

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SANFORD, NORTH CAROLINA**

The Historic Preservation Commission met in regular session in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 225 E. Weatherspoon Street, on Monday, March 22, 2021, at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Brian Mitchell, Chair
 Greg Stoch, Vice-Chair
 Philip Yarborough
 David Underwood
 Jason Cline
 Charles Petty

Council Member : Sam Gaskins

Staff Present: Liz Whitmore, Historic Preservation Planner II
 Angela Baker, Clerk to the Board
 Kevin Hornick, Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Having noted the presence of a quorum, Chair Mitchell called the meeting to order, and entertained a motion to approve the agenda. Board member Stoch made the motion, seconded by Board member Petty, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Mitchell asked for a Motion to approve the February 22, 2021, minutes. Board member Petty made a motion, seconded by Board member Underwood, the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Mitchell read the quasi-judicial reference statement

Administer the Oath: Chair Mitchell called all participants speaking in favor of, or against the COA's, as well as staff, to come forward to be sworn in for testimony. Applicant Mateo Gill Nava and Staff Liz Whitmore appeared and took the oath.

Conflicts of Interest: None.

- A. COA-21-12 – Application by TRI 3D Properties who wishes to : Proposal 1, replace the existing clay tile roof with the installation of new architectural shingles; Proposal 2, retain the original clay tile roof on the front façade of the structure and install architectural shingles on the back section of the roof; Proposal 3, retain the clay tile

roof on the front façade of the structure and replace the back side of the roof with a new metal roof, color to complement the color of the clay tile.

Staff Presentation: Staff Whitmore stated that the applicant had originally had a difficult time, page 10 of the Exhibits. The house that is under consideration, page 11, shows all the tremendous leakage. The roof hasn't been repaired in 5 years. After due diligence, they have found the original roofer, Exhibit G, that was received after the package had been disbursed; they have been able to find the clay tiles. If this had been received at the beginning it could have been approved at Staff level.

Applicant's Testimony:

Sarah, TRI 3D Properties, 219 N. Gulf Street, stated that she agrees to withdraw the original COA, and agrees to the roof being approved at Staff level.

- B. COA-21-11 – Application by Mateo Gill Nava, owner of 524 Summitt Drive, who removed the brick façade without benefit of a COA and wishes to replace all doors and windows, and replace the brick and existing sidings with hardy plank and stone in the front only up to the bottom par of the windows. Remove deck and build a new deck on the rear of the house. Remove the addition and rebuild the addition on the west side of the house. Replace the shingles and gutters and pour a new driveway.

Staff Presentation: Staff Whitmore stated that the Historic Preservation Commission received an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Mateo Gill Nava owner of 524 Summitt Drive. He had removed the brick façade from the house without appropriate approvals. A letter was sent and he immediately contacted Staff and came in to discuss. Staff Whitmore stated that he had been very responsive to staff. He wishes to replace all the doors and windows; he has removed the brick façade and replace with HardiPlank and stone in the front only up to the bottom part of the windows; remove deck and build a new deck on the rear of the house; remove the addition and rebuild the addition on the west side of the house; and replace the shingles and gutters and pour a new driveway. It was advertised in accordance with the General Statutes and posted on March 8, 2021.

Exhibit A, Original Front Façade, page 11.

3. Masonry

Guidelines A, B, C, D, E and F pages 11, 12 13, 14, 15 and 16 apply to this section of the staff report.

- a. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain original masonry and masonry design features that are character-defining elements of historic buildings, including bond patterns, cornices, moldings, chimneys, arches, quoins, and pediments.
Comment: The applicant removed the brick façade without benefit of a COA. The applicant is proposing to replace the original brick front façade with stone (sample of

stone) course up to the front windows of the rest of the structure will be HardiPlank / concrete board (sample of HardiPlank) installed and will be painted.

- b. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain historic masonry materials whenever technically feasible. If replacement is necessary, use like-kind materials when possible and appropriate new materials when not possible. New materials should compliment historic materials in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture.
Comment: The applicant removed the brick façade and siding and intends to install stone up to the window on the front of the house and the remaining siding will be HardiPlank / cement board which will be painted.
- c. It is appropriate to blend and match products to the existing mortar materials in appearance, texture, and color.
Comment: The original brick and mortar materials have been removed from the front façade.
- d. – h. does not apply.
- i. It is not appropriate to cover masonry with siding.
Comment: The masonry has been removed and the applicant does not intend to put it back.

