



**OAK RIDGE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
JUNE 17, 2020 – 7:00 P.M.
OAK RIDGE TOWN HALL**

MINUTES

Members Present

Debbie Shoenfeld, Chair
Caroline Ruch, Vice Chair
Kristin Kubly
Barbara Engel, Alternate (Sitting)
Courtenay Harton, Alternate (Not sitting)

Staff Present

Sandra Smith, Town Clerk
Sean Taylor, Planning Director

Members Absent

Paul Woolf
Brian Hall

Note: This meeting was conducted remotely under N. C. Gen. Stat. § 166A-19.24 by use of simultaneous communication using the Zoom online platform and in which Historic Preservation Commission members participated by simultaneous communication. Committee members were joined and participated in the entire meeting, unless otherwise noted.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Debbie Shoenfeld called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. She explained that the meeting was being conducted on Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic and that the public had been invited to join by phone or electronic device. Shoenfeld said residents who wanted to make public comments had been invited to participate in the electronic meeting.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Barbara Engel a motion to approve the amended meeting agenda to include tabling approval of the minutes of the May 18, 2020 special meeting, and Kristin Kubly seconded. Via roll-call vote, and the motion was passed unanimously (4-0).

3. APPROVE MINUTES

Kristin Kubly moved to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2019 regular meeting, November 20, 2019 regular meeting, and May 4, 2020 special meeting, and Caroline Ruch seconded. Via roll-call vote, and the motion was passed unanimously (4-0).

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. Town Council report.

Shoenfeld agreed to give the report to Town Council in July.

B. COAs reviewed/ approved at staff level.

Planning Director Sean Taylor said he had approved a screened porch to be built on the back of a house in Merriman Farms. Taylor said the porch could not be seen from the road.

C. COAs approved but not completed.

COAs outstanding are:

- COA-19-05 for Gary and Myra Blackburn's fencing
- COA-19-06 for Matt and Brooke Kuzmick's new front porch (not clear if the project is going to move forward)
- COA-19-08 for Stanley and Denise Sacks' house

D. Planning & Zoning Board meeting.

No issues related to the Historic District

E. Design Review Meetings.

Ruch and Kubly attended a Design Review Meeting for Oak Ridge Diner (COA-20-02).

F. Historic District violations.

None

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of chair and vice chair.

Caroline Ruch nominated Debbie Shoenfeld for chair. There were no other nominations. Via roll-call vote, Shoenfeld was unanimously elected HPC chair (4-0).

Kristin Kubly nominated Caroline Ruch for vice chair. There were no other nominations. Via roll-call vote, Ruch was unanimously elected HPC vice chair (4-0).

* * *

Shoenfeld explained that the purpose of the meeting is to provide the Commission with an opportunity to receive evidence concerning specific applications for Certificates of Appropriateness (COAs). The Commission follows quasi-judicial procedures which means that it makes findings of fact based upon duly admitted

evidence and sworn testimony. She said that the appropriateness of a COA is determined based on conformance with the Oak Ridge Historic District Design Guidelines and compatibility with the Historic District. Under state law, "compatibility" means that the proposed COA will not result in construction that is incongruous with the Historic District.

Shoenfeld said that the Commission will hear sworn testimony from the applicant and from other witnesses at its discretion, and all testimony is legally binding. The Commission can only consider and deliberate on matters of size, scale, materials, and other criteria as described in the Design Guidelines that relate to the appearance of the project and its compatibility with the Historic District. She said that the Guidelines are intentionally broad, in order to provide applicants with a broad pathway for compliance. Their overarching goal is to preserve the special character of the District by requiring that approved projects are compatible with the District and their surrounding buildings.

Shoenfeld explained that the Commission can approve or disapprove, or continue consideration of the COA, but a decision within 180 days from the date the application was submitted. She said that appeals of the Commission's decisions are heard by the Oak Ridge Board of Adjustment, and appeals from the Board of Adjustment are heard by Guilford County Superior Court.

