

MINUTES
FORSYTH COUNTY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION
AUGUST 5, 2009
4:00 P.M.
BRYCE A. STUART MUNICIPAL BUILDING
PUBLIC MEETING ROOM, ROOM 530
100 EAST FIRST STREET, WINSTON-SALEM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janet Banzhof, Seth Brown, Jeff Harbinson, Mark Maxwell, Jamie Moore, Rick Pender, Laura Phillips, Michael Phillips, Jeff Sowers

MEMBERS ABSENT: Norris Hutchins, Julie Poplin, Sharon Richmond

STAFF PRESENT: Kelly Bennett, Michelle McCullough, LeAnn Pegram

PRESIDING: Michael Phillips, Chairman

Mr. Phillips called the meeting to order. Commission members stated their names for the record. Mr. Phillips welcomed those present.

I. APPROVAL OF JULY 1, 2009 MINUTES

Motion: Mr. Brown
Second: Mr. Harbinson
Vote: Unanimous

II. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS

A. Local Historic Landmarks

1. Greg Richardson, Applicant
Gilmer Building (Landmark #37)
424 West Fourth Street, Winston-Salem
Request: Awning/Signage Installation
Case #: L001-09

Ms. Pegram, Ms. McCullough, and Mr. Bennett were sworn for testimony. Ms. Pegram presented the staff report, describing the application in detail. She presented a map showing the location of the property and photographs of the property.

Staff Comments: Staff found that the application was not incongruous with the character of the Landmark property for the following reasons:

1. The awning/sign would have a minimal impact on the historic character of the landmark building in that it was limited to one awning. Further, the size of the awning was in scale with the commercial character of the building, which had been adaptively reused as a restaurant. Only a small portion of the Gilmer Building's Fourth Street façade would be utilized for the awning.
2. The awning/sign would be fabric, which was a material recommended by the *Guidelines*. It would be compatible with the Gilmer Building in design, as it had a "traditional" feel and a simple, unobtrusive design with only the name of the business shown.
3. The location of the proposed awning/signage was appropriate for the Gilmer Building and would not obscure or conceal significant architectural features.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended that based on the preceding comments, the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Greg Richardson for 420 Building LLC, for the installation of an awning/signage at the Gilmer Building, 424 West Fourth Street, in Winston-Salem with the following conditions:

1. Commission staff shall review and approve the color of the proposed awning/signage prior to ordering and installation;
2. Commission staff shall review and approve the mounting method proposed for the awning/signage prior to installation in order that it did not damage original building materials; and,
3. Commission staff shall review and approve any revisions or deviations to any portion of the as-submitted work prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Regulations

- 1) If a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for the application, it would expire August 5, 2010. If a building permit was required to perform the approved work, such permit had to be obtained within one year from the date of COA issuance. Failure to comply with the one-year time limit would expire the COA. Commission staff could renew the COA within twelve months of original issuance. All other renewals of an expired COA could only be made by the Commission.
- 2) The applicant had to note that the scope of work for the project had to meet all other applicable building codes and ordinances. Any additional approvals or permits from the City had to be obtained prior to initiating work. The applicant needed to consult with the City Inspections Division at 336-727-2628 prior to beginning the project.
- 3) It was the applicant's responsibility to contact Commission staff regarding any and all conditions to which a COA was subject. That was a requirement of COA issuance. Additionally, the applicant had to contact Commission staff if, in the process of commencing the project, unknown circumstances arose, which could result in changes, alterations, or modifications.

Public Comment

Speaking in Favor of the Application: Greg Richardson, 3620 Dunhurst Drive, Pfafftown, NC

27040 was sworn for testimony, and spoke in favor of the application.

Speaking in Opposition to the Application: None

Commission Discussion

The Commission discussed the application.

Mr. Sowers moved that the Commission continue the application until later in the meeting when staff reviewed the landmark file on the property to see if a historic photograph of the building was available.

