



Meeting Minutes for October 12, 2021

The Burlington Historic Preservation Commission met virtually via ZOOM on Tuesday, October 12, 2021 at 7:00 PM. All staff and applicants presenting at this meeting were sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability. The meeting may be viewed online via YouTube at: <https://youtu.be/Xqdw8xilkAM>.

Members Present:

James Euliss, Chair
Lori Bryan
Kristina Meinking
Josh Adkins
Russ Vandermass-Peeler

Members Absent:

Brian Pennington, Vice Chair
Wendy Geiss

Guests:

N/A

Staff Present:

Jamie Lawson, Principal Planner

I. Call Meeting to Order

Mr. James Euliss, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Chair Euliss made a motion to excuse the absence of Mr. Brian Pennington, Vice Chair.

Ms. Lori Bryan, Member, seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Ms. Bryan moved the motion to excuse the absence of Ms. Wendy Geiss, Member.

Mr. Josh Adkins, Member, seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

II. Approval of Previous Minutes

Review of the Meeting Minutes for August 10, 2021.

Ms. Jamie Lawson, Principal Planner, indicated that staff had received suggested changes from Ms. Kristina Meinking, Member.

Ms. Meinking moved the motion to approve minutes with the changes.

Ms. Bryan seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Review of the Site Visit Minutes for September 7, 2021 meeting.

Ms. Bryan indicated that she was not present. Ms. Lawson clarified that Ms. Bryan may abstain.

Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Member, moved the motion to approve the minutes with the changes offered by Ms. Kristina Meinking, Member.

Ms. Meinking seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously with Ms. Bryan abstaining.

Review of the Meeting Minutes for September 14, 2021.

Ms. Bryan indicated that she was not present and would be abstaining from the vote.

Ms. Lawson indicated that further elaboration per Ms. Meinking's comments would be added to the minutes.

Ms. Meinking moved the motion to approve the minutes with the changes.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously with Mr. Adkins and Ms. Bryan abstaining.

III. Applications for Major Certificates of Appropriateness

Ms. Lawson informed the Commission that the applicant was not on the call for Item 1 and requested Item 2 be heard first.

Mr. Euliss confirmed with the Commission to adjust the agenda.

- a. **ITEM 2:** HD-21-45: A request by Sharon Dagers for a side porch enclosure with two paired double hung wood sash windows and a door at 2474 Glencoe Street, PID 141425. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and within the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) Zone District.

Ms. Lawson provided a staff report of this item to the Commission and stated that staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. Nelson and Ms. Dagers were sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability. Mr. Nelson and Ms. Dagers provided details about their project to the Commission.

Ms. Bryan asked if there were other homes in the area with enclosed porches.

Mr. Nelson and Ms. Dagers, Applicants, indicated that there are homes in the area with enclosed porches. Mr. Nelson indicated that Ms. Kathleen Turner provided a letter of approval from Preservation NC.

Mr. Euliss asked if the color and wood of the porch enclosure would match the existing residence. Mr. Nelson confirmed that everything, siding, trim color, and door color, would be the same as the existing residence.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that no public comments were received on this application and that no one present in the audience desired to speak on this item.

Mr. Euliss read the Findings of Fact into the record:

Findings of Fact (Porch Enclosure):

- C11-1. If built as part of the original structure, a porch and all of its features (decks, steps, handrails, balustrades, columns, brackets, spandrels, roofs) should remain in their original state. Porches and steps should not be stripped of any original material or architectural features. If a porch is a later addition, but has become an important part of the building, then the porch and all of its features should be retained.
- C11-2. New materials used to repair porches should match the design and dimensions of the original materials as closely as possible.
- C11-3. Repairs to porches using materials incompatible with the original materials are unacceptable; for example, metal supports should not be used as substitutes for wood columns, plywood as a substitute for beaded wood ceilings, or concrete as a substitute for tongue-and-groove wood flooring.
- C11-4. Porch restorations that involve the replacement of missing details such as steps, brackets, or balustrades should be based on historical documentation. Adding details to porches to create a false historical appearance is not allowed.
- C11-5. No porch should be enclosed if the historic character of the structure would be destroyed; for example, front porches should not be enclosed to create interior spaces. Whenever possible, existing infill should be removed to restore the original appearance.
- C11-6. Side porches may be enclosed to create sun porches if the design of the enclosure is compatible with the architecture of the structure. Sun porches should be designed so that they can be installed and removed without damage to the historic structure.
- C11-7. Original porch steps should be retained or the design and dimensions matched as closely as possible if repair or replacement is needed. Wood steps should always be painted to match the porch floor.
- C11-8. Porches may be screened if the framing is recessed and the screening is placed behind columns or balustrades. Screening should be designed so that it can be removed without damage to the historic structure.