Shoenfeld explained that Commission members should not engage in discussions with applicants regarding past or current COA applications and should not discuss the Commission's proceedings except with the Chair or Town staff.

Shoenfeld then explained what constituted a conflict of interest:

- A fixed opinion;
- Undisclosed *ex parte* communications with anyone about the case;
- A close familial, business or other relationship with an affected person; or
- A financial interest in the outcome of the case.

Shoenfeld asked if any Commission members had a conflict with the COA-20-01. Ruch, Engel and Shoenfeld each individually indicated that they had no conflicts of interest. Kubly said she had no conflict. She disclosed that she lived on Billet Road, but said she had not spoken to the applicant about the COA.

Re COA-20-02, Ruch, Engel and Shoenfeld each indicated that they had no conflicts of interest. Kubly also said she had no conflict, but that she had spoken to the applicant during the Design Review Meeting.

For COA-20-03, Ruch said she had no conflict, but she had been to the business and introduced herself, and told applicant Tammy Cobb that she should look at the Design Guidelines. Kubly said she had no conflict. Engel also said she had no conflict of interest, but that she had shopped at the business and told Cobb that the Commission would deal with the application as soon as possible. Shoenfeld said she had no conflict.

- B. COA-20-01:** Stanley and Denise Sacks request approval for a sign at 5915 Billet Road in Oak Ridge Township, Guilford County Tax Parcel # 0165528. The property is zoned RS-40 (Residential, minimum 40,000-square-foot lot), Scenic Corridor Overlay, Historic District Overlay. It is owned by Stanley and Denise Sacks.

Shoenfeld read the property description into the record. She said the property is also zoned Agricultural, and Planning Director Sean Taylor agreed. Taylor said a portion of the property along Oak Ridge Road is zoned Residential, but the majority of the property is zoned Agricultural. He added that the overall use of the property is Agricultural for a horse farm.

Shoenfeld asked Commission members if they felt the project falls within the scope of the Design Guidelines and whether sufficient information has been submitted for the Commission to make a decision. All Commission members each individually indicated that their answers were yes.

Shoenfeld referred to the staff report, which is hereby incorporated by reference and made a part of the minutes. She asked if there were any additions, and Planning Director Taylor asked that the staff report be accepted as submitted.

Shoenfeld asked if there would be any type of lighting on the sign. Taylor said no lighting plan had been submitted and that he could refer that question to the applicant. Applicant Denise Sacks said she had no plans for lighting at this time. Shoenfeld asked Taylor to explain bona fide farms and how they affect the ordinances and the Historic District. Taylor said bona fide farms are areas that are in active agricultural use. He said in North Carolina, zoning regulations tend to prefer the agricultural activity, so certain zoning aspects have to take a back seat to what is actually being done on the property. He said this area is actively being used as a horse farm and, other than Carolyn Brown's farm, it is the only property currently being used agriculturally in the Historic District.

Town Clerk Sandra Smith swore in Denise Sacks. Sacks said she hoped to move into her new home at 5915 Billet Road in the next few weeks. She said they had been doing projects at the property, mostly which involved restoration and cleaning. The property is being used as a farm and they have two horses; it will also be used for their primary residence. Sacks said they would like to install a sign at the corner of Oak Ridge and Billet roads with the name of the farm, Willow Oak Farm.

Sacks held up the sign so members of the Commission could see it. Ruch asked if the majority of the sign was black. Sacks said yes, that it was black with white lettering. Sacks said the fencing was white, and the sign was a picture of an oak tree.

Kubly asked if the sign was going to be attached to the top of the fence, and Sacks said yes. She explained that it would be installed at the corner where the fence is at an angle with the intersection.

Shoenfeld asked how the sign would be attached. Sacks said she was not sure yet, but that it would not be visible. She said it would likely be attached with through-and-through bolts, but she needed to make sure that it was secure so the horses could not disrupt it.