Second: Ms. Phillips
Vote: Unanimous

Commission Discussion

After viewing photographs from the landmark files in the Planning Board Office, the Commission further discussed the application.

Finding of Fact

Mr. Sowers moved that based upon the evidence that had been presented in the application and during the public meeting, the Commission find that the application was not incongruous with the character of the Landmark Building for the reasons stated in the staff report, with the conditions listed in the staff report, and with the additional condition that the awning be broken into two separate phases coinciding with the individual historical storefront entrances rather than one long phase.

Second: Mr. Brown
Vote: Unanimous

Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Harbinson moved that based on the preceding Finding of Fact, the Commission grant a COA to Greg Richardson, applicant, for awning/signage installation at the Gilmer Building (Landmark #37), located at 424 West Fourth Street in the West End Historic Overlay District for the reasons specified and the conditions expressed in the Finding of Fact made previously.

Second: Ms. Phillips
Vote: Unanimous

B. West End Historic Overlay District

1. Bill Mastoras, Applicant
House (Inventory #484)
1251 West Fourth Street
Request: Window Replacement (After-the-Fact)
Case #: W008-09

Ms. Pegram remained sworn for testimony. Ms. Pegram presented the staff report, describing the application in detail. She presented a map showing the location of the property and photographs of the property.

Staff Comments: Ms. Pegram stated that since the original COA application denial in March 2009, Commission staff had met with the applicant/owners of the subject property and visited the site on several occasions in order to determine how to proceed with a new application. Additionally, Commission staff had reviewed previous Commission-issued COAs for window replacement.

In visiting the site, Commission staff found that most of the original windows were retained on-site and stored in the basement (as staff recommended to the applicant immediately upon discussing the After-the-Fact work with the property owners). In examining those windows, it appeared that some were salvageable, yet a number were in an extremely deteriorated condition. The new application requested repairing and reinstalling three original 6/1 double hung wood windows on the front elevation (the fourth window had not yet been removed and it remained in place). Unfortunately, the small, central second story paired windows could not be found among the original windows. Therefore, the applicant proposed replacing those windows with vinyl replacement windows in a 4/1 pattern with exterior muntins. Overall, the less visible side elevations were proposed to be replaced with 6/1 double hung replacement windows, again with exterior profiles. The rear elevation, which was not visible, was requested to remain with windows in a 1/1 configuration.

In reviewing previous Commission decisions, it was determined that vinyl replacement windows (some with interior grids) had been approved in several instances, including two properties located directly across West Fourth Street from the subject property.

As stated in a July COA application staff report, Commission staff found that Commission staff, in most cases, did not recommend the replacement of original windows within the West End Historic Overlay District. However, in that particular instance staff found that window replacement, in selected locations, may not be incongruous with the character of the District because:

1. A number of original windows had been found to be in a deteriorated condition;
2. While the West End Historic District National Register Nomination classified the property as "Contributing" in 1986, some alterations were made to the property after that time and prior to the HO District establishment in 1993. The most significant change had been sheathing of the original stucco structure in vinyl siding. As such, its architectural significance had been compromised.
3. The *Guidelines* allowed the use of a substitute window material in secondary locations if the *appearance* of the window components would match those of the original. The application stated that would be the case, with the primary exception of the rear elevation. In that instance, staff found that the proposed 1/1 replacements would not be visible and the configuration was appropriate for a house of that time period and style (a 1920s, Foursquare style-influenced structure).

Therefore, due to the altered appearance of the house and the windows' condition, staff found that the replacement of windows on all elevations of the house, with the exception of the front elevation (excluding the second floor paired window), was appropriate with conditions.

