DRAFT MINUTES

Wake County Historic Preservation Commission
Tuesday, July 14, 2020 – 3:30 PM Room 2800 – Wake County Justice Center
301 S. McDowell Street, Raleigh, North Carolina

Members Present (10): Mr. Ed Morris (Chair), Mr. Jeff Hastings (Vice-Chair), Ms. Camille Morrissey, Ms. Carrie Ehrfurth, Ms. Nora Cambier, Ms. Peggy Beach, Mr. Dan Turner, Ms. Stephanie Ashworth, Mr. Brendan Fetter, Mr. Lee Tippett

Members Absent (2): Mr. Marshall Harvey, Ms. Lonnette Williams

Staff (3): Mr. Gary Roth and Mr. Jeremy Bradham, Capital Area Preservation, Inc. (CAP) Ms. Terry Nolan, Wake County Planning and Development Services Division

1. Call to Order / Roll Call:
Mr. Morris called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

2. Approval of July 14, 2020 Agenda
Hearing no objection, the agenda was approved as submitted.

3. Approval of June 9, 2020 Minutes
Hearing no objection, the minutes were approved as submitted.

4. Public Hearing to Consider CA-05-20

Applicant: Maurer Architecture
Owners: Powell Property Holdings, LLC
Landmark: Upchurch-Williams House
Location: 7213 Roberts Road, Cary
Jurisdiction: Apex

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation of the Upchurch-Williams House, addition of an handicap accessible ramp and terraced patio; new construction of secondary building venue, and site improvements including parking lot, walkways, and landscaping

Mr. Morris began by summarizing the public hearing procedures.

(http://www.wakegov.com/commissioners/Pages/meetingprocedures.aspx)

Mr. Morris swore in Mr. Roth, Mr. Bradham, Mr. Page, and Mr. Maurer. Mr. Bradham presented a PowerPoint summarizing the application. Following the presentation, staff recommended approval of the application. Mr. Morris asked if there were any questions for staff.

With no questions or comments for staff, Mr. Morris invited the applicant to speak on behalf of the application. Mr. Maurer of Maurer Architecture thanked commission staff for four months of hard work with the applicant and his team. He stated that he will answer any specific questions, should any arise from commission members.

With no discussion, Ms. Beach offered the following motion:

"I move that the WCHPC find as a fact that the site improvements and landscaping at the Upchurch-Williams House property is in accordance with the following *Wake County Guidelines for Setting & Site Features*:

2.1.1. Retain and preserve the historic setting of the landmark, including the visual and associative characteristics of the site that contribute to the overall historic character of the landmark building, structure, or site.
2.1.2. Maintain and protect the visual and associative characteristics of the landmark setting established by the relationship of the landmark to its site, including site topography, significant views and vistas, accessory structures, roads, walkways, fences, walls, and plantings.
2.1.3. Introduce new site features, building additions, and independent structures in ways that are compatible with the visual and associative characteristics of the landmark's setting.
2.1.4. It is not appropriate to introduce or remove a site feature or element if it will substantially diminish or radically alter the visual and associative characteristics of the landmark setting.

2.2.1. Retain and preserve the site features and plantings that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building, structure, or site.
2.2.2. Retain and preserve the historic relationship between the landmark building or structure, yards, and fields, and the site features and plantings. It is not appropriate to substantially alter site topography by grading, excavating, or filling.
2.2.3. Maintain and protect historic site features and plantings through appropriate methods. Seek the advice of a professional to protect site features and plantings from damage during or as a result of construction activities.
2.2.5. Replace deteriorated or missing site features with new features that are compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark building, structure, or site.
2.2.6. Replace significant plantings such as mature trees, hedges, and foundation plantings that are diseased or severely damaged with new plantings that are identical or similar in habit or species if possible. It is not appropriate to remove a healthy planting that is significant to the overall historic character of the landmark site. Plan site plantings that will evolve over time and maintain the sense of openness or enclosure of the site.
2.2.7. Introduce new site features and plantings, if needed, which are compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark building, structure, or site.
2.2.8. Locate new site features and plantings, if needed, in ways that maintain or enhance the overall historic character of the landmark and its historic context. It is not appropriate to introduce incompatible site features or equipment, including mechanical units, solar collectors, storage units, swimming pools, decks, playground equipment, and large satellite dishes, in locations that diminish or compromise the overall historic character of the landmark building, structure, or site.

