

**CITY OF ELIZABETH CITY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 2014
4:30 PM**

Chairman Golden called the meeting to order with the following members present: Roy Golden, Gordon Adams, Richard Boyd, Doris Johnson, Dorothy Rosenke and Marian Stokes. Also present were Angela Cole, Sr. Planner and Dawn Harris, recorder. An introduction of the Commission members was made. It was stated for the record that the Commission had a quorum with all members present.

Chairman Golden asked if there were any revisions or corrects to the December 12, 2013 minutes. Chairman Golden stated on page eight, second line; "he stated that there is not requirement" should be "no requirement." There were no other corrections. Chairman Golden asked for motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Boyd made a motion to approve the December 12, 2013 minutes. Ms. Stokes seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

Chairman Golden asked for approval or corrections of the minutes from the April 11, 2013 meeting. There were no corrections. Ms. Rosenke made a motion to APPROVE the April 11, 2013 minutes. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

Chairman Golden made the following statement:

Prior to today's meeting, notification was sent to neighbors living within 100' of the properties in question. Commission members received a copy of each application and were to visit the site. North Carolina law provides that persons have an opportunity to address an application; thus the Commission conducts a public hearing on the application. During the hearing the Commission receives evidence to determine that proposed changes are not incongruous with the special character of the historic district or the historic property. They review this evidence against guidelines listed in the City's ordinance before issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness. Each application is heard the same way. The judicial format of the hearing requires that they be impartial. Any written Staff comments are evidence presented just as any other evidence. If any Commission member has had reason to discuss the specific details of the application, they ask to be excused from hearing the application.

Because of the quasi-judicial format of the hearings, the Commission hears evidence and judges whether the change is not incongruous. The Commission is required by North Carolina law to swear in persons who speak before the Commission and offer evidence.

First item on the agenda was **Application HP-03-14** by George and Mona Grills for property located at 502 West Main Street. The applicants are proposing exterior renovations to the aforementioned property to include painting, repairing and the replacement of decayed/damaged items. Ms. Cole was asked to present Staff's report.

STAFF REPORT

The first case tonight is HP-03-14 involving property located at 502 West Main Street. Approximately 6,000 square foot lot located on the north side of West Main Street. The existing zoning classification is R-8 Residential. The structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Places – Inventory Nomination Form as the Ward-Randolph House. Documents indicate that the structure is an example of the Queen Anne style. The two-story frame house was built circa 1898.

Ms. Cole stated at this time that there was a correction to the Staff Report presented this evening. There was a Certificate of Appropriateness applied and issued for the subject property in August, 2010. The previous owner sought approval for front porch steps improvements; specifically the banisters. Ms. Cole stated to the Commissioners that they would find at their respective places a copy of said certificate and the written description of the project along with photographs. She stated a copy will be supplied to the current applicant.

The applicant requests approval for restoration construction to the existing historic structure.

The details of the petition are listed on page seven of the Staff Report and are as follows:

1. Replacement of rotted clapboard siding, as needed, on all elevations;
2. Installation of clapboard siding so as to cover/complete earlier renovation (door enclosure) along the side (east) elevation
3. Permanent enclosure of a second-story doorway along the side (west) elevation and installation and painting of clapboard siding as architectural finish
4. Permanent removal of wood stairway (remodel addition) along the rear (north) and side (west) elevations;
5. Repair and/or replacement of decaying soffit;
6. Repair front porch eave and molding;
7. Repaint house in similar color scheme:
 - a. Body: Valspar® No. 3005-4A Toasted Oat (Yellow)
 - b. Trim: Valspar® Signature No. CI 202 Snowcap White (White)
 - c. Accent: Valspar® No. 4007-2A Sharkfin (Gray)
8. Replacement of flashing edge on turret
9. Replacement and painting of front porch tongue-and-groove floorboard
10. Installation of wrought iron handrails at front porch/steps [This item has already been installed by the property owner; however Commission authorization is required.]

The applicant provides supporting documents including the contractor's webpage reference and photographs. A sample of the flash trim, floor board, and existing clapboard is available. Ms. Cole asked that the samples be passed around. The applicant's petition does not include a professional contractor quote with project cost estimates. Although the petition does not reflect research or consultation with preservation officers familiar with historic structures in the District; the applicant met with City staff to discuss the merits of the proposal.

