

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the  
Sanford Historic Preservation Commission  
Buggy Building Conference Room  
7:00 PM Monday, May 21, 2018  
115 Chatham Street

Roll Call:

Commissioners Present: David Nestor, Allen Gordon, Philip Yarborough,  
Brian Mitchell, Rebecca Whitaker & Greg Stoch

Commissioners Absent:

Staff Present: Liz Whitmore, Historic Preservation Planner, Anne Sears,  
Secretary to the Commission; Al Benschhoff, Commission Attorney

Government Official Present: N/A

Witnesses and Guests: Brandon Duty, Renee Duty and Jocelyn Stoch

Chair Mitchell called the meeting to order.

1. Staff Anne Sears called the roll and a quorum was determined.

2. **Approval of the Agenda for May 21, 2018:**

Chair Mitchell called for approval of the revised agenda for May 21, 2018. Staff Whitmore relayed that the agenda was revised. Commissioner Nestor moved to approve the revised agenda; seconded by Commissioner Stoch and the motion passed unanimously.

3. **Approval of the March 19, 2018 Minutes:**

Chair Mitchell called for the approval of the minutes for March 19, 2018. Commissioner Stoch moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Commissioner Nestor and the motion passed unanimously.

4. **Public Comment: N/A**

Chair Mitchell asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

5. **Public Hearings:**

6. Staff Liz Whitmore, applicants Renee Duty and Brandon Duty were given the oath by the Chair.

**Conflict of Interest:**

Chair Mitchell asked if there was any conflict of interest among the Commissioners pertaining to the cases being heard tonight (COA-18-29, COA-18-30, COA-18-31 and COA-18-32.) There was none.

Chair Mitchell opened the Public Hearing:

COA -18-29 – A Certificate of Appropriateness application from Renee Duty, property owner of 323 N. Vance Street, who wishes to relocate the exterior door on the side porch to the back side and replace the door on front side with a window and update the siding on the front side to match existing siding and remove brick steps at the door on front side of porch to match existing exterior and remove brick steps at door on front side of porch and relocate steps to back porch.

In accordance with the General Statutes, the public hearing was advertised once a week for two successive calendar weeks prior to the meeting date and all public notifications were fulfilled.

Staff Whitmore noted that the guidelines important to this case are: on page 3 (Exhibits A & B, pages 11 and 12) show the existing front and rear facades of the resource as it is today.

- a. It is appropriate that, if built as part of the original structure, a porch and all of its features (steps, handrails, balustrades, columns, brackets, spandrels, and roofs) should remain in their original state. Porches and steps should not be stripped of any original material or architectural features. Exhibit C shows where the original screened porch was located. At this time the applicant is not proposing to reopen the porch. However, the applicant wishes to remove and relocate some exterior elements, so if in the future they wish to open the porch they can and restore it to original. The applicant wants to remove the brick steps at the door on the front side porch and relocate the brick steps to the back porch (Exhibits B, C and D, pages 12, 13 and 14.) Staff stated on page 13 shows the side view of stoop and the steps coming down to the driveway. On page 12 (Exhibit B) is the back of the house. Staff noted that guidelines b, c, d & e do not apply.
  - f. On page 4, side porches may be enclosed to create sun porches if the design of the enclosure is compatible with the architecture of the structure. (Staff Whitmore noted that technically this one does not apply; but she wanted to point it out since the side porch has been enclosed.)
  - h. Original porch steps should be retained as closely as possible if repair or replacement is needed. This application includes the removal and relocation of steps (Exhibits B, and C, pages 12 and 13).
8. Windows and Doors: page 4, Guidelines pertaining to this case are:
- a. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain original window and door elements such as sash, glass, sills, frames, casings, hardware, weather stripping, lintels, and shutters. (page 14, Exhibit D) A window is to be installed where the applicant wishes to remove a door. Staff noted that the door on the front side porch will be removed and they are going to put a window in there.
  - b. This window should match as closely as possible with the other original windows that are currently in the home.
  - c. The applicant is proposing to replace a door with a window which shall retain the pattern, arrangements and dimension of the window of the character of the defining elevations. Staff noted that page 5 d and e do not apply.
  - f. Front doors in the historic district should be appropriate for the style of the house. They are going to remove the side front door and replace it with a window and staff understands that the window to be installed will be of the same material and pattern as the existing windows in the home (Exhibit D, page 14.) Guidelines g through k does not

apply. Shutters and their hardware are not currently on the house, so this guideline does not apply.