With no other questions for the applicant, Shoenfeld asked that Commission members cite the applicable Guidelines in their discussions, which would be used in creating the findings of fact.

Shoenfeld said the sign would show the name of the property, Willow Oak Farm, and because of the zoning, signs of this size and nature were permissible. She said that in considering the Guidelines and the sign, she did not find anything that stands out to make her think any of the Guidelines were not being met.

Kubly asked if Willow Oak was the historic name of the farm or if was a newer name. Sacks said she was not familiar with any historic farm name, but the sign does refer to the nine old willow oaks on the property that she had preserved. Although they are often called pin oaks, the trees are actually willow oaks, Sacks said. She also said they are the same type of trees that are located along the Town property on Oak Ridge Road. Kubly said she was asking the question in reference to Section B, item 1.m. under Signage, which says modest signs stating the name and year of construction of a contributing historic property were appropriate.

Shoenfeld then called for the findings of fact. Shoenfeld reiterated that there would be no lighting of the sign, and that the request seems to meet the Design Guidelines. She said the Commission wanted to include the staff report in the findings of fact and to state that the request meets the Guidelines.

Kristin Kubly moved to accept the findings of fact, which includes the staff report, and Barbara Engel seconded the motion. Via roll-call vote, the motion was passed unanimously (4-0).

Caroline Ruch made a motion, based on the findings of fact, to approve COA-20-01 to allow the construction of signage at 5915 Billet Road in Oak Ridge Township, Guilford County Tax Parcel # 0165528. The property is zoned RS-30 (Residential, minimum 30,000-square-foot lot) and AG (Agricultural), Scenic Corridor Overlay, Historic District Overlay, and is owned by Stanley and Denise Sacks. The scope of the work is to be as described in the COA application dated February 25, 2020, and as described in the applicant's presentation and responses to the Historic Preservation Commission at its meeting on June 17, 2020 using photos, drawings, and materials as presented to the Commission. Kristin Kubly seconded the motion, and via roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

Shoenfeld congratulated the applicant.

- C. COA-20-02:** Philip Cooke requests approval for an outdoor patio seating area at Oak Ridge Diner, located at 2205-L Oak Ridge Road, Oak Ridge Commons Shopping Center in Oak Ridge Township. The property is a portion of Guilford County Tax Parcel #0166224, zoned SC (Shopping Center), Scenic Corridor Overlay, Historic District Overlay. It is owned by JPC Monroe LLC.

Shoenfeld read the property description into the record. In order to confirm eligibility, Shoenfeld asked Commission members if they felt the project falls within the scope of the Design Guidelines and whether sufficient information has been

submitted for the Commission to make a decision. All Commission members each individually indicated that their answers were yes.

Planning Director Sean Taylor submitted the staff report, and added the additional information submitted that day regarding the heights of the existing columns and fencing at Rio Grande. He said the fencing was 52 inches tall and the brick columns were 44 inches tall.

Shoenfeld said the staff report was incorporated by reference and made a part of the minutes. She asked if there were any questions for Taylor, and none were voiced.

Town Clerk Smith swore in Darold Dumond, 7716 Kinross Drive in Oak Ridge, and one of his business partners, Drew Lacklen, 1021 Jefferson Road, Greensboro.

Dumond said that they would like to cut back the bushes and build a concrete patio and leave space for greenspace. Lacklen said that they would also like to have planters on the inside of the fence and plant ivy on the fencing to help block the wind.

Shoenfeld asked if there would be other planters with trees and shrubs, and Dumond said yes.

Ruch asked if they knew the height of the proposed columns and fencing, and Dumond said that they would mirror what the other establishments had and that the fencing would be four feet tall.

Kubly asked if they had selected the fencing, and Dumond said that he had looked at some but had not purchased any because he wanted this Board to approve the project first. Dumond said that the fence would be black aluminum.

Taylor shared a picture with the Board showing the proposed fencing.

