

MINUTES

Town of Southern Pines Historic District Commission Regular Meeting May 13, 2021 at 4:00 PM

The Town of Southern Pines Historic District Commission held its regular meeting on Thursday, May 13, 2021, at 4:00 PM. in the C. Michael Haney Community Room of the Southern Pines Police Department, 450 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Southern Pines, North Carolina.

Members present: Mart Gibson, acting Chairman, Steady Meares, Dorothy Shankle, Molly Goodman, Elizabeth Oettinger and Leslie Brians.

Member absent: Robert Anderson.

Staff members present: Suzy Russell and Cindy Williams.

Chairman Gibson called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

The oath of office was administered to new member Elizabeth Oettinger.

Steady Meares made a **motion**, which was seconded by Dorothy Shankle, to approve the Minutes of the April 8, 2021 meeting. **The motion carried unanimously.**

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

HD-07-21: Certificate of Appropriateness - Major Work for exterior alterations; 120 North Ashe Street; Applicant: Amy Stonesifer by Leonard Clayton Scott, Authorized Agent

Mr. Leonard Clayton Scott, on behalf of Amy Stonesifer, has submitted an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness - Major Work to construct a 500 square foot addition and to extend the existing front porch to wrap around each side of the structure located at 120 N. Ashe Street. The subject parcel is identified as PIN: 858106382111 (PARID: 00041459) and is zoned CB (Central Business). Per the Moore County tax record, the property owner is listed as Southern Porch, LLC.

Chairman Gibson confirmed that there were no conflicts of interest among the members of the Commission.

Molly Goodman made a **motion**, which was seconded by Mart Gibson, to open the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

STAFF PRESENTATION – Suzy Russell:

Ms. Russell stated that the application was for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work for the purpose of adding a 500 square foot addition to the eastern side of the existing structure and extending the existing porch to wrap around the left and right sides of the structure.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Clayton Scott:

Mr. Scott stated that the proposed addition will be on the eastern side of the building and will match the existing structure as closely as possible with the exception of the block on the foundation. The porch will be extended to wrap around each side. The roof will be metal, the siding will be aluminum and the windows will match the lower windows and the porch railings will be raised to meet building code.

Ms. Russell stated that aluminum siding may not be permitted.

Mr. Scott responded that aluminum siding is on the existing building and that a noncombustible material is required.

Chairman Gibson inquired about the foundation material.

Mr. Scott responded that it will be block with a scratch/parge finish. The existing beveled block is from the 1940's and is no longer being produced.

Ms. Russell stated that there is a section of the UDO under the Central Business development standards which states that building walls shall be finished predominately with brick, stucco or other non-metal siding determined by the Planning Director to be comparable in appearance and durability, but the Commission may take the applicant's request into consideration.

Leslie Brians asked what material is underneath the aluminum siding.

Mr. Scott responded that there is not wood siding under the aluminum siding.

Ms. Brians asked Mr. Scott for details regarding the new windows that will be added.

Mr. Scott responded that three windows on the left side will be removed and the new windows will be aluminum clad.

Ms. Brians asked Mr. Scott if it would be possible to reuse the windows.

Mr. Scott responded that they would try to reuse them.

Ms. Brians encouraged Mr. Scott to reuse as many of the original windows as possible and stated that the shutters are not original to the structure and were probably added in the 1990's and this type of building would have had actual storm windows and no decorative shutters.

Ms. Russell stated that shutters are used throughout the historic district and most are not original so if the applicant wishes to retain the shutters he may request to do so.

Chairman Gibson asked Mr. Scott if he was able to match the existing siding.

Mr. Scott responded that he had been told that he could match the existing siding and stated that he intends to include painting the entire exterior in his proposal.

Molly Goodman asked Mr. Scott for confirmation that the siding and foundation will be as stated in the staff report and that they will be keeping the shutters.

Mr. Scott confirmed and stated that he amended his application to state that he will reuse two of the existing windows on the side and one of the existing windows on the front.

Mr. Brian McKibben of 130 N. Ashe Street asked if the front elevation faces Pennsylvania Avenue.

Ms. Russell stated that the front entrance is technically on Ashe Street but the front of the building faces Pennsylvania Avenue.

Ms. Brians asked if the column on the Ashe Street elevation is going to be used since the porch will wrap around that side.

Mr. Scott responded that all of the columns would be replaced with new columns.

Ms. Brians stated that the existing columns distinguish the original structure from the addition.

