



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2021 6:30 PM
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS CHAMBERS
2nd Floor, Town Hall, 301 S. Brooks Street, Wake Forest, NC 27587

The following COVID-19 Protocols will be in place: 1) seats will be socially distanced; 2) masks are required for those who have not been vaccinated; 3) masks are optional for those who have been vaccinated; 4) contact tracing forms will be required.

Contact Historic Preservation Staff at mmichael@wakeforestnc.gov or 919-435-9516 for information or visit the Historic Preservation webpage under "Meetings" at <https://www.wakeforestnc.gov/planning/historic-preservation>

6:30 Regular Business

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of the June 9, 2021, Regular Meeting.
4. Public Comment (limited to 3 minutes per person) The HPC is interested in hearing your concerns, however, speakers should not expect HPC action or deliberation on subject matter brought up during the Public Comment segment. Topics requiring further investigation will be referred to the appropriate Town Staff and may be scheduled for a future agenda.
5. Treasurer's Report
7. Old Business
 - A. Home Tour
 - B. Budget
8. New Business and Announcements
 - A. Staff Update
 - B. Member Updates
9. Adjourn



TOWN *of*
WAKE FOREST

301 S. Brooks Street
Wake Forest, NC 27587
t 919.435.9400

www.wakeforestnc.gov

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2021

6:30 PM

Commission Members Present: David Bennett (Vice-Chairperson), Beverly Whisnant, Elizabeth Miller, Paige Bivens, Nancy Ginger, and Commissioner James Dyer (BOC Ex-Officio),

Commission Members Absent: Andrea Radford (Chairperson), Darina Bender, and Olivia Wilkerson (Youth in Government Ex-Officio)

Staff Present: Michelle Michael (HPC Staff Liaison), Melanie Rausch (Planner I), Deeda Harris (Town Clerk), Bradford West (Long Range Planning Manager) and Sam Slater (Town Attorney)

Guests: Nasser Akari, Mark Hawkins, and Erin Hawkins

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL – In the absence of the Chairperson the Vice-Chairperson will run the meeting. Vice-Chairperson David Bennett called the meeting to order at 6:37 pm, in lieu of a roll call vote commission members and staff introduced themselves as this meeting was the first in person meeting in over a year.

2. AGENDA. Vice-Chairperson Bennett asked for an approval of the agenda. Staff Liaison Michell Michael announced an amendment to the agenda. Under New Business staff updates were moved to after member updates. Vice-Chairperson Bennett asked for any other amendments there were none. Beverly Whisnant moved to approve the agenda as amended. Paige Bivens seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

3. MINUTES. David Bennett asked for an approval of the May 12th, 2021, minutes. Paige Bivens moved to approve the May minutes; Nancy Ginger seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion passed (5-0).

4. PUBLIC COMMENT (limited to 3 minutes per person) David Bennett asked if there was anyone who wished to make public comments. Staff Liaison Michelle Michael invited anybody in the audience to comment. There were no public comments.

6. TREASURERS REPORT Staff liaison Michelle Michael apologized to the group the report was received late in the day and a detailed synopsis of the reconciled budget will be provided at the next meeting. As of May 1, 2021, the beginning balance was \$40,070.92. \$4.61 of interest was earned and the ending balance as of May 31, 2021, was \$40,077.53. Transfers for reconciling 2019 to 2020 \$11,733.00 was removed as expenses from that year, and in 2020-2021 \$1,450 was removed for an adjusted projected balance of \$26,894.53 as of June 2021. Vice-Chair David Bennett asked if there were any questions. There were no questions. Nancy Ginger made a motion to receive and accept the treasurers report. Elizabeth Miller seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

5. PUBLIC HEARING.

Staff liaison Michelle Michael was sworn in by Town Attorney Sam Slater. Ms. Michael submitted the full agenda, staff report and COA from the June 10, 2020, meeting as well as COA 21-04 and staff report and any subsequent information.

COA 21-04 (After-the fact): A request from Mark and Erin Hawkins to allow a change from the approved COA. Smooth Fiber Board Siding was approved under COA 20-10, but woodgrain has been installed and the applicants are requesting approval.

The house is a new construction located at the site of 427 N Main Street. On the corner of East Juniper Street and North Main St across the street from the Wake Forest Historical Museum. The previous home that stood on the lot burned down in 2015. The new construction was presented to and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on June 10th, 2020, using smooth cementitious siding in keeping with the historic district standards. The original COA is 20-10.