Board Questions:

Chair Mitchell asked if there were any other structures in the District that have the stone. Staff Whitmore stated not to her knowledge.

Board member Stoch asked if that was the original brick façade. Staff Whitmore said yes.

Chair Mitchell stated that Real Estate Agents are not letting buyers know that they are in a Historic District and should contact Liz Whitmore, before making any changes.

Applicant's Testimony:

Junior, 4108 Carson Drive, spoke on behalf of Mateo Gill Nava, 524 Summitt Drive, Sanford. When the house was bought, he was not informed that he was in the Historic District. He stated that the foundation is cracking, and removed the brick and wanted to replace the stone for brick at the bottom.

He spoke with the Planning Department and then obtained permits from Inspections.

He would be willing to use the brick instead of stone.

Board Discussion

Chair Mitchell stated that he is willing to use brick for brick.

Board member Stoch how long he has owned the home.
Mr. Gill stated one year.

Board member Stoch asked if he has building permits.
He said yes.

Board member Stoch wanted to make sure he is willing to replace brick and make it look almost back to original.
He said yes.

Chair Mitchell stated that if any of the brick would be able to be used, it may help save some money.
He said that the brick wasn't even attached to the house.

Staff Whitmore brought the Board's attention to Exhibit F, page 15. She said it showed the significance of the rot and condition of the foundation.

Attorney Hornik stated for the record that it appears the brick in its original condition was not repairable without significant alteration of the original brick.

3. Additions to Existing Structures.

Guidelines Exhibits A, C, D, E, F and G pages 10, 12, 13, 14 and 16 apply to this section of the staff report.

- a. Retain and preserve earlier additions that contribute to the overall historic character and form of a district building.
Comment: The applicant is proposing to remove the deck and side addition on the west side of the structure. The applicant is proposing to remove the addition on the rear of the house to front façade replacing the deck on the west side of the structure. The deck will then be rebuilt behind the addition to the front façade of the structure on the west side. The deck will not be visible from the front façade of the property. The rear addition is not be replaced.
- b. Locate new additions cautiously, so they do not compromise the architectural integrity of the historic building.
Comment: The proposed addition to the west side of the structure will balance the structure by complimenting the east side of the structure. The deck will not be visible from the front façade of the property and it being installed in the rear appears to be appropriate.
- c. Minimize the size, scale and height of new additions so they do not visually overpower the historic building or substantially alter the site's proportion of constructed area to un-built area.

Comment: The proposed addition complements the addition on the east side of the house. The addition will not overpower the main structure or the existing addition on the east side of the house.

- d. Design the addition so that the overall character of the historic building and the building site, including its topography and any significant site features, are preserved.
Comment: The proposed addition complements the overall character of the historic building, the building site, including the topography.

- e. Design new additions to be compatible in height, roof form, scale, massing, surface materials, detail and proportion with the historic building.
Comment: The proposed addition is compatible in height, roof form, and scale, massing surface materials, detail and proportion with the rest of the dwelling.

Applicant's Testimony

Junior, on behalf of Mr. Gill, stated that they wanted to tear down the deck and the addition. Add an addition to the left side of the house to compliment the addition on the right side of the house.

Board Questions

Board member Stoch asked about the pitch of the roof of the addition. He said it appeared to be a flat, slanted roof.

Junior, replied that whatever was on the right side, they would mirror on the left.

Staff Whitmore clarified what it would look like, Exhibit C, page 12.

Staff Whitmore stated that hardiplank would be all the way around, and brick foundation.

4. Decks.

Guidelines Exhibits G and H, Pages 16 and 17 apply to the section of this staff report.

- a. If possible, introduce decks inconspicuously in areas that are not visible from the street, usually on the rear elevation, inset from either rear corner. Locate the deck with care so that it does not damage or conceal significant historic features or details of the historic structure.
Comment: The applicant is proposing to move the deck that is currently located on the front western side of the structure to the rear of the structure.
- b. Minimize the visual impact of the deck by limiting its size and scale. It is not appropriate to introduce a deck if it will visually overpower the building or site or substantially alter the site's proportion of the constructed area to un-built area.
Comment: The deck appears to be an proportionate size and will not overpower the building or site and will not substantially alter the site's proportion of the constructed

area to un-built area.

