



Meeting Minutes for October 11, 2022

The Burlington Historic Preservation Commission met on Tuesday, October 11, 2022, 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's Playlist, "Historic Preservation Commission Meetings:"

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLX2Do5DiQXize1mDyBLhHd_eJ4ov89fPU

Members Present:

Brian Pennington, Chair
Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Vice-Chair
Christina Benson
Vernon Hess

Members Absent:

Wendy Geiss
Michael Williams
Kristina Meinking

Staff Present:

Jamie Lawson, AICP, CZO, Planning Director
Conrad Olmedo, AICP, CZO, Planning Manager
Brianna Smith, Planning Office Manager

I. Call Meeting to Order

Ms. Jamie Lawson, Planning Director called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

II. Oath of Office for HPC Members

Oaths of Office were administered by Ms. Brianna Smith, Notary Public and Planning Office Manager.

Mr. Brian Pennington and Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler were affirmed in as existing Historic Preservation Commission Members.

Mr. Vernon Hess and Ms. Christina Benson were affirmed in as new Historic Preservation Commission Members.

III. Introduction of New Members

Ms. Lawson had all Historic Preservation Commission Members and Planning Staff introduce themselves to the commission and members of the audience.

IV. Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

Ms. Lawson opened the floor for nominations for the Historic Preservation Commission Chair.

Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Member, nominated Mr. Brian Pennington for the Commission Chair.

Ms. Christina Benson, Member, seconded the nomination.

All members were in favor. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Pennington, Chair, nominated Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler for Commission Vice-Chair.

Mr. Vernon Hess, Member, seconded the nomination.

All members were in favor. The motion was passed unanimously.

V. Approval of Previous Minutes

Approval of October 11, 2022 minutes was carried to the November 8, 2022 meeting.

VI. Applications for Major Certificates of Appropriateness

ITEM 1: HD-22-045: A request by Mr. and Ms. Whitlatch to install a driveway extension, parking area, stairs, and new fence at 2411 Glencoe Street, PID 140617. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) District.

Mr. Pennington inquired if the commission had any conflicts of interest amongst the commissioners. There was none.

Ms. Lawson swore that the information she provided tonight was the truth to the best of her ability.

Ms. Molly Whitlatch affirmed that the information she provided tonight was the truth to the best of her ability.

Ms. Lawson gave a brief overview of Ms. Whitlatch's planned project and detailed the application that was included in the packet provided to the commission.

Ms. Whitlatch stated that her property is in Glencoe Historic District and is governed by the Preservation North Carolina Covenant. Ms. Whitlatch stated that her property shares a driveway with the Alamance Museum. Ms. Whitlatch stated that their project is to extend the driveway and create a parking area for three cars. Ms. Whitlatch stated that the gravel would match existing in the area and would require small amounts of grading. Ms. Whitlatch stated that there would be a small amount of landscaping to be done, including removal of tree stumps. Ms. Whitlatch stated that renovations had started on this property in 1999 and was since abandoned until she picked it up. The second part of the proposed project is to add wooden steps and paint/stain them to match surrounding materials, the railings of the stairs will also match the rest of the home. Ms. Whitlatch stated that the third part of the application was to add an open picket fence to the backyard. Ms. Whitlatch stated that the fence will be behind 50% of the property by requirement of Preservation NC and that this is the only fencing allowed in Glencoe and it would be a wooden Cedar fence.

Ms. Lawson stated that included in the packet was the letter of approval from Preservation NC and the easement for the driveway.

Ms. Benson inquired about removal of trees and ensured with Ms. Whitlatch if she was removing alive trees. Ms. Whitlatch responded that she was removing dead trees and that she had a horticulturist come out to deem them as dead and ensured that she was not removing alive trees.

