

**MINUTES OF THE
GUILFORD COUNTY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
January 19, 2016**

The Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, January 19, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in the Blue Room of the Old Guilford County Courthouse, 301 West Market Street, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Members Present: Jerry Nix, Acting Chair; Jo Leimenstoll; Melinda Trevorow; Jane Payne; Christian Thoma; Julius Spradling; Abigaile Pittman; and Terry Hammond.

Members Absent: Tina Barber

Staff Present: Les Eger, Guilford County Planning Department.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS:

Acting Chair Nix requested updates from staff on three items: (1) Buffalo Creek Presbyterian Church Signage COA; (2) Hillsdale Brick Store COA; and (3) Kirkman Outbuilding COA. He asked that these items be addressed at the end of the agenda.

Ms. Payne moved to amend the agenda as requested, seconded by Ms. Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Nix, Leimenstoll, Trevorow, Payne, Thoma, Spradling, Pittman, Hammond. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 17, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Leimenstoll moved approval of the November 17, 2015 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Payne. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Nix, Leimenstoll, Trevorow, Payne, Thoma, Spradling, Pittman, Hammond. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA): Hillsdale Farm, 6043 Lake Brandt Road, Greensboro, North Carolina involving the construction of a storage shed, horse and donkey shed and demolition of structure under water storage tank. Owner: Michael R. Cooke, Hillsdale Farm, 6043 Lake Brandt Road, Greensboro, North Carolina, 27455. **(APPROVED)**

Mr. Eger described the location of the proposed storage shed and indicated that the applicant would like to paint the structure either Chestnut Brown or Charleston Green with a Charleston Green roof. The second building they would like to place on the property is a shed for a donkey or horse. The third request is to demolish the structure under the water storage tank. He provided information about the location of the structures.

Mr. Eger felt that the locations of the structures would not take away from the aesthetics of the main structure because the view is shielded and redirected toward the lake. The demolition is a safety issue because the roof of the structure under the water storage tank is rotten.

Mike Cooke, 6043 Lake Brandt Road, is the owner of the property. He was sworn as to his testimony in the following matter. He indicated that the structure under the water tower is not an original structure. It was built to enclose and cover lawn equipment. The water tower sits on four original concrete pillars about three feet high and there is no flooring in the structure underneath. The water tower will remain in place.

Responding to questions, Mr. Cooke estimated that the distance from the house to the new storage shed is 150 to 175 yards. The slope from the house to the new construction is flat. He would like the flexibility to paint the shed with the most appropriate color, either Chestnut Brown or Charleston Green, to make it visually melt away into the landscape.

Acting Chair Nix suggested that on the building where the topography is flat, there should be horizontal lap siding, as opposed to lap board, giving a more formal appearance. Either type of siding would be fine for the building which has a lower topography because it will not be seen as much. He was supportive of the proposed paint colors and felt since they were both dark colors, they would blend into the landscape.

Ms. Pittman questioned the option of using asphalt shingles on the second building. She would like to see more consistency with the other outbuilding in terms of the roof. Members noted that the first proposed shed for equipment will be 24' by 36' and the donkey shed will be 12' by 24' which is a standard size for a four-stall shed. The architecture of the two sheds is the same.

Ms. Leimenstoll moved approval of the COA application for Hillsdale Farms, 6043 Lake Brandt Road, Greensboro, North Carolina, for the construction of two new farm structures and the demolition of a structure underneath the water tower. There are plans and elevations for both proposed structures and she noted new structure #1 is 24' by 36' in terms of footprint and structure #2 is 12' by 24' in footprint. New structure #1 will be lap siding as opposed to board and batten and either of the Charleston Green or Chestnut Brown paint color. The other details of materials for structure #1 are complete but rather than the Charleston Green asphalt shingle, the owner will use the Charleston Green metal. These two structures are sited in appropriate locations for a site such as this and are an appropriate size and material for utilitarian buildings that they will not intrude or compromise historic character of the house or the farm in general and that in fact, the demolition of the structure under the water tower will strengthen the historic character of the water tower because it is not original. There are scaled plans and descriptions and it was specified where there were alternate materials, siding direction, or roofing which will be used. There was confusion about the dimension of structure #2 and that will be clarified on the plans to read 12' by 24'.

Ms. Pittman noted there was discussion about the stipulations on the status of the roof and she felt that should be included in the motion.

