

**Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission**  
**Regular Public Meeting**  
**February 20, 2024**  
**6:00 p.m.**  
**John McAdoo Room, 3rd Floor, Truist Building**  
**201 W. Market St., Greensboro, NC**  
**MINUTES**

**A. Call to Order**

Chair Payne opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending.

**B. Roll Call**

There was a Roll Call, and the following members were present: Jane Payne; David Horth; Terri Hammond; Abigaile Pittman, David Millsaps; Louis Gallien, Keisha Hadden; Raul Cardona-Torres; Sean Dowell and Jerry Nix.

One member was absent: Justin Cundall

**C. Agenda Amendments**

None.

Mr. Dowell suggested that each member introduce themselves and give a short background so the new members would have a better idea of the valuable input gathered from each member. Chair Payne felt that was a good idea.

Sean Dowell stated that he has been on this Commission and Vice Chair since late last year. He is a commercial real estate broker and developer doing historic, mixed-use properties around the state of North Carolina, among other things.

Jane Payne stated that she is Chair of the HPC, and she is a former paralegal with Brooks Pierce law firm, and she is now retired. She represents Jamestown.

Jerry Nix stated that he is glad to be "back home." Previously, he had served on the Commission for 30+ years. He worked for a theatrical stage rigging equipment company. His mother was one of the first people on this Commission during the bicentennial when they were doing landmarks for Guilford County, trying to identify those, and they came up with the 1979 inventory, which was needed to start this Commission in 1980. He is an at-large member.

Abigaile Pittman stated that she is unsure how long she has been on the Commission, and Ms. Payne stated probably as long as she has, which is about 20-22 years. She is an Urban Planner and has had a strong interest in historic preservation. She represents High Point.

Louis (Buzz) Gallien stated that he a former Dean and Professor at Appalachian State and a Greensboro resident and was on the Board for PGI long before they moved from Greensboro. His family has a couple of historic museums, one is the Mud House Plantation in Maryland and the other is the Stafford House in Kernersville, along with the slave cemetery they are curating in Kernersville. His interests are in historic preservation.

Terri Hammond stated that she represents Oak Ridge. She and her husband have restored the Sanders-Blaylock House in Oak Ridge. She has also been on the Commission for about 20 years.

Judi Decker, owner of Triad Reporting & Typing Services, has worked for the City, County and other governmental entities, recording meetings and providing summary minutes since 1994.

Justin Snyder, Guilford County Senior Planner, was staff to the Hillsborough Historic District Commission for about five years. He has taken over for Kaye Graybeal, Deputy Director for the Planning Department, who is retiring. Please bear with him as he learns the ropes of his new job. He has an interest in historic preservation among other things, and long-range planning definitely holds his interest more than current planning does.

Keisha Hadden stated that this is her first night on the Board, and she comes in with a background as a research scientist for vegetable seed company for 20 years, and then she taught college botany and biology and plant pathology for several years, and then she moved to Greensboro about 6 years ago. She lives in Fisher Park in an historic house, and she grew up in a historic house and has lived in several throughout her life and has an interest there. She is President of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Board, and for the past five years, her responsibility has been the COAs through the City for the neighborhood.

David Horth stated that he has been on the Commission for about five years. He retired after 30 years as Innovation Director for the Center for Creative Leadership. His appointment to this Commission was as a result of his being Chairman of what was originally called "The Aycock Historic District" and was the one that lead the change of name to "The Dunleath Historic District."

Raul Cardona is originally from Puerto Rico, and he came to High Point after working for a pharmaceutical company, and he has been in the pharmaceutical industry for 35 years. He has traveled over the globe, and he had the chance to live in Rome for two years, and he appreciates the history. When they came back, they bought a historic house, the Mendenhall-Blair house, and he has had a rough introduction to these meetings four years ago, and he quickly learned how important the house was in many ways. They had a developer who wanted to buy the property, and there was only one condition, which was that they could not destroy the house. In the end, they were able to save the house, and he is glad for that. This experience gave him a chance to join the Committee and when there was a vacancy, he joined. They love the house and the history, and he will protect and love the house for many years to come.

