

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
GOLDSBORO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AUGUST 5, 2025

The Goldsboro Historic District Commission of the City of Goldsboro, North Carolina, met in Regular Session in the Large Conference Room, City Hall Addition, 200 North Center Street, at 5:30 p.m. on August 5, 2025.

Present: Mr. Fritz Knack, Chair, Presiding
Mr. John Peacock, Vice Chair
Mr. Richard Best
Mr. Terry Cottle
Ms. Judith McMillen
Ms. Nancy Delia
Mr. David Archibald

Manning Musgrave (ALT)
Derek Roche (ALT)

Also Present: April Johnson Choice, Development Services Director
Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner
Ron Lawrence, City Attorney
Holly Jones, Planning Executive Assistant

Mr. Knack began the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Delia asked that the typo be corrected on page 3, to remove the extra 'the state' in the first paragraph. Mr. Archibald made a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 3, 2025, as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried.

Old Business

CA-09-25 – 204 E. Chestnut Street/200 S. John St.: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for a permit required for the deconstruction of the existing towers of St. Paul Methodist Church and new construction in accordance with the design guidelines of downtown Goldsboro. The church is currently zoned in the Central Business District (CBD). The property is located within the City of Goldsboro's Local Historic Preservation Overlay District. The property considered for approval is located on the southeast corner of S. John and E. Chestnut St. and is further identified as NCPIN# 2599-95-3044.

The item was presented by Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner, after being properly sworn in.

Mr. Saylor reviewed the information from the previous meeting regarding what the church had presented and that the Commission had tabled further discussion until a recommendation has been received from the State Historic Preservation Office. The letter was received July 3, 2025, and shared with the Commission and applicant. (See Exhibit A).

Mr. Knack reopened the public hearing so that the Board could ask questions of Michael Richter, representative for St. Paul Methodist Church. Mr. Richter was sworn in to speak.

Mr. Peacock asked if the Church had the chance to review the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Richter stated they had not, but he and the engineer had. He stated that they are looking into getting a second opinion to try and save the towers. Mr. Richter further stated that the church did not want to change the look of the church for the sake of making a change.

Ms. Musgrave asked if this is something the whole congregation is aware of and must weigh in on, or just the Committee. Mr. Richter stated it is more of a council awareness; they do not want to bring anything forth to the whole congregation until they have more solid answers.

Ms. Delia stated that no structural analysis was done. Mr. Richter stated that one was done, after the Engineers Report was released. Ms. Delia states, a lot of what we need to know is structural analysis. Mr. Richter stated they had done an analysis on the towers, and that is where their recommendation is coming

from. He also stated they have looked at other options. Ms. Delia stated she would like to have answers to at least the questions in the Letter.

Ron Lawrence, City Attorney, stated that it had been asked if questions could be emailed to the Church, but advised it would not be procedurally proper; questions could be posed tonight and answers could be brought back to the next meeting.

Mr. Knack wondered to what point the Commission was worried about the cost to the applicant. Mr. Peacock asked if repairing or replacing the towers was impossible, or if it was too expensive. He asked what number they are trying to stay under. Mr. Richter answered, the engineer has not said it is impossible to repair the towers, but has not found a viable solution. He stated that some recommendations are worth looking into, and some are not.

Mr. Knack stated that we cannot go forward to say go ahead and knock them down, until we have exhausted other options. He expressed that he was not sure what the full impact would be of losing the Church as a historic building. Mr. Richter stated he would like to know that as well. Mr. Best acknowledged that it had been alluded to that businesses would not be able to get the tax breaks if we are not on the list for Raliegh.

Mr. Best inquired what the cost difference is between repair and tear down. Mr. Richter stated it is about a half million dollars. Mr. Saylor interjected that he did not think feasibility needed to factor into the Commission's decision. Mr. Lawrence confirmed that the Commission needs to refer to the guidelines to determine if the request is congruous or not. He continued, stating that if it is a safety problem then feasibility needs to be considered.

Mr. Knack reiterated some of the questions the Commission is requesting answers to:

- What is the applicant's response to the recommendations in the Letter?
- How unsafe is the building? We need to know how much danger we are in.
- Can the Commission get something official stating if the towers have 3 months or 5 years before they may fall down?
- What are the other options being looked at? At least an overview.

Mr. Archibald asked if they had contacted Andrew Consulting Engineers in Wilmington. Mr. Richter stated they had not.