Mr. Scott responded they could probably remove the column on the front and move it to the side entrance but the column on the front will be new.

Ms. Brians stated that the columns that are added on the sides could be new but the four original columns should not be replaced.

Mr. Scott responded that they will have to remove those columns to rebuild the porch so that it meets code. They could cut the columns down to fit.

Chairman Gibson stated that if it was an obvious addition and there was no way to avoid it being seen as an addition then he could understand Ms. Brian's request that Mr. Scott reuse as much as possible and not try to cover up those differences, such as the columns, but in a case like this the columns would be indistinguishable from what was there previously.

Mr. Scott said all of the columns will be freshly painted and have matching molding so they will all look the same. The dimensions and profile will be exactly the same as the existing.

Ms. Russell asked Mr. Scott if he wanted to amend his application to state that he would use the five existing columns.

Mr. Scott responded no because he needs six columns just on the front. The knee wall and the roof are going to have to be removed. They are going to mimic the existing steps and reinstall them in the same location.

Ms. Brians asked if all of the tongue and groove is going to be replaced with new tongue and groove.

Mr. Scott responded yes.

Dorothy Shankle asked if the porch roof is going to be black metal.

Mr. Scott responded yes.

Ms. Shankle asked what material is currently on the main roof.

Mr. Scott responded that he thought it was asphalt and it will remain as is.

Mr. Paul Roberts stated that he owns a property in the vicinity and asked Mr. Scott if he had previously renovated any homes in Southern Pines.

Mr. Scott responded yes.

Mr. Roberts commented that the staff report stated that the home was 121 years old and inquired about the likelihood of the columns being original.

Mr. Scott responded that he doubted that the porch was original.

Molly Goodman made a **motion**, which was seconded by Leslie Brians, to close the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Ms. Russell stated that the applicant had amended his application to state that the existing windows will be used on the front and any new windows will match the existing windows and will be aluminum clad. She asked Mr. Scott if he was amenable to stating that the profile of the windows will match the existing windows.

Mr. Scott responded yes, and that he wanted to amend his application to state that the siding will be 9” aluminum lap siding, the shutters will match the existing shutters and the new windows will match the existing six over one Queen Anne lower elevation windows.

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION ACTION:

Molly Goodman made a **motion**, which was seconded by Steady Meares, that as a finding of fact the application was complete as amended during the hearing and that the facts submitted were relevant to the case because the request for a Certificate for Appropriateness - Major Work has met the specified submittal requirements as required in the Town of Southern Pines Unified Development Ordinance. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Molly Goodman made a **motion**, which was seconded by Leslie Brians, that as a finding of fact the application complied with Section 2.28.10 Criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work, Criteria C 1-3 in that:

1. *Work is compatible and appropriate in preserving, retaining, repairing, or restoring the defining historic character of a property and the district. Specifically, the work is considered compatible and appropriate in terms of material, design, dimensions, mass, scale, orientation, color and other applicable considerations.* The work is compatible because the proposed addition is in line with the setbacks of the existing building and maintains similar building height, proportion and maintaining the existing building height, proportions and roof forms.
2. *Work does not damage and remove significant character defining features of the building and will not adversely affect its contribution to the larger historic district.* The work does not remove significant defining features of the building and is consistent with existing historic building patterns. The addition is not overwhelming and is in a scale that complements the existing structure.
3. *Work is consistent with the adopted Design Guidelines for the historic district.* The addition will be oriented on the site to fit the established development pattern of surrounding buildings. The addition relates in size and composition to existing historic buildings and the building materials that will be used are current materials and they will not be an historic reproduction of materials from 1910, the year the structure was built, as is recommended in the Historic District Guidelines. The Commission has agreed to allow aluminum siding to match the existing siding despite it not being listed as being appropriate in the UDO.

Molly Goodman made a **motion**, which was seconded by Mart Gibson, to approve HD-07-21 as amended by the applicant. **The motion carried unanimously.**

HD-08-21: Certificate of Appropriateness - Major Work for exterior alterations; 219 NE Broad Street and 223 NE Broad Street; Applicant: The Beckett Company, LLC by Stephen F. Later, Manager

Mr. Stephen Later, on behalf of The Beckett Company, LLC, has submitted an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work to remove the existing awnings and restore the facade to its original appearance. The subject parcels are identified as PIN 858106384625 (PARID 00037112) and PIN 85810638436 (PARID 00032376) and are zoned CB (Central Business). Per the Moore County tax record, the property owner is listed as The Beckett Company, LLC.