David Millsaps stated that he lives a couple of blocks from here and has been on the Board for about a year. He used to watch "This Old House" on TV, and in the late 1980s, he bought a house from the Neighborhood Association on Rankin Place that had been rescued by the neighborhood. There was a period of time in which the world was changing and manufacturing and those kinds of things were going, so he and his wife decided to go into business. This year he will be celebrating 30 years of working on old places and enjoying opening up a space and seeing or touching something that no one had seen for about 100 years. He is sort of the "carpenter" of this group.

Chair Payne thanked everyone for sharing. She stated that there is such a diverse group gathered, and she feels that is very important.

#### **D. Approval of the December 19, 2023, Minutes**

Ms. Hammond pointed out that there was a double-up in Item D, where it says, "of the". The correction was noted and will be corrected.

Mr. Dowell moved approval of the December 19, 2023, minutes, as amended, seconded by Mr. Millsaps. The Commission voted unanimously (10-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Dowell, Millsaps, Hammons, Gallien, Nix, Horth, Cardona, and Hadden. Nays: None.)

**E. Old Business:**

None

**F. New Business:**

**Public Hearing Items:**

**Evidentiary Hearing Items:**

1. Certificate of Appropriateness application to make several interior changes and to remove a non-functioning chimney at the Grimsley Fry House, 408 Fisher Park Circle, Greensboro, NC 27401.

David Millsaps stated that he is involved in this house so he will recuse himself from this matter.

Justin Snyder stated that any member who has a known close business relationship, or who may otherwise benefit from the outcome of the decision, should also recuse themselves. Additionally, if anyone has had any *ex parte* communication or external communications outside of this hearing, please disclose that prior to the item being heard. There were no other recusals for this item.

Justin Snyder gave the staff report as follows:

The current owners, Alan and Lovelle Overbey, are requesting several interior changes and removal of a non-functional side/rear brick chimney at the Grimsley Fry House, located at 408 Fisher Park Circle in Greensboro, NC, Guilford County Tax Parcel #1964. The elevations and architectural plans in the enclosed application package show the work to be done.

**Exterior Changes Proposed:**

The applicants request approval to remove the existing brick service chimney on the south elevation of the roof at the rear of the home. The applicants state in their narrative that the existing chimney does not connect to any interior fireplaces, and it is not in use for any type of ventilation. Due to the elevation of the home relative to the street and existing vegetation, the chimney is also not visible from the street. The applicants also state that removal of the chimney would allow room for a larger vanity and linen cabinets in the bathroom, and it would also facilitate a kitchen renovation which will be a future phase of work.

**Interior Changes Proposed:**

The applicants request approval to renovate the existing interior upstairs hall bathroom. Per the applicants' narrative, the current bathroom appears to be a remodel completed approximately 30 years ago, and they state in their narrative that the remodel did not retain any fixtures, finishes, or layout characteristics original to the house. Therefore, they request permission to remove all existing bathroom fixtures, cabinetry, and tile finishes. Photos are provided in the application package for reference. In addition, the applicants wish to remove the shower walls and an interior wall, which does not appear to be load-bearing. They also propose to remove the entry door from the bathroom to the attic stair hall and to close the door opening. The new bathroom proposed would feature a steam shower, freestanding tub, double-sink vanity, and built-in linen cabinets. While final fixture and finish selections have not yet been made, the applicants have provided examples of the intended design direction, which would include hexagonal mosaic tile on the floor,

subway tile on the walls, and vintage-inspired fixtures. Staff would recommend that if the Commission is comfortable approving the work, that they allow staff to approve the new fixtures and designs as a minor work.

The second part of the interior work proposed by the applicants is a request to remove the cased opening at the hallway/stair landing and to remove the wall for the purpose of extending the hallway to the attic stairs. Per the applicants' narrative, the history of the cased opening in the hallway has been a subject of debate. While the existing casing matches other doorways upstairs, and the floor shows no obvious signs of a previous widening, the width of the opening and its location bisecting the rear landing is 'unusual.' They propose to completely remove the opening, wall-to-wall and up to the ceiling, and to extend the crown moulding in the hallway into this new landing space, which currently has no crown. They also propose to remove a wall and closet cabinet to extend the hallway to the attic stair hall and balcony door. Currently, the attic can only be accessed through the bathroom or an adjacent bedroom. Crown moulding would then be extended into this stair hallway, and the existing tile floor would be removed and replaced with wood flooring to match existing. Finally, the door from the bedroom to the stair hallway would be removed and the opening would be walled to increase privacy and furniture placement options in the bedroom.