- C12-1. The placement of color should be appropriate to the architectural style of the structure.
- C12-2. The placement of color should provide contrast between different materials, such as shingles and siding, and architectural elements, such as trim and soffits, if contrasting colors are appropriate to the style of the structure.
- C8-2. When the repair of a window or door is not feasible, the replacement should match as closely as possible with the original window or door in material, scale, character, and appearance. New windows or doors should have matching sash, glass, sills, frames, casings, and muntin patterns. New sash should be made of wood, not metal. Existing window casings and trim should be retained.
- C8-3. The pattern, arrangements, and dimensions of doors and windows on the principal elevations should be retained, unless restoring the appearance of the structure to its original design. On other facades, where not easily visible from the street, new openings should be proportionately the same as existing openings with matching elements. Window and door openings should not be enlarged or reduced to fit stock windows or doors.
- C7-2. Replacement materials should match the original wall materials in size, shape, and texture.
- C10-4. Awnings on windows, entryways and porches should be appropriate in design, proportion, scale and color to the architectural style and period of the structure.

Ms. Bryan moved the motion to approve the Findings of Fact.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Ms. Vandermass-Peeler moved the motion to approve the Application. <Minute 23:00>

Mr. Adkins seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Ms. Lawson informed the Commission that the applicant for Item 1 was now on the call. Mr. Euliss confirmed that the Commission could now hear Item 1.

- b. **ITEM 1:** HD-21-41: A request by Jennifer Patterson for removal of a healthy tree greater than four (4) inches in diameter, as measured from four (4) above ground, at 619 West Front Street, PID 126168. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and within the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) Zone District.

Mr. Euliss confirmed that there were no conflicts of interest.

Ms. Lawson provided a staff report of this item to the Commission and that staff recommends approval of the request.

Ms. Jennifer Patterson, Applicant, was sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability. Ms. Patterson provided details about her request to the Commission. Ms. Patterson included testimony that vehicles are clipping the tree requested to be removed.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that additional trees Ms. Patterson is proposing to plant were reviewed by the City Horticulturalist and were determined to be in character with existing trees in the area, tree name "Autumn Brilliance."

Ms. Meinking asked how old the tree. Ms. Patterson did not know the age of the tree but indicated that the tree may have been planted by a prior owner.

Ms. Meinking asked if the tree is diseased or dying. Ms. Patterson did not believe that the tree was diseased.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that no public comments were received on this application and that no one present in the audience desired to speak on this item.

Mr. Euliss read the Findings of Fact into the record:

Findings of Fact (Removal of Tree):

- B2-4. Mature, healthy trees should remain intact and undisturbed on a site, unless they are causing the structural deterioration of a building. A mature tree is defined as being four (4) inches or larger in diameter in West Burlington and as being fifteen (15) inches or larger in diameter in Glencoe measured four (4) feet above the ground.
- B2-8. When a tree is removed, the tree stump should be ground and the soil should be leveled and seeded.
- B2-11. New plant materials should be appropriate in species and scale to existing plant materials in the neighborhood.

Ms. Vandermass-Peeler moved the motion to approve the Findings of Fact.

Mr. Adkins seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Ms. Lawson indicated Ms. Patterson would be replacing the tree with the aforementioned tree species and recommended that this be a condition of approval.

Ms. Patterson confirmed that the tree would be planted based on the recommendation of the arborist.

Ms. Lawson provided a revised condition that the replacement tree is planted by the next appropriate planting season.

Mr. Euliss confirmed with the Commission that the condition would be added. Ms. Bryan confirmed that the condition be added to the motion of approval.

Ms. Bryan moved the motion to approve the Application with the condition that the tree be replanted with the “Autumn Brilliance” tree name species by the next planting season.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

Approved with Conditions unanimously.

Ms. Patterson asked if there would be flexibility in tree species selection. Ms. Lawson confirmed that a modified condition could be made that would allow administrative review of a different tree species selection.

Ms. Euliss confirmed that the modified condition was acceptable to the Commission.

Ms. Bryan moved the motion to approve the Application with the amended conditions that the tree be replanted with the “Autumn Brilliance” tree name species by the next planting season and that under the circumstances a different tree species is to be planted, that the City Arborist approve the tree species selection.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

Approved with Amended Conditions unanimously.