Ms. Leimenstoll amended her motion and added that the Commission understands that the metal roof will be a typical 5V metal roof that is seen on many farm buildings, or a close approximation of that with a dimensionality at the seams of approximately 3/4". The motion was seconded by Ms. Payne. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Nix, Leimenstoll, Trevorrow, Payne, Thoma, Spradling, Pittman, Hammond. Nays: None.)

NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

- (1) **Landmark Designation:** Accept, deny or return the landmark application (exterior and interior), Revolution Cotton Mill, 1200 Revolution Mill Drive, Greensboro, North Carolina. Owner: Historic Revolution, LLC 301 West Main Street, Durham, NC 27701. **(RETURNED FOR REVISIONS)**

Micah Kordsmeier is a Development Manager for Self Help, which acquired this property in 2012. They worked with the National Park Service to address issues with the previous owner's work in a portion of the property that had already been redeveloped. The National Park Service has reviewed and approved their plans to complete the project. They are a Federal and State Historic Tax Credit project and hope to complete their work in the fall. They are applying for landmark status for both the interior and exterior.

Mr. Kordsmeier reviewed plans they have for components of the project. Buildings B, C, and D contain the existing office space and events center that the previous owner had completed renovation on. They have done some work to remediate certain aspects of the previous owner's work. He commented that the previous work did not remove historic qualities that were really defining to the landmark. Buildings A and N

are currently being renovated to house office space and artist studios. Their design in these spaces utilizes a storefront glass system along the corridor to maintain the volume and expanse of the large floor plate. The third component of the building is comprised of buildings E, F, and G located in the rear of the southern side of the property. They will construct 142 apartments in these buildings. The apartments will respect the character of the mill as reflected in the large windows and wide central corridors. The fourth element of the project is building I which is the outbuilding along the creek on the southern side. The building will eventually house a restaurant which will hopefully be Natty Greene's. They are currently developing plans for this building that will be reviewed by the National Park Service for tax credits. The final element involves the exteriors and the site. When they acquired the property, it still had remnants of non-historic infill buildings that were constructed in between the two main buildings. They removed the infill structures to open up the buildings and maintain their historic character. Finally, there were exteriors on the northern side that were renovated by the previous ownership. Working with the National Park Service, they removed inappropriate wrought iron fencing and other items added to the landscape to enhance the historic character.

Responding to questions, Mr. Kordsmeier said that the Revolution Mill House is a separate parcel and is not part of the landmark application. It is a separate legal parcel that is a functionally related part of the complex and currently is being used for storage.

Eddie Belk, Belk Architecture, Durham, North Carolina, explained that in the model used in Durham they have not had to review alterations in tenant spaces of local landmark properties as long as they were executed within the Design Guidelines. For lead tenant major improvements that actually changed the open interior nature of the structure, they would need to come back for a Certificate of Appropriateness due to the nature of the tenant. Mr. Belk described changes they made to the subject property with the guidance of the National Park Service.

Mr. Kordsmeier clarified that it is not their intent to designate all the tenant spaces as space requiring Certificates of Appropriateness. Their intention is to designate the common areas rather than the tenant spaces themselves. It would be difficult to operate a commercial property if each tenant required a Certificate of Appropriateness.

During discussion, Mr. Thoma commented that more photographic evidence was needed showing what is currently there on the property for the record. The property footprint is part of what is under consideration and the Commission needs to know what is actually being considered on the property. Aerial photographs, maps, and drawings should be provided to represent what is currently the footprint of the property.

Mr. Nix pointed out that the National Register nomination form talked about 30+ acres whereas the designation application form says 25.47 acres are to be designated. He asked for clarification as to the actual amount of acreage. In addition, the application refers to a 19-acre site to be repurposed for larger office tenants.

Mr. Belk explained that the 19-acre site is not included within the 25.47 acres and is located south of Buffalo Creek. The 25.47 acres is north of Buffalo Creek and does not include building I or the Mill House. Mr. Kordsmeier said that the application includes the precise tax map number, deed, and plat book page of the property but for clarification, everything north of Buffalo Creek other than Revolution Mill House is included in the application.

Acting Chair Nix recommended that those two buildings that will be saved, Building I and the Mill House, should be part of this nomination. It will be better to include them now rather than later. Mr. Kordsmeier stated that the Mill House Building cannot be part of this nomination because it is under separate ownership and financing.

