Attachment 1

Orange County
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Summary

May 28th, 2014
Old Orange County Courthouse
106 East King Street, Hillsborough

APPROVED: 6-25-14

MEMBERS PRESENT: Todd Dickinson (Chair), Susan Ballard, Rob Golan, Jaime Grant and Bob Ireland (Vice-Chair)

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Peter Sandbeck, Rich Shaw

GUESTS: Fred Stewart, Architect for the Chatwood Project
Two interns from Preservation Chapel Hill

ITEM #1: CALL TO ORDER
Chair Dickinson called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm. He then recognized Fred Stewart and two student interns with Preservation Chapel Hill.

ITEM #2: CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: None.

ITEM #3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES (April 23rd meeting)
Grant wished to clarify her comment under item "5-d: Historic Resource Evaluation Exercise" about the Smith-Cole House. Her concern was about the lack of any substantive documentation about slavery and that era in the materials given to HPC members. Golan moved to accept the minutes, with Grant's correction noted, seconded by Ireland. Motion passed.

ITEM #4: ITEMS FOR DECISION:

a. <u>Application for Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for Chatwood</u>
Dickinson recognized Fred Stewart, project architect for owners Frances and Ed Mayes, who will present the application for a COA for additions and renovation to Chatwood. He noted that this was an official public meeting and that notice had been sent to all property owners within 500 feet as required by the County's HPC ordinance. No members of the public were in attendance at the meeting. This application will be reviewed in a quasi-judicial format so the HPC will follow the procedures in our ordinance and the state law. He noted that staff will present a staff report, then Mr. Stewart will make his presentation about the proposed project, then HPC members will be able to ask questions. He asked if any members needed to declare any conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest. No members had any conflict. Dickinson then provided a step-by-step overview of the process for the HPC's review of the proposed work at Chatwood. He then asked if Sandbeck and Stewart could take the affirmation.

Sandbeck began the staff report by presenting a PowerPoint overview of the property and its evolution, making reference to the National Register nomination and other background materials provided to members. Briefly, work proposed will consist of: new bathroom

addition to the east side of the 1840s rear wing; new shed dormer on the east slope of the 1840s wing; add two windows to the rear of the 1840 wing; rebuild 1950s sun porch to create new kitchen; new garden room at the west end of the new kitchen; new stone terrace around the new kitchen; and install new wood shingle or standing seam metal roof on all portions, new and existing. Discussion followed about the roof materials, the front porch, the driveway configuration, the boxwood plantings around the east side of the house, how to provide construction access to the rear without damaging the gardens, and the slope of the proposed flat kitchen roof. Also discussed was the issue of moving two windows on the 1840s wing, from the east wall to the south wall.

Sandbeck presented the staff report as provided in the member packages, noting that this was staff interpretation of the applicable sections of the HPC Design Standards. Members are not bound in any way by staff opinion but can offer their own viewpoints and interpretations as they form their final comments for the COA. Members discussed various aspects of the proposed project, as follows:

- the loss of the large shade tree at the south, which is proposed for removal to make way for the terrace
- need for adding a condition to require protection of landscaping
- add a condition to require a future submittal for roof materials and color, once those are decided
- Approximate square footage of proposed new additions? approx. 25% increase.
- Scale/size of proposed kitchen addition, and how large it appears in the drawings
- Elevation setback for new kitchen addition: existing sunroom is set back from the corners slightly, but new elevation drawings show no setback, while the floor plan drawings show same setbacks as existing. Mr. Stewart said he was planning to replicate the existing setbacks which are uneven. Staff noted that a deeper setback, of perhaps 12” is the accepted practice for such additions. There is also the question of roof water and how it will be handled with this flat roof configuration.
- Windows: it would be more appropriate to move the two windows from the side to rear of the 1840s wing. All new windows will have true divided lights, ie, there will be wood muntins for all windows. Window pane coatings and tint colors were also discussed regarding appearance and issues with reflected sunlight.

Dickinson then recognized Mr. Stewart, who stated that his clients are very committed to the stewardship of the property and it is in that spirit that they are renovating the property to make it a place where they can grow old. Their main design challenge was to create a livable master bedroom suite within the walls of the 1840 addition. They first looked into adding the bathroom at the rear but there it would obscure the chimney and cellar stair, thus leading to the current proposal for the bathroom on the east side. They worked to make the garden room compatible without making it “historic” or copying the old house details. Discussion followed about the stone foundations for the new portions and its overall look. They will seek to replicate the existing pattern and character for the foundation stonework. The risers for the steps of the terrace should be the same character as the foundation itself—uncoursed local/rubble stone topped by smoothly tooled modern stone, similar to the existing rear steps. The color of the new stone pavers should be similar to native stone colors if possible. The roof over the back door/kitchen door area will present challenges to balance water movement versus appearance. Members noted that the height of the addition seems taller than needed when compared to the ceiling height of the room in the Johnson wing. The garden room ceiling will be approximately 12 feet. Discussion followed about its scale, which is balanced by the fact that it is not visible from the public right of way. The lower windows will be casement type, while the upper ones will be awning type for ventilation.

