



Historic Preservation Minutes

September 7 , 2017

Members Present

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

Also Present

Tim Brown, Staff Liaison
Heather Poston, Secretary

Absent

Bob Amon
Bobby Compton, Town Board of Commissioners 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 August 3, 2017 meeting. No additions or corrections were suggested.

ACTION: Mr. Schaeffer made a motion to approve the Minutes of the August 3, 2017 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission as presented. Ms. Ritter seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Public Hearing-Mooresville Historic Preservation Design Guidelines Public Hearing

Mr. Brown introduced Mr. Phil Thomasson of Thomasson and Associates, Inc., who is the consultant that has prepared the public hearing draft of the proposed Design Guidelines update. Mr. Brown noted that the original Historic Preservation Commission Design Guidelines were adopted in 2005 with the intent to establish commercial and residential historic districts in Mooresville at the time. The overriding goal of stewardship of the Town's historic resources remains the same as embodied in the original documents. Since the local designation of the Commercial Core Historic in 2013, the Historic Preservation Commission, in applying the 2005 Guidelines in their review of Certificates of Appropriateness applications, has determined that updating the Guidelines was needed. The proposed update of the Guidelines incorporates best practices for construction, restoration, renovation, and repair in a document that clearly communications guidelines and expectations for preservation activities in a more user-friendly format. Mr. Brown briefly compared the content of Chapter 7, Shopfront to that of the proposed updated Guidelines to illustrate these points. Mr. Thomasson further noted that the proposed update added more clarity and efficiency to the Certificate of Appropriateness process, through increasing administrative application and approvals. Mr. Thomasson noted that the proposed update would also provide information regarding tax credits, energy efficiency best practices, new construction and the use of like kind materials and explained that application of the Guidelines will enhance property values and vitality of the historic commercial core. Mr. Thomasson provided an overview of how the proposed update was intuitively organized and clarified that application of the residential Guidelines were voluntary. Mr. Mattox agreed, noting that the update was intuitive and easy to understand. Mr. Schaeffer stated that he appreciated



Historic Preservation Minutes September 7 , 2017

that many of the activities currently requiring the formal issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness would now warrant administrative staff approval which would certainly help expedite the process and commented on the clarity of the document. Mr. Shaeffer asked if further clarity be given to the administrative review process. Mr. Thomasson noted that for many jurisdictions, the criteria for issuance of a building permit separated administrative review from formal review of a Certificate of Appropriateness and noted that routine maintenance items general required staff review or no review requirement. Ms. Ritter inquired about brick and paint colors. Mr. Thomasson noted that while the Appendix provides general guidance regarding paint colors, that paint is not regulated. Mr. Mattox inquired regarding the use of paint stabilizers for deteriorated brick such as brick that has had a stucco application over it or severe moisture damage. Mr. Thomasson recommended the use of salvaged brick if possible. Mr. Schaeffer noted that painting previously painted brick in the same color should not require a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Schaeffer suggested staff administrative review in the case of mortar application for repointing and requested generally that the Guidelines should prescriptively identify the level of approval required. Mr. Brown recommended that the public hearing for the Guidelines remain open so that it could be continued if necessary to receive any additional comment. Mr. Brown and Mr. Poore offered to address any further public comment following the meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Schaeffer made a motion to continue the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maddox. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness Application-178 North Main Street.