Ms. Leimenstoll commented that a larger version of the map needs to be provided along with aerial views to help the Commission understand the location of the boundaries. The metes and bounds along with acreage

should be provided for the property to be nominated. A large plat map of the entire property should be submitted that clearly defines the boundaries.

Acting Chair Nix commented that a chain of title should be included that reflects ownership before Revolution Mill was built up to the present time. This can be achieved through a title search.

The applicant would like to designate the public spaces on the interior of the buildings. Based on the Commission's previous experience, Acting Chair Nix stated his opinion that 25 acres and the exterior of the building is about the only thing that would pass. The inside should not be designated because a future owner may not do the inside as it should be done. It is very difficult for the tax assessor to do their calculations if public areas are designated and designating small sections of interior spaces can become problematic, especially if a tenant comes in and needs to make changes. It is better if the tax person can see the exterior walls and the land.

Mr. Spradling left the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Thoma pointed out that the common areas did not exist historically. Mr. Kordsmeier commented that the common areas are places where you can feel the historic character through the whole volume of the mill.

Ms. Leimenstoll commented that if it is the applicant's intent to request designation of the common interior spaces, details of the proposal should be very clear and reasoning for the designation should be included.

Mr. Kordsmeier stated that everything this is to be designated will be completed by November of 2016.

During discussion, Mr. Eger summarized comments made by Commissioners as follows: (1) Provide an aerial view showing buildings, grounds, and parking in relationship to Page 1; (2) Correct the acreage throughout the package; (3) Provide a large version of the property map clearly remediate the boundaries; (4) Provide a chain of title; (5) If interior designation of common spaces and corridors is pursued, provide clear plans with photographs and information about materials and height to determine what is to be designated. Map the interior floor plan, materials, glass walls, etc. all the way up to the roof line; (6) Submit pages that are not upside-down in the new packet; (7) Be sure the metes and bounds description is accurate.

Mr. Eger plans to type up the revision comments and send them to the applicant. He explained to the applicant that once the project has been completed in November, 2016, the application can be submitted and reviewed by the Commission. A prepared packet will then go to the City of Greensboro and presented to City Council for designation.

Ms. Leimenstoll moved to request revisions to the application, seconded by Ms. Pittman. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Nix, Leimenstoll, Trevorrow, Payne, Thoma, Spradling, Pittman, Hammond. Nays: None.) Mr. Spradling left the meeting unexcused and therefore, his vote counted in the affirmative.

(2) Approval of the 2016 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Schedule

Ms. Pittman moved approval of the 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting schedule as presented, seconded by Ms. Payne. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Nix, Leimenstoll, Trevorrow, Payne, Thoma, Spradling, Pittman, Hammond. Nays: None.) Mr. Spradling left the meeting unexcused and therefore, his vote counted in the affirmative.

UPDATES:

As requested by Acting Chair Nix, Mr. Eger provided the following updates for the Commission.

(1) Buffalo Creek Presbyterian Church Signage COA

The Church contacted Mr. Eger last week to request another continuance. They are still going back and forth about details of the signage. The case was continued until the February, 2016 Commission meeting because otherwise, the advertising process would need to start over.

(2) Hillsdale Brick Store COA

Mr. Eger informed members that Hillsdale Brick Store met with Town staff and they were told to take everything back to the original. Once this has been done, they will have to return to the Commission to request a COA. He confirmed that there were numerous problems and violations of the zoning code.

Ms. Pittman suggested that applications should be filled out by the local jurisdiction in a pre-application conference so it can be ascertained no zoning violations exist at the property. Mr. Eger plans to pursue this suggestion with Ms. Pittman.

(3) Kirkman House Outbuilding COA

Mr. Eger reported that the Kirkman House representative has not returned his calls. The windows and door frames were approved when the application was last before the Commission. There were questions about the door because the applicant wanted a Dutch door and there was nothing in the application to support having a Dutch door. Mr. Eger is going to call Tom Kirkman to see if there is a picture of the building with the original door.

Acting Chair Nix stated that the Bartlett Funeral Home in Gibsonville, North Carolina is for sale. The Queen Anne style home originally belonged to Dr. Dick. An addition was made in the 1960's and a tree has fallen on the rear of the house. The present owner is unable to fix the roof and the town is anxious to have the house repaired or demolished. The house is located across the street from the Gibsonville School.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further discussions before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry Nix, Acting Chairman
Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission

JN/sm:jd