



Historic Preservation Minutes

August 3, 2017

Members Present

Andy Poore, Chair
Larry Schaeffer
Mark McNeely
Andy Poore
Lee Ritter
Jay Maddocks
Henry Seyller

Also Present

Bobby Compton, Town Board of Commissioners Liaison
Heather Poston, Secretary

Absent

Bob Amon
Tim Brown, Staff Liaison

1. **Call to Order.** Chairman Andy Poore noted that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
2. **Approval of the Minutes.** Mr. Poore asked if there were any changes or corrections to the Minutes from the June 1, 2017 meeting. No additions or corrections were suggested.

ACTION: Mr. Poore made a motion to approve the Minutes of the June 1, 2017 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission as presented. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application for 224 North Main Street, Public Hearing and Consideration of Approval.** Mr. Poore asked if there were any potential conflicts of interest for members present in considering the application. Mr. Schaeffer noted that his firm serves as the Architect of Record for the project. Mr. Schaeffer asked to be recused from further consideration.

ACTION: Mr. Poore called for a motion to recuse Mr. Schaeffer as requested. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schaeffer presented the proposed scope of work associated with the Certificate of Appropriateness application and as identified in the staff report and exhibits for the application. (The Scope of work proposed as noted in the exhibits and staff report are incorporated into these Minutes as follows.)

Front Elevation

1. Repair and replace, if necessary, damaged brick. Upon renovation, clean masonry exterior. Repaint frames of second floor windows and trim.
2. Remove existing noncontributing store front, awning and stone veneer.
3. Install new wood framed store front with insulated glazing. Storefront to incorporate columns with design elements consistent with existing contributing shopfront elements within the District. Remove exterior stone flooring and front entrance and replace with hexagonal ceramic tile and grout consistent with the District and period.
4. Remove existing canvas awning and frame over storefront.
5. Add wall mounted blade or arm sign.

Rear Elevation



Historic Preservation Minutes August 3, 2017

1. Stabilize, restore, repair, repoint as necessary, clean, and repaint existing masonry using Prosooco Breathable Masonry Coating II (Recommended by SHPO). Paint CMU masonry landing.
2. Repaint frames of second floor windows and trim.
3. Replace rear door with new hollow metal door with glazing.
4. Install new metal handrail to landing and stairs.
5. Install new wall mounted exterior light a rear door.
6. Replace metal gutter downspout.
7. Install new canvas awning and frame over door. Awning color proposed is black.
8. Remove brick enclosing existing window fenestration and install two new single hung windows on first floor (original space bricked) to match existing second floor windows.
9. Remove abandoned electrical and mechanical fixtures and strategically locate new in concentrated location.
10. Install new ground-mounted HVAC units and protection bollards. (Same location as existing unit
11. Replace existing gutter and downspout to match existing.

Mr. Schaeffer noted that the existing shopfront was a noncontributing architectural element likely added in the late 1070's and lacks historical significance. Mr. Schaeffer noted that archival photographs of the original shopfront element could not be found. This existing shopfront is proposed to be replaced with a new shopfront renovation that is designed to reflect period appropriate detailing consistent with the District and the era in which the original building was constructed. The proposed shopfront will utilize wood framing and wooden pilasters which are consistent with the period that the building was constructed. Mr. Schaeffer hoped that upon removal, the original brick bulkhead might be in place. Mr. Schaeffer reviewed the details noted in the proposed front and rear elevation exhibits for the application. Mr. Schaeffer noted that the applicant intends to restore the rear window fenestrations and install new windows to match the existing. Mr. Schaeffer also noted the proposed addition of an exterior awning over the rear entry as well as the addition of railing to the dock and stairs to address life/safety issues. Mr. Compton inquired regarding the signage proposed. The proposed front elevation denotes the installation of a blade or arm sign in conjunction with a wall mounted sign within sign band of the proposed shopfront. (Please note that approval of the two signs is contingent upon compliance with the Town of Mooresville Zoning Ordinance.) Mr. Schaeffer noted that the signage proposed in the sign band accentuated the shopfront design and that signage parallel to the street was difficult to read. Mr. Maddocks inquired if work was proposed regarding the entry walkway. Mr. Schaeffer noted that further work was not contemplated.

Receiving no further questions or comments, Mr. Poore closed the public hearing and called for Commission discussion regarding the application.

Action: Mr. Poore closed the public hearing and proceeded to the Findings of Fact.

Mr. Poore 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.*

This finding was addressed in the affirmative and 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 August 3, 2017

This finding was addressed in the affirmative and 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. Maddocks made a motion in the affirmative noting that the conjectural features or new architectural elements proposed maintained the character of the existing building in compliance with the Design Guidelines and considering that archival documentation of the original elements could not be found. The motion 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 Mr. Mattocks stating that the original elements were to be retained that the elements proposed for replacement were noncontributing and lacked historical significance. The motion was unanimously approved.

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

Mr. Poore noted that no archival photographic documentation of the original elements or condition existed to his knowledge. A motion was made by Mr. McNeely that this finding was not applicable noting that there were no historic elements remaining from the original structure that warrant preservation that characterize the property. Mr. Seyller noted that the original architectural and masonry elements were to be preserved. 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. Poore that this Finding was addressed in the affirmative, noting that the there are no historically significant elements to be replaced and that the existing contributing elements would be repaired or restored. The motion on this Finding 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. Maddocks made a motion that this Finding be in the affirmative, noting that no physical or chemical treatments are proposed. 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. Poore made a motion to consider this finding not applicable. The motion was unanimously approved.



Historic Preservation Minutes August 3, 2017

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. Poore made a motion that this Finding was not applicable since no additions or alterations were proposed. 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.*

Mr. Poore made a motion that this Finding was not applicable since no new additions or construction were proposed that could potentially alter the essential form and integrity of the property. This Finding was unanimously approved as not applicable.

Mr. Poore then called for for a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 224 North Main Street based on consideration of the Findings of Fact.

Action: Mr. Poore made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 224 North Main Street. The motion was unanimously approved.

4. **Election of Officers.** Mr. Poore noted that the positions of Chair and Vice Chair were due for consideration. Mr. Schaeffer nominated for reappointment Mr. Poore as Chair and Mr. McNeely as Vice-Chair. Mr. Poore and Mr. McNeely accepted the nomination. Commissioner Compton applauded their past service.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Schaeffer and seconded by Mr. Maddox to reappoint Mr. Poore and Mr. McNeely as officers of the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion to reappoint Mr. Poore as Chair and Mr. McNeely as Vice-Chair passed unanimously.

5. **Old Business: Design Guidelines Update Status Report.** Mr. Poore noted that the final draft for the final draft of the document is being prepared and that the public hearing and information meeting was anticipated to occur as part of the regularly scheduled September 7th agenda of the Historic Preservation Commission. Consideration of adoption was anticipated at the Regularly scheduled October 5th meeting.

6. **Adjourn.** There being no further business, Mr. Poore made a motion to adjourn.

Action: Mr. Poore made a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 6:36pm.