Chairman Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Molly Goodman to open the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

STAFF PRESENTATION – Suzy Russell:

Ms. Russell addressed the Commission and stated that Mr. Later had applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work for the purpose of removing the existing pent roofs located on the front façade of the building.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Stephen Later:

Mr. Later stated that the roof is not original to the building and it is in very poor condition so he would like restore the façade to its original appearance. Based on their tentative, limited examination, the facade appears to be brick, which would be consistent with many other buildings downtown. The roof was added decades after the building was built.

Chairman Gibson noted that the brick is painted below the roof but not above on some of the storefronts and asked Mr. Later how he proposed to address that once the roof is removed.

Mr. Later responded that they would like to see what is existing once the roof is removed, but he would propose minimizing any new painting and will try to do something that is as least disruptive as possible.

Chairman Gibson asked if there are any transoms or other openings that have been sealed.

Mr. Later responded that his speculation is that it is a solid façade but he could not confirm that with any certainty.

Dorothy Shankle asked if Mr. Later planned to install awnings after the roof is removed.

Mr. Later responded that he wants to see what is existing and an awning is certainly a possibility but that is something he would want to discuss with his tenants.

Elizabeth Oettinger asked Mr. Later if he planned to do the same thing across all three businesses.

Mr. Later said it would be more attractive if all of the facades were consistent.

Leslie Brians stated that there is currently a wooden band under the roof and asked if that would be removed.

Mr. Later responded that to the extent that the stained glass is set back, there would be no reason to have an unoriginal wooden frame there. At the end of the day the effort is going to be replicate the historic appearance as much as possible and as tastefully as possible.

Ms. Brians stated that her only other concern was the condition of the brick behind the roof and how any potential damage will be mitigated.

Mr. Later stated that if the brick behind the roof needs to be repointed they will have that done. Chairman Gibson asked Mr. Later if he had any objection to the Commission stipulating that the brick will be repointed, if needed.

Mr. Later confirmed that he will repoint any brick that needs repointing.

Chairman Gibson asked Mr. Later how he wanted to address the possibility of installing an awning.

Mr. Later stated that he would rather not be locked into installing an awning because a tenant may prefer to not have an awning.

Ms. Russell stated that if Mr. Later decided to add an awning at a later date that would require approval from the Commission.

Mr. Later asked if a specific type of awning could be approved in the event they decide to install one.

Ms. Russell stated that in that case he would have to come back before the Commission for approval.

Vice Chairman Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Leslie Brians, to close the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Discussion ensued among the members of the Commission.

Molly Goodman made a **motion**, which was seconded by Mart Gibson, to reopen the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Vice Chairman Gibson stated that the Commission would like to stipulate that any repairs to the brick be done using lime based mortar.

Ms. Russell asked Mr. Later if he was agreeable to amending his application to state that any repair of the brick would be done using lime based mortar.

Mr. Later responded yes and asked for clarification regarding painting up to the demarcation line in the existing color.

Ms. Russell stated that because no one knows what is under the roof it would be better for Mr. Later to make any repairs that are necessary. Repainting with the same color and in the same location is considered ordinary maintenance that would not require approval. Repainting with a different approved color and different placement would be considered a Minor Work that could be approved administratively. Repainting a completely new color, painting a previously unpainted surface, or installing an awning would be considered a Major Work and require Historic District Commission approval.

Mr. Later stated that there is a distinct possibility that there is no paint under the roof structure and therefore the logical remedy that would be the most aesthetically appropriate would be to paint up to the demarcation line and if that included a few inches of previously unpainted brick it would certainly be a lot better than having a paint line in the middle of the façade rather than a demarcation line. He would like to have permission to paint up to the initial demarcation line knowing it is a good chance that is where it is going to go so his tenants will have a pleasant looking façade.