The National Park Service Technical Preservation Brief and a summary of the standards for restoration were included in the report. Staff's recommendation is as follows:

The National Park Service states that restoration of a historic property and/or structure should be completed in a manner that captures the true depiction of the resource at a particular period of time. The selected restoration period should follow extensive research and justified with photograph and/or written evidence; and, once selected, the deletion of exiting materials, architectural features, etc. from other renovation projects is expected. Although the proposed improvements are maintenance-related and not altogether objectionable, the applicant, does not state in the petition response the restoration period to be achieved – the 1970s when the District was nominated and established; initial construction in the late 1800s; the 1920s when any number of District properties were remodeled due to the increasing residential use of electricity and other public utility; 1950-60s when District homes were oftentimes converted to multifamily from single-family residential use; etc. With clarification as to the restoration period, the Commission can more precisely decide which elements of the petition are appropriate, namely the permanent removal of entry ways, stairway access, the front porch wrought iron railing, and paint color. However, if the applicant does not intend to identify a specific restoration period, then perhaps the Standards for Rehabilitation are a more appropriate and obtainable goal and should be applied.

If the petition is approved, Staff recommends that as a condition for approval the applicant perform all construction so as to satisfy all applicable building codes and local zoning regulation according to City Ordinance; and that the applicant, prior to construction, obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for any and all other exterior improvements planned in future phases, including the accessory garage and carport structures.

This concluded Ms. Cole's report.

Chairman Golden asked if there were any questions for Ms. Cole. There were no questions at this time.

Chairman Golden asked the applicant to come forward. Mr. George Grills came forward and was sworn in by Ms. Harris.

Mr. Grills stated that they are looking to complete this project within a year. The flashing on the turret aluminum specifications provided is not a color. There is a steel piece that is approximately the color that will be used on the aluminum. The back stairway will be removed in preparation for a garage. The decking and flashing will be done with existing materials.

Chairman Golden asked when the applicant was planning to add the garage. Mr. Gills stated after the summer. He stated it is depending on how far they get into this project, because funds are an issue. Chairman Golden asked if the garage would be attached to the home. Mr. Gills stated yes. He stated that he had a sketch of the garage if the Commission would like to see it. The sketch was passed around for the Commission to review.

Mr. Grills stated that the objective would be to maintain the existing clapboard sides in the same color. The shingles will be asphalt but in a scalloped design which is similar to the current singles.

Ms. Rosenke stated that she thinks the question regarding the timeframe is not only how long the project is going to take but what era they [Mr. and Mrs. Grills] are aiming for. What time period? Mr. Grills stated that they are looking to maintain the current period of time the house was built which was 1890.

Chairman Golden asked if the applicant would be keeping the back porch. Mr. Grills stated that the garage will consume that back porch.

Chairman Golden asked if the railings were put on by Mr. Grills. He stated they were and that was before he realized he had to get a permit. Ms. Cole stated that the previous owners were to participate in Ghost Walk, so they were trying to fast track some improvements back in 2010 that included the walkway and the railings so you could access the porch safely. They did away with the wrought iron. Ms. Cole stated that she didn't think that the railings part of the project was ever completed.

Chairman Golden asked if the wrought iron was appropriate for this age house. Ms. Cole stated not if the applicant is going back to the construction period. Mr. Grills stated that it did appear that there was wrought iron installed prior to the wood banisters. Ms. Cole agreed. Mr. Grills stated that was why he proposed the wrought iron. Ms. Cole stated that the Cross's [previous owners] application should have the wrought iron that they had. Ms. Rosenke stated that she would venture that it was a 1920/1940 addition and not an original feature of the house. Mr. Grills stated that he had attempted to find out when the porch had been enclosed. He believes that when they put up the wrought iron; however, he could not find any details or design drawings that showed the property. Mr. Boyd stated that his house is 1902 and it has wrought iron handrails.