COA 21-04 Proposed Exterior Changes: The applicant is requesting a change to COA 20-10 due to the high cost of building material, labor and the installation is mostly complete. Upon recent inspection the Town of Wake Forest discovered wood grain cementitious siding was installed as an oversight during construction. This material is inconsistent with the approved COA 20-10. However due to the high cost of building materials the applicant is requesting a change to the original 20-10 to allow wood grained siding as the high cost of materials and labor poses as an insurmountable hardship for the applicant.

Staff Liaison Michelle Michael displayed two photos of the siding. One close up and one of the home as it stands now. Construction is in progress.

The Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation follow for the purpose of analysis:

The Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment. (Note: This standard deals with use and thus does not apply to commission's design review process.) *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken. *Staff Analysis: Creating a false sense of historical development is inappropriate for properties within a historic district. This includes adding architectural elements that create the illusion of historic features and materials. Cementitious siding is not a historic material, and the application of wood grain pattern creates the visual illusion of clapboard siding, creating a false sense of historical development.* Ms. Michael stated creating a false sense of history is a part of the staff analysis utilized when determining what is appropriate for a historic district.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. *Staff Analysis: New construction should be differentiated from the old. Under our analysis adding wood grain pattern to cementitious siding creates the illusion of wood siding like that of historic buildings in the local district, smooth siding provides the differentiation required by the standard.*
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the history property and its environment would be unimpaired. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*

Wake Forest Historic District Design Standards

Additions and New Construction

1. Identify, retain, and preserve historic features that contribute to the historic character of the historic district and streetscape including but not limited to building height, scale, massing, proportion, fenestration patterns, setback, orientation, space between buildings, lot coverage, and roof shape and slope of surrounding buildings. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
2. It is appropriate for new construction projects to be compatible with the height, scale, massing, proportion, fenestration patterns, lot coverage, setback, and roof shape of surrounding historic buildings within the historic district. It is also appropriate to implement the principles of size, scale, rhythm, shape and form when planning new construction project. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
3. It is appropriate for the historic buildings in the district to maintain site prominence and priority on the streetscape in the historic district. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
4. It is appropriate to maintain appropriate setback when planning new construction projects:
 - a. Setbacks shall be uniform and establish a feeling of order and cohesiveness within the blockface and streetscape. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
 - b. New building shall be setback behind neighboring historic buildings. Porches are included when considering setback. Zoning requirements will also apply to setbacks. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
 - c. Side yards shall be consistent in size to side yards of neighboring buildings. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
5. It is appropriate to implement the principles of orientation when planning new construction projects:
 - a. New structures shall face the same direction as existing structures. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*

- b. The primary entrance shall face the primary street. For commercial buildings with rear parking a front entrance is still required. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
6. It is appropriate to use materials on new construction that were traditionally found in the historic district, including but not limited to wood, brick, stone, stucco, and rusticated concrete block.
 - a. Smooth-faced cementitious siding installed in a traditional manner with similar exposure and size to emulate horizontal wood siding is also appropriate for new construction projects. *Staff Analysis: The approved COA-20-10 included smooth-faced cementitious siding to be installed in a traditional manner to emulate horizontal wood siding in keeping with the standard. An oversight during construction led to the installation of wood grain cementitious siding.*
 - b. It is inappropriate for new construction projects within historic districts to utilize synthetic siding and details including but not limited to vinyl, PVC, and aluminum. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*
7. It is inappropriate to site or locate new construction projects that necessitate the relocation or demolition of historic buildings or outbuildings. *Staff Analysis: Does not apply.*

Proposed Findings of Facts

Staff offers the following findings for the Commission's consideration.

Based upon the information contained in the application, specifications, and staff report, the Commission finds that the application for COA 21-04 to change COA 20-10 to allow wood grained cementitious siding does/does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Wake Forest Design Standards for the Local Historic District and Local Landmarks and is or is not congruous with the special character of the historic district.

Proposed Conditions

Staff offers the following findings for the Commission's consideration:

- 1. Any changes to the proposed project require review and approval by staff.*
- 2. The applicant will ensure all other requirements of project and the approved COA 20-10 are met.*

David Bennett asked if there were any questions for Ms. Michael regarding the staff report. Vice-Chair Bennett invited the applicants to provide their testimony regarding the COA request. Sam Slater swore in Mark and Erin Hawkins of 619 S Main Street. Mark Hawkins stated the siding was an oversight and not installed intentionally. Mr. Hawkins stated he believes the mistake happened for a

couple of reasons the first being the home construction was delayed from the start causing confusion. Then Mr. Hawkins stated the home was modeled after a new construction in the Madison Park neighborhood in Raleigh that did have wood grained siding. Mr. Hawkins continued to say that they do not prefer wood grained siding, but the installation is already almost complete and changing it now would be extremely expensive. Mr. Hawkins stated the texture is not terribly noticeable from the street, and their intention was not to match or replicate history. The siding was simply a mistake. Mr. Hawkins thanked the commission for their time and consideration.