Dumond said that they were not doing brick columns. Shoenfeld replied that their COA said that they were doing brick columns. Dumond said that he would do brick columns and would meet any requirements set forth by this Commission. Shoenfeld asked Taylor or Smith if she could update their application to reflect that the application prefers to not have brick columns, and Smith said to just include that language in their motion.

Kulby asked if they were going to have something in place of the brick columns, and Dumond said that they were going to have a lot of planters incorporated with the fencing that would look similar to the establishments around them like the Bistro 150 and Craft and Vine.

Shoenfeld said that the Bistro 150 is not a good example to reference when deciding what fencing to use at the Oak Ridge Commons Shopping Center.

DuMond said that they wanted to have their patio be nicer than Craft and Vine and would not look like The Bistro 150. He said that the posts from the black, aluminum

fencing would be hammer drilled into the existing concrete and will surrounded by a lot of planters.

Kulby asked if the planters would be similar in scope to what Rio Grande has, and DuMond said that yes and perhaps larger. He said that they would be similar in size to what the former Bella Luna restaurant had.

Kubly asked if the Commission could approve a COA without seeing an actual sample, and Smith replied that the Commission could specify in their motion that the fencing needed to be similar to others in the shopping center.

Shoenfeld said that the Commission could require the applicant to supply Town Staff with a cutsheet before installation started.

DuMond said that he had given the Commission a drawing, and Shoenfeld said that the drawing does not show if the fencing will be similar to Rio Grande, the former Bella Luna or Craft and Vine.

Taylor said that the fencing at Rio Grande, the former Bella Luna and Craft and Vine are all the same.

Shoenfeld stated that the fencing at Rio Grande has a small second railing and that the fencing at Bella Luna has finials at the top.

Ruch said that what she thought Taylor was saying is that they are all made out of the same material.

Taylor said that the material is a black, square aluminum fencing.

Dumond said that their fencing would look the most like the fencing at the old Bella Luna. He also said that the new fencing would not have pickets at the top but would have a flat top instead.

Taylor said that from a staff perspective, the new fencing should look similar to the fencing at Craft and Vine because that location is the closest to the Oak Ridge Diner.

Dumond told the Commission that their fencing would have no opening and would have nicer planters than the ones at Craft and Vine.

Shoenfeld verified that the new fencing would not have a passageway out to the street, and Dumond confirmed that their fencing would be in a horseshow pattern with the only entry being from the sidewalk near their front door.

Ruch asked is the brick columns would be replaced by the fencing meeting in the corners with planters, and Lacklen said that planter will be all around the inside of the fencing along with ivy and that the fence would be anchored into the concrete.

Lacklen said that they had asked their neighbor if they would pull out the rest of the greenery but had not heard back from them.

Shoenfeld said that they could not cut any greenery from another storefront and DuMond said that they were trying to create a consistent border look between the old shrubs next door and the new shrubs that they were going to plant.

Engel asked if the ivy was going to be planted on the outside of the fence, and Lacklen replied no. He said that planters would be planted 12 inches on the outside of the fence and that dirt would be around three sides of the inside perimeter of the fence. Lackeln said that planters would be planted in the dirt.

Taylor showed Commission members an image of the site so that they could see where the fencing would be installed in relation to the current shrubs.

Shoenfeld asked Commission members if they had additional questions for the applicant and none were voiced.

Shoenfeld asked Commission members if anyone had any areas of the Design Guidelines that they would like to discuss.