- c. **ITEM 3:** HD-21-47: A request by Sarah Vincent for removal of a chimney, not believed to be original to the home, at 706 West Davis Street, PID 126130. The property is located within the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and within the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) Zone District.

Mr. Euliss confirmed that there were no conflicts of interest.

Ms. Lawson provided a staff report of this item to the Commission and that staff recommends approval of the request.

Ms. Sara Vincent and Mr. Harold Vincent, Applicants, were sworn to tell the truth to the best of their ability. Ms. Vincent provided details about her request to the Commission. Ms. Vincent included testimony that remove of the chimney would allow a better seal for the roof.

Ms. Meinking asked when the house was built. Ms. Vincent indicated that that home was built in 1917.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler asked what was the purpose of the chimney when it was first installed. Ms. Vincent indicated that the chimney runs to a boiler in the basement and is not connected to any fireplaces.

Ms. Meinking asked staff what documentation was researched to determine if the chimney was original to the property. Ms. Lawson indicated that the chimney was visible in a photo from the National Historic Register Nomination, prior to establishment of the Local Historic Overlay District. Ms. Vincent indicated that the photo in the National Historic Register Nomination may have been taken in the 1970s or 1980s.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that one email was received on this item and that it was in support of the request.

Ms. Sue Lazara, Member of the Public, indicated that the chimney proposed to be removed may not be original because it lacks the brick pattern and mortar found present on the existing chimney's of the home.

Ms. Vincent indicated that the chimney proposed to be removed may have been built at the time a heating system was installed on the home.

Ms. Meinking commented on concerns regarding how to determine if the chimney is original to the home.

Mr. Euliss read the Findings of Fact into the record:

Findings of Fact (Removal of Chimney):

- C4-1. The design of original chimney masonry should be preserved. Brick corbelling, clay chimney pots, or other original features should be repaired rather than removed.
- C4-2. Original chimneys visible from the public right-of-way should be repaired or rebuilt rather than removed or shortened when they become deteriorated.
- C4-3. Special care should be taken to ensure that repairs blend in color, composition, and texture.
- C4-4. Parging (covering with cement) is not an acceptable alternative to repointing deteriorated chimney masonry.
- C4-5. Chimneys or furnace stacks added after the original construction may be removed if the appearance of the structure will otherwise remain unchanged.

Ms. Bryan moved the motion to approve the Findings of Fact.

Ms. Meinking seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Mr. Euliss indicated that it was difficult to determine if the chimney was original.

Mr. Vincent inquired as to the process on how to determine if a chimney is original.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that staff does not have further resources to determine whether or not the chimney is original. Ms. Lawson communicated that the request is related to maintenance of the roof and necessary to prevent further damage to the property. Ms. Lawson confirmed that the chimney is not visible to the street and that staff is in support of the request due to the chimney's impact on proper and adequate roof maintenance.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler expressed that the home is architecturally well designed and that the chimney was unlikely to have been incorporated into its' original design.

Ms. Bryan expressed agreement with Mr. Vandermass-Peeler concerning the aesthetic.

Ms. Meinking expressed a condition to photo document the existing chimney. Ms. Meinking indicated that this documentation could assist in future considerations of similar requests.

Ms. Lawson and Ms. Vincent clarified the photo angle necessary to document the chimney.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler moved the motion to approve the Application with conditions of providing the required pictures documenting the chimney.

Ms. Bryan seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

IV. New Business

Mr. Euliss confirmed that there was no new business.

V. Other Business

a. Architectural Survey Update

Ms. Lawson updated the Commission that the State is under review of the Survey and that a public meeting will be held at 6:30 PM on November 11th, 2021. Ms. Lawson provided further details on the Survey's results.

b. Local Historic District amendment update

Ms. Lawson updated the Commission on the four properties requesting to be removed from the Local Historic Overlay District and that the report has been submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office for their 30-day review.

Ms. Meinking asked if the Commission would be writing a report.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that the Commission may provide a supplement to the report or addendum, which would then be forwarded to the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City Council.

Ms. Meinking asked what the timeline would be for the supplemental letter.

Ms. Lawson confirmed that the report would be included in the Agenda Packet for the Commission's December meeting.

c. Minor Certificates of Appropriateness update

Ms. Lawson updated the Commission on administrative reviews.

d. CLG Training

Ms. Lawson updated the Commission on Certified Local Government training opportunities as forwarded by the State Historic Preservation Office.

Ms. Lawson updated the Commission on the Design Standard update.

VI. Adjournment

Ms. Vandermass-Peeler moved the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Bryan seconded the motion.

Approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.

END OF MEETING