



Historic Preservation Minutes

March 3 2016

Members Present

Clark Tew, Chair
Jay Maddocks
Larry Schaeffer
Andy Poore

Also Present

Tim Brown, Staff Liaison
Bobby Compton, Staff Liaison

Members Absent

Mark McNeely
Bob Amon

-
1. **Call to Order.** Clark Tew called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.
 2. **Approval of the Minutes.** Mr. Tew asked if there were any changes or corrections to the Minutes from the February 4, 2016 meeting. Hearing none, Mr. Tew asked for a motion to accept the minutes as written.

ACTION: Mr. Schaeffer made a motion to approve the Minutes of the February 4th, 2016 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission as submitted. Mr. Maddocks seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously as presented.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application for 177 North Main Street, Public Hearing and Consideration of Approval.** Mr. Tew asked if there was any Historic Preservation Commission member or members that needed to request recusal. Mr. Schaeffer requested recusal since the applicant and property owner, Ms. Catherine Scholten, was a client of his architectural firm. Mr. Tew called for a motion to recuse Mr. Schaeffer from consideration of this Certificate of Appropriateness application proceeding for the reason stated. The motion for recusal by was approved unanimously by the Commission. Mr. Tew noted that a quorum was present to consider the request. Mr. Tew then called upon Mr. Brown to present the staff report for the application. Mr. Brown was duly sworn in. Mr. Brown noted that the structure, located at 178 North Main Street, is designated as noncontributing within the Commercial Core Historic District and the tax records indicate that the structure was built in 1910. Mr. Brown also referenced the revised front elevation submitted by the applicant. Mr. Brown provided a summary of the Staff Analysis, exhibits supporting the request, and the scope of work proposed in the Certificate of Appropriateness application. Mr. Brown noted that the applicant is proposing significant exterior repair of deteriorated masonry and renovation of both the front and rear facades.



Historic Preservation Minutes March 3 2016

The scope of the Certificate of Appropriateness application was presented as follows:

Front Elevation

1. *Repair and replace* existing damaged brick. Original masonry window openings to be restored.
2. *Replace* three second story windows to upper front elevation.
3. *Stabilize, restore, repair, and repaint* water damaged painted masonry using Prosoco Breathable Masonry Coating II (Recommended by SHPO)
4. *Install* wood cornice trim and fascia.
5. *Repair* and paint existing store front and frames as required.
6. *Remove* existing tile below storefront and install new tile.
7. *Install* new wood and glass entry door.
8. *Install* new arm or projecting sign and wall mounted sign.
9. *Repaint* existing storefront elements.
10. *Install* (2) new exterior wall sconces to front facade.
11. *Remove* existing awning.

Rear Elevation

1. *Remove* (2) existing infilled window fenestrations on first and second floors.
2. *Repair, repaint, and replace* existing masonry as necessary. Original masonry window openings to be restored.
3. *Replace* windows to match existing.
4. *Repair* of the existing loading dock and wooden stairs as needed.

Mr. Brown made reference of the archival photographs of the building noting that all of the original contributing elements of the front façade have been removed or altered prior to its current noncontributing classification. Mr. Brown noted that the original cornice and coping elements shown in these photographs were originally made of tin. Mr. Brown noted that the owner proposes to remove the noncontributing tile work below the shop front and install a new entry door; otherwise the existing noncontributing shop front will be unaltered except for painting the aluminum channeling. Mr. Brown noted that the methods proposed for repairing the masonry are those recommended by the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Brown noted that the owner proposes to remove the existing awning. The owner proposes to return a wood cornice element to the front façade that is reflective of the original tin cornice work. The owner also proposes to add new projecting and wall-mounted signs and exterior lighting as shown in the exhibits. Mr. Brown noted that the owner proposes to install two new windows in the rear elevation that were previously removed to match the exiting windows and repair masonry as needed.