Staff stated that she recommends the following conditions:

- a. Provide details of the window to be installed.
- b. Provide a detail or written statement that the siding to be used will be wood and will match the existing siding.
- c. The applicant shall provide in writing the material, rise and run, and the number of steps to be installed at the rear of the structure. The steps will be brick.

Chair Mitchell asked if there were any questions for staff:

Commissioner Stoch wanted to confirm with staff Whitmore that the COA is for removal of the steps; removal of the door and replacing the door with a wooden window and to include steps on the back of the house? Commissioner Nestor asked staff whether that door on page 11, Exhibit A, will stay Staff Whitmore stated yes, the front door is going to stay; and she stated that nothing is happening on the front elevation. Commissioner Gordon asked whether the applicant, Renee Duty is ok about providing the details of the window that will be installed and the siding to be used and the materials? Staff said yes. Commissioner Stoch asked whether they are going to construct and reconstruct the brick, staff stated they plan to use the same brick.

Mrs. Renee Duty approached the podium.

Mrs. Duty was asked to explain the work being proposed. Mrs. Duty noted that on page 11, (Exhibit A) there is nothing that we are going to change there. Page 12, (Exhibit B) shows the porch that you see to the right and the window that is there; we will replace that with the door that is on the front of that porch. She stated they want to salvage that door and relocate it to the back. The applicant shared that if it is at all possible they would like to save the window and door because it is original to the home. Commissioner Stoch asked if that window was six over one like the other windows of the house? Mrs. Duty stated she couldn't say for sure, and Commissioner Stoch stated that it appears to be. Commissioner Yarborough noted that the window on the right of the porch appears to be smaller, four over one and the rest of the windows seen larger. Mrs. Duty said that she would only have one window, the six over one window on that side and it will be centered and this window appears to be larger. (Reference: page 12, (Exhibit C) and page 14 (Exhibit D.) On page 14, Exhibit D the window appears to be smaller. Mrs. Duty stated the new siding is flat-lapped siding and it will match the existing siding.

Chair Mitchell closed the Public Hearing.

Discussion continued among the commissioners. Commissioner Yarborough had a question about where the door would be placed, and Commissioner Whitaker provided him an explanation. Commissioner Yarborough asked if the brick from the steps being removed are they going to be reused. Chair Mitchell stated he understood that they would have to be completely demolished and then the brick will be used on the rear of the house to construct new steps. Commissioner Stoch asked staff Whitmore if the materials were appropriate? She stated yes.

No other discussion was held among the Commission.

FINDING OF FACT:

Commissioner Nestor moved in regards to COA-18-29, 323 N. Vance Street, that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project, if the removal and relocation of the brick steps, the removal of the door on the front façade of the enclosed porch and the installation of a window is done in accordance with the decision by the Historic Preservation Commission, it will be congruous with the character of the district, for the reasons that: 1. The windows that they are being taking out, the wooden door proposed to be removed will be reused and any siding that will replaced will match the existing siding and the bricks that are demolished from the steps will be reused in construction of the new steps. Therefore for these reasons we find that this project will be in general harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole; second by Commissioner Allen Gordon and it passed unanimously.

FINAL MOTION:

Commissioner Nestor moved based on the preceding finding(s) of fact, I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Renee Duty for COA-18-29, 323 N. Vance Street and approve COA-18-29 with the following condition, 1) that in the event that any of the items which are intended to be reused and it is found that those items cannot be reused for any reason the applicant will go to staff for approval of any new products that are used; seconded by Commissioner Gordon and it passed unanimously.

COA-18-30- A certificate of Appropriateness COA- 18-30 was received by Renee Duty, property owner of 323 N. Vance Street who wishes to remove the exterior door and brick steps going into the kitchen on the back side of the house and replace the siding to match the rest of the existing siding.

In accordance with the General Statutes, the public hearing was advertised once a week for two successive calendar weeks prior to the meeting date and all public notifications were fulfilled.