Chairman Golden stated that the balusters and the railings appear in good shape. Mr. Grills stated that the contractor had pointed out that the bottom of the posts are rotted and will need to be clipped and added onto.

With there being no other questions for Mr. Grills, Mr. Boyd made a motion to APPROVE Application HP-03-14 for repairs and refurbishing as presented. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

Next item on the agenda was **Application HP-04-14** by Robert L. Weltzin, D.C. for property located at 305 East Church Street. The applicant is proposing exterior renovations to the aforementioned property to include painting, repairing and the replacement of decayed/damaged items. This includes, but not limited to the replacement of 120 windows, replacement of rear roof addition, decking and removal of veneer brick and brick stair entrances. Ms. Cole was asked to present her report.

STAFF REPORT

This is case HP-04-14 for property located at 305 East Church Street. It is located on the south side of East Church Street at the intersection of East Church and Pool Streets. The zoning classification for this property is Central Business. The property maintains the original

commercial zoning designated at the time the Unified Development Ordinance and official zoning maps were established by the City of Elizabeth City. Most of the land use activity in this section of the District is mixed, being commercial and residential – single- and multi-family. The structure addressed as 305 E Church Street is listed on the National Register of Historic Places – Inventory Nomination Form as the (former) First Methodist Church. Documents indicate that the original structure, constructed circa 1857, was an example of the Greek Revival style. The building was the second for the First Methodist Church congregation. At present, the large three-story stuccoed brick shell is all that remains of the original edifice, which had a pediment and columns on the main façade, tall spire, and recessed portico. Eventually the church sold the property to local contractor, L. B. Perry, who, in the early 1930s gutted and converted the structure to a twelve-unit apartment building. Mr. Perry increased both the footprint and the height of the original structure. The remodeling enlarged the height from 1½ story into three stories with wooden decks wrapped completely around the building.

File records indicate a Certificate of Appropriateness being issued for the subject property and existing structure in May 2005. The applicant applied for and received Certificate 07-05 authorizing exterior painting; building addition (elevator room) at the rear elevation; wooden decks at each apartment unit; new mansard roof; and shutters on front and rear elevation windows. An amendment to the original Certificate was issued in February 2006 modifying the wood decking detail. The Certificate was never executed and has since expired.

The applicant requests restoration of the existing structure to the 1930s Perry period so as to initiate both commercial and single-family dwelling land uses. The details of the petition are listed on page three of the Staff Report.

Please refer to the applicant's supporting documents – manufacturer's specification sheets, architectural elevations, and written project description for details. Staff reviewed the National Park Service Technical Preservation Briefs Standards for Restoration; there are multiple Briefs that are applicable to the proposed restoration project. Those began on page five of the report. For space, not all relevant excerpts and commentary were reprinted in staff report.

The National Park Service states that restoration of a historic property and/or structure should be completed in a manner that captures the true depiction of the resource at a particular period of time. The selected restoration period, in this case a 1930s remodel, should follow extensive research and justified with photograph and/or written evidence; and, once selected, the deletion of exiting materials, architectural features, etc. from other renovation projects is expected. The applicant provides photograph and written description of the Perry conversion of the historic edifice to the existing apartment structure. Because the building has sat vacant for almost two decades all that remains is a shell of the former multifamily land use; the expectation is there will be minimal "deletion" of material and architectural features. Conversely, the applicant proposes an introduction of new composites for the building's windows, doors, decking, and railings, as well as changing the visual setting (landscape and yards) of the property. As a rule of restoration, deteriorated features and materials from the restoration period must be repaired rather than replaced. However, where the deterioration is severe and beyond repair or otherwise lost, the new feature must match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. This guideline is reiterated in Brief No. 45 Preserving Historic Wood Porches discussion of plastic and composite material as porch replacement material, which states "...when the historic porch

contributes to the historic character of a building, the particular substitute material that is being considered should accurately match the appearance of the wooden feature being replaced. Composite materials that can be routed or shaped to match specific pieces being replaced have greater potential for use in repairing a historic porch. Materials that cannot be shaped to match the visual appearance of the historic pieces being replaced usually are not suitable for use on historic buildings.” The collective volume of the three decks and their being a prominent architectural feature at every elevation warrants careful consideration of the proposed materials – including flooring, balusters, and railing.