- c. Minimize the damage to historic building by constructing decks to be self-supporting. Attach them to the historic building with care so that loss of historic fabric is minimized.

Comment: The deck will be self-supporting with limited attachment to the main structure.

- d. Align decks typically with the height of the building's first floor and screen the decks structural framing with foundation planting, lattice or other compatible screening materials.

Comment: The deck appears to align with the buildings first floor.

- e. Paint or stain decks in colors that are complimentary to the Historic District.
- f. It is not appropriate to introduce a deck if it will require the loss of a character-defining building or site feature.

Applicants Testimony

Junior stated that they will tear down the deck because it is rotten, and then replace it behind the addition.

Board Questions

Chair Mitchell asked about the approval for the deck.

Staff Whitmore stated that they would have to a permit from building inspections.

8. Windows and Doors

Guidelines Exhibits I and J pages 18 and 19 apply to this section of the staff report.

- a. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain original window and door elements such as sash, glass, sills, frames, casings, hardware, weather stripping, lintels, architraves and shutters.

Comment: The applicant is proposing to install new windows and doors in the entire structure.

- b. When the repair of a window or door is not technically feasible, the replacement design should match as closely as possible with the original window or door in material, scale, character, design, and appearance. New windows or doors should have matching sash, glass, sills, frames, casing, and muntin patterns. New sash should be made of wood, not metal unless metal is historically appropriate to the structure. Existing window casings and trim should be retained.

Comment: The replacement windows have snap in grid, the original windows are one over one. If the grids are not installed the configuration of the windows will complement each other. The materials for the new windows appear to be vinyl.

- c. The pattern, arrangements, and dimensions of doors and windows on the principal elevation or other character fining elevations should be retained, unless restoring the appearance of the structure to its original design. Window and door openings should not be enlarged or reduced to fit stock windows or doors.

Comment: The pattern, arrangements, dimensions of the windows appears to be the same. Window and door opening should not be enlarged or made smaller to fit the proposed windows or door.

- d. Windows or doors with snap in muntins should be avoided.

Comment: Snap in muntins appear to be included with the replacement windows.

- e. Existing vinyl windows should be replaced per historic guidelines.

Comment: The existing windows are wood and are being proposed to be replaced.

- f. Front doors in the historic district should be appropriate for the style of the house. Flat surfaced doors and those with contemporary decorative windows should be avoided. A solid wood door is not a suitable replacement for an original door constructed of wood panels and glass.

Comment: The applicant is proposing a new front door.

- g. – l. Guidelines do not apply.

Applicant's Testimony

Staff Whitmore stated that Exhibit J, page 19 is the door that the applicant wishes to use to replace the front door.

Junior, stated that the windows are rotten. So, all windows and doors will need to be replaced.

Staff Whitmore stated that the house has been vacant at least 5 years, and there has been no maintenance at that the property.

Board Discussion

Board member Stoch wanted to know if the door had been purchased, and if not, would like a more old fashioned door.

Mr. Gill indicated that the door had not been purchased, and they would be open to the Board's recommendation.

Staff Whitmore stated that she would work with the Applicant to find a door that would be more appropriate time period.

Board member Petty stated that on page 19, Exhibit J, the door to the right of the picture, would be a more appropriate door.

Board member Cline thanked the Applicant for taking on the project.

Board member Yarborough thanked the Applicant for working with the Staff and the Board.

Board member Stoch also thanked the Applicant for improving the home.

Motion:

Board member Stoch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact the proposed project COA-21-11, 524 Summitt Drive, that if the removal of the brick façade is replaced with a brick similar to the original brick, color and style choice approved at staff level, is congruous with character of the district in that it is retaining as close as possible the original character of the house while accommodating for the damage that existed in the brick façade which made it impossible to repair the foundation and as a result is in general harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole. Seconded by Board member Yarborough.

Board member Stoch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact the proposed project COA-21-11, 524 Summitt Drive, with regard to the removal of the side deck and the replacement of the side deck with a new addition and a new deck behind the new addition that the new addition and the old addition on the right side (east side) of the building will compliment each other that the roof lines will be pitched and that these will be done with hardiplank and doing this will generally be in harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole and what had become historic styling of the original addition will be complimented with one upon on the other side. Seconded by Board member Petty.