2.4.1. Retain and preserve walkways, driveways, and parking areas that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building, structure, or site, including their width, configuration, scale, materials, curbing, and related plantings in appropriate ways.
2.4.5. If a walkway or driveway is completely missing, replace it with a new feature based on accurate documentation of the original design or a new design compatible in location, configuration, dimension, scale, materials, and color with the historic building site, streets, and district.
2.4.6. Introduce new walkways, driveways, or parking areas, if necessary, which are compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark and site. Consider location, scale, materials, and configuration when determining compatibility. Retain the general site topography and any significant landscape or site features. It is not appropriate to diminish or substantially alter the overall historic character of the landmark site through the introduction of new walkways, driveways, or parking areas or through the introduction of inappropriate materials.
2.4.6. Locate new parking areas unobtrusively in locations that do not diminish or intrude upon character-defining elevations of the landmark or important site features. Incorporate existing mature vegetation, if possible, and introduce additional perimeter landscaping or screening to lessen the impact of new parking areas. Subdivide large parking areas with planting strips. It is not appropriate to radically reduce the overall ratio of green space to paved area on a landmark site.
2.4.7. Protect mature vegetation and significant site features from damage caused by the construction of new walkways, driveways, and parking areas.

I further move that the WCHPC find as a fact that the rehabilitation and restoration of the Upchurch-Williams House is in accordance with the following *Wake County Guidelines for Building Exterior*:

3.1.1. Retain and preserve wood features that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building, structure, site, or district.
3.1.2. Retain and preserve historic wood fabric such as siding, trim and details, as well as their paint colors and finishes.
3.1.3. Maintain and protect wood features and surfaces with appropriate methods as described on the preceding page.
3.1.4. Prepare previously painted wood for repainting using the gentlest effective method. It is not appropriate to strip paint from or clean wood features and surfaces with destructive methods such as sandblasting, power washing, and using propane or butane torches. Use chemical strippers only if gentler methods such as low-pressure washing with detergents and natural bristle brushes are ineffective and they should be pretested on a sample area first.
3.1.5. Repaint wood surfaces and features as needed in colors appropriate to the historic landmark.
3.1.6. Repair deteriorated or damaged wood features through traditional patching, consolidating, piecing, or reinforcing by other accepted preservation methods.
3.1.7. Replace in kind a deteriorated or damaged wood feature if necessary to match the original in design, material, dimension, and detail. Replace only the

deteriorated portion or detail of a feature rather than the entire feature where possible. Consider compatible substitute materials only if use of the original material is not technically feasible. It is not appropriate to replace or cover historic wooden features such as siding, trim, or window sash with contemporary substitute materials such as vinyl, masonite, or aluminum.
3.1.8. Replace a missing historic wood feature with a new feature based upon accurate documentation of the original or a new design compatible with the scale, size, material, and color of the historic landmark.
3.1.9. It is not appropriate to introduce wood features or details to a historic landmark that serves to create a false historic appearance; such as the addition of Victorian brackets to a twentieth century bungalow.
3.1.10. It is not appropriate to strip historically painted surfaces down to bare wood and apply clear stains or finishes to create a natural wood appearance.
3.1.11. It is not appropriate to replace painted historic wooden siding that is sound with new siding to achieve a uniformly smooth wooden surface.
3.1.12. It is not appropriate to replace or cover historic wooden siding, trim, or window sashes with contemporary substitute materials.

3.2.1. Retain and preserve masonry features that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building, structure, or site.
3.2.2. Retain and preserve the historic masonry fabric of landmarks such as brick, stone, concrete, terra cotta, and stucco, as well as their form, pattern, detail, color, and texture.
3.2.3. Maintain and protect masonry features and surfaces by appropriate methods as described on the preceding page.
3.2.4. Test any proposed cleaning or paint-removing technique well in advance on an inconspicuous sample area. It is not appropriate to use destructive cleaning techniques such as sandblasting, power washing, or high-pressure water blasting on historic masonry surfaces. Use chemical cleaners only if gentler methods like low-pressure washing are ineffective.
3.2.6. Repair deteriorated or damaged masonry surfaces and features through traditional methods for consolidating, piecing-in, or patching.
3.2.8. Replace in kind a deteriorated or damaged masonry feature if necessary to match the original in design, material, dimension, and detail. Replace only the deteriorated portion or detail of a feature rather than the entire feature where possible. Consider compatible substitute materials only if use of the original material is not technically feasible.
3.2.10. It is not appropriate to introduce masonry features or details to a historic landmark that serves to create a false historic appearance.