Shoenfeld directed Commission members to page 37 of the Design Guidelines, Section 2.b., regarding Landscaping. Shoenfeld read from Section 2.b., item a, which says that as a rule, retain and maintain mature trees and shrubs in accordance with Park 1 of the American National Standards Institute A300 Standards for Tree Care, which prohibits topping and deep pruning. Any deviation from these standards will require a Certificate of Appropriateness. She continued reading from Section B, item c, which says replace lost mature trees and shrubs with similar plantings, and repair landscape features with authentic or similar materials. Shoenfeld then read Section B, item e from the Design Guidelines, which states that it is preferred to use native plants species and plants that are historically well established in the Historic District, such as boxwoods, hollies, azaleas, and privet. Shoenfeld suggested that the applicants consider looking at these types of plantings for their big planters. Shoenfeld also encouraged the applicants to consider planting historically appropriate trees like understory trees like Japanese maple, dogwood, holly or crepe myrtle, smaller magnolias, crabapple, Virginia pine, and oriental cherry.

Shoenfeld directed Commission members to page 41 of the Design Guidelines, Section 4 regarding Fences and Walls. Shoenfeld read item b, which says utilize historic materials and design elements in the district in designing new fencing, and ensure that the new design is compatible with the building with which it is associated and with nearby contributing properties. Shoenfeld said that she believed that the new fencing would meet this guideline.

Shoenfeld continued to read item c, which says keep front yard fences or walls to a maximum height of 42 inches, and back or side yard fences to a maximum height of seven feet. Shoenfeld asked the applicants if they were aware that the fence had to be 42 inches in height, and Dumond replied that he did not but would make sure that the new fence met this requirement.

Shoenfeld asked the applicants if they were ok with their fence being shorter than the rest of the fences?

Engel said that she thought that having a shorter fence would not look good given that the other fences were taller.

Ruch said she thought having the shorter fence would not make it congruent with the other fences, and Kubly agreed.

DuMond asked Commission members if he should consider 48 inches in height for the fence, and Shoenfeld said that the other fences were 50 inches but that the Commission would consider 48 inches.

Kubly said that she thought it was important for the fences to all be the same height in order for them to be congruent.

Shoenfeld asked the applicants if they were ok with a 50-inch fences and they both replied, yes.

DuMond said that he was not going to break the rules and would do what the Commission asked them to do. He said that during COVID that he was important to be able to serve food outside, so getting the patio installed was important to their restaurant. DuMond told the Commission that they do not sell alcohol right now, but they may in the future. DuMond said that having a fence was a requirement for serving alcohol, so he was glad to be ahead of the game in relation to getting the fence approved.

Shoenfeld asked Commission members if they had additional questions for the applicants?

Kubly asked if the Commission could approve the COA contingent upon the applicants submitting a sample of their fencing, and Shoenfeld said yes.

Shoenfeld asked the applicants to bring either a sample of the fencing or a picture of the fencing to Town Hall before starting the installation process.

DuMond said that it was not a problem and that he would be glad to submit a sample to Town Hall.

Shoenfeld said that it is always better to approve a COA when the Commission members can see a what the actual material will look like.

DuMond said that he would bring a sample to Sean as soon as possible.

Taylor told DuMond that he could email him a picture of the fencing and that he would find a copy of what Craft and Vine submitted for their fencing sample if that would be helpful to him.

With no other questions for the applicant, Shoenfeld asked that Commission members cite the applicable Guidelines in their discussions, which would be used in creating the findings of fact.

Shoenfeld then called for the findings of fact. Shoenfeld reiterated that there would be no brick columns, that the fence would be 50 inches tall and would be anchored to the concrete. Shoenfeld made note that the Design Guidelines say that the fencing must be 42 inches, but that the Commission wanted congruency to the already 50-inch tall fences already installed at the shopping center. She said the Commission wanted to include the staff report in the findings of fact and referenced page 41, section 4 regarding Fences and Walls of the Design Guidelines. Shoenfeld read item c, which says keep front yard fences or walls to a maximum of 42 inches, and back and side yard fences to a maximum of seven feet. Shoenfeld referenced page 37, section B regarding Landscaping of the Design Guidelines. Shoenfeld said that the applicants were planning to use native plant species in their planters.