The proposed changes to the doors and windows – removing existing wood-framed elements to replace with fiberglass and vinyl options – is a fateful, but expected alteration, especially considering the large number of window openings. With the exception of the front entry doors, the applicant proposes a complete change to the existing grille pattern – in the transoms above the doors, the doors themselves, and the windows. The existing transoms are without grille pattern. The remaining existing doors have a single lower panel with custom 13-lite pattern. As a compliment to the existing doors the remaining historic windows are double hung and with a custom ten-lite pattern. The petition response indicates both a plan to seal all upper story windows and doors, and a plan to install as listed above; clarification is needed on this project element.

Staff was not able to thoroughly evaluate and make comment on the requested vegetation removal and requisite landscaping improvements without making a few assumptions. There was not adequate information provided in the application response. Site visits indicate that there are several inappropriately placed, but otherwise healthy trees and shrubbery on the property. There is a mature Southern Magnolia in the rear yard along the east property line that Staff would like to see retained. The abundance of invasive undergrowth – weeds and vines – make identification and health assessment of the rear yard shrubbery (at the southeast corner) difficult. Removal, in whole or in part, may be necessary so as to complete parking area and stormwater management improvements. Staff provides a photograph of the (presumed) tree to be removed. The subject tree is in the side yard on the west property line; its removal will be necessary to complete the proposed driveway improvement. The application response states that there is a landscaping plan included. However, the site plan detail sheet reproduction (Applicant’s Page 19 originally entitled Nehemiah II, Inc. dated September 9, 2004; the original information has been obliterated and new data inserted) is not a sealed drawing done to scale. An acceptable site plan has not been submitted to the Zoning Administrator for official review. In addition to the Commission’s review and approval of any vegetation selection, the Zoning Administrator must approve all commercial vehicular area improvements, including the requisite landscaping. Likewise, all trash and recyclable containers stored outdoors must be screened and the abutting residential land use must be buffered from any driveway, parking and loading area improvements. These improvements must receive authorization from the Zoning Administrator.

Staff recommends discussion of additional site improvement elements not introduced the application response, but would require Commission consideration and approval: the use of storm and/or screened doors, fencing (as an element of screening), exterior lighting (for the commercial operation), and signage. Considering our weather climate and the residential land use, the inclusion of screened storm doors may be in order. If used along the front elevation, an architecturally-sensitive product should be selected. If the proposed layout is approved, then

vegetative and/or fence screening will be required along the entire abutting Allen property line. Exterior light fixtures, accents and appurtenances should be period-appropriate and must be authorized by the Commission. Similarly, on-premises (freestanding) and wall signage must be approved by certificate, administratively or by the Commission.

In addition to the landscaping and as noted above, there are Phase I and II improvements that require Zoning Administrator and City Engineer authorizations prior to construction and zoning permit issuance, including, but not limited to: site lighting (pole fixtures); signage; impervious parking area; stormwater retention and drainage; secondary building access (rear); parking area landscaping; incompatible land use and Dumpster screening; on-site and right-of-way sidewalk improvements; and vehicular curb cut/right-of-way access. The applicant has not received the necessary authorization. State and City codes, ordinances, and regulations will affect the proposed site improvements, and as a result, the associated aesthetics that are subject to Commission consideration. Staff requests that the Commission withhold making final decision on these elements, providing only comments and recommendations at this time. The request to reserve decision affects petitioner's Phase I improvement Nos. 5, 8, 10 (in part), 11 and 12; and Phase II improvement Nos. 2 (in part), 4 and 6, as listed above.

In as much as each individual element of the application is approved, Staff further recommends that as a condition for approval, the applicant, to the degree reasonably and financially possible, adhere to the National Park Service Technical Preservation Brief standards for restoration, cleaning, repair, and maintenance as highlighted above; that, for the public record a time table be established for both Phase I and II; and that construction, placement, and all other site improvements satisfy all applicable building codes and local zoning regulation according to City Ordinance.

This completed Ms. Cole's report. There were no questions for Ms. Cole. Chairman Golden called the applicant forward. Mr. Bill Waters and Mr. Robert Weltzin came forward and were sworn in by Ms. Harris.