Ms. Lawson inquired if Ms. Whitlatch had the City Horticulturist come out. Ms. Whitlatch stated that the horticulturist was Encanto Arborist's who came out. Ms. Lawson inquired if she had any paperwork to forward to staff to ensure dead trees were being removed. Ms. Whitlatch responded that she didn't but would be happy to have the City Horticulturist come out.

Ms. Whitlatch stated that the trees were on her neighbor's property. Ms. Lawson encouraged Ms. Whitlatch to get her neighbors approval before removal. Ms. Whitlatch stated that she had gotten her neighbors permission

Mr. Pennington inquired is Ms. Whitlatch had spoken with her neighbor that she shares the driveway with. Ms. Whitlatch responded that she had spoken with her neighbor and got his approval and stated he may be submitting his own application for the driveway.

Ms. Lawson stated that staff had not received any calls or emails about the property.

Mr. Pennington asked for staff recommendation. Ms. Lawson responded that staff was recommending approval for the request.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Findings of Fact:

The following findings of facts were included in the staff report as part of the application:

Site Design Standards

Design Standards for Driveways, Walkways and Steps, Parking Areas and Fences

1. New driveways should not be constructed where they did not previously exist historically. If for some reason a new driveway is permitted, it should only provide access to a parking area at the rear of the lot. If a new driveway is planned next to an existing driveway on an adjacent lot, a planting strip shall be left to avoid a wide expanse of pavement.
2. Minimize the width of driveways to the extent possible. Consider features such as a landscaped central strip to minimize the amount of permeable surface.
3. Existing driveways may be eliminated where they did not exist historically, and their elimination shall be encouraged.
4. Consideration should be given to the ratio between green areas and paved areas. Large expanses of paving are discouraged. Circular driveways in front yards are inappropriate unless the drive can be documented for the specific structure and follows City Codes.
5. Appropriate materials shall be used for driveways. Driveways in West Burlington's historic areas are concrete, asphalt, brick or gravel. Driveways in the Glencoe Mill Village district

are concrete and gravel. New concrete driveways shall be Roadside Brown 3000 mix with small aggregate with a 2" slump. Liquid dose is 1.64 lbs per 94 lbs and powder mix is 1.25 lbs per 94 lbs. Other than that, it should be in the same spec as regular concrete. 10-15% cement 60-70% aggregate about 20% water.

6. Front walkways that lead directly from the public sidewalk to the front door shall be maintained, except where originally oriented in another direction. Additional walkways needed for access shall be appropriate in placement, scale, and materials.
7. New parking areas shall be designed to minimize their impact on the environment. Existing mature trees shall be saved, if possible. New trees shall be planted to replace any lost trees and/or to maintain and enhance the tree canopy.
8. New fences are discouraged in any front yards unless there is historic documentation about such a fence previously existing. They are prohibited in all front yards in Glencoe Mill Village.
9. If a historic fence or wall must be replaced, it shall match the original in size, design, materials, color, pattern, texture, and detail. Fences in the front or front side yards should be constructed of wood picket, brick, stone, or cast iron. Pickets should be stained or painted and cast iron should be painted.
10. New fences or walls shall be constructed of traditional materials and design, and only in locations that are characteristic of the Historic District. Walls shall not be constructed of cinderblock or cement block unless it is stuccoed or veneered with brick. Walls constructed of artificial siding that seek to resemble brick veneer, stone veneer, or wood veneer are not allowed. Walls shall not feature plastic panels, corrugated metal or any similar material.
11. Avoid constructing retaining walls in front yards where none existed historically. When approved, they shall be constructed of stone, brick, or textured block. Poured concrete and wood timbers shall be prohibited.
12. Front yard fences shall feature a degree of transparency by allowing visibility between vertical members. Opaque fences, including privacy fences, shall only be allowed in rear yards.
13. Front yard fences shall range between 3 and 4 feet in height, while the supporting posts can project up to 6 inches above the main components of the fence. On corner lots, a fence may exceed 4 feet in height at the side yard if it is placed at or behind the midpoint of the house, but shall not be higher than 7 feet at any point.
14. Wooden picket fences shall be limited to historic residential areas. The width of pickets, spacing and design shall be compatible with historic picket fences in the area.
15. Metal, wood, and iron fences shall be slightly elevated above the ground to avoid ground moisture and the resulting rust or deterioration. The only exception is for dog-owners who need to avoid their dog digging out.
16. Split rail, basket weave, and horizontal board fences are inappropriate styles and shall not be used in the Historic Districts or on Landmark properties.
17. Privacy fences enclosing a rear yard shall be recessed at least 5 ft. behind the front plane of the building's front facade. Rear privacy fences shall not exceed 7 ft. in height.
18. Chain link and vinyl fences shall not be used in areas that are visible from a street. Taller privacy fences are best suited for rear yards. The structural members of wooden privacy