Caroline Ruch moved to accept the staff report as findings of fact. She added that the applicants asked to remove the usage of brick columns from their application. Ruch said that the black aluminum fencing would be 50 inches tall and would be anchored into the concrete. Ruch continued that the new fencing would look similar to the fencing used at Craft and Vine and that planters would be used in their design. She added that the application meets all of the requirements found on page 37, Section B, items c & e of the Design Guidelines on landscaping in that the applicants would be using native plant species in their plantings and that the front yard fence would be a maximum of 42 inches. Ruch noted that the Commission had decided to allow this fence to be 50-inches in height in order to be congruent to the other fences already in the shopping center. Ruch said that the application meets all the requirements found on page 41, Section B of the Design Guidelines on parking areas in that the applicants will utilize mature plantings and trees to screen parking areas. Barbara Engel seconded the motion, and via roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

Caroline Ruch made a motion, based on the findings of fact, to conditionally approve COA-20-02 to allow the construction of an outdoor patio seating area with fencing, located at 2205-L Oak Ridge Road, Oak Ridge Commons Shopping Center in Oak Ridge Township. The property is a portion of Guilford County Tax Parcel #0166224, zoned SC (Shopping Center), Scenic Corridor Overlay, Historic District Overlay. It is owned by JPC Monroe LLC. The scope of the work is to be as described in the COA application dated February 28, 2020, and as described in the applicants' presentation and responses to the Historic Preservation Commission at its meeting on June 17, 2020. The work is conditional on the following stipulations: a picture of the black, aluminum fencing material must be submitted before the work begins and the deletion of the brick columns as requested by the applicants. Kristin Kubly seconded the motion, and via roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

Shoenfeld congratulated the applicants.

- D. COA-20-03:** Tammy Cobb and Deanna Privette request approval for signage at Pineapple Porch, 2204 Oak Ridge Road in Oak Ridge Township. The property is Guilford County Tax Parcel # 0165779, and is zoned CU-LB (Conditional Use-Limited Business), Scenic Corridor Overlay, Historic District Overlay. It is owned by Ralph and Joyce Biggs.

Shoenfeld read the property description into the record. In order to confirm eligibility, Shoenfeld asked Commission members if they felt the project falls within

the scope of the Design Guidelines and whether sufficient information has been submitted for the Commission to make a decision. All Commission members each individually indicated that their answers were yes.

Shoenfeld noted that the COA had not been signed by the applicants, but that the Commission could approve it based on the condition that the applicants sign it.

Planning Director Sean Taylor submitted the staff report and added the additional information submitted that day regarding the signpost being 5.6 inches tall, the horizontal portion of the sign being 4 feet, 6 inches wide and the sign itself being 2 feet by 2 feet.

Shoenfeld said the staff report was incorporated by reference and made a part of the minutes. She asked if there were any questions for Taylor, and none were voiced.

Town Clerk Smith swore in Tammy Cobb, 605 Rachel Smothers Drive in Greensboro.

Cobb said that she would like to get approval for two signs. She said that one sign would be placed by the road and the other sign would be placed on the front of the building.

Shoenfeld asked the applicant if she is requesting two signs, and Cobb replied yes.

Cobb told the Commission the one sign was on a signpost that Joyce Biggs had used for her boutique and that the other sign was an eight-foot sign that Biggs had also used that she is modifying for Pineapple Porch.

Taylor shared pictures with the Commission of what the proposed signs would look like.

Shoenfeld asked Commission members if they had questions for the applicant.

Shoenfeld asked the applicant if she was planning on lighting the sign, and Cobb said yes if she could get electricity to the sign.

Shoenfeld told Cobb that she would need to submit another COA for lighting in the future, but that the current COA did not include lighting for the signs.

Ruch asked the applicant how the sign would be mounted, and Cobb said that she was going to use the same metal mounting that Biggs had used on her previous sign.

Shoenfeld said that she would like to discuss the free-standing sign that is proposed to be installed on an existing sign holder and a temporary sign that has their business hours on it.