Staff Whitmore stated on page 3 the guidelines state: (Exhibit B, C and D pages 12, 13 and 14) shows the location of the door and steps that the applicant wishes to remove (left hand side of the photo in Exhibit B, page 12.) It appears that these steps are not original to the structure (they protrude into the driveway) (Exhibit D, page 13.) Staff added that it makes it hard to get a modern-day vehicle in there because it is only about 9 to 10 feet wide. (Staff noted that c, d, e, f, g and h does not apply.) Staff Whitmore stated if you look at page 4, # 8 (a) under Guidelines state:

Windows and Doors:

- a. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain original window and door elements such as sash, glass, sills, frames, casings, hardware, weather stripping, lintels, architraves and shutters. Staff noted that it appears that the door is not original to the house, the steps that protrude into the driveway do not match the bricks used for the foundation, therefore, and it is likely that this entrance was added at a later date (Exhibits B, C and D pages 12, 13 and 14.)

Staff noted that this is an old-style door; but the window next to it is not typical of the style of that house for that period and the iron handrails are not typically of that period either. She stated that with all the concrete; it indicates that they were added later.

Staff asked everyone to look at page 5, # 7 (Siding and Trim), and then continued to Guidelines: on page 6.

- a. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain the shape, form, height, materials, and details of historic structure walls, architectural features that define the character of exterior walls. The applicant is proposing to remove the door and enclose it with German siding that matches the original siding on the home (Exhibits B, C and D pages 12, 13 and 14.) It was verified that lap-siding is on this house.
- b. It is not appropriate to introduce exterior wall features that diminish the original design or damage the exterior wall materials or create a false historic impression. The removal of the door and enclosing it with matching siding should not diminish the original design, damage exterior wall materials or create a false impression.) Note: (c, d, e and f does not apply.)
- g. It is appropriate to preserve, protect and retain original wooden trim, wooden features (siding, shingles, brackets, cornices, balustrades, columns, pediments etc.) The applicant is proposing to remove an existing door and install siding which will match the siding on the home at this time (Exhibits B, C and D pages 12, 13 and 14.) Note: (c, d, e and f does apply.)

Chair Mitchell asked if there were any other questions for staff ?

Chair Mitchell had a question regarding (Exhibit A page 11.) He stated he is looking at the wall on the right hand-side, and staff noted no, it is on the west-side of the house and that would be the north-side of the house and it would be on the back side of the house where the parking area is located. Staff asked everyone to look at page 12, Exhibit B. She noted that picture shows the driveway that comes off of Chisolm Street and the area that gets larger is the parking area. She added if you look on (page 14 Exhibit D) it shows that door and the steps, and on page 13 Exhibit C you can see it on the right-hand side, and on page 12, Exhibit B is the entire back façade of the structure. Chair Mitchell said that on (page 12, Exhibit B) it is the door on the far left, and Chair Mitchell added that the previous COA is about the window on the far right and staff stated yes. Commissioner Stoch asked whether the steps will be completely gone, and the door will be enclosed, and staff stated yes. Commissioner Nestor asked if any windows were going back in and staff stated no, and he asked if the little window will be gone as well and staff stated yes. Chair Mitchell asked if the house was broken up at some time; and staff stated yes, that it has been vacant for a very long time, it is a solid home; but there have been many alterations to the interior of the house. Commissioner Stoch noted that it was a sister house; and Commissioner Whitaker asked him to explain why he called it a sister's house. Commissioner Stoch noted it was similar to his house in design; the same builder, but not the same people having ownership. Staff Whitmore stated that the house at 221 N. Gulf and 323 N. Vance is totally different. Commissioner Stoch asked if this is the same brick as the other staircase and staff Whitmore noted it was.

Applicant Renee Duty approached the podium.

Commissioner Yarborough had a question about (page 12, Exhibit B) where the meter base and the breaker box are located, it looks like a partition is located there and a different type of siding was used in the location. He asked Mrs. Duty about when you speak about re-siding that and making it solid; his question is there is not a wall there, it is just a partition, right? Ms. Duty noted that you can tell from inside the home; that at one time it was an open porch and it has been closed in, so their thoughts were, when we eliminate that door and window, we would bring the siding up to that to match the existing siding. Chair Mitchell asked the applicant, Mrs. Duty if they would need more brick and the brick that was there could be salvaged? She stated that they plan to restore and use the bricks from the retaining wall to help with the new steps they are building. Commissioner Yarborough asked the applicant to verify that it is lap siding being used; not German siding? Mrs. Duty stated that is correct.