Mr. Poore opened the public hearing and swore in Mr. Brown to present the application, staff analysis, and exhibits. Mr. Brown noted that the building was classified as a noncontributing within the district. Significant architectural element on the building had been removed over time prior to the establishment of the historic district as noted in the archival photographs of the building. Mr. Brown noted ant a Certificate of Appropriateness had been issued in 2016 for the property but work had not commenced to date. Mr. Brown noted that the applicant desires to maintain the mercantile classification and establish a restaurant use within the building. Mr. Brown reviewed the exhibits associated with the deteriorated condition of the front façade. The applicant prefers to restore the original brick face of the façade if it can be stabilized, but noted that the applicant is requesting that the Certificate of Appropriateness provide the applicant with the option to remove the façade and replace it with matching new masonry if restoration is not possible or impractical. The applicant also intends to restore the three second story window fenestrations on the original front façade. Mr. Brown noted that the applicant proposes to repair and repoint the existing rear masonry façade as needed and restore the rear window fenestrations and replace with wood simulated SDL windows that match the remaining existing rear windows. Mr. Brown also reviewed the signage proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Brown next introduced Mark Siemieniec, the architect of Record for the project, to provide additional testimony. Mr. Siemieniec was duly sworn in. Mr. Schaeffer asked if the brick work would be repointed and restored if possible. Mr. Siemieniec confirmed that this was the intent of



Historic Preservation Minutes September 7 , 2017

the applicant. Mr. Siemieniec asked if the rear unpainted masonry façade could be painted. Mr. Brown noted that the North Carolina Historic Preservation Office strongly discourages painting unpainted brick. Mr. Schaeffer asked if the existing rear dock and deck would be maintained. Mr. Siemieniec noted that it would be replaced with a new dock and deck of similar scale as the noncontributing existing as warranted by building code requirements. Mr. Schaeffer recommended that the Certificate of Appropriateness permit the replacement of the front façade with a new masonry façade rather than prescribe or propose a construction treatment or method. Mr. Siemieniec concurred that this description would provide greater flexibility in determining the actual construction technique to be used if replacement is found to be necessary. Mr. Siemieniec noted that he has discussed the replacement option with the State Historic Preservation Office staff.

Receiving no further questions, comments, or testimony Mr. Poore closed the public hearing and called for Commission discussion regarding the application. Mr. Schaeffer recommended that the restoration techniques be reviewed and endorsed by the Historic Preservation Office and Iredell County. Mr. Mattox suggested an approach that ensured consistency and continuity with the surrounding buildings. Mr. Mattox suggested that the Certificate of Appropriateness address the appearance of the exterior facades rather than prescribe specific construction techniques. Mr. Schaeffer concurred with this approach, adding that this approach most likely would not create a delay in resolving a building code issue should one arise. Mr. Siemieniec agreed with this approach on behalf of the owner. Mr. Schaeffer asked that the Commission approve this approach and that the construction method be approved by both the State Historic Preservation Office and Iredell County. Mr. Maddox seconded this motion and it was approved unanimously.

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.*

A motion was made by Mr. McNeely that this Finding was applicable. The motion as seconded by Mr. Maddox 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.*

A motion was made by Ms. Ritter that this Finding was not applicable, noting that much of the contributing architectural elements had been removed. This Finding 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 that this Finding was not applicable noting that there were no conjectural features or new architectural elements proposed and that the changes



Historic Preservation Minutes September 7 , 2017

proposed to restore the existing building were in compliance with the Design Guidelines. 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. Schaeffer in the affirmative noting that the rear elevation would be restored. The motion 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 by Mr. McNeely in the affirmative regarding this Finding, noting that there were no historic elements remaining from the original structure that warrant preservation that characterize the property. 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 by Mr. McNeely that this Finding was addressed in the affirmative. 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 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. Mattox made a motion to consider this finding not applicable. 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. Schaeffer made a motion in the affirmative regarding that this Finding based on the exterior treatment proposed for the front façade. This Finding 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. Maddox 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.



Historic Preservation Minutes September 7 , 2017

Mr. Poore then called for for a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 178 North Main Street based on consideration of the Findings of Fact.

Action: Mr. Schaeffer made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application for 178 North Main Street which was seconded by Mr. McNeely. The motion was unanimously approved.

5. Old Business: North Main Street Pedestrian Safety Zone Project.

Mr. Brown provided a brief overview of the project scope and noted that construction start for the project had been scheduled and that construction was anticipated to be completed before the Christmas Parade event scheduled for November 21st.

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 7:21pm.