Shoenfeld told the applicant that the sign that has the store hours on it is considered to be a temporary sign. Shoenfeld said that under signage, temporary political or real estate signs, are not regulated by the Design Guidelines. Shoenfeld asked Taylor to confirm that temporary signs can only be up for one week and Taylor replied that yes. Taylor said that would be glad to talk about the temporary sign with Cobb.

Shoenfeld said that she noticed that the free-standing sign is shaped like a T and may have space for the other sign to be added, and then it would not be considered a temporary sign.

Shoenfeld said that page 34, Section N, in the Design Guidelines regarding signage that the maximum area for the limited business zoning district is 32 square feet. Shoenfeld said that the size for the proposed free-standing sign is much smaller than what is allowed.

Shoenfeld continued reading in the Design Guidelines on page 35 under Additionally Applicable to Commercial Signage, that the appeal to customers of the quality and character of a business' merchandise and service can be enhanced by the attraction of well-designed buildings and complementary signage. Every sign should be an integral and noticeable part of the building it serves and a good neighbor to other commercial and adjacent properties. The building and its sign should be considered part of an overall image, each supporting the other and helping to draw customers.

Shoenfeld then directed Commission members to page 35 of the Design Guidelines, under Additionally Applicable to Commercial Signage, Section A. Shoenfeld read, as a rule, limit signs to one sign per parcel.

Shoenfeld said that this business can only be seen from Oak Ridge Road and is not seen from an intersection or a corner, but that she wanted Commission members to discuss that this applicant is requesting two signs.

Ruch said that the future amendments to this rule would allow one accessory free-standing sign per parcel and one accessory attached sign per business.

Shoenfeld said yes, but that those amendments had not been approved yet. Shoenfeld said that the Commission could approve the two signs based upon what the future amendments would say.

Engel asked if the former Josie's Boutique signs were approved, and Shoenfeld replied that she was not sure because that approval would have happened before her time on the Board.

Ruch said that she felt an exception may have been made in the past for the two signs due to the set back of the house and when you are traveling from the Kernersville side of HWY 150 into Oak Ridge that you would not see the house or the mounted sign on the house.

Shoenfeld asked if Commission members feel like the location of the building and its proximity to the road require two signs in order for one to be visible from the street, and Commission members agreed.

Shoenfeld read under Additionally Applicable to Commercial Signage, Section B, in the Design Guidelines that states limit trademarks to 25% of the sign area.

Shoenfeld asked Cobb is she considered the pineapple to be a trademark or just a graphic, and Cobb replied that she considered it to be a graphic.

Shoenfeld asked Commission members if anyone else had any questions regarding the free-standing sign, and none were voiced.

Shoenfeld said that the Commission would move on to consider the proposed accessory attached sign.

Shoenfeld said per the Town of Oak Ridge's Code of Ordinances that the maximum area for accessory attached signs in a limited business zone is 7.5 % of wall area or 25 square feet. Shoenfeld said that the proposed sign is definitely smaller in scale than what is allowed.

With no other questions for the applicant, Shoenfeld asked that Commission members cite the applicable Guidelines in their discussions, which would be used in creating the findings of fact.

Shoenfeld then called for the findings of fact. Shoenfeld reiterated that Taylor's staff report had been updated with the sign dimensions and the findings of fact should include the reasoning why the Commission is allowing two signs. Shoenfeld suggested that the findings of fact should also include that the pineapple is considered to be a graphic and not a trademark.