Staff Recommendation: Ms. Pegram stated that based on the preceding comments, staff recommended that the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Bill Mastoras for Bill G. Mastoras and Pete Mastoras for the replacement of windows as proposed in the COA application for the House at 1251 West Fourth Street in the West End Historic Overlay District, with the following condition:

1. that Commission staff review and approve any revisions or deviations to any portion of the as-submitted work prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Regulations

- 1) If a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for the application, it would expire August 5, 2010. If a building permit was required to perform the approved work, such permit had to be obtained within one year from the date of COA issuance. Failure to comply with the one-year time limit would expire the COA. Commission staff could renew the COA within twelve months of original issuance. All other renewals of an expired COA could only be made by the Commission.
- 2) The applicant had to note that the scope of work for the project had to meet all other applicable building codes and ordinances. Any additional approvals or permits from the City had to be obtained prior to initiating work. The applicant needed to consult with the City Inspections Division at 336-727-2628 prior to beginning the project.
- 3) It was the applicant's responsibility to contact Commission staff regarding any and all conditions to which a COA was subject. That was a requirement of COA issuance. Additionally, the applicant had to contact Commission staff if, in the process of commencing the project, unknown circumstances arose, which could result in changes, alterations, or modifications.

Public Comment

Speaking in Favor of the Application: None

Speaking in Opposition to the Application: None

Commission Discussion

The Commission discussed the application.

Finding of Fact

Mr. Brown moved that based upon the evidence that had been presented in the application and during the public meeting, the Commission find that the application was not incongruous with the character of the West End Historic Overlay District, with a condition that all the windows on the front elevation would be replaced with wood as per the *Design Guidelines*.

Second: Mr. Harbinson

Mr. Maxwell made a friendly amendment that the Finding of Fact be based upon the information as set forth in the staff report and subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report, minus the specific portion of the staff report that said, "excluding the second floor pair of windows." Mr.

Brown and Mr. Harbinson accepted the amendment.

Vote: Unanimous

Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Sowers moved that based on the preceding Finding of Fact, the Commission grant a COA to Bill Mastoras, applicant, for window replacement (After-the-Fact) at the House (Inventory #484), located at 1251 West Fourth Street in the West End Historic Overlay District for the reasons specified and the conditions expressed in the Finding of Fact made previously.

Second: Mr. Maxwell

Vote: Unanimous

2. Mobrix, LLC/Chris Ramm, Applicants
Former Summit Street Pharmacy (Inventory #99)
492 West End Boulevard
Request: Installation of Signage
Case #: W009-09

Ms. Pegram remained sworn for testimony. Ms. Pegram presented the staff report, describing the application in detail. She presented a map showing the location of the property and photographs of the property.

Staff Comments: Staff found the application was not incongruous with the character of the District for the following reasons:

- 1) While the *Guidelines* stated that wall signs were not recommended for walls that had not previously contained a sign, the proposed wall sign for the north (side) elevation would be applied to an already painted stucco finish, rather than an unpainted masonry surface. Removal of such a sign in the future could be readily achieved by repainting the north (side) elevation, with no damage to the surface.
- 2) The proposed sign was compatible in material, size, scale, and character with the former Summit Street Pharmacy building and with the District. The sign would be 40 square feet smaller than the sign ordinance allowed, resulting in a dimension that would be approximately 8'x20'. This scale and proportion was much more in keeping with the character of the District than the previously denied request. Large scale advertising signs covering entire, or nearly entire, elevations were not found in West End.
- 3) A border for the sign was proposed, which would reflect architectural elements of the building (stonework on the front elevation of the building). The overall design was of a single cyclist with the name and establishment date of the business painted beneath in the same font as was utilized in the front elevation sign (which was previously approved by the Commission).
- 4) The proposed sign would be painted, which was historically a method used to create advertising signage.
- 5) The signage would not cover a large portion of the north (side) elevation, nor would it cover any significant architectural features, or block pedestrian views along the street.