3.4.4. It is not appropriate to remove paint film with techniques that are destructive to the material substrate, including the use of butane or propane torches, sand-blasting, water blasting, and power washing.
3.4.5. When repainting, follow best practices for removing or mitigating lead-based paint.
3.4.6. Recoat previously painted or stained surfaces in colors that are appropriate to the historic landmark or district. It is not appropriate to paint an unpainted historic brick, stone, concrete, cement block, copper, or bronze surface if it was not painted or coated historically.

3.4.7. Enhance the exterior architectural features and materials of the historic landmark with the appropriate selection and placement of paint color consistent with its architectural style. In particular, the foundation color is usually darker than the body of the building in order to visually anchor it to the ground.
3.4.8. It is not appropriate to strip wooden surfaces that were historically painted down to bare wood and apply clear stains or sealers to create a natural wood appearance.

3.6.1. Retain and preserve exterior walls that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building or structure including their shape, form, height, materials, and distinctive architectural elements.
3.6.2. Retain and preserve historic wall materials as well as their size, shape, profile, patterns, textures, and color.
3.6.3. Maintain and protect historic exterior walls, surfaces, and features by appropriate methods as described on the preceding page.
3.6.4. Recoat previously painted or stained exterior walls in colors that are appropriate to the historic landmark or district. It is not appropriate to coat an unpainted wall surface if it was not painted or coated historically.
3.6.5. Repair deteriorated or damaged exterior walls and their distinctive surfaces and features through traditional methods of repair. It is not appropriate to remove a significant wall feature, such as a storefront, projecting bay, chimney, or cornice, rather than repair and maintain it.
3.6.6. Replace in kind a deteriorated or damaged exterior wall material or feature to match the original in size, shape, material, dimension, pattern, texture, color, and detail. Replace only the deteriorated portion or detail of a feature rather than the entire feature where possible. Consider compatible substitute materials only if use of the original material is not technically feasible.

3.7.1. Retain and preserve windows and doors that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building or structure, including both their functional and decorative features and details.
3.7.2. Retain and preserve the historic materials and finishes of windows and doors.
3.7.3. Maintain and protect the surfaces and features of windows and doors by appropriate methods as described on the preceding page.
3.7.4. Recoat previously painted or stained windows and doors in colors that are appropriate to the historic landmark.
3.7.5. Repair deteriorated or damaged windows and doors, their distinctive features, and their details through traditional methods of repair.
3.7.6. It is not appropriate to remove distinctive window or door features such as shutters, tracery, or stained glass rather than repair them.
3.7.7. Replace in kind a deteriorated or damaged window or door feature or detail to match the original in design, material, dimension, and detail. Replace only the deteriorated portion or detail of a feature rather than the entire feature where possible. Consider compatible substitute materials only if use of the original material is not technically feasible.

3.8.1. Retain and preserve porches and entrances that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building or structure, including both their functional and decorative features and details.

3.8.2. Retain and preserve the historic materials and finishes of porches and entrances.
3.8.3. Maintain and protect the surfaces and features of porches and entrances by appropriate methods as described on the preceding page.
3.8.4. Recoat previously painted porches or entrances in colors that are appropriate to the historic landmark.
3.8.5. Repair deteriorated or damaged porches or entrances and their distinctive features and details through traditional methods of repair. It is not appropriate to remove distinctive architectural features such as columns, railings, brackets, or decorative trim rather than repair them.
3.8.6. Replace in kind a deteriorated or damaged porch or entrance feature or detail to match the original in design, material, dimension, and detail. Replace only the deteriorated portion of a feature rather than the entire feature where possible. Consider compatible substitute materials only if use of the original material is not technically feasible.

