closing that passageway off and creating a new hallway going through what is currently a powder room, which was enclosed underneath an original side porch, and they are replacing that powder room and will place it under the rear stairs as a very cozy space. That will require a little bit of enlargement of the coat closet that is currently under the stairs. Those are the modifications of the existing spaces. They are all rooms that would be considered secondary.

The third element of the proposal is the relocation of the existing detached garage. The historic photograph shows the carriage house in the same place as the proposed location for the garage. This photo appears to be very early after the house's construction, and you can see that there is a carriage house structure that is clearly of a different design than the garage that stands on the property now. The current garage was probably built around 1937, when the Fry family bought the house. They propose to relocate the current garage structure to roughly what appears to be the original location of the first carriage house on the property. That allows for more windows on that family room addition. The garage will also be rotated 90 degrees so that the garage door faces the street and will be at the end of the driveway. The garage will be placed on a new foundation, which will be slightly lower than the one that it currently is on. This will adhere to the City of Greensboro's height limits for accessory buildings relative to the distance from the property lines. There will be a couple of modifications to the garage structure, as currently there are carriage doors that are manually operated and have a bypass operation, and they would like to remove those and custom build an overhead garage door to match the design of the original carriage house doors. They will also remove a window on the side of the garage and add an entry door into the garage. There is a room on the right side of the garage that was likely servants' quarters that would be turned into an office space. The floor is raised above the floor level of the

garage due to the grade and how it slopes up at the rear. They would like to drop that down and have the floor level inside the office space be at the same height as the garage slab to give more ceiling height and allow them to not have to deal with the steps directly next to the garage door.

The last major category of proposed changes is to the landscaping, and they have taken pains to work with what they have on the site and accentuate the features that are already in place. There are several low, standard landscape walls that run parallel to the street and terrace the property as you move up from the street towards the rear. The primary bedroom addition on the side extends out into one of those flat terraced areas, and the building will divide that outdoor space on the side of the house, which is a lot of space, and the building will give definition to two (2) different spaces that are proposed towards the front of the addition, including a small garden and a koi pond area with lots of landscape screening, just to try and make the addition recede when seen from the street. This creates a very private outdoor area and patio living space at the rear of the property. Anywhere the original stone landscape walls need to be removed for the additions to be constructed, they plan to salvage that stone and repurpose it elsewhere. One place is at the driveway near the street, where they propose to build a couple of stone retaining walls on either side of the driveway.

Mr. Horth asked if they are actually moving the current garage and renovating it? Mr. Arnett responded that was correct.

Mr. Nix asked if the patio area at the back is not currently existing, and will that be added? Mr. Arnett stated that was also correct. Mr. Nix asked about the type of siding that they intend to put on the side when the garage is moved. Mr. Arnett stated that all of the materials they plan to use are very close to what is on the house currently, so it would be wood, lap-siding, wood trim, and some composite skirt board because it will be close to the ground. But otherwise mostly wood trim and detailing as the existing house, with the same exposures, widths, and detailing. The shutters will be louvered shutters in the same design as the original. For the roofing on the additions, the bedroom addition is just a flat roof, so it will have a rubber roof on it, and then the other two (2) additions will have architectural shingles, and they are proposing a slate look with a color as close as possible to the existing slate on the main roof. They also proposed replacing the current asphalt shingles on the front porch and the garage with the same shingle that will be used on the additions. Currently, it is just a three-tab asphalt shingle on those roofs. The floor on the front porch is tongue-and-groove wood, and that will not be changed.

In response to questions by Ms. Pittman, Ms. Overbey stated that they found some materials in the upper attic space in the garage, and they pulled down original shutters, a lot of windows, and there was an arched window where there is now a bathroom. It

can be seen on the original photographs, and it is in its entirety, and everything is pristine. They plan to re-install that into the breezeway in front of the house. It will not be seen from the street, but they plan to use as much as they can of the original materials they have found.