As stated earlier, the painted sign could be easily removed by simply painting the already painted stucco finish of the building.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the preceding comments, staff recommended that the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Mobrix, LLC/Chris Ramm for Mobrix, LLC for the installation of signage as proposed in the COA application for the former Summit Street Pharmacy Building, located at 492 West End Boulevard in the West End Historic Overlay District, with the following condition:

- 1) that Commission staff review and approve any revisions or deviations to any portion of the as-submitted work prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Regulations

- 1) If a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for the application, it would expire August 5, 2010. If a building permit was required to perform the approved work, such permit had to be obtained within one year from the date of COA issuance. Failure to comply with the one-year time limit would expire the COA. Commission staff could renew the COA within twelve months of original issuance. All other renewals of an expired COA could only be made by the Commission.
- 2) The applicant had to note that the scope of work for the project had to meet all other applicable building codes and ordinances. Any additional approvals or permits from the City had to be obtained prior to initiating work. The applicant needed to consult with the City Inspections Division at 336-727-2628 prior to beginning the project.
- 3) It was the applicant's responsibility to contact Commission staff regarding any and all conditions to which a COA was subject. That was a requirement of COA issuance. Additionally, the applicant had to contact Commission staff if, in the process of commencing the project, unknown circumstances arose, which could result in changes, alterations, or modifications.

Public Comment

Speaking in Favor of the Application: Alisa Keegan, 1260 West Fourth Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101 was sworn for testimony, and spoke in favor of the application.

Speaking in Opposition to the Application: None

Commission Discussion

The Commission discussed the application.

Finding of Fact

Mr. Harbinson moved that based upon the evidence that had been presented in the application and during the public meeting, the Commission find that the application was not incongruous with the character of the West End Historic Overlay District for the reasons stated in the staff report and with the typical condition that Commission staff review and approve any deviations to any portion of the as submitted work prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Second: Mr. Maxwell
 Vote: Unanimous

Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Maxwell moved that based on the preceding Finding of Fact, the Commission grant a COA to Mobrix, LLC/Chris Ramm, applicants, for installation of signage at the former Summit Street Pharmacy (Inventory #99) located at 492 West End Boulevard in the West End Historic Overlay District for the reasons specified and subject to the condition expressed in the Finding of Fact made previously.

Second: Mr. Brown
 Vote: Unanimous

3. Loraine A. Cernak & John M. Cernak, Applicants
 Apartment Building (Inventory #147)
 864-866 West Fourth Street
 Request: Removal of Two Windows & Replacement with Two Doors; Installation of Signage; Request to Recommend Parking Variance to Zoning Board of Adjustment
 Case #: W010-09

Ms. Pegram remained sworn for testimony. Ms. Pegram presented the staff report, describing the application in detail. She presented a map showing the location of the property and photographs of the property.

Staff Comments: Ms. Pegram stated that the application consisted of three requests:

- A. Removal of two windows, replacement with two doors, and addition of wood balustrades in order to create accessible second story porches. Commission staff found that the application was not incongruous with the character of the District because:
1. While two original windows would be removed, they would be replaced with 15-light doors taken from the interior of the structure, and which were designed as exterior doors.
 2. The existing window openings would be utilized, as would the casing, resulting in an opening that had only been altered to extend to the floor, thus retaining and preserving the position, number, size, proportion, and arrangement of historic windows and doors in a building wall. Further, the window opening width would not be enlarged or reduced.
 3. While the proposed work would be conducted on the side elevations, these elevations were visible from West Fourth Street. However, the public view of these side elevations would remain the same, reading as a three glass-pane wide window/door opening.
 4. The proposed balustrade would match the existing first floor porch balustrade in material and design, which was an appropriate manner in which to approach the new railing, as the style of the building was clean and symmetrical. Building code would require that the railing be 42" in height.