Caroline Ruch moved to accept the staff report, to include the dimensions of the free-standing sign, as findings of fact. She added that there will be no lighting to the signs at this time. Ruch referenced page 35, Section A of the Design Guidelines that states that as a rule, limit signs to one per parcel. Ruch said that this Commission was of the mind to allow a second free-standing sign due to the set back of the business and the view from the street. In addition, the pineapple is considered a graphic by the applicant and therefore would meet the guideline found on page 35, Section A of the Design Guidelines that states limit trademarks to 25% of sign area. Ruch also said that both of the signs are considered smaller than what is allowed by the Design Guidelines. She referenced page 34, Section N, item 3 that states that the maximum area for a free-standing sign in a neighborhood business is 25 square feet and page 34, Section O, item 2 that states that the maximum area for an accessory attached sign in a limited business zoning district is 7.5% of wall area or 50 square feet. Kristin Kubly seconded the motion, and via roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

Caroline Ruch made a motion, based on the findings of fact, to approve COA-20-03 to allow for the placement of signage at Pineapple Porch, 2204 Oak Ridge Road in Oak Ridge of Township. The property is Guilford County Tax Parcel # 0165779, and is zoned CU-LB (Conditional Use-Limited Business), Scenic Corridor Overlay, Historic District Overlay. It is owned by Ralph and Joyce Biggs. The scope of the work is to be as described in the COA application dated June 12, 2020, and as described in the applicant's presentation and responses to the Historic Preservation Commission at its meeting on June 17, 2020. The work is conditional based upon the property owners' signatures on the COA application being obtained and submitted to Town staff. Barbara Engel seconded the motion, and via roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

Shoenfeld congratulated the applicant.

6. **COMMITTEE REPORTS/UPDATES**

- A. **2019-20 budget.** The Commission agreed by consensus to allow staff to purchase a subscription to the Newspapers.com website to be used for research materials.
- B. **Grant program.** Shoenfeld reported that due to Covid-19, an abundance of rain and the inability to schedule contractors to receive quotes that the number of historic grant applications was affected. As a result of these issues, the deadline for the grant applications was extended until the end of April 2020. Gene Stafford submitted a grant application after this deadline. The grant panel discussed the issue as well as the fact that Stafford had not completed the 2019-20 fiscal year grant awarded to him for an out-kitchen. She said the panel recommended allowing Stafford an extension for the 2019-20 grant and not to award him a grant as requested for the 2020-21 fiscal year. She reported by the grant panel had also recommended awarding a \$2,000 grant to Drew Donnell and a \$1,750 grant to Amy Klug of the Old Mill. Shoenfeld said that \$1,250 was not awarded in grants for the 2020-2021 fiscal year. Shoenfeld told the Commission that the Historic Heritage Grant Committee requested that HPC and Town Council release restricted grant funds in the amount of \$750. The \$750, along with \$1,250 would make up the \$2,000 for Stafford's project.

Ruch made a motion to approve the Historic Heritage Grant Committee's request. Kristin Kubly seconded the motion, and via a roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

- C. **Historic inventory/Markers.** Shoenfeld said that Sandra Smith is continuing to work on the Inventory Project. Shoenfeld also said that Smith had agreed to complete a sweeping survey of properties outside of the Historic District. Shoenfeld told Commission members that at the request of property owners, Steve Lanz and Tony Cooler, that the marker at the Zach Whitaker House had been removed. Shoenfeld said that it was felt that the marker was causing an inability to sell the property. She said that she felt that the new owners will allow the Commission to put the marker back onto the property.
- D. **Training.** Commission members were reminded that they needed to attend one historic preservation training session per year.
- E. **Communications outreach.** Shoenfeld said that she would be sending out a press release regarding the Historic Heritage Grant recipients once the HPC budget is approved.
- F. **Display case.** No report
- G. **Coffee table book.** Shoenfeld said that HPC was contracting with Sandra Smith to write the stories associated with the properties that have been selected for publishing in the coffee table book.

- H. Historic Heritage Day. (Sept 26)** Shoenfeld said that the Commission needs to make plans for the Heritage Day in the event it becomes a reality given the Covid-19 restrictions.

7. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None

8. ADJOURNMENT

Barbara Engel moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Caroline Ruch seconded the motion, and via roll-call vote, it was passed unanimously (4-0).

Respectfully Submitted:

Sandra B. Smith, CMC, NCCMC
Town Clerk/HPC Staff

Deborah D. Shoenfeld
Chair