Mr. Nix stated that in touring the house in 1984, one of the most interesting things about the exterior shutters is that usually you have to raise the sash on the inside, stick your hand out there and unlock it, pull the shutter to, and fasten it. At this house, you do not have to do that. The windows stay shut, and inside, there is a ring type thing with a rod, and you pull that out, and push the rod, and it will bring it back and lock the shutter in place, and then if you want to close it from the inside, you leave the window down and you just take that rod and pull it and fasten it back. He has never seen exterior shutters with a mechanism like that. Ms. Overbey pointed out that they all work, too.

Mr. Arnett stated that there is only one (1) original window and one (1) exterior door that will be altered by these three (3) additions, and they plan to save those and re-install them.

Mr. Horth asked that on the side of the house that is covered, and you drive through, he is curious if someone used that as a carport at some point? Mr. Arnett stated that he thinks, originally, it may have been used for a stagecoach or carriage, so it was easier for passengers to off-load onto the high step.

Mr. Nix wanted to make a suggestion - when he walked in the house after having read the National Register nomination form, in the kitchen he saw the terrible window over the kitchen sink. He is thankful that is going to be removed. There was an article written about the butler's pantry that had already been removed, and at that time there was no choice in the matter because all the work had already been done, but there is a new pantry going in, and he would suggest that in the area between the dining room door and the kitchen, you could use that area as a pantry. The ideal thing about this was when they were having formal meals, it was easy for the butler to bring in food and service items easier. Mr. Arnett stated that they have already checked into that, and that is an idea they are certainly giving some thought to.

After further conversations concerning the proposed additions and changes. Chair Payne asked if there was anyone wishing to speak either in favor or in opposition to this request.

Anne Stringfield, 1005 N. Eugene Street, was sworn in and stated that she is representing the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She is here today to represent the FPNA Board and stated that on Sunday, June 2, they held a Special Meeting to hear the details of discuss this very extensive COA. She is pleased to say that they support

the COA with no conditions. She thanked all the members of the Commission for their service on the County Historic Preservation Commission, as it is very important.

Chair Payne asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak and no one came forward. The public hearing was closed.

Chair Payne then asked if the Commissioners wished to have some more discussion concerning this request.

Discussion:

Mr. Dowell stated that the findings of fact are why to support or deny, the Commissioners just need to be clear on what that is. The staff has given a recommendation that they look at each of the components separately, and he agrees with that. Mr. Dowell asked why this is historic, and why is it important? Are any of the changes proposed impacting any of the historic elements that were aligned with the State, and if the applicants are asking for credits today, could they get those credits with these types of changes? According to the Fisher Park Historic District designation of 1991, this neighborhood was one of the early planned neighborhoods with extensive park features, and that was what made Fisher Park amazing. It was one of the first Greensboro planned and developed neighborhoods and one of the earliest to do so in North Carolina. Landscaping is definitely important within the framework with what the Commission has. In 1991, there were 670 residentially designated properties with 220 garages, retaining walls, and other outbuildings and subordinate structures. This garage is very natural for what is within the district. The house, specifically, was put on the Register for three (3) reasons; the Queen Anne Colonial Revival residence, 1905 to 1910, for the functional hipped roof of the garage from 1905 to 1910, and for the functional front stairs from 1905 to 1910. The current columns on the porch were also noted as a reason that it was accepted on the National Register. He gives this information as framework to say, obviously, when there are new additions, they have to be treated in such a way that the upgrade will not replicate or replace something that is historic.

Following staff recommendations, he would take this in four (4) topics as follows:

- 1) Interior changes to the kitchen, closet, and whatnot. Support or deny and why?

Mr. Nix stated that when someone buys a house, they always want to change the kitchen and bathrooms, and that is always normal. Because the 1984 modifications to the kitchen are not intrusive and this is a revamp, the main thing is taking the wall out and having an open activity and family room. That gives an open floor plan in that area. It looks great to him, with the new addition on the righthand side adding a mud room

and larger pantry that are compatible with the house. Mr. Dowell noted that there is limited impact to the interior with the change of one door and one window. While the interior changes are making it more functional, doing so it seems that there is no impact on the fabric of the property. Mr. Horth added that they will retain the historic parts of it while making it improved functionality. The rest of the Commission members agreed with the previous comments.