I further move that the WCHPC find as a fact that the addition of a terraced patio and handicapped accessible ramp at the Upchurch-Williams House is in accordance with the following *Wake County Guidelines for Setting & Site* Features and *Building Exterior* and *New Construction & Additions*:

2.3.8. Introduce new fences and walls only in locations and configurations that are consistent with the character of the landmark building and site. Construct new fences and walls of traditional materials in designs compatible with the landmark building and site in scale, material, height, and detail. Locate new fences and walls in ways that reinforce both the site's overall historic character and any historically defined site divisions or boundaries.
2.3.9. Introduce utilitarian fences and walls, if necessary, only in locations that will not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site.

3.10.1. In considering proposed new uses for historic landmarks, determine if the accessibility and life safety requirements related to the use change are compatible with preserving the landmark's historic character and setting.
3.10.2. Explore with code officials alternative methods of code compliance with equal or superior effectiveness that preserve the landmark's historic character.
3.10.3. Seek input from local disability groups and preservation specialists in developing appropriate solutions to accessibility.
3.10.4. Accommodate accessibility and life safety requirements in ways that do not compromise features that are significant in defining the character of a landmark building, structure, or site.
3.10.5. Meet accessibility and life safety requirements in ways that do not diminish the landmark's character-defining elevations, features, finishes, or details.
3.10.6. Locate life safety changes such as fire doors, exterior stairs, or elevator additions on the rear elevation or a non-character-defining elevation of the historic landmark.
3.10.7. Design any new or additional means of access or egress so that the change is reversible and the original design of a historic entrance or porch is not compromised.

4.1.1. Introduce decks, when needed, in ways that are compatible with the character of the landmark's historic setting. It is not appropriate to introduce a deck which detracts from the overall landmark setting or which requires the loss of a significant site feature such as a mature tree.
4.1.2. Introduce decks cautiously and only on non-character-defining elevations, typically the rear elevation. Locate decks so that they do not diminish, conceal, or detract from the character of the historic landmark.
4.1.3. Align decks generally with the height of the building's first-floor level. Visually tie the deck to the building by screening with compatible foundation materials such as skirt boards, lattice, masonry panels, and dense evergreen foundation plantings.
4.1.4. Design new decks, rails, and related steps to be compatible with the landmark structure in materials, scale, color, and detail.
4.1.5. Construct new decks so that they may be removed in the future with minimal damage to the landmark building. Attach new decks to landmark structures in ways that minimize the loss of historic fabric.
4.1.6. Limit the size and scale of decks so that they do not visually overpower the landmark structure or significantly alter the proportion of built to unbuilt area of the landmark site.
4.1.7. In rare occasions where it is appropriate to site a deck in a location visible to the public right-of-way (i.e. the side of a building), it should be treated in a more formally architectural way. Careful attention should be paid to details and finishes, including painting or staining the deck's rails and structural support elements in colors compatible with the colors of the building.

I further move that the WCHPC find as a fact that the construction of a new secondary building (venue) at the Upchurch-Williams House property is in accordance with the following *Wake County Guidelines for New Construction & Additions*:

4.4.2. Introduce new outbuildings and accessory buildings, if necessary, that are compatible with the historic character of the primary historic building, any contributing secondary buildings, and the site. Consider compatibility of a proposed structure in terms of location, form, roof shape, height, size, scale, materials, detail, and finish. Introduce simple, utilitarian structures, if needed, only in locations that will not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site.
4.4.3. Locate new outbuildings and accessory buildings carefully to maintain the overall visual and spatial character of the landmark site. Consider the relationship to the primary landmark building and any accessory structures in terms of setback, spacing, and orientation. It is not appropriate to introduce a new outbuilding or accessory structure in a location that will require the removal of a significant site feature, planting, or building element.
4.4.4. Avoid damage to significant site feature, including archaeological resources and mature trees, by limiting excavation and grading related to the new construction work. Protect such site features from damage due to the use of heavy equipment or other construction-related activities as well.
4.4.5. Design new secondary buildings to be compatible with but differentiated from the primary historic building and any historic secondary buildings on the site.

