



Historic Preservation Minutes

May 4, 2016

Members Present

Clark Tew, Chair
Jay Maddocks
Larry Schaeffer
Denise Kelly
Mark McNeely

Also Present

Tim Brown, Staff Liaison
Bobby Compton, Town Board of Commissioners

Members Absent

Andy Poore
Bob Amon

-
1. **Call to Order.** Clark Tew called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.
 2. **Approval of the Minutes.** Mr. Tew asked if there were any changes or corrections to the Minutes from the March 3, 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 March 3, 2016 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission as submitted. Mrs. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application for 133 North Main Street, Public Hearing and Consideration of Approval.** Mr. Tew noted that a quorum was present to consider the request. Mr. Brown was duly sworn in. Mr. Tew then called upon Mr. Brown to present the staff report for the application. Mr. Brown made reference to archival photographs of 133 North Main Street, archival photographs of Mooresville shopfronts, and photographs denoting compatibility and continuity within the block. Mr. Brown also referenced an illustration drawn by the applicant, Mr. Mark Beck, denoting the proposed upper transom installation in the current sign band location above the existing shop front. Mr. Brown noted that the sign band as a noncontributing element is proposed to be removed, the proposed decorative cornice element installation is to be located above shop front lintel, and mechanical awning installation is also requested as part of the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Brown referenced the first archival photograph taken between 1905 and 1915, which showed that the original front elevation contained the upper transom element. Mr. Brown then referenced the second archival photograph of the shop front taken in the 1940's which shows the original decorative cornice element, noting that by this time, the original flush shop front had been replaced to address the prevailing display configuration of the 1930's and 40's with the recessed entry door



Historic Preservation Minutes May 4, 2016

which increased display space configuration and provided a covered entry. The photograph also showed that the original transom, which had been covered or replaced by a sign band. Mr. Brown noted that an upper transom above the shop fronts was a standard design element for all of the commercial buildings from the turn of the century which allowed additional ventilation and natural light into the first floor. Mr. Brown noted that many of the original transoms still exist on buildings within the historic district were constructed of large clear or smoked glass panes separated by wood mullions or smaller panes of smoked or colored glass. Some of the original transoms are noted in the archival photographs of the exhibits. Mr. Brown noted that the cornice treatment proposed was also quite common. Mr. Brown noted that the applicant proposes to install a transom of contemporary design compatible with the existing contributing architectural elements of the building. Mr. Brown reviewed the illustration provided by the applicant. Mr. Brown noted that the mullions separating the glass will be placed to provide additional symmetry between the shopfront element and the upper story windows. Mr. Brown also noted the mechanical awning and molding shown in the illustration. Mr. Brown then reviewed the applicable historic preservation design guidelines referenced in the staff analysis.

Mr. Schaeffer asked about construction material contemplated for the proposed cornice treatment. Mr. Brown suggested that this question be directed to the applicant. Mr. Tew asked if the state historic preservation office had been contacted. Mr. Brown indicated that he did not consult with the state historic preservation office. Mr. Schaeffer asked if the proposed work would affect the historic tax credits associated with the previous building renovation by the applicant. Mr. Brown indicated that the work proposed would not impact the previous work.

Mr. Tew then acknowledged the applicant, Mr. Mark Beck, who was duly sworn in. Mr. Beck noted the building was originally renovated in 2008-09. Mr. Beck noted that his company utilizes 90% of the total floor area with the exception of the first floor retail space which he intends to upfit to accommodate a food service use. Mr. Beck noted that he desires to return the original transom element while retaining the existing contributing shopfront element. Mr. Beck noted that the proposed cornice element would be designed by an architect to achieve the right proportional balance. Mr. Beck noted that the proposed transom element would be designed to be visually proportionate to the existing upper façade and shopfront. Mr. Beck noted that when the building was previously restored, the shopfront element was not restored at the time. The desire is to partially restore the front to reflect the original 1906 appearance while retaining the contributing 1930's era shop front. Mr. Beck emphasized the importance of architecturally designing the proposed elements to achieve the correct architectural proportions. Mr. Beck also provided his approach philosophy advocating preservation and authenticity to effectively address adaptive reuse. Mr. Schaeffer praised Mr. Beck regarding his previous renovation work on the building. Mr. Schaeffer inquired regarding the proposed design of the cornice. Mr. Beck noted that the original cornice was more linear, but the design proposed was intended to better provide proportionality to the original upper story and the 1930's era



Historic Preservation Minutes May 4, 2016

shopfront. The rounded elements of the cornice proposed are intended to visually relate to the upper story arched windows. Mr. Schaeffer noted that he liked what the proposed cornice was intended to accomplish and that the proposed transom increase natural light into the building. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the previous cornice was not very ornate. Mr. Beck noted that the cornice design proposed was intended to address the existing condition where the building does not proportionally match. Mr. Tew noted that the archival photograph appeared to show a glass transom with thick mullions. Mr. Tew asked about the framing proposed. Mr. Beck noted that a framing element would be a part of the transom design, but perhaps not as thick as those denoted in the archival photograph and that the transom would be designed by an architect. Mr. Schaeffer suggested that the Commission consider approving the request contingent upon the final designs being submitted to staff for administrative review and approval if found in keeping with the exhibits and testimony presented, with the ability of staff to require additional review by the Commission. Mr. Maddocks asked if the decorative small paned leaded glass was contemplated. Mr. Beck responded that such a design would be incorrect and inappropriate to the building. Mr. Beck noted that the mullions will not be aluminum clad. Mrs. Kelly inquired about the awning proposed. Mr. Tew asked when Mr. Beck thought the current sign band was installed. Mr. Beck thought that it may have been installed in the 1950's but could have been as early as the 1930's when the original store front was replaced.