Mr. Cottle asserted that they need to come up with a plan to keep it historic. Mr. Knack agreed that tearing down the towers is a significant change, that he did not feel would be congruous with the standards; the applicant would be required to come up with justification for violating the standards. Mr. Richter replied that there is at least one other option they are pursuing.

Ms. Delia asked Mr. Richter if he had the structural analysis that SKA had done. Mr. Richter stated he did not have it, and would have to ask SKA for it. He explained that it was mostly calculations, but they might be able to do a summary. Ms. Delia stated they would like to have it because it addresses the safety factor they are looking at.

Ms. Musgrave asked about the 40-page report mentioned in the analysis provided at the last meeting. Mr. Richter referred to the other report that had been previously provided, stating he believed that was the report being referred to.

Mr. Knack suggested the Commission wait for the response to the Letter and other questions the Commission had posed. He also asked how the Commission could request a safety analysis.

Mr. Lawrence read from NCGS 160D-948:

“Certain changes not prohibited.

Nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent the ordinary maintenance or repair of any exterior architectural feature in a historic district or of a landmark that does not involve a change in design, material, or appearance thereof, nor to prevent the construction, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, moving, or demolition of any such feature which the building inspector or similar official shall certify is required by the public safety because of an unsafe or dangerous condition. Nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent a property owner from making any use of his or her property that is not prohibited by other law. Nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent the maintenance or, in the event of

an emergency, the immediate restoration of any existing above-ground utility structure without approval by the preservation commission.”

Mr. Knack clarified if the applicant or the Commission could request the inspection. Mr. Lawrence confirmed that if the Commission feels it is needed, they can make a motion for staff to request it.

Mr. Cottle asked if the congregation had been presented the report, so they could decide as a whole what they wanted to do. Mr. Richter stated that the congregation has not gotten all of this, but the Church Council has been given a summary, and they do not currently have another viable solution.

Mr. Best noted that the Letter indicated the State is willing to come down. Mr. Richter stated they would like that. Mr. Lawrence informed them that the Church would have to request for the State to come down.

Mr. Peacock asked if the Commission could request for the Building Inspector to have a look from a safety perspective, and assess the situation. Ms. Delia asked if the building inspector has the knowledge to access the safety of the towers, or if it would only muddy the water.

After brief discussion, the Commission decided not to request the opinion if the building inspector, at this time.

Mr. Peacock asserted that all of the things in the Letter, an engineer should have a look at, and get the Commission an answer on each point. Mr. Knack stated that the applicant has indicated it is unsafe; we need a way to know how unsafe.

Mr. Cottle asked Mr. Richter if he knew what the Church wanted to do based on the report. Mr. Richter expressed that the Church does not want to change the aesthetics of the church for the sake of change, but there are certain considerations to take into account.

Mr. Archibald stated that he has looked at the SKA report and they believe the towers need to be demolished; he does not feel the Commission will get a different answer. Mr. Richter reiterated that they are looking into another option.

Mr. Roche inquired if the State could recommend an engineer, stating they should have a list from around the state. He continued, stating that Mr. Richter’s personal resources does not seem to have gotten us to a good place. Mr. Best agreed that we would be in a better place if the State came down, at the Church’s request, to have a look. Mr. Richter confirmed that they were not shy for another opinion or suggestions.

Mr. Knack asked for a motion to have the applicant answer the questions in the SHPO Letter and those posed by the Commission. Mr. Best made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Peacock.

Mr. Cottle was concerned that they could not get the answers in a month. The Commission discussed.

Mr. Best amended his motion to add that the applicant reach out to the SHPO to request a visit. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried.

Mr. Peacock asked if a motion was needed for how much time to give them to answer the questions. Mr. Lawrence confirmed a motion would be needed to state what meeting to continue the public hearing to.

Mr. Peacock made a motion to continue the public hearing to the October 7, 2025 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Best and unanimously carried.

New Business

Mr. Knack announced that the 100th Anniversary of Derailabration in Goldsboro was coming up in April of next year, and he would like the Commission to be part of the party. He asked for any suggestions or ideas. Ms. Delia stated that there used to be a huge celebration, and hopefully there are still some people around that know what has been done in the past. Ms. McMillen asked if it was known which group had done it in the past, because that would be a good place to start.

Ms. Delia asked if the museum had ever changed their door, and where they were on that. Mr. Saylor confirmed that the museum has not changed the door. He has reached out to the President of the Board, but has had no response, and will soon begin issuing a violation.