It is not appropriate to attempt to make a new secondary building duplicate a historic secondary building unless an accurate reconstruction is undertaken.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1) **Existing trees will be maintained between the Upchurch-Williams House and the proposed parking area, enhancing the visual barrier between the two.**

2) **The Thoroughfare Buffer required by the Town of Apex will screen the driveway, proposed parking area, walkways, and the venue building, but the area along the front of the house will remain open to maximize visibility of the Upchurch-Williams House.**

3) **Existing trees will remain and new plantings will be placed within the Landscape Buffers on the western boundary of the property bordering I-540 and the southern property boundary, providing a natural buffer for the site.**

4) **Plantings around the Upchurch-Williams House will be used to accent the house as well as screen mechanical equipment, parking, and direct views to protect the overall historic character of the site.**

5) **The driveways and walkways will be graded to blend and match existing topography and will be constructed using either exposed aggregate concrete or crusher run to blend in with the rural landscape of the site.**

6) **The stormwater pond required by the Town of Apex will be located in the southwest corner of the property and will blend into the natural topography and include landscape plantings to screen its view from both the venue building and the Upchurch-Williams House.**

7) **Any grading to the site will be done to blend and match existing topography and allow positive drainage to the stormwater pond.**

8) **The existing wood siding, corner boards, windows, window trim, doors, porch floor, and wood columns on the Upchurch-Williams House will be scraped, sanded, and painted to be consistent with the architectural style, and no abrasive techniques will be used.**

9) **Damaged architectural elements (both wood and masonry) will be repaired through consolidation or reinforcement, and any elements beyond repair will be replaced in kind.**

10) **One existing non-historic window will be removed on a non character-defining rear elevation and replaced with wood siding.**

11) **New vented wood porch skirting will be installed between the existing brick piers of the porch and not detract from the visual aesthetic or give a false historic appearance.**

12) New historically-appropriate wood louvered shutters with hardware that function, or appear to function, will be installed on primary front, north, south, and rear façades.

13) New historically-appropriate wood doors flanking the front porch will be installed to match the existing front door.

14) A new wood handicapped accessible ramp will be located to the rear of the northern side of the front porch and screened by both the porch itself and landscaping so as not to be seen from the front of the Upchurch-Williams House; it is designed so that it may be removed in the future without any damage to the existing front porch.

15) A new wood and masonry terraced patio will be constructed at the rear of the Upchurch-Williams House to connect the finished floor of the rear door of the house to the rest of the site, and the deck is terraced in a way to maintain visibility with the rear elevation and not be visible from the public right-of-way. The brick masonry will be whitewashed so as to differentiate the deck brick from the existing masonry of the house. This terraced patio will be independent of the house and may be removed in the future without any damage to the existing house.

16) New wood steps will be added to the porch at the front and the north side by the handicap access ramp.

17) The siting of the secondary building will be 154' 11" behind the rear of the Upchurch-Williams House, and the finished floor elevation will be 18' lower than that of the Upchurch-Williams House.

18) The new secondary building (venue) will fit into the natural topography of the site and does not require the removal of any significant site features, plantings, or building elements, so it will not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site.

19) The overall design, materials, detailing, form, height, size, and scale of the new secondary building (venue) is compatible with, but differentiated from, the primary historic building so as to avoid duplication and creating a false historic appearance and do not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site.

20) The new secondary building (venue) will be clad in clapboard wood siding with wood trim, moldings, doors, and windows and painted to match the primary historic building, and its roof will have architectural asphalt shingles.

21) The new secondary building (venue) will have clipped 45-degree corners that build upon the design elements of the bay windows of the Upchurch-Williams House without duplicating any architectural elements.

22) The landmark property is 5.5 acres and allows for a new secondary building (venue) of the proposed size (4,199 square feet) to be constructed without

diminishing the overall historic character of the landmark building (3,477 square feet) and site and is sited carefully to maintain the overall visual and spatial character of the landmark site.

23) **The landmark setting and view from the public right-of-way of the Upchurch-Williams House will be retained and preserved and display the visual and associative characteristics of a rural farm in southern Wake County.**

Seconded by Mr. Hastings. In discussion, Ms. Ehrfurth thanked the design team, the owners and commission staff for brining such a well-thought-out plan and commended the design of the new venue building with its clipped corners and massing. Ms. Morrissey further stated that this is a massive project, and it is good to see so many Wake County Design Guidelines used and followed.

QUERY: Ms. Cambier asked about signage and other details. Mr. Roth stated that items not presented in this major work COA will be submitted in another COA at a later date.

With no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Beach offered the following motion: "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the site improvements and landscaping, the rehabilitation and restoration of the historic house, the addition of a terraced patio and handicapped accessible ramp, and the construction of a new secondary building (venue) at the Upchurch-Williams House."