Board member Stoch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact the proposed project COA-21-11, 524 Summitt Drive, that the replacement of all the windows in the house, windows to be approved at staff level, and the replacement of the front door, styled with the time period and to be approved at staff level, will repair damage that exits and that this will generally be in harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole. Seconded by Board member Underwood.

Chair Mitchell called for a vote on the previous three motions. The motion carried.

Final Motion:

Board member Stoch moved that based on the preceding findings of fact, moved that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate Appropriateness to Mateo Nava and approve the proposal as shown in COA-21-11, 524 Summitt Drive and conditions as discussed by the Board and the preceding Findings of Fact. Second by Board member Underwood.

Chair Mitchell called for a vote. The motion carried.

- C. Application by Brett Long owner of 408 N. Gulf Street who wishes to paint the brick façade, relocate front steps on the stoops from the side to the front and add a new handrail. Remove 1 small tree (lot is heavily wooded).

Staff Presentation: Staff Whitmore stated that the Historic Preservation Commission received a Certificate of Appropriateness, COA-21-13, application from Brett Long, property owner of 408 N. Gulf Street, who wishes to paint a brick house that has not been previously painted and install new shutters. He would also like to remove a dogwood, planted too close to the house and it is in poor condition. The site was advertised in accordance with the General Statutes, and the site was posted on March 5, 2021. She stated that the house sits very far off the road and it is a very heavily treed lot.

Staff Whitmore stated that if it is masonry, the Board and Staff does not like to see it painted. She said, however, the applicant is proposing to paint the house. Exhibit A, page 11.

Masonry Guidelines:

- a. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain original masonry and masonry design features that are character-defining elements of historic buildings, including bond patterns, cornices, moldings, chimneys, arches, quoins, and pediments.
Comment: The applicant is proposing to paint the original masonry, the application does not propose to change the masonry design features. Exhibits A, B and C, pages 11 and 12.
- b. Does not apply.
- c. It is appropriate to blend and match products to the existing mortar materials in appearance, texture, and color.
Comment: The applicant is proposing to paint the existing brick exterior therefore, the color of the existing mortar will be covered with the proposed paint. Exhibits A, B and C, pages 11 and 12.
- d. – f. Does not apply.
- g. It is not appropriate to paint previously unpainted masonry.
Comment: The applicant is proposing to paint the previously unpainted brick. The main façade would be painted a light grey and the trim will be white and the door will be painted black. Exhibits A, B and C, pages 11 and 12.
- h. It is appropriate to retain and maintain the original or early color and texture of masonry surfaces. Brick or stone surfaces may have been painted or whitewashed for practical or aesthetic reasons. Indiscriminate removal of existing paint from masonry surfaces may subject the building to harmful damage and may give it an appearance it never had.
Comment: Should the original masonry be painted the original color of the masonry would not be maintained; however, the texture would remain. No paint removal from the masonry is proposed.
- i. Does not apply.

Landscaping and Trees (Private Residence) Guidelines:

- a. It is appropriate to protect, retain, and maintain landscaping that contributes to the character of the historic district. This includes large trees and original or historically significant trellises, patios, terraces, and fountains.
Comment: The applicant wishes to remove a dogwood (Exhibit A, page 11) planted too close to the house, that is in poor condition.
- b. – d. Does not apply.
- e. It is appropriate to maintain the existing grade on the site when technically feasible.
Comment: Should the commission approve the removal of the tree the applicant shall remove the stump and back fill the whole once the tree is removed.
- f. It is appropriate that mature, healthy trees should remain intact and undisturbed on a site, unless they are causing the deterioration of a building, accessory buildings, appurtenant features or creating a safety hazard.
Comment: The tree is planted too close (Exhibit A, page 11) to the structure and the potential for future damage is possible.
- g. Trees which are dead or diseased should be replaced with an appropriate tree.
Comment: The tree is in bad shape and should be removed, due to the extreme shade this property has a and a replacement tree is not recommended. However, it would be attractive if the applicant would plant foundation plants.
- h. Tree removal shall be completed in a manner so that the affected area seems original to the landscape.
Comment: The applicant shall remove the stump and back fill the holes so the affected area appears original to the landscape.
- i. – j. Does not apply.

