

AGENDA

ORANGE COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

6:30 PM

Virtual Meeting via GoToMeeting—link sent upon written request

February 24th, 2021

<u>TIME</u>	<u>AGENDA ITEMS</u>
6:30	1. Call to Order
6:32	2. Changes or Additions to Agenda
6:34	3. Approval of Minutes: Dec. 9, 2020 meeting (Attachment 1)
6:35	4. Items for Decision: None
6:35	5. Discussion Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Outside Agency grant application reviews for the Orange Co. Museum and the Burwell School (Attachment 2)b. Presentation on John Paisley Hughes House (c.1825, 1860s and 1890s), Cedar Grove
7:50	6. Updates and Informational Items <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Dendrochronology projectb. Book project status/updatec. Blackwood Farm preservation fundingd. Cameron Ice House sign and repairse. Open air time for other new information by members/staff
8:15	7. Adjourn

****Next meeting: March 24, 2021****

**Orange County
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**DRAFT Meeting Summary
December 9, 2020 at 6:30 pm
Virtual Meeting via GoToMeeting**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Susan Ballard, Todd Dickinson, Art Menius, Paul Noe, Steve Peck

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Loter

STAFF PRESENT: Peter Sandbeck

GUESTS: Fred Stewart

ITEM #1: CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dickinson called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.

ITEM #2: CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: None

ITEM #3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES for Oct. 28, 2020 (Attachment 1): Menius moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ballard; motion approved.

ITEM #4: ITEMS FOR DECISION

a. Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Chatwood (Attachment 2)

Staff provided members with an overview of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application for Chatwood. The project architect, Fred Stewart, was present to represent property owners Alexandra and PJ Heller. Staff explained that this was a public meeting and that letters had been sent to adjoining property owners within 500 feet. No property owners responded to the letter with any comments or questions. Staff gave a PowerPoint presentation showing location maps, site plans and historic and modern photos of the Chatwood property, along with the floor plan and elevation drawings depicting the proposed work. In brief, the project consists of constructing a new bathroom addition to the east of the c1845 rear wing, rebuilding and enlarging the existing rear sun porch to create a kitchen, installing a new stone terrace and constructing a separate free-standing screened room or pavilion at the west end of the house. The proposed work is shown in detail on plans submitted by architect Fred Stewart, dated Nov. 17, 2020. Staff reviewed how each work item meets or does not meet the official HPC Design Standards. Staff pointed out that most of the proposed work was approved by the HPC in 2014-15, with a subsequent submittal approved by the HPC in 2018 for a modified version of the 2014-15 work. Discussion followed. Dickinson pointed out that the majority of the work being done here is focused on the 1940s addition and not affecting the main house. Mr. Stewart explained that the only real change from the last submittal was the addition of the screened room. Members agreed that the COA should include mention of archaeological monitoring during construction, as was done for the previous COAs for this project. Concern was also expressed regarding the gardens, to make sure that site work for this project does not have an adverse impact on the historic plantings and landscaping. Members expressed their appreciation for the architect's efforts to modify the design to significantly reduce the visual impact of the new porch room.

Based on the information presented and items raised during discussion, Menius moved to approve the COA for the proposed work at Chatwood as presented, based

on the findings of fact presented in the staff report, with the additional condition that archaeological monitoring and recording be performed if any evidence surfaces during the work. Noe indicated he would be happy to make a site visit(s) as needed during construction in the event that discoveries were made; motion seconded by Peck; discussion followed. Menius offered a revised motion to accept the staff recommendations to approve the COA with the landscape and archaeological conditions as written, seconded by Noe; motion passed.

- b. **Approval of HPC Calendar for 2021 (Attachment 3):** Staff reviewed the proposed calendar for 2021. Members discussed and agreed on the proposed dates for meetings, on the last Wednesday of July as has been our tradition. Menius moved to approve, seconded by Ballard; motion passed.

ITEM #5: DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- a. **Annual Report and Work Plan for 2020 (Attachment 4):** Dickinson asked staff to present the updated draft report for discussion. Staff noted that Commissioner Greene expressed special interest in having the HPC renew efforts to plan for a future local historical/cultural marker program, with the understanding that this project will require some funding as well as the creation of a process for vetting marker proposals for content and accuracy. One goal of such a program will be to allow the county to commemorate people and events of local significance, especially marginalized and overlooked people/topics. Menius suggested that we go ahead and add this to our work plan for 2021. Menius, Noe, Peck and Ballard volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to look into a marker program. There can also be a digital component to this project. Pricing for a standard high quality marker for a county program will cost in the range of \$2,400. Similar markers can be seen along the state's highways for the Civil War Trail marker.
- b. Possible cancellation of February 26th meeting due to lack of business. We might need to meet is if we are required to review the applications for outside agency funding by a certain deadline. Members agreed to cancel unless we are required to review those.