Vice Chair Bennett asked if there were any questions prior to closing the public comment period. Ms. Michael asked the applicant if they accepted the conditions proposed for COA 21-04 as stated specifically condition number 2. Mr. Hawkins responded that he is uncertain of other challenges that may come up through the remainder of the project and would rather keep it more fluid. Ms. Michael stated a possible change to the COA can be “the applicant will ensure all other requirements of project and the approved COA 20-10 are met or brought back to the commission for approval.” Vice Chair Bennett stated the condition will be to endeavor to meet all the remaining terms of COA 20-10 and any changes require approval. The commission and staff accepted the change to COA 21-04 condition 2. Beth Miller asked the applicant to review the conditions of COA 20-10 to ensure they are being met and nothing else has been missed or forgotten. Mr. Hawkins agreed and stated they will continue to collaborate with staff and the commission throughout the construction process. Mr. Bennett asked if there were any other questions or members of the audience who would like to provide comments. Sam Slater clarified that this was the time for questions or comments.

Commissioner Dyer stated he would be happy to speak for the proposal. Sam Slater swore in Jim Dyer of 545 North Main Street. Mr. Dyer stated that from the street it is not clear that the siding is wood grained and the home is a great addition to the neighborhood. Vice Chair Bennett asked for any additional comments. Nasser Akari of 238 North Main Street was sworn in by Sam Slater. Mr. Akari stated he would like to support the comments of commissioner Dyer. Mr. Akari stated the house looks really good, there is nothing negative about its appearance, and that it will be a great addition to N Main Street. Mr. Bennett asked for any last questions or comments before deliberation. There were none, and the public comment period was closed.

Nancy Ginger stated based on what was submitted and what has occurred, this does not seem to be that big of an issue and is not something that we should turn down especially considering cost. Ms. Ginger added it looks good, the neighbors are in support of it and it is not so completely off from what was approved that the commission should deny it. Paige Bivens stated she did not notice the siding was wood grained. Ms. Bivens stated she agreed with Ms. Ginger that mistakes do happen, and this does not seem so egregious that it should be denied. Ms. Miller stated it is incredibly hard to tell which houses do and do not have wood grained siding that she too believes it inappropriate to deny the proposal. Ms. Miller continued to state she understands the value in not allowing reproduction houses but does not think this change has turned the house into that. Mr. Bennett stated his thought in reviewing this was two-fold. One, mistakes happen and the project still remains compatible in height, scale, setback, etc. Mr. Bennett stressed the importance of being careful about setting precedent as this project will not be meeting the local standards. He suggested that this project does not meet the standards but remains congruous with the district. Ms. Ginger asked if the commission could state that as a part of their approval to prevent from setting a dangerous precedent. Mr. Bennett responded he believed so. Mr.

Bennett asked if there was a motion. Ms. Ginger made a motion “based upon the information contained in the application, specifications, and staff report, the Commission finds that the application to change COA 20-10 to allow wood grained cementitious siding does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Wake Forest Design Standards for the Local Historic District however is congruous with the special character of the historic district the commission moves to approve the proposal subject to the agreed upon conditions including all other changes being approved by the commission or staff.” Beth Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

7. Old Business

- A. **Budget** – Staff Liaison Michelle Michael stated that next meeting will have a thorough breakdown of the budget.
- B. **Historic Marker Program** – Staff reviewed the local marker program that was provided to HPC members and posted on the Town website with the agenda. The program has been through initial internal review with Planning, Public Works, and Engineering who provided their feedback which has been incorporated. Staff showed the revised marker design options and the HPC selected Option 1 as the new marker design. Vice Chair David Bennett asked for a motion for approval to take the program to the Board of Commissioners. Beverley Whisnant moved to accept the Historic Marker program with the edits completed by Staff, as well as option number 1 of the proposed sign design. Paige Bivens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

- C. **Staff Follow-Up: - Property Owner Correspondence, Progress at Forestville Baptist Church**

At the May HPC meeting members requested staff reach out to Forestville Baptist Church to check on their restoration progress and to bring back requirements for staff and the HPC to communicate with property owner’s and upkeep within the local district. Ms. Michael researched previous actions and cases and found that if there is a violation staff will issue the violation notice. If it is not a violation that is specifically covered in the Town ordinance or design standards, then the Town will not take action. Since repainting is not an ordinance or law and does not require a COA the Town can take no action towards a property owner in need of repainting their home. Ms. Michael stated that if members would like to change the standards to require a COA for paint that is within their power. Ms. Whisnant thanked staff for clarifying.