Note that per the applicants' narrative, "All original doors and trim material to be removed will be saved for potential reuse in future phases of the project. Bricks from the service chimney to be removed will be saved for incorporation into a future landscape feature."

#### **Background Information for the Project:**

1. The landmark designation includes the interior and exterior of the home and the lot.
2. It was designated as a historic landmark in September of 1984.
3. The architecture for the home is Colonial Revival, and the home dates to approximately 1915.
4. The current chimney appears to be non-functional.
5. Numerous interior renovations have been made to the property, including an interior bathroom remodel with modern materials.
6. The applicant proposes repurposing all doors, trim, and chimney bricks where possible to maintain historic integrity of the materials.

#### **The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:**

The Standards (Department of Interior Regulations, 36 CFR 67) pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

#### **The Standards for Rehabilitation are as follows:**

- A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

- Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
- Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
- Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
- Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Chair Payne asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this application.

Mr. Dowell stated that this property is already on the National Register, and when they did interior and exterior designations, were any of these elements designated in what they had prior? Justin Snyder responded that he did not think anything was specifically designated, as far as these features go. Jerry Nix stated that it was designated in 1984, and those were the early years of the Commission. The house was designated on the interior and exterior, and at that point, they did not go in and specifically point out which mouldings or doors or anything that were to be designated. It was just done as a whole. He does not think anything has been done since 1984 to the interior of the house.

Alan Overbey and Lovelle Overbey came to the podium for their testimony in this matter. Mr. Overbey stated that he is very involved in the community and runs a CEO peer group for CEOs here in the area. He is the current Chairman of the Board at the Business School at UNCG and on the Endowment Board, so he spends a lot of time at the University. He just renovated a warehouse off of Oakland Avenue, which was an old chemical company that he restored with his cousin to a classic storage facility.

Lovelle Overbey stated that she grew up in northwestern Pennsylvania and came to Greensboro to go to college in 1987. They then moved to Michigan, and while there, they lived in the 3<sup>rd</sup> largest historic district in the country, Heritage Hill, located in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Currently, they live in the Starmount neighborhood, and the home they now live in is pretty architecturally significant as the architect was Edward Lowenstein, and it is a modernist home. Her heart really lies in an older home,

and they wanted to be close to downtown. They hope this is their forever home. Regarding the proposed changes, the first project would be the chimney, and there is not a sister chimney, and it used to service the wood stove in the kitchen, and that will not be re-installed. Inside the house, the brick for the chimney cannot be seen, but it takes up a lot of prime space that could be used for a cabinet in the bathroom and would provide storage needs on the inside. The goal is to get this part of the renovations done so they can move into the upstairs of the house while the downstairs is being done.

Mr. Horth stated that, looking at the elevations, if that chimney is taken out, he could not figure out where it was inside the house that would make a difference. Ms. Overbey stated that looking at the picture of the bathroom and the kitchen, you can see the location of the chimney on the interior. Ms. Overbey pointed out that the chimney is no longer operational or in use and serves no purpose. The plans indicate the location of the chimney in the kitchen and in the bathroom.

Ms. Pittman asked if there would still be access to the attic. Mr. Overbey stated that, currently, you have to access the attic from coming from the back bedroom or the bathroom, and they do not think that wall was original to the house.

Jesse Arnett, representing the applicants, 3312 Wyrick Drive, stated that he is the designer for this project. He is also the Chair of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission and a member of the Board of Trustees for Preservation Greensboro Development Fund, and he has been working on historic homes professionally for well over a decade and has taken a lot of his projects through the Greensboro HPC, and this is his first time with the County HPC. In response to a question, he stated that there have only been three previous owners in the house's history. Mr. Overbey stated that the Grimsleys built the house in 1907, and then in 1937, the Frys bought the house and lived there for about 40 years.

Justin Snyder pointed out that the records on the house are probably available through the Greensboro HPC and Mike Cowhig has those records. The renovations in 1984 would have gone through the Greensboro HPC guidelines.