Shutters Guidelines::

- a. It is appropriate to retain and repair existing historic shutters and their hardware.
Comment: It appears that the existing shutters have been added at a later date, the proposed replacement shutters are appropriate for this house (Exhibit A, page 11).
- b. If a historic shutter must be replaced, the new shutter should compliment the original shutter in size, shape, number of panels, and style. New shutters that are not part of the original design must be carefully reviewed to determine historic appropriateness and correct design relative to the structure and neighborhood.
Comment: It appears that the proposed shutters appear correct to the design

relative to the structure and neighborhood (Exhibit B, page 11).

- c. Shutters should be attached to the window casing and not the siding or wall. Shutters should cover the entire window casing and not the siding or wall. Shutters should cover the entire window when closed. Even if the shutters do not close, they should appear to. Ornamental shutters may be appropriate if they can be historically attributed to the structure.
Comment: It appears that the proposed shutters will cover the entire window if they were to be closed. (Exhibit B, page 11).

Applicant Testimony

Brett Long, 7131 Heartfield Drive, Raleigh, NC,.

Chair Mitchell stated that the Board does not like to paint brick. He said that if the brick was damaged and the paint would cover the damage, it would give the request more leniency.

Mr. Long stated that the brick had a lean to it.

Chair Mitchell stated that he would need to bring more evidence for the Board to be more comfortable with painting the brick. Painting the trim is not a problem, and will be approved at Staff level. The tree doesn't seem to be an issue, and will be approved at Staff level.

Chair Mitchell asked if he was taking down all the stairs.

Mr. Long said he was not doing that; he was just putting up a safety rail.

Board member Stoch asked how long he owned the house.

Mr. Long said a month and a half.

Board member Stoch asked why he wanted to paint the brick.

Mr. Long said that the house was not originally a brick house. The house was a siding house and it was replaced with the brick façade all the way around. He said the foundation was crumbling and there are some cracks. He said the house is off the road and because the house is so heavily wooded, you can't see it from the road. Paint would make the house stand out. The house is 1500 square feet.

Board member Stoch is opposed to painting brick. Unless there are issues with the mortar or brick. He said he could support painting the trim; and removing the trees.

Staff Whitmore stated that there is no foundation, and the brick is all the way to the ground. This tends to make the brick more brittle.

Board Discussion

Chair Mitchell stated the house on Bracken Street was a unique situation. They had several additions and they painted it all one color to tie the additions together. He stated that he was

hard pressed to agree to the painting of the house.

Board member Stoch agreed.

Attorney Hornik stated that if the applicant had evidence to satisfy the Board regarding the brick, the Board could entertain a motion to table.

The applicant stated that he didn't believe the brick was in bad enough condition to satisfy the Board for approval to be painted.

Motion: Board member Stoch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project COA-21-13, 408 N. Gulf Street, if it has been found that the proposed painting of the unpainted brick is done in accordance with the decision of the Historic Preservation Commission, is incongruous with the character of the district, for the reasons that generally the Board tries to maintain unpainted brick and there does not appear to be substantial evidence of deterioration or damage of the brick that will justify painting the brick and that is not generally not in harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole. Seconded by Board member Underwood.

Chair Mitchell called for a vote. The motion carried.

Motion: Board member Stoch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project COA-21-13, 408 N. Gulf Street, that the removal of the dogwood tree, the installation of the new shutters (which the style will be approved at staff level) and painting of trim (color selection will be approved at staff level) is congruous with the character of the district are generally in harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole. Seconded by Board member Petty.

Chair Mitchell called for a vote. The motion carried.

Final Motion: Board member Stoch moved based on the preceding findings of fact, moved that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Brett Long and approve the proposals as shown on COA-21-13, 408 N. Gulf Street as discussed by Staff, except for the painting of the brick. Seconded by Board member Yarborough.

Chair Mitchell called for a vote. The motion carried.

Old Business

Staff Whitmore forwarded the information regarding the chimney pots to Attorney Susan Patterson.

New Business

Staff Whitmore read the COA's that had been approved. Attached.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned on motion of Board member Petty, seconded by Board member Underwood, and unanimously carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Adopted this 24th day of May, 2021.

BY: 
Brian Mitchell, Chair

ATTEST:


Angela M. Baker, Clerk