- B. Installation of signage. Commission staff found that the application was not incongruous with the character of the District because:
1. The signage was compatible in material, size, scale, and character with the building and the District. The simple, yet contemporary design and placement of the signage worked well with the Craftsman-style duplex.
 2. The signage was constructed of wood, which was a traditional sign material recommended by the *Guidelines*.
 3. The signage was unobtrusive and did not cover a large portion of the façade, any significant architectural features, or block pedestrian views along West Fourth Street. Additionally, the signage was removable.
 4. The signage met the regulations required by the sign ordinance.
- C. Request to recommend a parking variance to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Commission staff found that the request was not incongruous with the character of the District because:
1. The *Guidelines* stated that every effort should be taken to minimize the impact of new parking.
 2. Creation of the required number of parking spaces and the resulting configuration requirements was simply not possible given the coverage of the historic building on the site. In order to meet the parking requirements, important elements of the building would need to be demolished, which was not in keeping with the character of the structure and the District as a whole. Obviously, that would render the building incongruous with the historic aspects of West End.
 3. Approving a variance would not create problems with increased on-street parking as the property owners currently were able to pull into the existing driveway. Additionally, the nature of the applicant's business did not create a large amount, if any, of visitor or client parking. As such, there would not be a public safety threat if the number of required spaces was reduced or eliminated.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the preceding comments, staff recommended that the Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Loraine A. Cernak and John M. Cernak for the: 1) removal of two windows, replacement with two doors, and addition of balustrades; 2) installation of signage; and, 3) recommendation for a parking variance to the Zoning Board of Adjustment as proposed in the COA application for the former Apartment Building, located at 864-866 West Fourth Street in the West End Historic Overlay District, with the following condition:

- 1) that Commission staff review and approve any revisions or deviations to any portion of the as-submitted work prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Regulations

- 1) If a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for the application, it would expire August 5, 2010. If a building permit was required to perform the approved work, such

permit had to be obtained within one year from the date of COA issuance. Failure to comply with the one-year time limit would expire the COA. Commission staff could renew the COA within twelve months of original issuance. All other renewals of an expired COA could only be made by the Commission.

- 2) The applicant had to note that the scope of work for the project had to meet all other applicable building codes and ordinances. Any additional approvals or permits from the City had to be obtained prior to initiating work. The applicant needed to consult with the City Inspections Division at 336-727-2628 prior to beginning the project.
- 3) It was the applicant's responsibility to contact Commission staff regarding any and all conditions to which a COA was subject. That was a requirement of COA issuance. Additionally, the applicant had to contact Commission staff if, in the process of commencing the project, unknown circumstances arose, which could result in changes, alterations, or modifications.

Public Comment

Speaking in Favor of the Application: None

Speaking in Opposition to the Application: None

Commission Discussion

The Commission discussed the application.

Finding of Fact

Ms. Phillips moved that based upon the evidence that had been presented in the application and during the public meeting, the Commission find that the application was not incongruous with the character of the West End Historic Overlay District for the reasons stated in the staff comments and at the public meeting and with the condition that the configuration of the second floor porches be as they were shown in the images presented that day at the meeting with the usual condition and regulations.

Second: Mr. Maxwell

Vote: Unanimous

Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Maxwell moved that based on the preceding Finding of Fact, the Commission grant a COA to Loraine A. Cernak & John M. Cernak, Applicants, for the removal of two windows and replacement with two doors; the installation of signage; the request to recommend a parking variance to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the Apartment Building (Inventory #147), located at 864-866 West Fourth Street in the West End Historic Overlay District.