Chair Mitchell closed the public hearing.

FINDING OF FACT:

Commissioner Gordon moved in regards to COA-18-30, 323 N. Vance Street that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project at 323 N. Vance Street, if lap-siding is installed to match the existing siding, the removal of the rear door and the brick steps that are on the rear façade are done in accordance by the decision by the Historic Preservation Commission, the changes will be congruous with the character of the district, because Exhibits B, C & D on pages 12, 13, and 14 show the door locations of the door and steps that the applicant wishes to remove; it appears that these steps are not original to the structure, and it also appears that the door is not original to the house; the steps that protrude into the driveway do not match the brick foundation, therefore, it is likely that this entrance was added at a later date, see (Exhibits, B, C and D on pages 12, 13 & 14.) The applicant is proposing to remove the door and enclose it with siding that matches the original siding and the remove the door and enclose it with matching siding, which should not diminish the original design, nor damage the exterior wall, and they will be filling in the window with materials that match the rest of the house. Therefore this application has been found to be in general harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole; seconded by Commissioner Whitaker and it passed unanimously.

FINAL MOTION:

Commissioner Gordon said based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Renee Duty and approve the proposal(s) as shown in COA-18-30- 323 N. Vance Street; seconded by Commission Whitaker and it passed unanimously.

COA-18-31- A Certificate of Appropriateness application was received from Renee Duty, property owner of 323 N. Vance Street, who wishes to add a support column on the front porch of the house to match the other columns and build a pergola from the front porch roof line to the end of the front of the house.

In accordance with the General Statutes, the public hearing was advertised once a week for two successive calendar weeks prior to the meeting date and all public notifications were fulfilled.

Staff Whitmore noted that the Guidelines state on page 3, (Exhibit A, page 9) shows the existing front and rear facades of the subject resource:

- a. It is appropriate that, if built as part of the original structure, a porch and all of its features (steps, handrails, balustrades, columns, brackets, spandrels, and roofs) should remain in their original state. Porches and steps should not be stripped of any original material or architectural features.

The applicant is proposing to add a pergola to the front porch of 323 N. Vance Street (Exhibits A, B, C and D pages 9, 10, 11 and 12.) On page 10, (Exhibit B) shows the side steps coming off the porch. On page 11 (Exhibit C) is an example the applicant found on line and she wishes to add a structure similar to this to the front porch (page 12, Exhibit D. On page 12 ((Exhibit D) staff stated that the rendering shows the location of the proposed pergola. Staff noted that none of the original architectural features are going to be removed.

- b. New materials used to repair porches, should be like-kind and compliment the design and original materials in size, shape, placement, pattern, and details.

Staff noted that the applicant has not submitted what type of materials they intend to use to construct the pergola. She stated if the Commission approves the COA, staff recommends that the applicant provide a list of materials that will be used to construct the pergola and a detail or written description of how the pergola is going to be attached to the house prior to release of the COA Placard. (Guidelines, c, d, e, and f do not apply).

On page 4, g states:

- g. It is appropriate when constructing new porches, entrances and balconies to use historic roof forms, materials, and details compatible with the main building. At this time a materials and details list has not been provided, staff recommends this information be provided prior to release of the COA- Placard; if the application approved and it is recommended from the guidelines above. The work being proposed does not remove any of the original materials on the porch and therefore I recommend that if it is approved; that a list of materials will be provided by staff and that they intend to use to construct the pergola. No Trex type material is to be used.

Commissioner Yarborough noted that on (Page 9, Exhibit A) there are three columns and then on the far left you have what looks like a base for another column and he asked staff if she is proposing a similar column? Staff Whitmore stated yes and it would match those columns. Commissioner Yarborough reiterated, so it would basically balance the front where you would have your overhang from one end to another with additional columns? Staff stated yes. Commissioner Stoch asked staff about (Exhibit D, page 12) that just shows the location of the post and wanted to know if that was correct? Staff stated yes. Commissioner Gordon asked staff Whitmore to tell him a little bit about (Exhibit C, page 11.) Staff states that this picture shows what the applicant would like to do. This is only a sample and a reference of where it is going. Chair Mitchell asked whether if it (the rafter is hooking onto the porch roof for weight support or is it an independent structure.) Staff Whitmore noted that it would be an independent structure. Everyone praised the improvements.