Steady Meares made a **motion**, which was seconded by Leslie Brians, to close the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION ACTION:

Leslie Brians made a **motion**, which was seconded by Steady Meares that as a finding of fact the application was complete as amended by the applicant and that the facts submitted were relevant to the case, because the request for a Certificate for Appropriateness - Major Work has met the specified submittal requirements as required in the Town of Southern Pines Unified Development Ordinance. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Leslie Brians made a **motion**, which was seconded by Steady Meares, that as a finding of fact the application complies with Section 2.28.10 Criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work, Criteria C 1-3, in that:

1. *Work is compatible and appropriate in preserving, retaining, repairing, or restoring the defining historic character of a property and the district. Specifically, the work is considered compatible and appropriate in terms of material, design, dimensions, mass, scale, orientation, color and other applicable considerations. **The work is compatible because the removal of the modern pent roofs would reveal the original brick which has historical significance and contributes to the overall historic district.***
2. *Work does not damage and remove significant character defining features of the building and will not adversely affect its contribution to the larger historic district. **The work does not remove significant defining features of the building because the pent roofs were a contemporary addition and are not consistent with the overall special character of the historic district. The removal will expose the brick wall which is consistent with existing historic building patterns.***
3. *Work is consistent with the adopted Design Guidelines for the historic district. **The effect of removing the pent roofs on the historic building restores the existing original brick façade which contributes to the significance of the building as it exists in the overall district.***

and therefore moved to approve HD-08-21 as amended by the applicant. **The motion carried unanimously.**

HD-09-21: Certificate of Appropriateness - Major Work for exterior alterations; 143 NE Broad Street; Applicant: Advantage Equities 10892 LLC by Tom Gisler, Authorized Agent

Mr. Tom Gisler on behalf of Advantage Equities 10892 LLC, has submitted an application requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work replace existing windows on the front of the building and paint the front of the building located at 143 NE Broad Street using Historic District approved colors. The subject parcel is identified as PIN 858106381441 (PARID 00034561) and is zoned CB (Central Business). Per the Moore County tax record, the property owner is listed as Advantage Equities 10892, LLC.

Chairman Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Leslie Brians, to open the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

STAFF PRESENTATION – Suzy Russell:

Ms. Russell stated that Mr. Gisler had applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work for the purpose of replacing the existing front windows, repairing and rebuilding the existing Luxfor windows and repainting the painted front façade of the building with approved colors.

Leslie Brians expressed her appreciation for the proposed improvements and asked how the windows will be integrated into the contractor’s design.

Mr. Gisler responded that the frame will have three large panes and there is just a hollow frame above and the Luxfor windows will be inserted into the opening.

Ms. Brians asked Mr. Gisler if the application only included the windows.

Mr. Gisler responded that the doors will remain the same.

Ms. Brians asked if the existing window frames will be removed and Mr. Gisler confirmed.

Paul Roberts stated that he owns a nearby building and that he fully supported the project.

Chairman Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Elizabeth Oettinger, to close the public hearing. **The motion carried unanimously.**

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION ACTION:

Mart Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Steady Meares, that as a finding of fact the application was complete and that the facts submitted were relevant to the case because the request for a Certificate for Appropriateness - Major Work has met the specified submittal requirements as required by the Town of Southern Pines Unified Development Ordinance. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Mart Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Steady Meares, that as a finding of fact the application complies with Section 2.28.10 Criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major Work, Criteria C 1-3, as amended, in that:

1. *Work is compatible and appropriate in preserving, retaining, repairing, or restoring the defining historic character of a property and the district. Specifically, the work is considered compatible and appropriate in terms of material, design, dimensions, mass, scale, orientation, color and other applicable considerations because the repair of the existing Luxfor widows have historic significance and contribute to the overall historic district and the existing windows below them are being replaced with new windows in the same placement and are in keeping with the special character of the district.*

2. *Work does not damage and remove significant character defining features of the building and will not adversely affect its contribution to the larger historic district and the work does not remove significant defining features of the building and are consistent with existing historic district building patterns because the existing Luxfor windows are being repaired which maintains the significant defining character of the façade.*
3. *Work is consistent with the adopted Design Guidelines for the historic district because the historic district guidelines allow for painting previously painted surfaces and the new paint scheme is in keeping with the design guidelines because painting the currently painted front façade of the building is a recommended practice. The design guidelines encourage retaining the character defining features of a storefront and the repair and maintenance of the Luxfor windows retains the special character which contributes to the significance of the building as it exists in the overall district.*

and therefore to approve HD-09-21. **The motion carried unanimously.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

Mart Gibson made a **motion**, which was seconded by Steady Meares, to elect Leslie Brians as Chairperson and Elizabeth Oettinger as Vice Chairperson of the Commission. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Steady Meares made a **motion**, which was seconded by Elizabeth Oettinger, to adjourn the meeting. **The motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 6:14 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Cindy Williams
Secretary to the Historic District Commission