Chairman Golden asked Dr. Weltzin if there was anything in his project that he would like to clarify for the Commission or what is most important to him. Dr. Weltzin stated that he had tried to break it down into different phases. In phase 1 he wants to improve the exterior of the building and fix the current masonry structure and cleanup the stucco. He would like to paint the building and put in the windows. That is what he is really concerned with. He stated that he cannot do anything without first getting the windows in. He stated that it is his understanding that the building has been sitting vacant for twenty years. It is a beautiful building. He and his wife are eager to do this restoration project. They currently reside in Raleigh. They are trying to get this building established and fixed up to have his chiropractor office on the first floor along with other alternative health care providers. He stated he is also looking at purchasing the building at 301 East Church Street.

Dr. Weltzin stated that one of his concerns right now is Staff's recommendation to not go ahead with the temporary ramp on the south side/back side of the building. He stated that he has a brother that is paralyzed and he would like to have the ramp for him and for his business along with compliance with ADA regulations. Chairman Golden stated that she thinks it is based on the some of the grading issues at the back of the property, which also have to be addressed. Dr.

Weltzin stated that he did not provide the engineering prints yet. He stated that it was his understanding that he is just here to get prior approval that the project is okay.

Chairman Golden mentioned that the applicant had not mentioned replacing the doors and obviously he had just forgotten because it does need doors. She clarified that it would be offices on the first floor; multiple offices. Dr. Weltzin stated that right now it will be just his office. He would like to have other health care providers in there. The top two floors will be his residential space.

Chairman Golden asked for comments/questions. Mr. Boyd stated that this is certainly an undertaking.

Dr. Weltzin plans on replacing all the doors and windows in the building. Certain doors will be secured according to the fire code so they cannot open.

Mr. Adams asked when the porches go on if Dr. Weltzin plans on opening up the doors. Dr. Weltzin stated yes. Mr. Adams asked if the porch addition was phase 1 or 2. Dr. Weltzin stated the front and back porch are both in phase 1. The main entrance to the clinic will be in the posterior side on the south side away from Church Street. He stated that what he is here for is to go ahead and get it approved to get the ramp built along with stairs on the backside and as they progress into the other phases then they will set footings for the more permanent structures. Mr. Adams asked if there would be a driveway all the way from the front to the back. Dr. Weltzin stated that is correct. He would like to have a one-way driveway coming from Church Street along the west side of the building. He stated that pending the Commission's approval it will also determine where his future signage will be.

Chairman Golden stated that the applicant was going back to the 1930 period; however the materials are not of the 1930 period. She stated that is a little concerning. She stated that she is very uncomfortable with the Trex deck/porches. She stated she is not uncomfortable with the vinyl windows considering there are 100. She is concerned with the look of the Trex on this historic property. Dr. Weltzin asked what Chairman Golden's recommendations would be for period appropriate. There are pictures of what the church used to look like and there are pictures of what the Perry apartments looked like. He stated he is trying to combine the two. He stated that the fact that there is a nomination for it to be on the Historic Registry; he has never had confirmation that it is truly on the National Historic Preservation Registry. He has only seen the application. In which case, that goes back to the 1857 and the church structure. Ms. Stokes stated that you would obviously not want the building looking like a church. Dr. Weltzin stated however; that is the reason he has the roofline the way it is and the columns. He is going with Greek Revival. Ms. Stokes stated that the Trex comes in so many different types, shapes and colors. She stated that you can hardly tell it from wood. She asked if the historic guidelines state that you can use a composite as long as it looks like the original. Ms. Cole stated; and drilled to look like wood. Mr. Waters stated that there are so many different types. He stated that the line they are looking to use is called Colonial Restoration Millwork. It doesn't rot, nor does it have to be painted.