Mr. Tew asked for any additional comments. Mr. Brown summarized the applicant's intent in the design of the elements to restore visual balance and proportionality.

Hearing no further comment, Mr. Tew moved to close the public hearing and asked for Commission discussion regarding the application. Mr. Schaeffer noted that he endorsed the intent of the applicant to return these design elements to the building, but had concerns regarding the cornice proposed. Mr. Tew stated that he liked the idea of the cornice while he recognized his obligation to review in light of the Department of Interior's standards to not create a false sense of time, place, and use by adding conjectural features. Mr. Tew posed the question of whether or not the cornice proposed was a conjectural feature, noting that is not the stated intent of the applicant. Mr. Maddocks asked if the awning and transom design could suitably bring the balance and restoration of proportionality desired by the applicant, noting that it might be appropriate to review the cornice design at a later date. Mr. Tew stated that he thought that the transom and awning design would be entirely appropriate based on the testimony of the applicant on how these proposed elements would be designed and would be compatible with the surrounding buildings. Mr. Tew stated that the proposed cornice was not intended to create a false sense of an historic element historic such as a copy of an existing feature which would comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards and the design guidelines of the Commission. Mr. Schaeffer stated that he believe that the Findings of Fact can be found in the affirmative providing that the designs are reviewed by Mr. Brown and that the elements did not copy existing historic elements. Mr. Tew asked Mr. Schaeffer to make a motion.



Historic Preservation Minutes May 4, 2016

Action: Mr. Tew made a motion for the Historic Preservation Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 133 N. Main Street providing that the transom be constructed of glass with an appropriate mullion treatment to be approved by staff; and appropriate awning treatment consistent with the testimony given and in keeping with the design guidelines be reviewed and approved by staff; and the proposed cornice be designed in such a way as to not misrepresent a historic cornice element and that it will be of contemporary design also reviewed and approved by staff. Mr. Tew asked for a second to the motion which was made by McNeely. Mr. Maddocks suggested that staff review the appropriateness of the cornice to ensure that a false sense history is not created and to review the color and design of the awning to ensure compliance with the design guidelines as well as review of the transom materials and design for compliance. Mr. Schaeffer recommended that should staff find that the proposed elements, upon review, did not meet these findings and those of the motion, could request further review by the Historic Preservation Commission. The amendments to the original motion were seconded by Mr. Maddocks. Calling for a vote on the amended motion, the motion passed unanimously. Mr. Tew then called for a motion to move to consideration of the Findings of Fact. The motion in favor passed unanimously.

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 and retail use, which will require minimal changes to the site and environment. The motion was seconded by Mr. McNeely. 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. Schaeffer made a motion in the affirmative regarding this Finding on the basis of testimony that there are no historical elements being altered or removed. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kelly. Receiving no further discussion, on the motion the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.



Historic Preservation Minutes May 4, 2016

- 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.*

A motion was made by Mrs. Kelly to approve this Finding based on the testimony that the owner intends to create new elements and that are contemporary in nature and that the architectural drawings of these proposed period appropriate elements are to be reviewed by Staff for compliance with this Finding. Receiving no further discussion, on the motion, the motion was seconded by Mr. Schaeffer, 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 in the affirmative by Mr. Tew that existing historic elements are to be retained. Receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was seconded by Mr. McNeely, 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 Mr. Maddocks in the affirmative in that existing historic elements that characterize the property are to be preserved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schaeffer. 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 Mr. Schaeffer that this Finding was not applicable, noting that there are no historic significant elements to be repaired or replaced. The motion on this Finding was seconded by Mrs. Kelly, 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. Schaeffer made a motion that this Finding was not applicable, noting that no physical or chemical treatments are proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr.



Historic Preservation Minutes May 4, 2016

McNeely. Receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion was unanimously approved.

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 Mrs. 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. McNeely made a motion to approve this Finding, noting that the applicant as presented in the testimony received, intends to maintain the existing historical elements while adding the features proposed to meet this finding. Mr. Maddocks 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. Schaeffer made a motion that this Finding is not applicable, noting that no new addition or no new construction is proposed. Mrs. Kelly seconded the motion and receiving no further discussion on the motion, the motion 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 with the conditions contained in Mr. Schaeffer's original motion for review and approval by staff of architectural drawings of the elements proposed. 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 and supporting narratives are substantially completed. Mr. Brown noted that the completed work will be presented sometime this summer in



Historic Preservation Minutes May 4, 2016

keeping with the September deadline for completion. Grant awards for the FY 16-17 funding cycle will be made in May.

5. **Tour of Home Funding.** Mr. Tew noted that he hoped to resolve this matter within the next few months.

6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business for the Historic Preservation Commission to consider, Mr. Tew made a motion to adjourn the meeting then proceed to conduct the planned workshop.

Action: Mr. Tew made a motion to adjourn. The motion, seconded by Mr. McNeely, was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 7:03pm