Second: Mr. Brown

Vote: Unanimous

III. MINOR WORK COA APPROVALS

A. West End Historic Overlay District

1. Clinton W. Buss, Applicant
Leak-Stratton House (Inventory #435)
1230 West First Street
Request: Removal of a Portion of Aluminum Siding; Removal of Aluminum Awnings;
Installation of Shutters; Removal of Two Damaged & Dangerous Bradford Pear Trees
Case #: MWW021-09
2. David & Terri Goff, Applicants
Samuel D. Hancock House (Inventory #117)
641 Summit Street
Request: Hemlock Tree Pruning
Case #: MWW022-09
3. Tom Harris, Applicant
Snider-Nelson House (Inventory #386)
930 West End Boulevard
Request: Removal & Replacement of Rear Steps
Case #: MWW023-09
4. William & Doris Wise, Applicants
Crawford-Hanes-Watkins House (Inventory #368)
1114 West Fourth Street
Request: Removal of American Holly Tree & Removal of Dead Dogwood Tree
Case #: MWW024-09
5. Samuel C. Ogburn, Applicant
Aaron Cook House (Inventory #342)
1114 West Fourth Street
6. Catherine G. Hendren, Applicant
J.N. Still House (Inventory #390)
915 West End Boulevard
Request: Front Porch Repair & Removal & Replacement of Window
Case #: MWW026-09
7. Richard A. Pender, Applicant
Garage/Apartment (Inventory #372)
1147 West Fourth Street
Request: Demolition of Box-In Eaves & Restoration of Original Eaves
Case #: MWW027-09

B. Local Historic Landmarks

1. Linda A. Hobbs, Applicant
Levering House (Landmark #17)
516 South Main Street, Winston-Salem
Request: Rear Porch Repair

Case #: MWL005-09

2. Jerome D. & Kathleen Q. Keyser, Applicants
John Siewers House (Landmark #60)
Request: New Kitchen Installation; Front Entrance Repair; Roof Replacement
Case #:MWL006-09

IV. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REVOCATION OF A PROPERTY AS A LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

- A. River John Conrad House (Local Historic Landmark #38)
1606 Conrad Road, Lewisville
Tax Block: 4608, Lot 002B
PIN: 5876-38-8815.00
Date of Designation: November 9, 1981
Requested by: Nadine M. Lesko & Kerry M. Link, Property Owners

Mr. Phillips stated that the item was a public hearing. Ms. Pegram then presented the staff report:

The River John Conrad House was located at 1606 Conrad Road in western Forsyth County. On November 9, 1981, the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners designated the property a local historic landmark. In May 2009 the Commission received a request from the property owners to repeal the ordinance designating the River John Conrad House as a landmark property. In determining the proper course of action to take with regard to the request, it was the opinion of the Forsyth County Attorney's Office that the same procedure as that to designate a landmark had to be followed. Therefore, the Historic Resources Commission was to conduct a public hearing and vote on whether or not to recommend revocation of the ordinance to the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners.

Commission staff therefore, as part of that process, had the following comments.

Since 1976, 121 properties throughout Forsyth County had been designated Local Historic Landmarks. Landmark properties must be found individually significant in at least one of the following four areas (criteria):

- A. A property that was associated with events that had made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B. A property that was associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C. A property that embodied the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represented the work of a master, or that possessed high artistic values, or that represented a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- D. A property that had yielded, or may likely yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In considering those four criteria, the River John Conrad House property met Criterion B, the association with the lives of historically significant persons. John Conrad was a member of the Conrad family, a family with strong Moravian ties to the community. Conrad was significant as he was well-known for operating a ferry across the Yadkin River for many years. Additionally, he was an early landowner in the area, significant for his early 19th century ownership of 950 acres. A majority of the original designation application materials discussed John Conrad and his descendants.

In addition to a property being significant in one or more of the aforementioned areas, a property must also retain a high degree of integrity. In the case of a building, "integrity" included its original design and materials. When designated as a landmark property, it was acknowledged that the property had undergone some changes, including the removal and replacement of the original front porch. The application materials discussed original woodwork in the house, including mantels, chair rail, doors, and moldings. However, the State Historic Preservation Office, at that time, suggested a more thorough architectural description be prepared. The files did not reflect that a detailed architectural description was submitted, yet the property ultimately received landmark designation.

In 2009, the property owners retained Nancy Van Dolsen to prepare a report on the River John Conrad House property, which included an architectural investigation. Ms. Van Dolsen was a qualified preservation consultant and architectural historian in North Carolina, who served during an interim period as the National Register Coordinator for the State Historic Preservation Office. Commission staff, therefore, believed she possessed the qualifications necessary to prepare an accurate and scholarly report on the property.