Seconded by Mr. Hastings.
N.B. Mr. Hastings noted that this project is the culmination of many months of hard work by all parties, and, he is excited to see both the historic house restored as well as the extended venue contributing to economic development in the Town of Apex.

With no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

6. Public Hearing to Consider CA-02-20

Applicant: Bradford West, Senior Planner, Town of Morrisville
Owners: Town of Morrisville
Landmark: Morrisville Christian Church
Location: 222 Church Street, Morrisville
Jurisdiction: Morrisville
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to reduce parking spaces directly in front of the church, repave the reduced spaces with brick pavers, and add walking paths in historically appropriate materials

Mr. Morris swore in Mr. Roth, Mr. Bradham, Mr. West, and Mr. Spanioli. Mr. Bradham presented a PowerPoint summarizing the application. Following the presentation, staff recommended approval of the application. Mr. Morris asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Spanioli from the Town of Morrisville stated that the town believes the proposed work will enhance the historic character of the landmark site and will answer any specific questions, should commission members have any.

QUERY: Mr. Hastings asked how many parking spaces are currently on the landmark site. Mr. West stated that there are currently 10 parking spaces, and the proposed work will reduce that number to 3.

With no further discussion, Ms. Ashworth offered the following motion:

"I move that the WCHPC find as a fact that the revisions to the parking area of the Morrisville Christian Church is in accordance with the following *Wake County Guidelines for Setting & Site Features*:

> **2.4.1.** Retain and preserve walkways, driveways, and parking areas that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building, structure, or site, including their width, configuration, scale, materials, curbing, and related plantings in appropriate ways
> **2.4.6.** Introduce new walkways, driveways, or parking areas, if necessary, which are compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark and site. Consider location, scale, materials, and configuration when determining compatibility. Retain the general site topography and any significant landscape or site features. It is not appropriate to diminish or substantially alter the overall historic character of the landmark site through the introduction of new walkways, driveways, or parking areas or through the introduction of inappropriate materials.
> **2.4.6.** Locate new parking areas unobtrusively in locations that do not diminish or intrude upon character-defining elevations of the landmark or important site features. Incorporate existing mature vegetation, if possible, and introduce additional perimeter landscaping or screening to lessen the impact of new parking areas. Subdivide large parking areas with planting strips. It is not appropriate to radically reduce the overall ratio of green space to paved area on a landmark site.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1) **The current parking area is not historic and is not significant to the character of the landmark**

2) **The new driveway and parking areas will be constructed of brick pavers and will be compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark and site**

3) **The new five and six-foot pedestrian walkways will be constructed of aggregate-exposed concrete and will be compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark and site**

4) **The ratio of green space to paved area will be increased"**

Upon a second by Ms. Morrissey and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Ashworth offered the following motion: "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the revisions to the parking area of the Morrisville Christian Church."

Seconded by Ms. Morrissey. Mr. Morris stated that it is good to see some green space return to the property, where there was historically more green space. **With no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.**

7. Public Hearing to Consider CA-04-20

Applicant: Edward and Jeanne Ridpath
Owners: Edward and Jeanne Ridpath
Landmark: Walter Aiken House
Location: 313 S. Fuquay Avenue, Fuquay-Varina
Jurisdiction: Fuquay-Varina
The applicant is requesting an After-the-Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a non-contributing shed and the construction of a new shed

Mr. Morris swore in Mr. Roth and Mr. Bradham. Mr. Bradham presented a PowerPoint summarizing the application. Following the presentation, staff recommended approval of the application. Mr. Morris asked if there were any questions for staff.

QUERY: Mr. Tippett asked if it would be inappropriate to introduce new windows in the new building to mimic the historic house. Mr. Bradham stated that the Design Guidelines require similar materials (wood) but a different design so as not to create a false historical appearance.

With no further discussion, Ms. Morrissey offered the following motion:

"I move that the WCHPC find as a fact that the removal of the c. 1980s shed and the construction of a new shed on the Walter Aiken House property is in accordance with the following *Wake County Guidelines for Setting & Site Features* and *New Construction & Additions*:

2.5.1. Retain and preserve outbuildings and accessory structures and their visual and associative characteristics that contribute to the overall historic context of a landmark site including their siting, orientation, spacing, scale, and materials.
2.5.2. Retain and preserve outbuildings and accessory structures such as garages, barns, dependencies, sheds, and well houses, that are significant in defining the overall historic character of a landmark building, structure, or site.