No other questions for staff.

Chair Mitchell closed the public Hearing.

FINDING OF FACT MOTION:

Commissioner Stoch moved in regards to COA-18-31 at 323 N. Vance Street that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project COA- 18-31 at 323 N. Vance Street if the support column on the front of the house and installation of a pergola from the front porch roof line to the end of the front of the house, is done in accordance with the decision by the Historic Preservation Commission, it is congruous with the character of the district, for the reason(s) that it is keeping with the character of the era, and the column that is being built will match the existing columns and will not remove any pieces of the existing porch or porch roof and that the owner will work with Staff Whitmore to provide a detailed list of materials and a general understanding of the design; before a COA-placard is released, and for these reasons it is found that this application is generally in harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole; seconded by Commissioner Yarborough and it passed unanimously.

FINAL MOTION:

Commissioner Stoch moved based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Renee Duty and approve the proposal (s) as shown in COA- 18-31, 323 N. Vance Street with the condition listed as stated; seconded by Commissioner Phil Yarborough.

1. Prior to release of the COA Placard staff recommends that the applicant provide a list of materials that will be used to construct the pergola, and a detail or written description of how the pergola is going to be attached to the house

COA-18-32- A Certificate of Appropriateness application was received from Renee Duty, property owner of 323 N. Vance Street who wishes to replace boarded up windows on exterior with siding to match the existing exterior.

In accordance with the General Statutes, the public hearing was advertised once a week for two successive calendar weeks prior to the meeting date and all public notifications were fulfilled.

Staff Whitmore noted that the Guidelines state on page 3, under Windows and Doors (page 11, Exhibit B) shows a window that has been closed. It is circled in red on the photo. The applicant wishes to take that window out and put in new siding all the way across, to match the existing siding.

Staff shared that on page 5, staff's comments are that the north facing window has been boarded and the interior window has been enclosed. If the boards are removed and the siding that matches the existing siding is installed it appears that the work meets the intent of the guidelines. The two west facing basement windows outlined in red (page 12, Exhibit C). Staff noted for security reasons the applicant wishes to brick them in and paint them to match the existing foundation. Staff noted that the proposed bricking in of the windows is for security reasons.



Chair Mitchell asked if there were any questions for staff.

Being none, Chair Mitchell closed the Public Hearing:

Commissioner Nestor relayed that basically the brick will match, the siding will match, and the applicant plans to paint the foundation. Commissioner Yarborough added that the window that will be covered up with like siding is going from one end to another and there will not be a seam and Staff Whitmore shared that it will not look like it does now.

**FINDING OF FACT:**

Commissioner Yarborough moved in regards to COA-18-32, 323 N. Vance Street, that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project, COA -18-32 at 323, N. Vance Street, if the boards are removed and the siding that matches the existing siding is installed, it appears that the work meets the intent of the guidelines. The two west facing basement windows, if the boards are removed and the windows are bricked in (for safety concerns) and painted to match the existing foundation is done in accordance with the decision by the Historic Preservation Commission, is congruous with the character of the district, for the reasons, that the brick will be like brick and it will be painted to match the foundation and it will be secure and also the siding will match the rest of the house and no longer will have a seam; and they will remove the window that has been trimmed in and covered by plywood; and therefore this application has been found to be generally in harmony with the criteria in the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole; seconded by Commissioner Stoch and it passed unanimously.

**FINAL MOTION:**

Commissioner Yarborough moved based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Renee Duty and approve the proposal (s) as shown in COA-18-32, 323 N. Vance Street; seconded by Commissioner David Nestor and it passed unanimously.

Applicant Renee Duty and Brandon Duty and son leave.

5. **Old Business:** N/A

6. **New Business:**

a. **Staff update:**

1. Staff Whitmore provided updates on Minor and Major COA's included by reference.

**Announcements:**

Staff Whitmore noted that they were having a party for Britt Buchanan at Depot Park at 8:00 pm. There was no other business for the Commissioners to discuss.


7. **Call for Adjournment:**

Chair Mitchell called for adjournment. Commissioner Allen Gordon moved to adjourn; seconded by Commissioner Philip Yarborough and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Adopted this 25 day of June 2018

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair: Brian Mitchell

Attest:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary to the Commission: Anne Sears