Chairman Golden asked the applicant why he wanted all the porches. He stated because of the pictures and having access to the doors. Chairman Golden stated that she is more concerned with the living area. Dr. Weltzin stated that it would be nice to go out on the deck. Chairman

Golden asked if the windows are for ventilation. She stated that she is trying to find out where he [Dr. Weltzin] is coming from other than pictures of the 1930's. Dr. Weltzin stated that currently everything has been gutted out of the building. You can see where the original windows had been in the hallways where you could prop open help ventilation. The decks are there because that is the way it was with the Perry apartments. He stated he thought it would add a lot of character to Church Street. The roof line goes out over top of the surface of the decks. That will help direct the water flow away from the foundation of the building and help preserve it even longer. Dr. Weltzin stated that he would like to go ahead and see the back of the building—the parking lot—be elevated approximately five feet. That helps with water drainage coming off but also is for patience coming in. Some people have mobility issues. Mr. Adams asked how he plans to elevate that area. Dr. Weltzin stated that is up to his structural engineer.

Ms. Stokes asked Dr. Weltzin if he has spoken with anyone regarding approval for the driveway or raising the parking area. Dr. Weltzin stated that it is his understanding that he had to get approval from the Historic Preservation Commission before going to the next step. Mr. Waters stated that the Building Inspector would not talk to them at all without them having a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Cole stated that even with the Certificate of Appropriateness there will be another step. There will be Plan review that will have to occur. In response to Commissioner Adam's question, Ms. Cole stated that the City's Engineer will speak to the elevation. Ms. Cole stated that she is not an engineer; however, there is not a single property within the historic area that has a raised elevation such that the subject property drainage would sheet flow off into the public right-of-way without some onsite maintenance. Pool Street already floods.

Mr. Adams asked what the Commission is looking at to approve today; certainly not everything. He asked what the applicant needs to move to the next step. Ms. Cole stated if she remembers what Mr. Wiltzen had said; it is the painting, updating the stucco, windows, doors and whether the ramp could be approved.

It was decided to look at each step in phase 1 with the exception of numbers 5, 8, 10, 11 and 12 as requested by Staff.

1. Repair of degraded exterior – underlying brick masonry joints (mortar) and top-layer stucco.

Chairman Golden recommended the applicant looking into the manuals on historic preservation through the State that indicates exterior masonry. It is repair, cleaning and matching of anything that needs to be matched. Ms. Cole stated that the manuals were emailed to the applicant.

Ms. Rosenke made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 1 of Phase 1. Ms. Stokes seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

2. Repaint structure in similar color scheme:
 - a. Body: White
 - b. Trim: White
 - c. Accent: Slate gray

Chairman Golden asked what was meant by “accent.” Mr. Wiltzen stated that the gray was for the decking and the ceiling of the decking on the back of the structure. Ms. Rosenke stated that white covers a lot of territory. Mr. Wiltzen stated with the stucco surface he will be looking at an annual maintenance. There are two white buildings on either side of this structure. Mr. Wiltzen thinks the area just needs to be freshened up. The current gray color is dreary and he thinks the white will make a dramatic change in the neighborhood. Mr. Waters stated that the structure could use some gray accents window stools or something like that—the masonry features. Chairman Golden stated not around the windows. Mr. Waters stated right; just to give it some color.

There being no more discussion, Chairman Golden called for a motion. Ms. Stokes made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 2 of Phase 1 as presented. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

3. Installation of 120 each double pane single hung six-over-one vinyl windows:
 - a. 54 each 5'6" x 6'4" openings to have two each windows
(a total of 108 each window units)
 - b. 12 each 3'9" x 6'4" openings to have one each window unit
 - c. Manufacturer/Model: Encompass by Pella®
 - d. Grille Detail: ¾" contour; six between-the-glass lite pattern
 - e. Hardware & Grille Color: White

These are the windows in the addition to the house. Chairman Golden suggested for the applicant to use the style of the 1930 windows instead of those presented. She stated that they are available in the Pella®. Mr. Wiltzen stated that originally that is what he was looking for; however, it comes back to which historic era he is going for. Is it the Greek Revival, which is more of the church time period? He stated that is why he went with the squares instead of the elongated. Chairman Golden stated that the windows she recommended are definitely 1930's, because she has those in her house.