In concluding his staff report presentation, Mr. Brown noted that the Commission is charged to consider the testimony presented relative to encouraging consideration of congruency, continuity, and consistency with surrounding contributing structures on the block, as opposed to stewardship of the repair and preservation of historical elements. The obligation of the Historic



Historic Preservation Minutes March 3 2016

Preservation in this case is to reasonably, appropriately, and consistently apply the Design Guidelines in consideration of this application. Mr. Brown then made reference to the applicable Guidelines included in the exhibits. Mr. Brown asked if there were any questions from the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the presentation of the Certificate of Appropriateness application. Mr. Tew inquired regarding the guidance given by the Historic Preservation staff. Mr. Brown noted that Mr. Schaeffer also contact the SHPO staff and could also elaborate upon the guidance he received.

Mr. Tew then recognized Mr. Schaeffer to present on behalf of the owner. Mr. Schaeffer was duly sworn in. Mr. Schaeffer noted that while there are no contributing elements of the front façade to salvage or restore. The goal is to contextually relate the renovation proposed appropriately to the existing architectural vocabulary of the downtown streetscape by using similar types of elements. Mr. Schaeffer noted that SHPO staff concurred that there were not elements to preserve or restore. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the second story windows proposed will match the dimensions of the original window fenestrations which were currently blocked up. Mr. Schaeffer also noted that while not a part of the application, the owner may be interested in installing a balcony to the second upon revision to the Design Guidelines to address such additions. Mr. Compton noted that the adjacent property has a balcony and spoke favorably of such an addition in the future. Mr. Brown noted that if the Town is awarded a grant from SHPO in May for the current grant application cycle, the extensive revisions proposed to the Design Guidelines would move forward to completion. Mr. Maddocks inquired regarding the nature of the second story window fenestrations of the front façade. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the original fenestration was rectangular and the owner hopes to maintain the original opening sizes upon repair. Ms. Kelly asked if the rear façade masonry would be painted. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the owner is proposing to repair and repoint the rear façade masonry, but not paint the natural brick as this is discouraged by SHPO. Mr. Schaeffer noted that this brick is coated so that painting to preserve the brick is not required as in previous applications. Mr. Tew asked if the existing shop front would be replaced. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the owner is only proposing to paint the aluminum channel work in keeping with the dark paint treatment found on several other shop fronts in the downtown. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the noncontributing tile veneer below to the shop front window will be removed. Mr. Tew then inquired regarding the second story, front façade window treatment proposed. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the window treatment proposed is different because it is not a restoration. Mullions will be on the outside and similar to those at the Deluxe Ice Cream building. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the window style proposed was not intended to reflect a restoration since it cannot be achieved. Mr. Schaeffer noted the wide variety of window treatments in the downtown and that the windows proposed would be consistent and congruent with the variety found. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the black window mullion can be found at the corner of Moore and Main streets in close proximity. Mr. Brown noted that the Guidelines call for a contemporary yet compatible treatment which is the intent proposed by the applicant. Mr. Schaeffer also noted that the windows will also be recessed. Mr. Tew asked if the wall mounted sign lettering would be attached to the masonry front façade or painted. Mr. Schaeffer noted that this treatment has not been determined. Mr. Brown noted that wall mounted signs were common to the surrounding building and were also shown in the archival photographs. Mr. Tew asked if there were any examples of ornamental entry door treatments or



Historic Preservation Minutes March 3 2016

patterns. Mr. Schaeffer emphasized that the objective requirements of providing a contemporary application is as with new construction as opposed to matching an existing condition. Hearing no further questions from the Historic Preservation Commission, Mr. Tew asked if anyone else would like to provide testimony. Mr. Tew swore in Mr. Gary Preston to provide testimony. Mr. Preston stated that as a downtown property owner, he supported the Certificate of Appropriateness application as proposed. Hearing no further comment, Mr. Tew moved to close the public hearing.