Ms. Hammond stated that he did not have a problem with removing the chimney on the interior bathroom and kitchen area, all the way to the basement, but she asked if there was any way to build some kind of support in the attic so that they could leave the top of the chimney on the roof? Mr. Arnett stated that, theoretically, it is possible to do that, but it would be much more of a structural challenge to suspend that type of weight while removing the interior sections. It would require them to do a whole lot more work to distribute that weight all the way down to the foundation. He pointed out that their feeling about this chimney is that it is not functional and is not a character-defining feature of the house and not connected to any kind of fireplace and is not a primary chimney and is not at all visible from the street. Removal has many more benefits for the proposed interior changes, especially in the bathroom and then in the kitchen.

Ms. Overbey stated she would like to address the archway in the hallway. Mr. Arnett stated that they would like to remove that archway and the small wing walls that come out on either side all the way up to the ceiling just to create a larger landing space at the top of the rear stairs. They don't know if this was an original feature, but there is no clear evidence that it was expanded over time, but it is unusual.

Mr. Dowell asked which features were character-defining, in general. Ms. Overbey stated that they feel the only character-defining features would be the fireplaces.

Chair Payne asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak on the proposed project.

Linda Lane, 805 Magnolia Street, stated that she is the Committee Chair for the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association (FPNA), and she is a professional interior designer with National Certifications and is a former City HPC member for multiple terms. After careful review of the documents submitted for this COA and site visits, the FPNA supports a portion of the total request and they are outlined in Page 9 of the COA and summarized as follows:

- 1) Kitchens and baths are the most removed parts of a historic home, helping to modernize the lifestyles of its occupants. The current bath was updated in the early 1980s and represents that period. The proposed design in this COA seems to be a thoughtful and sensitive approach in creating a period bathroom with modern-day amenities. The Fisher Park COA Committee supports this plan.
- 2) The status of this property as a County landmark and on the National Historic Registry is significant, and its condition is excellent for its age. Clearly, the past owners took pride and carefully maintained this handsome property over many years. They do not support the removal of the chimney. It is built with the same standard of materials as the other chimneys, regardless of its original purpose. Also, given that the chimney is visible from the sidewalk facing the south elevation, the interior footprint within the house is minimal, and its overall condition is good, so they believe it is not sufficient reasoning to warrant the total demolition.
- 3) They support only the following: (1) Remove the linen closet only into the common hallway with a cased opening to match others, (2) Add continuous flooring into the small hallway where attic stairs ascend to connect spaces, (3) Close the opening into the bath from the hallway and continue base trim to follow the original, and (4) Approve the closure of the bedroom door into the attic stairway landing area and match all existing trim features as well. They do not support the removal of the cased opening in the second hallway to the 10'6" ceiling frame, as this is a modernist approach and element, nor do they support adding a large crown to match the hall crown into the attic staircase landing area, where space exists behind the hall wall. The crown in the second floor hallway looks newly added and not original in scale to the period.

That is the opinion of the Neighborhood Association.

Justin Snyder stated that basically what happens is when it is designated a landmark as part of the interlocal agreements with each individual town, they give up the right to review, and they give that right to the Commission. Guilford County is offering the tax deferral in exchange for the ability to have control over the designated elements of the property.

Chair Payne stated that the public portion of the meeting would now be closed, and the Commission members would have their discussion.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Dowell stated that now the Commission will debate the merits and what they have seen. Evidence will be based on Findings of Fact in order to make their decision, which would be denial, approval, approval with conditions, or asking for more information. In this National Register District, the Fisher Park District, which was designated in 1992, this was specifically designated for a couple of features that the National Parks thought defined this home historically. The functional hipped roof on the garages was designated as a character-defining feature, as were stairs at the property. National Parks saw those features as highly important. They also noted that this being one of the early urban planned neighborhoods, exterior features and outside integrity elements were very important. This is a Colonial Revival home, which comprises 130 of 670 houses, so it is 19% of the inventory.

Ms. Pittman stated that she would like to see two motions made, one for the chimney and then one for the interior changes proposed.