Mr. Waters stated that the 1930 windows do come in the Pella® in the most expensive window that they make, which is their Architectural Series. He stated that it is seven times the cost. Mr. Waters stated that on Phase 2 it is going back to the 1850 style more so than the 1930 look. Chairman Golden stated that is what has to be determined. She asked what era the applicant is going to do. She asked if he was going back to the 1800's or go with the 1930. Dr. Weltzin stated that he would really like to go back to the 1857 era.

Ms. Cole stated that when Director Brooks and she went through the application it was their feelings that if the apartment, multi-family, commercial is going to be the objective in the use then the 1930's look should be what they are going for. She stated forget Greek Revival and the church. That is gone and you are not going to get that look back. There is no way to achieve that except to take off two stories. Staff's opinion is that the applicant's goal is to take the structure to the 1930's and achieve that as close as possible. Staff certainly understands and respects the price point of the windows: vinyl versus wood, the grilles, etc. Staff leaves that to the Commission's interpretation and final decision. Mr. Wiltzen stated that the reason they are having this discussion is because it is in the National Registry and it was built in 1857.

Chairman Golden stated that it wasn't removed from the National Registry when it was renovated to this extent. You have to appreciate that, too. Mr. Waters asked if the Commission would like to see an actual window. Chairman Golden stated no that she thinks she knows. She stated if he wanted to show them he could. Mr. Waters showed a sample window to the Commission. Mr. Boyd asked Mr. Waters if they were going with a multi-pane above (inaudible dialogue.) Chairman Golden stated that she had read that the applicant would like the mullions in between the glass. Mr. Waters stated that it is easier cleaning and maintenance. Ms. Cole stated that she believes the Commission has always gone with the mullions on the outside in other cases. Chairman Golden stated that we have. Mr. Boyd stated that the Commission had gone with the in between mullions before.

Chairman Golden stated that the Commission would give a pass on the vinyl windows. She personally would like to see the 1930 window look and have the mullions on the outside. She asked for a motion regarding the windows. Mr. Boyd stated that he does not have any issues with the internal mullions. Mr. Adams stated that he recommends them also. Mr. Waters stated that unless you are right up on the window you are not able to tell the difference. Ms. Cole stated that you can tell the difference and this is a commercial building.

Chairman Golden asked for a motion regarding number three. Ms. Rosenke made a motion to APPROVE the vinyl windows in Item Number 3. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

Ms. Stokes made a motion to APPROVE the double-hung window; six-over-one design with internal mullions. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: STOKES, ADAMS, BOYD. ALL OPPOSED: GOLDEN, JOHNSON, ROSENKE.**

Ms. Johnson asked if the internal mullions have ever been applied to a commercial application or just residential. Chairman Golden stated that she could not speak to that because it has not happened that way since she has been on the Commission. Mr. Boyd asked about Zack Robertson's windows. They were two-over-two. Ms. Cole stated that the mullions were outside of the windows. Chairman Golden stated that the Commission had insisted on it. Ms. Cole asked Ms. Johnson about her particular project. Ms. Johnson stated that the mullions were outside her windows. Mr. Boyd stated he would change his answer to no.

Another motion was requested. Ms. Stokes stated that she would amend her motion as follows: to APPROVE the double-hung window; six-over-one design with external mullions. Ms. Rosenke seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. ALL OPPOSED: ADAMS. MOTION PASSED.**

The color white was approved, but needed no motion.

4. Installation of 18 each Pella® fiberglass entry doors:
 - a. Front:
 - i. Number: Three (3) each
 - ii. Style: Full Light
 - iii. Exterior Color/Finish: White

- iv. Tansom Grille: ¾” contour, six lite, white

Mr. Adams made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 4 (a), Phase 1 as presented. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

b. Side:

- i. Number: Twelve (12) each
- ii. Style: Four-panel, Twin Colonial Light
- iii. Exterior Color/Finish: White

Mr. Boyd made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 4 (b), Phase 1 as presented. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

c. Rear:

- i. Number: Three (3) each
- ii. Style: Full Light
- iii. Exterior Color/Finish: White
- iv. Tansom Grille: ¾” contour, three lite, white

Mr. Adams made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 4 (c), Phase 1 as presented. Chairman Golden seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

5. OMITTED

6. Remove existing brick veneer at grade so as to reconfigure front entrance and delete side and rear stairs;

Ms. Cole stated that when she did the site visit she found that the rear stairs are already gone.