ITEM #6: UPDATES AND INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. **Dendrochronology Project:** Staff provided an update on the status of the fundraising for this project. We have the \$5,000 from the Covington Foundation, plus a county contribution of \$2,000 matched by the Alliance with another \$2,000. The Preservation Fund has agreed to add \$5,000 to our budget. We will include the courthouse in the project and utilize some of the funding from our research project for that. We'd like to invite Moorefields to be included in the project, but not clear if they can help with the funding. The owners of the Burnside Great Barn would like to get that building dated and are willing to help with financial assistance. Staff will provide a list of potential properties to include in the project.
- b. **Book Project Update:**
We obtained feedback from the Alliance board attorney regarding the proposed contract for the book design firm, so are reviewing those now to see if we can adjust the contract wording to be satisfactory to all properties. The author has finished all the county and town entries with the exception of approx. 10 for the town, which she'll work on while she starts of the writing of the historical and architectural essay. She will utilize all the existing reports and essays where they are accurate and will credit appropriately. We need to get the designers under contract so that they can work on the promotional visuals we need to use with our fund raising letter. Catherine Bishir has been incredibly helpful through her work on editing the property entries. Peck reminded members of the importance of including a full representation of properties relating to people of color.
- c. **Oaks Community Preservation:** Staff participated in a zoom meeting with the newly-formed preservation group called HOSTA (Historic Oaks Stewardship Alliance. They wish

to move forward to pursue a possible National Register Rural Historic District nomination for the rural community that surrounds the area around the Bingham School and the Bethlehem Presbyterian Church.

- d. **Occaneechi Village:** We did host another workday to continue work on the large hut; we now have the frame for that finished and ready to cover with thatch this spring. Staff will work to make sure you get invitations to future work days.
- e. **Hughes Academy repairs and Cameron Ice House roof repairs:** Staff showed photos of the Hughes Academy, a very intact 1860s vintage schoolhouse that was moved to county school board property on Cameron St. The rear door needs repairs so staff is working on getting estimates to present to the board of ed. HPC support will help get some funding released for this project. The former Ice House will need some roof repair soon, as some wood shingles are rotted or missing. The late Dean Ruedrich, who restored this in the early 2000s, left some of the original shingles stored in the ice house that we can use. We also need HPC support for a current effort to create and build an interpretive sign for the ice house. The Preservation Fund has agreed to help pay for half of the cost of a new sign, now being developed by a local Eagle Scout, Issac Trost. The Alliance is willing to match that funding, so this should happen by this summer.

ITEM #7: **ADJOURNMENT:** the meeting was adjourned at 8:31.

Meeting summary by Peter Sandbeck, DEAPR staff

**FY 2021-22 ORANGE COUNTY OUTSIDE AGENCY
APPLICATION SCORECARD**

OUTSIDE AGENCY EVALUATED: Historical Foundation for Hillsborough and Orange County

PROGRAM NAME: (If applicable): _____

ADVISORY BOARD/COMMITTEE: Historic Preservation Commission

I. Who is the program's CUSTOMER and what does the customer value?

EVALUATIVE COMPONENT	REFERENCE	YES	NO	MAX SCORE	SCORE
a. Agency demonstrates County funds will be used for program purposes that benefits customers, clients, participants who are Orange County Residents	* Program Information - Target Population & Performance Measures Chart			5	
b. Client data suggests that the agency/program supports the value of reaching diverse constituencies. (gender, ethnicity, age, geography, income level)	* Program Information - Target Population & Performance Measures Chart			5	
c. Client data suggests appropriate growth in the program over time.	* Program Information - Target Population & Performance Measures Chart			5	
d. Agency explains the importance of funding this program and the direct community investment.	* Program Information - Target Population & Performance Measures Chart			5	
TOTAL SCORE FOR CUSTOMER				20	0

II. What are the program's RESULTS?

EVALUATIVE COMPONENT	REFERENCE	YES	NO	MAX SCORE	SCORE
a. Actual Results for FY 2019-20 appear consistent with the program's goals and activities.	* Program Information - Performance Measures Chart			10	
b. Agency and Program Budgets demonstrate sustainability over 3 years?	* Program Information - Performance Measures Chart			10	
c. Actual Results for FY 2019-20 support a positive impact on program customers/participants.	* Program Information - Performance Measures Chart			10	
d. Actual cost per program unit/individuals for FY 2019-20 appears reasonable and appropriate.	* Program Information - Performance Measures Chart			10	
TOTAL SCORE FOR RESULTS				40	0

III. What is the program's PLAN for implementation and improvement?

EVALUATIVE COMPONENT	REFERENCE	YES	NO	MAX SCORE	SCORE
a. Stated Program Goals and Activities for FY2021-22 appear consistent with the program's mission and clearly indicate how services will be provided.	Cover Page Agency Info. Program Info. Agency/Program Budget			10	
b. Anticipated Results for FY2021-22 appear attainable by 6/30/2022 and will have positive impact on program participants.	Cover Page Agency Info. Program Info. Agency/Program Budget			10	
c. A realistic program budget with reasonable cost for providing services is outlined.	Cover Page Agency Info. Program Info. Agency/Program Budget			10	
d. There is a sufficient rationale to justify need for Orange County funding.	(Entire application)			10	
TOTAL SCORE FOR PLAN				40	0

SUB TOTAL: SCORE FOR CUSTOMERS	0
SUB TOTAL: SCORE FOR RESULTS	0
SUB TOTAL: SCORE FOR PLAN	0

TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE	0
--------------------------------	----------

Supplemental Questions	
1.) Based on the information provided in the agencies funding application, does the Advisory Board recommend this agency/program receive continued County funding or new County financial support?	Answer
1.a) If Yes, should the agency receive an increase?	Answer
1.b) If No, is this agency "new"?	Answer

ADVISORY BOARD COMMENTS

Instructions: Type comments in the box below. To begin a new paragraph, press the Alt and Enter keys.