Ms. Hammond stated that she feels the chimney was original to the house, because her house has one, and it was built in 1911. She would be in favor of keeping the exterior portion of the chimney and eliminating it on the interior. Mr. Gallien stated that he leans toward agreeing with the FPNA because they have done their homework, and they have invested their time in this. Mr. Horth stated that he would keep the chimney on the exterior supported in some way on the interior. Mr. Nix stated that he is torn because he is concerned about keeping the roof alignment, and this chimney is a character-defining exterior feature. Mr. Cardona stated that he thinks to provide a balance for a family to take care of the house for the next 30 years, it's important, so the proposal is well thought out in terms of the interior, and the chimney is part of the original design. Ms. Pittman stated that she can support the interior changes, but she is torn about the chimney.

#### **Motion Regarding Chimney:**

Mr. Dowell moved that the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission, because this chimney is in good condition, and a historic part of the original fabric and is character-defining, the Commission is not comfortable with the chimney's removal on the exterior, which is visible and part of what makes this property historic, but the Commission would be comfortable with non-visible interior changes being made (i.e. things behind the walls and not visible from the exterior chimney area).

Therefore, the exterior elements (of the chimney) are saved and interior elements (of the chimney) would be de-designated. The HPC compromises and insists that the exterior stay the same, but the interior can be de-designated. The HPC sees the exterior (chimney) as a historical element that is character-defining, visible to the public in good condition, hence, no reasonable removal request and part of why this house is unique, de-designating the interior of the chimney only in order for the applicant to be able to make renovations on the inside they would like to make, seconded by Mr. Horth. The Commission voted (9-0-1) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Hammond, Gallien, Dowell, Nix, Horth, Cardona, Hadden. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

Ms. Pittman wanted to be clear that the de-designating of the interior is only for the chimney and not the whole house.

#### **Discussion Regarding Interior:**

Mr. Horth stated that one of the things the neighborhood was worried about was the interior wall being taken down, but the Commission does not have any evidence that the wall has historic notes. Ms. Pittman stated that she was in support of its removal because she heard evidence that it was a 1984 renovation and isn't original to the house anyway. Mr. Nix stated that he has no problem with the plans for interior changes, as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Horth stated that he supports the application regarding the interior renovations. Ms. Hadden stated that she also does not oppose the proposed interior changes. Mr. Dowell stated that he is hearing that the Commission members feel that the bathroom is a prior renovation and is not historic and no evidence that the casements were historic, due to the fact that it's the only casements in the house and that because this is a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, non-primary location, and a bathroom for which changes are expected anyway, and that the Commission is amenable to granting the request.

Ms. Hammond asked a question regarding the door from the primary bedroom and wanted to know the reason for that. Mr. Arnett responded that there is already access to that bedroom from the main hallway, and it's possible that the doorway was added at a later time to create that direct connection to

the bathroom, but they really don't know. The functional reason for eliminating it now is it will make the room more private and more appropriate as a primary bedroom. Also, there is very little closet space, and removing that door allows the placement of more storage space. Mr. Dowell asked for a list of the changes again on the interior.

#### **Motion Regarding Interior Changes:**

Mr. Horth moved that the proposed interior changes, two (2) on the proposal, are accepted by the Commission, and the Findings of Fact are that none of the items that are asked to be removed are designated historic items; therefore, all of the items required to make this a habitable bathroom and bedroom space should be accepted. Mr. Dowell added that this was a prior 1980s renovation that is being updated, and the majority of the proposed changes were not original to the house. Therefore, the Commission voted (9-0-1) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Hammond, Gallien, Dowell, Nix, Horth, Cardona, Hadden. Nays: None. Recused: Millsaps.)

#### **G. Non-Public Hearing Items:**

None

#### **H. Other Business**

Justin Snyder reported that Kaye Graybeal is retiring, but she may appear at some meetings from time-to-time. It was wonderful having her as staff for so long to this Board, and she was a good mentor to him.

Ms. Hadden asked when the City, Stefan-Leih or Mike (Cowhig), would have said, "And the Staff thinks this . . . ." Justin Snyder responded that County staff does not make COA recommendations. He used to deal with the Historic District Commission, but they only made recommendations because they had specific guidelines or standards, as they are called now, to follow that were written exactly for that district, but because this Commission's Standards are so broad-ranging because of using the Secretary of Interior Standards, he basically puts applicable standards in the staff report and lets the Commission make its own Findings of Fact and its own decisions.

Mr. Dowell added that they definitely need to justify what and why and not set precedents because each case is unique, but the next person may want to do the same type of renovation work, and the Commission needs to make sure it is appropriate to the situation.