Mr. Dowell made a summary of the findings of fact: It appears that HPC would be in favor of approval of the applicants' interior changes to the kitchen, closets, and otherwise, because it creates limited impact on historic fabric with only two (2) specific changes being a door and a window. This is an update to a kitchen and bathroom, which has been allowed in prior decisions, and the bigger changes to come later, which are not a part of this application, are outside of the historic areas of the house.

Mr. Dowell moved to approve the interior items, seconded by Mr. Nix. The Commission voted (5-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Nix. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

2) Exterior changes including the construction of additions and guard rail additions.

There is precedent in prior cases to allow safety and security, i.e. exchanging historic standards for current standards. At the Hart and Thomas Martin House at 204 N. Mendenhall Street, a railing change was allowed in 2020. That was an increase in height to make it meet insurance and City standards. At the Blair-Coltrane House in January 2023, the Commission allowed an ADA compliant addition to a non-original porch in order to make that meet ADA standards. In February 2023, the Commission allowed cemetery security gates to be added at the Tabernacle United Methodist Cemetery at 5721 Methodist Road in Greensboro. There is a precedent to allowing improvements for safety and security and insurance.

Regarding the guard rail additions, the fact that they are not connecting to the historic fabric, and that this will be separately added, is also a lot of great attention to detail by the homeowners. The guard rails would also emphasize the columns. It appeared that the Commission members all agreed with the summary for this portion of the COA.

Mr. Dowell moved to approve the request for the change in guard rails, as presented by the applicant and staff, as guard rail additions would allow current standards of safety, security and insurance, they are not replicating a historic element, and they are putting in an element that is modern, and the guard rails would not be ornate in any way and would be of simple, functional design, seconded by Mr. Nix. The Commission voted (5-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Nix. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

3) Mr. Dowell summarized the proposed exterior additions to the property.

After the previous discussions, the Commission members felt that the additions were appropriate, as were the moving of the garage with minor changes to it and having it face the street. Mr. Horth stated that he likes the idea of changing the doors to an original look. The Commission is comfortable with moving the garage as it is going to an original location, as noted by historical documentation, to a look that is consistent with its past, and that in the general landscape of the property, they feel it is appropriate for the setting in this property. This proposed change is within the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Dowell moved to approve the proposed relocation of the garage to another location on the property, seconded by Mr. Nix. The Commission voted (5-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Nix. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

On the back of the home, not visible to the street, there is an addition as well as on the left-hand side of the house, which is also not visible from the street. The rear addition does not impact the historic fabric, other than the one (1) door and one (1) window, which was already discussed, and the Commission agreed on it. He pointed out that these were good reasons to accept the rear addition. Mr. Dowell stated that he would advocate that the Commission approve the additions to the rear.

Mr. Dowell moved to approve the rear additions, as presented by the applicant and the staff report, seconded by Mr. Horth. The Commission voted (5-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Nix. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

Regarding the side addition, Mr. Dowell stated that it is somewhat visible from the street; however, it is set out from the house and has similar elements that are made to look historically different and not as ornate and is meant to be subordinate. Mr. Nix pointed out that the proposed side addition is more streamlined as the door is in the back and not on the side, so that leaves that area with a clean view with the window there.

Mr. Dowell moved to approve the proposed addition to the side of the home as presented by the applicant and the staff report, seconded by Ms. Pittman. The Commission voted (5-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Nix. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

Mr. Dowell noted that in July 2020, the Commission approved the John H. Adams Inn for a new addition, and this was an outside courtyard that was enclosed fence space, and it got a new roof structure. It was in the back of the building, and it did not impact the look of what was there, and it was different enough that there wasn't a problem. So, this Commission has approved additions with visual changes as supported by the

Secretary of Interior Standards. Also in July 2020, the Commission approved a new addition on the Julian Price House at 301 Fisher Park Circle, and they did the same at the Thomas Martin House at 204 Mendenhall Street, where there was reconstruction of certain aspects of an accessory building based on matching materials, and the Commission approved that addition, as well. The Commission allowed reconstruction of a front porch on the Simeon-Wagoner House at 5838 N.C. Highway 61 and allowed a two-story addition on the Haycock House on Pearson Street in July 2021. That two-story addition had been approved, so there are five (5) other precedents of similar situations for approval of these additions.

4) Landscaping and hardscaping changes to the property were discussed.