fences shall face the property of the individual erecting the fence. An alternative is double siding the fence so that structural members are not visible from either side.

19. Existing chain link fences shall be screened, when possible, with vegetation such as ivy, climbing roses, wisteria, evergreens and/or shrubs, as well as trees where appropriate.
20. Fences may be used to screen parking areas, garbage areas, and mechanical systems, but shall not exceed 4 ft. in height.
21. The finished side of a fence shall face outward.

Motion:

Mr. Russ Vandermass-Peeler, Vice-Chair, made a motion to approve the findings of fact included in the packet.

Mr. Hess seconded the motion.

All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hess made a motion to approve Ms. Whitlatch's application.

Vice-Chair, Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: HD-22-047: A request by Ms. Sue Lazara to repair the porch columns, posts, handrails and install a 7'x 10' brick patio at 727 West Davis Street, PID 126108. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and in the Local Historic Overlay (LHO) District.

Ms. Lawson swore that the information she provided tonight was the truth to the best of her ability.

Ms. Lawson gave a brief overview of Ms. Sue Lazara's planned project and detailed the application that was included in the packet provided to the commission.

Ms. Sue Lazara affirmed that the information she provided tonight was the truth to the best of her ability.

Ms. Lazara stated that her proposed project included fixing a spindle on her front step railing, and to restore the front porch to its original configuration. Ms. Lazara detailed areas on the porch that had been modified incorrectly in the past and detailed her plans to restore the porch. Ms. Lazara also gave details about the small stone patio she wanted to install in the back of her property.

Mr. Pennington inquired about the posts Ms. Lazara was wanting to fix, stated that he couldn't tell the differences in the posts from the images provided.

Mr. Pennington inquired if the commission had any conflicts of interest amongst the commissioners. There was none.

Ms. Lazara indicated on photos provided the areas that needed the restoration to the commission members. Ms. Lazara clarified that the bricks would match the rest of the porch.

Ms. Benson inquired about which posts the applicant was referring to. Ms. Lazara clarified which posts were original to the house and which needed to be restored.

Mr. Pennington inquired if the applicant was replacing the posts with taller posts. Ms. Lazara stated that she was keeping the posts because they were original to the home but was adding a capital and base to restore the post to match the original post.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler clarified that the work Ms. Lazara had proposed to do on the posts would make the post the correct height. Ms. Lazara confirmed that it would.

Ms. Lawson stated that staff had not received any calls about this property.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler clarified with Ms. Lazara if she had planned to use bricks preexisting to a fireplace for the patio area. Ms. Lazara confirmed she had planned to use the existing bricks for the area.

Ms. Benson inquired if the patio area was going to be right next to the neighbors and if the bricks she had planned to use were historic and would match. Ms. Lazara confirmed that the bricks would match the rest of the home.

Ms. Benson inquired if there were any large trees near the patio. Ms. Lazara stated that there was a Pointed Pecan Tree and a Japanese Maple Tree that would remain. Ms. Benson inquired if the patio would be between the trees and Ms. Lazara confirmed that was the planned location.