Ms. Michael reached out to Forestville Baptist Church to enquire about their progress on restoration and spoke with a church representative. They were awarded a challenge grant from the Covington Foundation for painting and repairs. Windows are being repaired and the roof has been replaced; progress is happening however much of it is taking place in the interior of the structure. Donations can be made through their website.

8. New Business

- A. **Member Updates** - Michelle Michael asked if there were any comments from members? There were no comments.
- B. **Staff Updates** – Ms. Michael stated she had one remaining update. She asked the HPC to recall that in April they met potential new members and made two recommendations to the Board of Commissioners. Beth Miller, who is on the HPC today, was one of those recommendations, and a recommendation was made for a new local district property owner. Ms. Michael reviewed the process for electing new members. The HPC members review all applications and vote on

recommendations to take to the Board of Commissioners. When the HPC votes, members cast their votes electronically to the Executive Assistant's office. At this stage of the process HPC staff takes no further action until receiving direction from the Board of Commissioners. The recommendations went to the Board of Commissioners, they voted on accepting Ms. Miller, but the Board voted to hold on the local district applicant. There has been no further action on the local district applicant. Ms. Michael stated, "I am here to ask if you would like me, on your behalf, to ask the Board of Commissioners to take action on the nomination. Beverly Whisnant asked for clarification. Ms. Michael stated "you had two applicants you voted on in April. You voted for an at-large member, which was Beth Miller and you voted for a local historic district member which was Charlotte Jenkins. You all recommended to the Board those members be approved for the Historic Preservation Commission.

Ms. Whisnant stated she, "would like to see the HPC make a statement on the Board's decision to hold because the applicant was recommended by the HPC, and we have no idea why the vote would be held." Ms. Whisnant continued to say she would really like to see Charlotte Jenkins approved and to have her come on the HPC. Ms. Ginger asked, "Do we know why they held the vote?" Ms. Michael deferred to Commissioner Dyer who stated, "I received a video from one of the neighbors on North Main Street, of the applicant walking her dog, and the dog doing its business in the yard, and she walked off, and that did not sit well with me. Again, if you guys want to have her on the Board, I will withdraw my withdrawal, but I was thinking you might want to open it up for someone else as well."

Ms. Miller asked "just to clarify what the process is, once the application has been sent to the Board of Commissioners are they just going to accept or hold? Or can they reject? Because I feel like right now that application is in limbo and it should be completed in some fashion. So if they were to choose to reject obviously we would want to open it up for other applicants." Mr. Dyer stated, "I am ready to move forward either way."

Ms. Whisnant stated, "If that is the reason... That sounds like an issue that can be discussed between the neighbors." Commissioner Dyer responded, "It absolutely does." Ms. Whisnant continued, "She [the applicant] has qualifications that we have already approved. Had we even known about the dog in the yard, we can't know what we would have done, but dare I say I would have thought that was not enough to keep this person off the HPC" Mr. Dyer stated, "well, if it had been my yard, I would have felt differently." Ms. Ginger stated, "You know if someone took a video you start thinking this is probably not the first time this has happened. I am speculating, but you do wonder if maybe this is a repeated issue?" Commissioner Dyer responded "I cannot address that, I only saw it one time."

Vice Chair Bennett asked "Michelle the question is whether this has been remanded back to the HPC for a vote?" Ms. Michael responded, "no this has not been remanded back to you all. The BOC will either vote to approve the recommendations of the HPC, deny the recommendation of the HPC and appoint another person, or deny the recommendation and send it back to the HPC to find another candidate. It is in their prevue, if they disagree with your recommendation to deny it, either recommend someone else or send it back to you all to provide a new applicant" Ms. Whisnant stated, "so we just have to wait until they do one thing or another?" Ms. Michael responded yes.

Ms. Miller asked "is there a mechanism for us to request they take action in some way?" Ms. Michael responded "yes, you absolutely can request they make a decision one way or another. In fact, when staff completes their annual report to the parks service, one of the questions is, "Did you fill all your vacancies in a timely manner?" and our grant funding is linked to that, so I think that it is within your prevue to ask for them to make a decision." Paige Bivens made a motion to recommend the HPC takes the recommendation for the local district member back to the BOC for

them to vote on the application. Beverley Whisnant seconded the motion. Vice Chair Bennett asked if there were any other comments or questions. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

9. Adjourn. Vice-Chairperson Bennett asked if there was a motion to adjourn. Nancy Ginger made a motion to adjourn, Beth Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (5-0). The meeting adjourned at 7:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Radford, Chairperson

Melanie Rausch, Secretary