Justin Snyder stated that his role is more advisory for procedural issues to make sure the Commission does not run afoul of the State Statutes.

Mr. Nix stated that he would like to bring up a couple of things that need to be discussed. The first item is that this Commission is now about 40 years old, and a lot of the slides that were taken for the interiors and exteriors of these houses and buildings. When he went off the Commission, at that time they were just starting to discuss it, but a lot of the slides are becoming cloudy and are deteriorating. Something needs to be done about saving these slides, either making new ones or put them on a different type of record, i.e., CDs, because there are going to be times when they are going to need to go back to those slides or something new to be shown on the screen here for the Commissioner members to review. That is history, and in the past 40 years, a lot of things have changed. Somehow, that needs to be put in the budget to either put it on more slides or CDs or some type of future video for safekeeping.

Justin Snyder stated that he could make that request. It would help if the Chair and/or Vice Chair would create a letter and sign it with a specific request on behalf of the Commission if the Commission feels that they want to do that. He cannot guarantee that it would be in the budget. He advised that the budget is already about 99% done. They started many months ago and are nearly done working on it.

After a short discussion and several members felt that it was a good idea, Mr. Horth moved that they propose that the County put money in the budget so that the slides of the historically designated properties are maintained in perpetuity, seconded by Mr. Cardona. Therefore, the Commission voted (10-0), unanimously, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Payne, Pittman, Hammond, Gallien, Dowell, Nix, Horth, Cardona, Millsaps, Hadden. Nays: None.)

Mr. Dowell stated that each city that participates here pays annually for this Commission, so whether the County can put it in their budget or not, ideally, the payment of fees to be a part of this Commission could maybe be a way to finance the project. Justin Snyder stated that he is not an expert on the budget, but he would certainly check into that.

Ms. Hammond asked if Mr. Nix had any idea how many slides would be involved. Mr. Nix stated that they used to be in binders, and when a property was designated, they needed exterior shots of the property and on the inside, and it could be anywhere from 10 to 20 per property, depending on how big the structure is. Ms. Hammond said it would probably be about 2,000 or more slides involved. Chair Payne suggested that they find out how much it would cost, just to see if it was feasible to ask that it be added to the budget. Justin Snyder stated that digitizing the slides would be ideal for keeping the slides safe. Mr. Horth stated that he had some slides restored before, and they actually improved the quality of the original slide.

Mr. Nix added that many years ago, this was an educational Commission, and they would go into the schools and business meetings and make presentations with these slides and talk about what the Commission does. They also made about three or four 8-track tapes, and someone from UNCG did that for them, and one was on brick structures in Guilford County, and one was on log structures, one on railroads, and one on Greek Revival Architecture, and there may have been another one. When these copies were made, they were given to every school in Guilford County in the library so that students would have access to that information. Now, those 8-track tapes need to be transferred over to a CD or something.

Mr. Nix stated that the next item to think about, when he was asked to become a member this time, Justin sent him a link to the County website, and it had all of the historic properties that have been designated on there, and you could click on Whitsett, and it would show what has been designated, and Greensboro, and so forth. He clicked on Whitsett, and the first thing he saw was the John Bell outhouse, and the picture was of a rock house that was two blocks down the road and had nothing to do with the John Bell outhouse. He then clicked on the D.P. Foust House, and it just had Foust House and Sedalia Post Office. He knows it's the D.P. Foust House, and it should have been distinguished. Then he pulled up the W.R. Smith House in Whitsett, and it listed the description that came directly out of the 1979 inventory. Since that time, the house has been moved and it's on the National Register, and it's been listed as a historic designation, and it has none of the history on it.

Mr. Dowell stated that the digitizing could make that website updated.

Mr. Nix stated that he just stopped searching and he doesn't know how many other mistakes are on there. There needs to be some staff person or someone to maintain that site better.

Justin Snyder noted that staff time is very, very limited with their current workloads. He doesn't know who he could find to do that kind of work. Mr. Nix stated that maybe a student could do it. Justin Snyder stated that the Commission members are very welcome to find people to do this and work with staff, as well.

### **I. Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

### **Next Scheduled Meeting – March 19, 2024**

Respectfully submitted,

February 29, 2024

*Triad Reporting & Typing Services*