Public Comments:

There was no one in attendance to give public comment.

Findings of Fact:

The following findings of facts were included in the staff report as part of the application:

Design Standards for porches:

- A1. Preserve and maintain historic porches, porticoes and balconies and their details, materials, and features that contribute to the significance of the building and the area. Prioritize repair over replacement. If not visible from streets, rear porches can be removed to accommodate rear building additions. If visible from a street, only non-historic rear porches can be removed.
- B1. Repair historic porches, porticoes, and balconies, their details and features, using accepted preservation methods.

- C1. Only replace the deteriorated portion of a feature or detail if it must be replaced. The new portion shall match the original in design, scale, size, color, texture, and material.
- C2. When it is acceptable to replace elements of a porch or portico, materials must have the appearance of original materials if visible from a street. For example, metal supports should not be used as substitutes for wood columns, plywood as a substitute for beaded board ceilings, or concrete as a substitute for tongue-and-groove wood flooring.
- C3. Use substitute replacement materials only if using the original material is not possible. Fiberglass and composite units are the most appropriate alternatives for elements such as columns and balustrades on front facade and side porches. Metal replacement columns and posts are acceptable for the rear, if visible from a street, but vinyl is prohibited.
- C4. Replace missing porches, porticoes, or balconies only when there is evidence that such feature existed historically and when it can be replaced with a fair degree of historic accuracy based on evidence and/or comparable such features in the area.
- Front porch architectural elements shall be consistent in design with those commonly found in the area, including roofs, steps, columns, and balustrades. The height and thickness of balusters, rails and handrails shall be consistent with historic examples found in the area. Inappropriate examples often encountered include columns and balustrades that are too narrow, as well as the use of creek stone for porch columns.

Motion:

Ms. Benson made a motion to approve the findings of fact included in the packet.

Vice- Chair, Mr. Vandermass-Peeler seconded the motion.

All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Vandermass-Peeler, Vice-Chair, made a motion to approve Ms. Lazara’s application to restore the spindle on the steps of her porch, restore the post on the front porch, and to install a patio area in the back yard of the property.

Ms. Benson seconded the motion.

All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business – None

VIII. Other Business

a. Overview of Historic Design Standards

Ms. Lawson gave a brief overview of the adopted Historic Preservation Overlay Design Standards. Ms. Lawson notified the commission that staff was planning to have training opportunities for the commissioners at future meetings with the consultants from the project.

b. Minor Certificates of Appropriateness Update

Ms. Lawson gave brief overviews of each minor COAs that had been recently approved that were included in the Historic Preservation Commission's packet.

c. Certified Local Government Training

Ms. Lawson reminded the commission members of the ongoing requirement to complete trainings. There was a brief discussion about online training and if the state was still accepting those trainings, and if new members would be able to complete the same training. The commissioners also discussed with staff how many trainings were required each year. Discussion was had about would trainings were recorded for commissioners to participate in after the training date.

d. Aurora-Pickett Hosiery Update

Ms. Lawson gave a brief update on the status of the Aurora- Pickett Hosiery being designated as a local landmark. Ms. Lawson stated that the same developers of the May Hosiery Apartments had purchased the Aurora-Pickett Hosiery to also turn into apartments. Ms. Lawson gave an overview of the rezoning potential and the rezoning process the hosiery would go through for the apartments. Ms. Lawson stated that this project is hopeful to be great for economic development in Burlington. There was also an inquiry about whether or not affordable housing would be available at the apartments.

Discussion:

There was brief discussion about the commission meeting on election day in November. Staff stated they would check for applications and if they had none, they would potentially cancel the meeting. Any trainings or discussion topics would be post-poned to later meeting.

There was discussion about recognizing former Historic Preservation Members for their service on the commission that would happen at a later date.

IX. Adjournment:

Ms. Benson, Commission Member, made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Hess, Member, seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

END OF MEETING