4.4.1. Replace an outbuilding or accessory structure that is missing or deteriorated beyond repair with a new design based upon accurate documentation of the original or a new design compatible in form, roof shape, height, size, scale, materials, detail, and finish with other secondary structures on the site and the primary historic building.
4.4.2. Introduce new outbuildings and accessory buildings, if necessary, that are compatible with the historic character of the primary historic building, any contributing secondary buildings, and the site. Consider compatibility of a proposed structure in terms of location, form, roof shape, height, size, scale, materials, detail, and finish. Introduce simple, utilitarian structures, if needed, only

in locations that will not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site.
4.4.3. Locate new outbuildings and accessory buildings carefully to maintain the overall visual and spatial character of the landmark site. Consider the relationship to the primary landmark building and any accessory structures in terms of setback, spacing, and orientation. It is not appropriate to introduce a new outbuilding or accessory structure in a location that will require the removal of a significant site feature, planting, or building element.
4.4.4. Avoid damage to significant site feature, including archaeological resources and mature trees, by limiting excavation and grading related to the new construction work. Protect such site features from damage due to the use of heavy equipment or other construction-related activities as well.
4.4.5. Design new secondary buildings to be compatible with but differentiated from the primary historic building and any historic secondary buildings on the site. It is not appropriate to attempt to make a new secondary building duplicate a historic secondary building unless an accurate reconstruction is undertaken.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1) **The c. 1980s shed is not listed as a contributing structure in the landmark ordinance, therefore it is noncontributing to the overall historic context of the landmark site**

2) **The new shed is constructed on the footprint of the demolished shed and is compatible with the historic character of the primary historic building in respect to form, roof shape, height, size, scale, materials, detail, and finish**

3) **The new shed is wood framed with wood windows and wood siding and is compatible with the historic character of the primary historic building in respect to form, roof shape, height, size, scale, materials, detail, and finish**

4) **The new shed is a simple, utilitarian structure in a location that does not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site**

5) **The new shed is compatible with but differentiated from the primary historic building"**

Upon a second by Mr. Turner and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Morrissey offered the following motion: "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the c. 1980s shed and the construction of a new shed on the Walter Aiken House property."

Seconded by Mr. Turner. Mr. Morris stated that in the wake of Hurricane Florence in 2018, he remembers seeing on the news that a tree fell onto the demolished shed and the back of the house, and this appears to be an appropriate design. **With no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.**

7. Election of Officers 2020-2021

a. Chair – C. Edward Morris
b. Vice-Chair – Jeff Hastings

Ms. Ashworth presided for the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair.
Upon a motion by Mr. Turner, seconded by Ms. Morrissey, the Commission elected Mr. Ed Morris Chairman of the WCHPC by acclamation.
Upon a motion by Mr. Turner, seconded by Ms. Morrissey, the Commission elected Jeff Hastings as Vice-Chairman of the WCHPC by acclamation.
Ms. Ashworth announced that Mr. Morris has been elected Chairman and Mr. Hastings has been elected Vice-Chairman, serving the Commission from July 2020 to July 2021.

8. **Staff Report**
   a. PLANWake -- Comprehensive Plan Update: None.
   b. Zebulon Board of Commissioners – Public Hearing for Barbee House Landmark Designation Hearing – on or after August 3, 2020: The Zebulon Board of Commissioners will hold a public hearing for consideration of the George Sprite and Neva Flowers Barbee House as a Zebulon Historic Landmark.
   c. John & Nancy Strain House, 8536 Lake Wheeler Road, Fuquay-Varina Under contract: Mr. Roth stated that a draft of the landmark report has been completed, and it appears that the house may have been constructed earlier than 1860, which was previously believed. The consultant was extremely impressed with the house. CAP will be the recipient of the donated house in the coming months, so further examination of the house will be possible once restoration work begins.
   d. Seth Jones Cemetery, 2417 Rolesville, Road, Wake County ETJ – Under contract: Mr. Roth stated that the landmark report is currently being written by the consultant and was paid for with funds from the previous fiscal year.
   e. Preservation Celebration, Fuquay-Varina – April 25, 2021- Confirmed: The Town of Fuquay-Varina has confirmed April 25, 2021 for the date of the *2021 Wake County Preservation Celebration* at the *Cultural Arts Center* in Fuquay-Varina.
   f. Minor Works COA Approvals: Mr. Bradham presented a minor works COA that was approved by staff:
      CA-06-20 – Hales-Tunnell-Bunn House, Wendell: The exterior of the house and garage are being repainted with a different color
   g. Wake County Budget: Ms. Nolan stated that the FY2021 Wake County budget included a cut to the preservation fund for historic landmarks and has already been passed by the WCBOC. As everyone is aware, there was a budget increase request by CAP for its services as staff to the commission, but that increase was not granted. This is not a reflection on CAP, but instead there were cuts throughout the entire budget through a majority of departments in Wake County. The Emergency Operations Center has been fully staffed through the Covid-19 pandemic and a lot of funding has been directed toward that facility.