The property report concluded that the River John Conrad House was substantially changed during a comprehensive 1983-1984 alteration. The property owner at that time submitted and was issued a Certificate of Appropriateness by the (then) Historic Properties Commission. Only a general description of the work was found in the Commission's files, and no plans/drawings were located. According to the 2009 report, alterations included the following: removal of three of the four corner fireplaces; removal of the two-story porch; demolition of the antebellum kitchen; removal of the first floor exterior door transoms; removal of original door hardware and installation of pocket doors; removal of outbuildings; removal of interior plaster and replacement with sheetrock; modification of floor plans; and, barn and garage construction. Subsequent to the 1984 work on the house, there were additional changes to the house, largely consisting of interior modifications.

According to the Van Dolsen report, the significant remaining original components of the house included its heavy timber frame and roof truss system, the Germanic eave "kick," and the south side decorative chimney.

Commission staff had reviewed the landmark file on the property and the 2009 report. It was staff's conclusion that the River John Conrad House had lost a high degree of its integrity, which was a required component of landmark designation. However, that conclusion should not be construed to mean that only properties with no alteration, including site changes, were worthy of landmark designation. If that was the case, staff ventured to say that there would likely be no landmark properties in the state of North Carolina. Over time, properties change. It was the degree and significance of the change against which a property's overall integrity must be measured.

As a final comment, the State Historic Preservation Office had reviewed the request (and supporting materials) to repeal the landmark ordinance and had stated:

We believe that the report provides the Forsyth County Historic Resources Commission and the Forsyth County Commissioners with adequate information on the loss of architectural and historical significance. We further believe that the River John Conrad House has lost the architectural and historical integrity necessary for local landmark designation.

In conclusion, staff recommended revocation of the ordinance, dated November 9, 1981, designating the River John Conrad House as a local historic landmark (Tax Block 4608, Lot 002B, PIN: 5876-38-8815.00).

Public Comment

Speaking in Favor of the Application: Richard Sieg, representative for the petitioners, was sworn for testimony, and spoke in support of revocation of the landmark ordinance.

Speaking in Opposition to the Application: None

Commission Discussion

The Commission discussed the application.

Ms. Phillips moved that Commission recommend to the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners that the ordinance dated November 9, 1981 designating the River John Conrad House at 1606 Conrad Road, Lewisville, NC as a historic landmark be revoked.

Second: Mr. Maxwell

Vote:

For: Ms. Banzhof, Mr. Harbinson, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Moore, Mr. Pender, Ms. Phillips, Mr. Sowers

Against: Mr. Brown

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Education Committee

Ms. McCullough noted that the committee was still on summer hiatus and would begin meeting again later in August. She encouraged Commission members to begin submitting ideas for a speaker and projects.

B. Historic Marker Committee

Ms. Pegram noted there was nothing new to report, with the exception of the West Salem historic marker unveiling, which was scheduled for September 12th.

C. Old Salem/Bethabara Design Review Guidelines Revision Committee

Mr. Bennett noted that the draft guidelines were under review by the City Attorney's Office.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed Bethania Historic Overlay District Discussion

Ms. Pegram explained that staff had been working for some time to schedule a meeting with the parties involved to communicate about how the project would proceed.

B. Update on After-the-Fact COA Denials

1. Sosnik House
1224 West First Street, West End Historic Overlay District
Painting of Decorative Stone Retaining Wall and Concrete Walkway

Ms. Pegram reported that the property was apparently now in foreclosure. That meant that neither the property owner nor the bank would make changes. However the requirement to repair existing situations ran with the property, not with the ownership and anyone purchasing the property would be responsible for the repairs.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. McCullough reminded the Commission members about a notice in their packets concerning a conference in the Yadkin Valley scheduled for the upcoming weekend.

Ms. McCullough stated that Heather Fearnbach was now writing the end of the Phase III architectural survey update.

Ms. McCullough stated that the Hope Fraternity area would be going to the National Register Advisory Committee in October.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.