Regarding the landscaping/hardscaping proposed changes, Mr. Dowell stated that, as a reminder, Fisher Park was the very first suburban planned neighborhood, and there clearly is a landscaping and exterior component as to why this neighborhood is historic. He asked for input from the Commission members on this plan by the applicants.

Chair Payne asked if there was anyone who wished to speak more on the landscaping plan.

Ms. Overbey stated that they are adding a lot of trees, but because of the addition, they do have to take one (1) tree out that they are not happy about, but they are adding approximately fifteen (15) more trees. There are some overgrown dogwoods and overgrown camellia bushes in the front, but the grapevine granite foundation is beautiful, and they want to remove those shrubs so that foundation can be seen. They are adding a koi pond and the terrace retaining walls are already there that go across to the Latham-Baker House, and so they are not really adding, they are just keeping those features. Some of the stone in the terrace walls will be removed, but they are reusing that stone in other locations on the property. The porte cochere is very narrow, so they need a place to turn around in the driveway. At the right in the front, they are making a seating area in that location with a cement bench and maybe a fountain. In response to questions, Ms. Overbey stated that the tree to be removed is approximately 60 years old, and the removal is unavoidable if they want to put the bedroom addition on the side of the house. They are also adding some large-growth trees in the front of the house. Ms. Overbey stated that this is not the first old house that they have lived in. The first house was in Westerwood, and that was a 1920, and they lived in the 2nd largest historic district in Grand Rapids, Michigan, Heritage Hill, and that was a 1910 house, so they knew what they were getting into, and they have sought those types of houses before. They lived in a 1929 house in Starmount, and currently live in a Lowenstein home that was built in 1964. It is very large and strange, so they wanted to be closer to downtown

and not have an indoor pool. Mr. Nix stated that he doesn't see any problem with the plans presented.

Mr. Dowell stated that in adding precedent to this, in June 2021 and the Florence Female Boarding House at 1715 Penny Road, the Commission allowed trees to be removed in exchange for new trees, because they were located in an easement and they had to be removed, and also because it did aid in the layout of the site.

Mr. Nix pointed out that landscape designer Chip Calloway was very instrumental in this Commission when it first started, and he has done a lot of historic properties, from very simple layouts to more elaborate layouts.

Mr. Dowell stated that he is still a little confused about what will be covered on the exterior in the future. Do the trees have a certain size? Justin Snyder responded that based on the levels of the work list, he would offer that the State Historic Preservation Office, as well as most jurisdictions now are trending away from regulating the landscaping because it is finite, and it is one of those things that changes all the time and is subject to acts of God among other things that can change landscaping matters. It is difficult administratively to keep up with. Unless it is a designated Treasure Tree or something else like that, which would severely impact the streetscape, they would prefer not to get involved.

Mr. Dowell stated that he is one for clear expectations and standards, and as a homeowner, he would like to know what he had to live under. He feels that the Commission needed to walk away today with clear understanding about what is protected and what's not protected. Justin Snyder stated that, typically, the historic landscapes, like boxwoods or old Treasure Tree species that have streetscape value, those would be the types that the Commission should concentrate on. He stated that he would get clear advice from the County Attorney's Office on that because he is not sure that new trees are covered under the COA review process. In an historic district, typically, they would become part of it, but he is unsure about landmark because landmark designations are often very specific as to the inclusions. It is tied to the history in time when it was designated, not really to things planted afterwards.

Mr. Dowell pointed out that it is tied to that specific site, but there are only 107 sites under HPC, and they only take special homes, and for the Commission to turn around and say, "No, we're not going to cover future additions under covenants," does not make sense to him. Justin Snyder stated that if the Commission makes it clear in the motion that they do wish for any of these changes to be run through the process in the future, then it's on the record that they have made that decision. Mr. Nix pointed out that the main thing in this is to know that the decorative stonework, as well as the steps, the risers beside them, the walkways, and accessory buildings will be protected. This includes anything that affects the landscaping, like driveways and what was built at the

time that the house was built. He stated that there really is nothing in the yard of note, except the stonework, which is exquisite and well-known in several houses in Greensboro. He feels that is what is really designated in the landscaping, not necessarily the trees.