Reports/Discussion

Mr. Saylor discussed updating the guidelines, and becoming a Certified Local Government (CLG).

Design Standards: Update City of Goldsboro's Historic District Commission Design Standards.

The item was presented by Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner.

Mr. Saylor reviewed the timeline of the Historic District Commission, the Design Guidelines for Goldsboro, and the reasons for updating those standards. (See Exhibit B)

Mr. Saylor reiterated that the provisions of the Commission must be framed as 'standards' rather than 'guidelines'; this update should have been completed a few years ago, so Goldsboro is a little behind. He introduced the new Director of Development Services, April Choice. He stated that they had decided to revise the guidelines in house. The guidelines will cover all of the historic district, and will include the Quasi-Judicial and Certificate of Appropriateness processes.

Certified Local Government (CLG): Goldsboro's status and goals.

- i. Architectural Inventory: Update Inventory
- ii. Preservation Plan: Elevate Goldsboro 2050
- iii. Historic Districts and Cultural Activities: Economic Development

The item was presented by Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner.

Mr. Saylor reviewed what a CLG is and what the benefits are for the City to achieve this status. (See Exhibit C) He also reviewed where the City is in this process, and what the next steps are.

Mr. Peacock commended Mr. Saylor for taking these projects on. He asked for clarification on the inventory requirement for becoming a CLG. Mr. Saylor stated that SHPO was always there to provide guidance. Mr. Peacock also asked if the provisions being framed as 'standards' rather than 'guidelines' gave it more teeth. Mr. Saylor stated that was the intent of the statute. He continued, stating that others have revised their provisions to more closely resemble the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Peacock agreed that Mr. Best had previously made a good point, that without following the standards, we are not able to get grants and other funding.

Other Business

Mr. Saylor asked the Commission to hand out the cards provided regarding Elevate Goldsboro, and scan the QR Code to visit the site and contribute to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan update.

Ms. Musgrave asked the Commission to think of something they could do for the late Charles Gaylor III.

There being no further business, Mr. Knack asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Musgrave made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Cottle. The motion was unanimously carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:46 p.m.



Fritz Knack
Chair



Holly Jones
Planning Executive Assistant



North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources
State Historic Preservation Office
Ramona N. Barros, Administrator

Glennice Tubb Stree
Secretary Pamela Brewington Caldwell

Office of Archives and History
Deputy Secretary Dawn I. Wilton, Ph.D.

July 3, 2025

Paul Saylor, Preservation Planner
Department of Planning
200 N. Center Street
Goldshoro, NC 27530

Email: psay@sora@ncdnc.gov

RE: Proposed work on Saint Paul's Methodist Church, 204 East Chestnut St., Goldshoro, Wayne County

Dear Mr. Saylor:

Thank you for your recent submittal of the Goldshoro Historic Preservation Commission's request for our advice under NC GS 160D-947(d) regarding the towers and other work on Saint Paul's Methodist Church, 204 East Chestnut St. Goldshoro. Advice provided by the HPO is non-binding and should not be considered an official ruling by our office or a determination regarding how the commission should decide a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) case.

Senior Restoration Specialist Jeff Adolphsen reviewed the COA and offers the following technical advice:

Per the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, we recommend that the congregation consider rehabilitating both towers rather than demolishing them. The structural assessment appears very thorough, however, we believe that the specific recommendations to repair the main church building are also applicable to each tower. This approach would preserve the historic elevations of the church. As a last resort, we recommend that the towers be reconstructed in kind, if repair is not undertaken. As a note, the church, featuring the northwest tower that was reconstructed in 1955 after Hurricane Hazel damaged the previous soaring tower and steeple, is listed as contributing to the character of the federally certified (by the National Park Service) local historic district.

If the towers are demolished, we believe that the building's status as a contributing property to the district would be undermined. If the tower demolition proceeds, the loss of the two most distinguishing features on the main elevation would negatively affect the historic integrity of the building. Character defining features of the church include the following: siting of the towers on the front elevation, asymmetrical height, lancet window openings, corbelling, orenellation,

Location: 170 East Grove Street, Raleigh, NC 27601 Mailing Address: 467 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-4147 Telephone/Fax: (919) 416-6571/919-416-6580

4. Can the insertion of a needle beam or other solutions be incorporated to make needed repairs to masonry at either tower?

