



Historic Preservation Minutes

June 2, 2016

Members Present

Clark Tew, Chair
Larry Schaeffer
Bob Amon
Mark McNeely
Andy Poore

Also Present

Tim Brown, Staff Liaison

Members Absent

Denise Kelly
Jay Maddocks
Bobby Compton, Town Board of Commissioners

--

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 May 5, 2016 meeting. Mr. McNeely pointed out a minor typographical error regarding a surname. Mr. Tew asked for a motion to accept the Minutes of the May 5th meeting as amended.

ACTION: Mr. Tew made a motion to approve the Minutes of the May 5, 2016 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission as amended. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application for 162 North Main Street, Public Hearing and Consideration of Approval.** Mr. Tew asked if there were any potential conflicts of interest for members present in considering the application. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the applicant had previously discussed the required content of a Certificate of Appropriateness Application with him prior to submittal but that neither he nor his firm was retained for any professional services nor does his firm serve as the Architect of Record. Mr. Tew inquired if Mr. Schaeffer could review this application without bias and Mr. Schaeffer affirmed that he could do so without bias. Mr. Tew also disclosed that his firm, at least two years prior to the application submittal, had provided unrelated professional services to the applicant's firm, Surfaces Southeast, Incorporated and stated that he could provide an unbiased review of the application. Mr. Tew asked if there was a subsequent motion relative to these disclosures to either recuse or allow Mr. Schaeffer's and his participation or to be recused from further consideration.

ACTION: Mr. Amon made a motion to allow Mr. Schaeffer and Mr. Tew to participate in the Public Hearing. The motion passed unanimously.



Historic Preservation Minutes June 2, 2016

Mr. Tew called the Public Hearing to order. Mr. Brown was duly sworn in. Mr. Tew then called upon Mr. Brown to present the staff report for the application. Mr. Brown noted that the applicant is proposing to add a storefront awning and second story window awnings to the contributing structure. Mr. Brown made reference to archival photographs of 162 North Main Street, and photographs denoting compatibility and continuity within the block. Mr. Brown noted the applicable awning guidelines which are a part of the adopted Historic Preservation Commission Design Guidelines and included as part of the application exhibits. Mr. Brown referenced the archival photographs of the building which showed retractable second story window awnings on the building and noted that the building has had a more contemporary storefront awning in the past but that the awning and frame had been removed. Mr. Brown referenced the existing awnings on adjacent buildings. Mr. Tew asked if the building has had window awnings in the past. Mr. Brown referenced the archival photograph denoting the retractable window awnings above the second story windows. Mr. Tew inquired if the proposed awnings were required to meet the awning standards set forth in the Guidelines and applicable zoning ordinances. Mr. Brown confirmed that compliance was required.

Hearing no further questions or comment, Mr. Tew closed the public hearing and called for Commission discussion regarding the application. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the awnings proposed were consistent with the historical past, is in keeping with those of surrounding structures, and is in keeping with the awning style that is appropriate with the building.

Action: Mr. Schaeffer made a motion to proceed to the Findings of Fact. The motion was seconded by Mr. Amon. Mr. Tew noted that a motion in favor would be a motion to proceed with the Findings of Fact. The motion 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 this Finding 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. Amon. 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.*



Historic Preservation Minutes June 2, 2016

Mr. Amon stated that he believed that this Finding is met and made a motion in the affirmative. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schaeffer. 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.*

Mr. Amon noted that the visual archival record presented in the exhibits supports this Finding and made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded by Mr. McNeely, 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 and not changed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schaeffer, 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. Schaeffer in the affirmative in that existing historic elements that characterize the property are to be preserved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Amon. 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. Tew 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 Mr. Schaeffer. 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.*



Historic Preservation Minutes June 2, 2016

Mr. Tew made a motion that this Finding was not applicable, noting that no physical or chemical treatments are proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schaeffer. 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. Mr. Schaeffer made an amended motion to include Findings 8, 9, and 10 as not applicable. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. McNeely. Receiving no further discussion on the amended motion, the amended 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.*

This Finding was unanimously approved as not applicable.

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.*

This Finding was unanimously approved as not applicable.

Mr. Tew noted that upon consideration of the Findings of Fact, called for a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 162 North Main Street. The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness made by Mr. McNeely and seconded by Mr. Schaeffer. The motion was unanimously approved.

4. **Old Business. Further Consideration of Preliminary Local Historic Landmark designation of Morrows Chapel.** Mr. Tew called upon Mr. Brown to present the updated preliminary application. Mr. Brown noted that the preliminary application for designation was initially reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission in October, 2015. The Commission, in its initial review, concluded that Morrows Chapel was potentially worthy of designation; however, recommended further research be conducted to support the application. Mr. Brown reported that since the presentation of the initial application, further research has been conducted and that the church congregation has been solicited to provide additional information



Historic Preservation Minutes June 2, 2016

and photographic documentation. Mr. Brown noted limited success has subsequently been made to date, particularly noting the additional documentation regarding the construction of the current sanctuary and fellowship hall, the arbor, and the construction and operation of the Rosenwald school formerly located on the site. Mr. Brown noted that while strides had been made in documenting historic aspects of the property, archival photographs have not been discovered. Mr. Brown noted that the cemetery has been documented photographically and that staff will remain diligent in its search for additional documentation and archival photographs of the church buildings, church activities, arbor, and school. Concluding his presentation of the additional findings to date, Mr. Brown recommended that the application be further consideration by the Town Board of Commissioners for designation. Mr. Tew commended staff and Mr. Poore in the efforts to date to advance the initial application and supported the application moving forward. Mr. Amon concurred. Mr. Tew called for a motion to move the preliminary application forward.

ACTION: A motion was made by Mr. Amon and subsequently seconded by Mr. McNeely to advance the preliminary application of Morrows Chapel for further consideration.

5. 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 keeping with the September deadline for completion. Notification of Grant awards for the FY 16-17 funding cycle have not been announced.
6. **Adjournment.** There being no further business for the Historic Preservation Commission to consider, Mr. Tew made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Action: Mr. Tew made a motion to adjourn. The motion, seconded by Mr. McNeely, was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:27pm