Dickinson sought comments from the public. There were none. He asked the HPC members if there were any other questions for Mr. Stewart. He then referred members to the staff report and asked if they wished to make any changes. He noted that members should assume that staff has correctly applied the appropriate categories of our guidelines, starting on page 9 of the staff report. They should point out any omissions or errors. Sandbeck noted that this submittal was based on very preliminary drawings. It is good practice to require additional updated plan submittals showing final plans and details as they evolve. The COA for this project can be worded to stipulate that updated plans must be submitted.

Members agreed that there should be a condition that the construction will protect the roots and existing shrubs/landscape to the fullest extent possible. A site plan should be submitted to show how this will be accomplished, as per Design Standard II-3-A.

Golan expressed special concern about archaeological artifacts. There needs to be a way to protect/salvage archaeological findings, if any, during the work. Our guidelines do not allow the HPC to require private owners to perform archaeological work. After discussion, Grant proposed that Design Standard II-F-7 seemed to be most applicable to this project, where it states: “record any archaeological evidence that is uncovered….”

For roofing, the HPC will require a future, more detailed submittal for review. For metal, show how will it be detailed, or for wood, what sort of shingles, ridge treatment etc. Samples may be needed, as per Design Standards III-B-20 and III-B-22.

Dickinson and others agreed that side setbacks should be required for the kitchen addition, in the range of 10” to 12” of inset, in the final plan submittal, as per standards III-C-1 and III-C-2.

As to the windows, members agreed that the COA should require that the two old windows from the east side of the 1840s wing must be reused on the south wall or labeled and stored. Dickinson pointed out that the proposed dormer window on the east slope of the rear wing will be an entirely new addition. There was general agreement that it is partially hidden by the roof of the new bathroom so will not be very visible. New windows should have true divided lights with wood muntins, and should not have tinted or reflective coatings that are visible.

As a final note, Sandbeck noted that the SHPO or PNC may have other review conditions that could require design changes not reviewed by the HPC, and thus revised drawings may come back to the HPC for review again if those entities force design changes.

Dickinson asked for a motion to act on the application for a COA submitted by Mr. Stewart for the proposed additions at Chatwood. Ballard moved to approve the COA as submitted, based on the findings of fact and subject to the added conditions recommended in the staff report to address the HPC’s Design Standards II-A-3, III-B-20, III-B-22 and III-C-10, with the special requirement that the owners/architect submit more fully developed plans, details and samples as soon as these are available. The COA will also be subject to the following additional conditions proposed by HPC members:

- provide for archaeological recordation
- the kitchen addition must incorporate side setbacks of 10” to 12”
- reuse or store the two old windows on the east side of the 1840s addition
- the stone steps for the terrace must match the existing rear step detail, with rubble local stone risers
- All new window glass must be as clear as possible; do not use tinted or colored glass.

Golan seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously. (COA letter of approval attached as official record of the decision).

ITEM #5: DISCUSSION ITEMS

b. <u>Orange County/Chapel Hill Preservation/History Symposium Duties</u>

Members discussed the various tasks and duties needed for this event, particularly on Saturday. Over 90 people registered as of today, for one or both days in total, with 60-70 coming on Friday, and a smaller crowd anticipated on Saturday. Tasks included table/chair set up, getting food and coffee, and helping at the registration table, then set up and take down at Moorefields on Saturday.

c. <u>Membership:</u>

Sandbeck submitted the HPC's recommendation to appoint Grace White to the County Clerk; she should be considered by the BOCC and appointed at their regular meeting on June 3, 2014.

ITEM #6: UPDATES AND INFORMATION ITEMS

a. <u>Developments on County Survey Update and Book Project:</u>

The County received an email from the SHPO telling us that they were planning to approve our application for a CLG grant, but no official letter has arrived yet. Our county matching funds were included in the manager's recommended budget.

ITEM #7: ADJOURNMENT: Golan moved to adjourn, seconded by Ballard; motion passed. Chair Dickinson adjourned the meeting at 9:23 pm.

Meeting summary by Peter Sandbeck, DEAPR staff