Mr. Tew then charged the Commission to consider the application request based upon the testimony received to support the Findings of Fact. Mr. Tew summarized the testimony regarding the approach to renovation and repair of the front façade, noting that the window and door elements, while distinctive, are congruent. Mr. Tew noted that the cornice element is not intended to replicate the original tin cornice and mantle elements and that the signage proposed will require compliance with the Town's sign ordinance as well. Mr. Tew noted that he did retain some concern regarding the entry door treatment proposed. Ms. Kelly noted that her observations that there is considerable variation in the entry doors and shop fronts in the downtown. Mr. Mattocks added that since the building was not a contributing resource to the District, he considered the approach proposed for renovation and repair in keeping with the Guidelines and applauded the improvements to be gained. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Tew directed the Commission to consider the Findings of Fact.

1. *The property will be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*

A motion was made by Mr. Tew to approve on the basis that the structure will continue to support a commercial business, which preserves its historic use. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly. Receiving no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

2. *The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property will be avoided.*

Mr. Maddocks made a motion that this Finding was not applicable since that there were no historical elements to lend historical character with the exception of the masonry which will be retained and is not being altered. Mr. Tew noted that the shop front was not likely historic. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly. Receiving no further discussion, on the motion the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.

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



Historic Preservation Minutes March 3 2016

A motion was made by Mr. Tew to approve this Finding based on the criteria that here are no historical elements nor are conjectured features proposed to be added Those to be added are contemporary in nature. Receiving no further discussion, on the motion, the motion was seconded by Mr. Maddocks, which was unanimously approved.

4. *Changes to the property that have acquired historic significance in their own right are being retained and preserved.*

A motion was made by Ms. Kelly that the Finding was not applicable as there is no evidence of existing historic elements are to be retained. Receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was seconded by Mr. Maddocks, which was unanimously approved.

5. *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property are being preserved.*

A motion was made Ms. Kelly that this Finding was not applicable noting that the only significant element to be repaired was the existing masonry and the overall approach to be undertaken is one of maintaining congruency with surrounding contributing structures. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly. Receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.

6. *Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features has been substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

A motion was made Ms. Kelly that this Finding was not applicable, noting that the only significant element to be repaired was the existing masonry and the overall approach to be undertaken is one of maintaining congruency with surrounding contributing structures. The motion on this Finding was seconded by Mr. Poore, and receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.*

Mr. Tew made a motion to approve this Finding, noting that the only chemical treatment presented in testimony was the breathable paint proposed to stabilize the original brick of the front façade. This appears to be a gentle treatment which will not damage the underlying material and is recommended by the SHPO. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly. Receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.



Historic Preservation Minutes March 3 2016

8. *Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, the applicant has shown that mitigation measures will be undertaken.*

Mr. Tew made a motion to consider this Finding not applicable since no archeological resources are evidenced or were discussed as part of the testimony received. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly. Receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

Mr. Tew made a motion to approve this Finding, noting that the only significant architectural element, although not historical, is the shop front which is being maintained. Mr. Poore seconded the motion and receiving no further discussion, on the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

Mr. Tew made a motion that this Finding is not applicable, noting that no new addition or no new construction is proposed. Ms. Kelly seconded the motion and receiving no further discussion on the motion, the was unanimously approved.

Mr. Tew noted that upon consideration of the Findings of Fact, called for a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application. The motion to approve was made by Mr. Poore and subsequently seconded by Ms. Kelly. The certificate of Appropriateness was unanimously approved.

4. **Old Business.** Mr. Brown informed the Commission that the work associated with the Historic Preservation Fund Pass-Through Grant for the Mooresville and vicinity architectural survey was proceeding on schedule and that staff has submitted an application for the upcoming cycle of the Historic Preservation Fund Pass-Through Grant to update and complete extensive revisions to the Design Guidelines. Grant awards will be made in May. Mr. Brown noted a potential schedule conflict for the May 5th Historic Preservation Commission meeting and if there is business to be considered calling for the meeting, recommended that it be moved to Wednesday, May 4th.
5. **Adjournment.** There being no further business for the Historic Preservation Commission to consider, Mr. Tew made a motion to adjourn the meeting.



Historic Preservation Minutes March 3 2016

Mr. Tew made a motion to adjourn. The motion, seconded by Ms. Kelly, was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:58pm