Additional Recommendations

1. **Repoint the walls of the towers and church with an appropriate mortar.** Include the sloped top elevations of the buttresses, where the buttresses abut the wall, and around window and door openings including protruding brick window hoods and the windowills. Lime mortar is autogenous and will move and self-heal with expansion and contraction due to temperature and moisture fluctuations. The church history that is available online indicated that the church was repointed in the 1980s. The engineering report states that the mortar is Portland cement based. Portland cement is no longer recommended for repointing mortar if it is not historic because it is too hard and impermeable. Portland cement mortar can damage individual brick face (spalling); leave hairline cracks, when curing, that allow moisture penetration, and retard evaporation from the interior masonry wall.
2. **Treat damaged brick and underfired brick with a stone consolidant to halt further deterioration.** We have seen ProSoCo's OH-100 ([Submittal data - OH100 Consolidation Treatment - Penetrating Stone & Masonry Strengtheners - ASTM VOC - BuildSite](#)) successfully used on underfired, spalled, and sandblasted brick in the past. Severely eroded or deteriorated brick can be replaced in kind. Note that we do not recommend the use of a water repellent with this product. The stone strengthener that does not incorporate the water repellent is recommended. See the following note.
3. **Do not use a water repellent.** We do not recommend the application of a water repellent. According to the Brick Industry Association's *Technical Note 6A - Colorless Coatings for Brick Masonry*, the "application of a water repellent coating is not necessary to achieve water resistance in brickwork subjected to normal exposures where proper material selection, detailing, construction and maintenance have been executed." Note that a water repellent will not keep water from entering the structure where there are cracks between brick and mortar and it will not stop infiltration due to deficiencies at sills and copings or at insufficiently filled mortar joints - all defects that have been identified in the structural report. The tech note further states "Penetrating water-repellent coatings seldom stop water penetration through cracks more than 0.02 in. (0.5 mm) wide, and their effectiveness under conditions of wind-driven rain is limited. As a result, the use of water-repellent coatings to eliminate water penetration in a wall with existing defects can be futile." Thus, the recommendation to make needed repairs being the best option. View mortar as the sacrificial element in the wall. Instead of repairing brick on a cyclical basis, the mortar is what should be repaired when needed. The tech note does state that a repellent may be warranted at a parapet that is particularly vulnerable to water absorption, but we advise the tried-and-true methods of the past as listed in these recommendations.
4. **Remove the cracked parge coat atop the parapets.** The cracking permits water intrusion (especially into weathered mortar joints), but retards evaporation. Cap the parapet to shed water from the top of the masonry. Install flashing under new parapet material. Alternatively, investigate the installation of a hydraulic mortar wash atop the parapet. This will require routine maintenance and occasional replacement.

monumental steers and door openings, and angled flared buttresses at the front corners of each tower

Alteration of the front elevation as proposed will create an appearance that never existed and result in the loss of the church's two most identifiable and iconic features. Of the seven aspects of National Register integrity, five will negatively be impacted if the towers are removed, after demolition of the towers, only the aspects of location and setting will remain unchanged. Design, materials, and workmanship would irreparably be lost with the demolition of the towers. Likewise, feeling and association are also negatively altered to a point where the original congregants and those familiar with the 1955 Hazel repair work may not be able to recognize their own church if the towers are removed.

With the loss of the two towers and the creation of a new front elevation, we are concerned that if an architectural survey is conducted downtown and a National Register nomination written, the church would no longer be classified as contributing to the character of the historic district.

From our analysis, it appears that much of the problem is from deferred maintenance or incorrectly executed work in the past. We agree with many of the recommendations for repairs to the main block of the church, but question why those same suggestions are not applicable to the two towers. The report states that the partially reconstructed portion of the (northwest) tower rests on the underlying multi-wythe historic masonry structure, which could (over time) lead to a structural failure. It appears that the concern only applies to the northwest tower. Why then is demolition of the southwest tower also recommended? The report further states that "It should be noted that a structural analysis of the existing towers... was neither authorized nor performed." Given that statement, we recommend the Commission inquire as to why the recommendation is being made to demolish both towers. Likewise, we wonder why are the recommendations for the remainder of the church not applicable to the two towers? Are there options to repair or partially reconstruct the northwest tower that will secure the tower's structural integrity?

We offer the following recommendations and proffer additional questions that we believe can lead to the preservation of the iconic towers of St. Paul Church. The typical maintenance items are tried-and-true and should reduce water penetration throughout the exterior of the church.