Justin Snyder stated that in moving forward when they do the designations, they need to be very specific, because you may not want to designate the entire interior, it may just be the stairs, maybe just the newel post on the stairs. It could be that specific. He thinks that is a good practice moving forward and also gives the Tax Department and staff, in the future, very clear parameters, as far as what they do and don't need to run by the Commission. He feels for now it is best to consider the proposal within the historic context as well as the modernization attempts, and see if the Commission feels it is appropriate, based on past precedents and everything else that is being considered.

After some conversations, it appeared that the Commission members were in favor of the landscape plans as submitted.

Mr. Dowell stated that landscape is a very important element, and when the State Historic Preservation Office looks at something (for example, someone changing their historic windows), it is immediately de-designated or undesignated. He does want to make sure that there is clarity in what the Commission would say it was important to keep. Clearly, the non-negotiable is the stonework that is original to the house and should be part of the exterior designation.

Mr. Dowell stated that the only non-negotiable item would be the stonework outlined in the historic documentation. He is not that concerned about the landscaping or some of the other changes but wants to make sure that the Commission knows what their designations are. He felt that the important questions of this request are related to what is visible from the street, and what are the historic elements that make this house important. We know that Fisher Park is about green space and that's why it has a National Register designation. He feels that planting trees makes a lot of sense. He wants staff to know what they need to look at and what not to look at.

Justin Snyder asked if the Commission would ask that, in the future, applicants provide photographs of the existing landscaping to staff for documentation. Mr. Dowell and Chair Payne stated that sounds like a very good idea.

Mr. Dowell moved to approve the landscape/hardscape plan as detailed by the applicant and submitted with the staff report, and the findings of fact as enumerated in the discussion, seconded by Mr. Nix. The Commission voted (5-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Horth, Nix. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

At this time, Mr. Millsaps rejoined the Commission for the remainder of the meeting.

F. Public Hearing Items:

None.

G. Other Business

Justin Snyder stated that there is someone in the audience that would like to speak to the Commission.

Chair Payne asked for anyone wishing to speak to come forward.

David Craft, 807 Simpson Street, stated that he previously lived at 605 N. Church Street, which is a county landmark and has also moved a garage because it is a contributing structure. He really came about the house that sits next to the jail that is being torn down that fronts Eugene Street, and he has gotten lots of different answers that don't make sense. The County owns the house, and he asked if it is an historic structure that they should be concerned about.

Justin Snyder responded that the County actually owns the house. It is his understanding from Property Resources that based on its condition and non-original location, and the fact that it has been so heavily modified, they just don't see the value of preservation of it. Mr. Dowell asked who they should be talking to about that. Justin Snyder stated that it is the County Property Management Department. Mr. Dowell stated that Jesse Arnett with Preservation Greensboro Development Fund, who has been looking at trying to do some preservation and Dawn Chaney has been actively talking with the County about this house. Justin Snyder added that Dawn Chaney owns the lot next door to the house. Mr. Nix stated that he would be happy to speak with Mr. Craft on this matter. Justin Snyder gave a phone number for contact information.

On another matter, Mr. Millsaps stated that he would like to bring up the matter of the Commissioner's attendance at the meetings and thanked everyone who had attended tonight. With no quorum to make decisions, some projects could be backed up for two months or more. He was appointed by the Board of County Commissioners, as were the rest of the members, and that is the one thing that was discussed in depth, a member's commitment to attending the meetings. Justin Snyder stated that he was going to look into this concern, and he would report at the next meeting. He pointed out that there are people who would like to serve on the Commission, and it isn't fair to keep someone who is not going to attend regularly.

Ms. Payne asked if there were going to be any nominations for members representing Jamestown in the near future, as she does not know how much longer she will be able to serve. She would follow up with Justin on this on this later.

Ms. Pittman asked if the notice, contact list and agenda could be sent in a larger font, as she is starting to have a difficult time seeing it as it is now. Justin Snyder stated that the

County is getting ready to update its website and overhaul the whole thing and streamline it, and part of process is also making it ADA accessible.

H. Adjournment

There being no further business before the commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

The next meeting of the HPC is scheduled for July 16, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

July 5, 2024

Triad Reporting & Typing

Services