Mr. Boyd made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 6, Phase 1 as presented. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

7. Remove existing vegetation – hardwood tree and shrubbery; [side (west) elevation]

Mr. Adams asked if the removal would affect the installation of the future driveway. Ms. Cole stated that yes it would. The removal of the tree is necessary in order to install the driveway. The width proposed runs almost to the property line. That tree root structure needs to come out. Ms. Stokes stated that it looks like it is right up against the building.

Ms. Rosenke made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 7, Phase 1 as presented. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

8. OMITTED

9. Replace roof on existing 16.3' x 9.4' single-story extension: (rear elevation)
 - a. Manufacturer: Owens Corning® Oakridge® Shingles
 - b. Structural Composition: Architectural shingle
 - c. Color: Onyx Black

Ms. Stokes made a motion to APPROVE Item Number 9, Phase 1 as presented. Ms. Johnson seconded the motion. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

10. Construct a temporary (Phase I only) rear stairway, porch and ADA ramp for commercial entrance
 - a. Structural Composition:
 - i. Flooring and railing
 1. Manufacturer: Trex®
 2. Structural Composition: Manufactured composite
 - ii. Railing supports: Pressure-treated wood
 - b. Color: Gray-ish

Following discussion Mr. Boyd made a motion to APPROVE as long as the applicant meets all the criteria from other departments. Ms. Johnson seconded the motion. Ms. Cole asked if the Commission wanted to include the detailing on the Trek®. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

Mr. Boyd amended the motion to include that the Trek® product be milled to replicate tongue-and-groove wood; if this is not available they are to go with traditional porch flooring. Mr. Adams seconded this amendment. **ALL IN FAVOR: GOLDEN, ADAMS, BOYD, JOHNSON, ROSENKE and STOKES. MOTION PASSED.**

Dr. Weltzin asked if there was going to be a problem with the wrap-around deck at this time. Chairman Golden stated that she thought that was one of the issues that would be coming back to the Commission. Mr. Waters stated before spending several thousand dollars on architectural drawings for the decks they wanted to know if the Commission was going to have issues with the decking. It was recommended that the applicant get an architect. The Commission is not comfortable making decisions without the drawings available. Dr. Weltzin asked about the style of the columns. Chairman Golden stated that she thinks the columns will have to be appropriate to the 1930's.

This completed Dr. Weltzin's hearing.

Ms. Cole stated that Staff has not approved any Certificates administratively. Ms. Cole does have a meeting with ECDI Director, Rebecca Cross to discuss trashcans, benches and other infrastructure in the Central Business District.

Chairman Golden asked where to draw the line on materials for historic buildings. When you have looked on twenty years of absolute devastation and you have someone that wants to own it and fix it. It is very troubling to say no you can't have those windows and no you can't have that porch and no you can't do this and you turnaround and tell someone else oh sure, you have a different type of property. Chairman Golden stated that she doesn't think it will sit well within

the community. Ms. Rosenke stated such as the internal versus the external mullions. Chairman Golden stated that she wrestles with this. Ms. Cole stated that from Staff's prospective and she has had this conversation with the Board of Adjustment because they have to make calls on variance and interpretation and often times when you are dealing with property, you are dealing with income. That's Dr. Weltzin's case here and it is hard to give that no. One of the things that the Board of Adjustment; quasi-judiciary as the Historic Preservation Commission, they have six itemized criteria in the Ordinance that they can fall back on. If the applicant doesn't meet all six, then they are out and the Board has to say no. The Commission on the other hand, their standards is loosely defined. Without design standards the Commission has to rely and fall back on what NPS and the Briefs put the standard. Add to that the "changing of the guard" that happens periodically; preferences will change, opinions will change. Ms. Cole stated that while this Commission is here they can draw their prospective line in the sand and keep the bar set there. If the bar is not set higher then we will get what we have always gotten. It is expensive owning and maintaining, restoring and rehabilitating historic properties. It comes with the territory.

Following brief discussion and with no further business, meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Dawn Harris, Recorder