Note re: Multi-Wythe Masonry Construction - The report states that outer wythe has a gap at all the areas that were opened in the masonry wall to perform a visual inspection. The incorporation of an air gap in multi-wythe masonry walls easily postdates the construction of St. Paul Church. Thus, it is most likely not an intentional construction feature. Which, if any, of the following recommendations can be employed to restore the structural integrity of the towers?

1. Grout the three wythes with a permeable grout. Jahn has products that appear applicable for this purpose. Apply stone strengthener to the historic brick. Or, can a lime mortar be injected into the voids? Is there a better alternative to bind the three wythes together?
2. Mechanically tie the outer wythe to the two inner wythes and fill the void between the outer wythe and inner wythes and the voids within the inner wythes with grout as described above. Mechanically reinforce inner wythes as necessary. Apply stone strengthener to the historic brick.
3. Reconstruct the outer wythe to current standards to create a gap to keep water from the inner wythes. Mechanically reinforce inner wythes and grout solid. Reuse historic brick and apply a stone strengthener. Is there a good match to the historic brick?

5. **Investigate the installation of a hydraulic mortar wash atop the window hoods, corbelling, or other areas of flat masonry protrusion.** This approach will require routine maintenance and occasional replacement.
6. **Properly seal wall penetrations.**
7. **Adapt as necessary, the roof of each tower.** This approach could include thru-wall flashing and a new drain system to quickly remove water from the roof. The few photos with the report did not clearly show the intersection of the masonry and roof on the interior of the parapet. It appears that the vertical masonry walls were parged and possibly painted with an elastomeric coating that also covers the roof. We are working on a similar project where copper thru-wall flashing will be run on the inside of the parapet and under replacement coping and tied into the copper gutter that leads to replacement scuppers. Per the photos on page 23 of the report, it appears that water has been entering through the upper section of the northwest tower for a long time. However, wasn't this section of the tower rebuilt in 1955? If yes, the older lime-based mortar is not applicable. Does this suggest that water is penetrating the wall around hairline cracks in the Portland cement mortar, or from brick corbelling, or from atop the parapet or the roof?
8. **Adapt, as necessary, the intersection of the roof and each tower.** This approach could include flashing and counter flashing and the installation of a cricket.
9. **After sufficient time, replaster the interior walls with lime-based plaster.** Rake out the old mortar joint on the interior wythe to act as a key for the new scratch coat. Note a lime-based plaster, as with lime-based mortar, has some plasticity characteristics and will expand and contract with temperature and moisture fluctuations. Lime based plaster will also tolerate intermittent wetting in a multi-wythe wall, whereas, a gypsum-based plaster will deteriorate (pillow effect) once exposed to moisture and water. An alternative is to furr out the masonry walls with wood studs or metal furring channels and cover with fiberglass wrapped sheetrock by DensArmor Plus or similar.
10. **Alternative recommendation re: reconstruction.** If the above recommendations are not pursued, the final recommendation is to reconstruct each tower to duplicate their current configuration and detailing.

Questions for Historic Preservation Commission to pose

1. What, if any, repair options were considered that retained both iconic towers?
2. What methods can be employed to repair both towers?
3. What are the estimates to repair both towers including any partial reconstruction of the northwest tower?
4. What are the cost estimates to: (1) demolish the two towers, (2) provide design services to remove the two towers and rebuild the façade as designed which includes structural modifications to the roof, exterior walls, and floor, and (3) construct the proposed design?
5. What is the cost differential to repair the towers and/or partially reconstruct the northwest tower versus demolition, design, and construction of the proposed design?

The Restoration Services Branch stands ready to provide technical assistance to the church and its stewards and can make an in-person visit at the church's invitation to discuss these recommendations.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of assistance to the commission. Please do not hesitate to contact us should the commission have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Kristi Brantley
Preservation Commissions Coordinator

Cc: Ramona Barros, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Jeff Adolphsen, Senior Restoration Specialist

V. Reports/Discussion

A. Design Standards: Update City of Goldsboro's Historic District Commission Design Standards. Refer to timeline below:

City of Goldsboro Design Guidelines/Standards Timeline:

- ❖ **1979** – An Architectural Inventory of the City of Goldsboro “Historic District” study area was begun in May 1979 by Barbara Hammond.
- ❖ **1981** – First Historic Zoning District established along with the Goldsboro Historic District Commission by City Council on May 18, 1981.
- ❖ **1983** – The first Guidelines for Property Improvements in the Goldsboro Historic District were presented by the Department of Planning and Redevelopment in July 1984.
- ❖ **1984** – The Documentation for Review and Certification was prepared for the Goldsboro Historic District Commission by the Department of Planning and Redevelopment in July 1984.
- ❖ **1985** – Certified by the U.S. Department of the Interior in March 1985, the Goldsboro Historic District encompasses approximately 46 blocks.
- ❖ **1987** – An Architectural Inventory of Goldsboro North Carolina was prepared by Barbara Hammond, a doctoral candidate, and sponsored by the City of Goldsboro.
- ❖ **2007** – The Downtown Goldsboro Development Corporation (DGDC) funds the Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro. It was revised in 2009.
- ❖ **2021** – NC General Statute Chapter 160D. In 2019, Chapter 160D consolidated city and county enabling statutes for development regulations and formed GS 160D-947(c) which states: [Historic Preservation Commissions] **Must** frame preservation district provisions as “standards” rather than “guidelines.”
- ❖ **2025** – Update the *Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro* to the City of Goldsboro *Historic District Commission Design Standards* in-house to align more with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Moreover, updating the Standards would create an opportunity to:

1. Address the entirety of the Historic District (1 of only 3 Local Historic Districts in NC recognized by the NPS) to directly support the Historic District Commission.
 2. Include the quasi-judicial process.
 3. Include the COA process.
 4. Include the newly added (2024) Resilience Design Standards created and adopted by DNCR, SHPO, UNC SOG, NCSU.
 5. Include Sustainability Standards.
-

V. Reports/Discussion

B. Certified Local Government (CLG):

What is a CLG?

- ◆ 1980 Congress amended the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to require each state to establish a procedure by which local governments may be certified to participate in the national framework of historic preservation programs.
- ◆ This requirement has become the "Certified Local Government (CLG) Program." Over 45 in NC! Local governments that qualify for certification must have an active and legally adequate historic preservation commission and must meet the federal requirements for certification.
- A local government must: *(Basic Responsibilities)*
 1. Enforce legislation designation & protection of historic properties.
 2. Qualified historic preservation commission.
 3. Maintain inventory of historic properties.
 4. Public participation in the local historic preservation program. (workshops, lectures, tours)
 5. Participate in the National Register process.
 6. Annual CLG training for staff and commissioners

Where are we?

To seek Certified Local Government status:

1. Comprehensive inventory of the area's cultural resources has been or will be conducted.
2. Information on the area's locally designated historic district and/or landmarks (we have no designated landmarks, yet!).
3. Ordinance creating the local commission.
4. Commission's rules of procedure.
5. Design Standards/Guidelines used by the commission.
6. Resumes of the members of the commission.
7. Description of the commission's past and current activities.

Achievement and Assessment

Performance Assessment:

- Once a local government is certified, the SHPO shall perform annual monitoring activities and a quadrennial performance review.
- The reports enable the SHPO to ensure that the CLG continues to meet the minimum requirements and becomes a vehicle for commission self-evaluation, publicizing CLG accomplishments locally and statewide, and identifying issues and needs.
- Each CLG submits an annual report covering the period July 1 to June 30.

V. Reports/Discussion

B. Certified Local Government (CLG):

What is a CLG?

- ◆ 1980 Congress amended the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to require each state to establish a procedure by which local governments may be certified to participate in the national framework of historic preservation programs.
- ◆ This requirement has become the "Certified Local Government (CLG) Program." Over 45 in NC! Local governments that qualify for certification must have an active and legally adequate historic preservation commission and must meet the federal requirements for certification.
- A local government must: *(Basic Responsibilities)*
 1. Enforce legislation designation & protection of historic properties.
 2. Qualified historic preservation commission.
 3. Maintain inventory of historic properties.
 4. Public participation in the local historic preservation program. (workshops, lectures, tours)
 5. Participate in the National Register process.
 6. Annual CLG training for staff and commissioners

The Benefits?

Local governments and commissions benefit in the following ways:

1. GRANTS from SHPO
 - Architectural/Archaeological Surveys
 - Architectural Plans or Feasibility Studies
 - National Register Nominations
 - Preservation Plan (Elevate Goldsboro Comprehensive Plan)
1. Celebrate the City's cultural diversity and preserve and enhance our historic assets. Goldsboro's Economic Positioning Statement: *Goldsboro is Eastern North Carolina's center for innovation, national defense, affordable living, and cultural diversity. In our community, dreams take flight while people and businesses grow.*
2. Thrive Historic Districts, Cultural Activities, Local Historic Marker Program, Awards, Events, Public Outreach