QUERY: Mr. Morris asked how much money was cut from the preservation fund. Ms. Nolan stated that she didn't have that information on hand, but Mr. Bradham noted from an email that there was enough to fund one or, potentially, two landmark reports.

   h. Potential Historic Landmarks: Mr. Roth noted that there is a potential historic landmark in Wendell located at 1 N. Main Street. It is a commercial building that has been rehabilitated and all the modern building covering removed. Staff will begin reaching out to the owners of the property to see if this is something that

would interest them. With funding constraints, the preservation fund only contains enough to complete one landmark report, or two if the county has any additional money. There may be ways to partner with towns to help fund a landmark report. If two other properties are designated as historic landmarks in FY2021, there would be 6 landmark plaques presented at the *2021 Wake County Preservation Celebration*. Mr. Roth encouraged all commission members to seek out potential historic landmarks and to always keep an eye out for something that may have been missed.

N.B. Mr. Morris suggested that local historical societies could also partner with the commission to fund a landmark report. In Wendell, in particular, there are connections between this commission and the Wendell Historical Society, so that is always a potential option.

QUERY: Ms. Cambier asked if the commission members or staff would consider an owner-written landmark report, as she did for her previous house many years ago. Mr. Roth stated that owners can write their own landmark reports, but expectations for SHPO have gotten much tighter over the years. Mr. Turner noted that most of the potential landmark property owners don't have the funds to pay up front for a landmark report, and while they are perfectly allowed to write their own landmark report, they will have to travel to the courthouse and archives for records and produce pictures to SHPO standards. The consultants hired to write these landmark reports do many of these reports each year and have good working relationships with SHPO staff. The landmark reports must be written to the same standards as a National Register Report. Mr. Turner further noted than any National Register report SHPO forwards to the National Park Service is of the highest quality, and the average person, having to adhere to these standards, would likely face a lot of issues and frustration. Mr. Morris stated that the NC SHPO has never had a National Register application denied by the National Park Service.

QUERY: Ms. Cambier asked if a property is on the National Register of Historic Places, can it be fast tracked to be designated as a historic landmark. Mr. Roth noted that the commission pursues properties that are on the National Register of Historic Places, but a separate report still needs to be written, even if it uses much of the same information.

i. CLG Training: Mr. Roth stated that SHPO is conducting all of its CLG training online in a series of training videos. Everyone is encouraged to participate and watch the videos, but two members have to watch three of the videos and submit reports about what they learned in each video. Staff will send out an email with the details from SHPO and get the names of those that are willing to participate to fulfill the commission's CLG requirements.

9. **Old Business**: None.

10. **New Business:** None.

11. **Other Business:** Ms. Cambier asked if this commission would ever consider delandmarking particular properties that may have had any connection to slavery. Mr. Bradham stated that the Wake County Design Guidelines are the standard to which these properties are judged not the current political climate. Mr. Roth further explained that this is an architectural history program, and history of the property is included in the landmark report for historic context. Mr. Turner emphatically stated that this commission would never consider delandmarking a property due to its connection to slavery.

12. Chair's Report: Mr. Morris thanked all commission members for attending the first in-person commission/board meeting in Wake County in four months. He thanked Wake County staff for setting up everything and ensuring the safety of the commission members.

13. Adjourned: Hearing no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:52pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeremy Bradham
Secretary

*Copies of any of the designation reports and other information regarding agenda items available by