

DRAFT AGENDA

**Wake County Historic Preservation Commission
Monthly Meeting
Tuesday, February 10, 2026 --3:30 PM
Room 2800 – Wake County Justice Center
301 S. McDowell Street, Raleigh, North Carolina**

- I. Call to Order/ Roll Call**
- II. Approval of February 10, 2026 Agenda**
- III. Approval of November 18, 2025 Minutes**
- IV. Principles and Standards Draft Review and Discussion
w/Consultant Katie Cook, Loggia, LLC**
- V. Staff Report**
 - A. Reappointments to the WCHPC
 - B. Preservation Celebration May 3, 2026 – Good Hope Baptist Church, Shotwell
 - C. Potential Landmark Candidates
 - D. CLG Training
 - E. Other
- VI. Old Business**
- VII. New Business**
- VIII. Other Business**
- IX. Chair's Report**
- X. Adjourn**

DRAFT MINUTES

**Wake County Historic Preservation Commission
Tuesday, November 18, 2025 – 1:00 PM Room 2800 – Wake County Justice Center
301 S. McDowell Street, Raleigh, North Carolina**

Members Present (9): Mr. Jeff Hastings (Chair), Mr. Ed Morris (Vice-Chair), Mr. Dan Turner, Ms. Stephanie Ashworth, Ms. Suzanne Prince, Ms. Peggy Beach, Ms. Judy Bass, Mr. Nathan Guerin, Mr. Brendan Feters

Members Absent (3): Ms. Lonette Williams, Mr. Tom Carrigan, Ms. Karen Padgett

Staff (3): Mr. Gary Roth and Mr. Jeremy Bradham, Capital Area Preservation, Inc. (CAP)
Ms. Terry Nolan, Wake County Planning and Development Services Division

1. Call to Order/ Roll Call

Mr. Morris called the meeting to order at 1:02pm.

2. Approval of November 18, 2025 Agenda

Approved as submitted.

3. Approval of October 14, 2025 Minutes

Approved as submitted.

4. Public Hearing for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CA-12-25)

Owners: Patricia O'Neill

Landmark: John B. and Nancy Strain House

Location: 8536 Lake Wheeler Road, Raleigh

Jurisdiction: Fuquay-Varina

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a secondary garage building.

Mr. Morris began by summarizing the public hearing procedures.

<https://www.wake.gov/departments-government/board-commissioners/meetings-schedules-materials/meeting-procedures>

Mr. Morris swore in Mr. Bradham and Mr. Roth. Mr. Bradham presented a PowerPoint summarizing the application. Mr. Bradham reviewed the proposed site plan and elevations, noting that the garage is positioned as far to the rear of the property as possible and oriented to minimize visual impact on the primary historic house. The structure is designed to be compatible with the historic character of the landmark with wood siding, wood garage doors, true divided-light windows, and a standing-seam metal roof. The second-floor suite is accessed via an exterior stair located on the rear elevation.

Exterior lighting associated with the garage consists of three gooseneck fixtures modeled after agricultural lighting commonly used on 1930s-era barns and outbuildings. Landscaping and site features are designed to retain existing mature vegetation and preserve the overall ratio of green space to paved area.

*Copies of any of the designation reports and other information regarding agenda items available by calling (919) 833-6404 or e-mailing info@cappresinc.org

Mr. Bradham provided the following relevant *Principles and Standards* for the proposed work:

Settings & Site Features

2.1.1. Retain and preserve the historic setting of the landmark, including the visual and associative characteristics of the site that contribute to the overall historic character of the landmark building, structure, or site.

2.1.2. Maintain and protect the visual and associative characteristics of the landmark setting established by the relationship of the landmark to its site, including site topography, significant views and vistas, accessory structures, roads, walkways, fences, walls, and plantings.

2.1.3. Introduce new site features, building additions, and independent structures in ways that are compatible with the visual and associative characteristics of the landmark's setting.

2.1.4. It is not appropriate to introduce or remove a site feature or element if it will substantially diminish or radically alter the visual and associative characteristics of the landmark setting.

2.4.6. Introduce new walkways, driveways, or parking areas, if necessary, which are compatible with the overall historic character of the landmark and site. Consider location, scale, materials, and configuration when determining compatibility. Retain the general site topography and any significant landscape or site features. It is not appropriate to diminish or substantially alter the overall historic character of the landmark site through the introduction of new walkways, driveways, or parking areas or through the introduction of inappropriate materials.

2.4.7. Locate new parking areas unobtrusively in locations that do not diminish or intrude upon character-defining elevations of the landmark or important site features. Incorporate existing mature vegetation, if possible, and introduce additional perimeter landscaping or screening to lessen the impact of new parking areas. Subdivide large parking areas with planting strips. It is not appropriate to radically reduce the overall ratio of green space to paved area on a landmark site.

2.4.8. Protect mature vegetation and significant site features from damage caused by the construction of new walkways, driveways, and parking areas.

2.7.5. Introduce new exterior lighting, if necessary, that is compatible with the historic landmark and site in character and scale. Consider compatibility of a proposed fixture in terms of location, appearance, material, scale, color, finish, and lighting brightness. It is not appropriate to introduce new lighting that diminishes the overall historic character of the landmark or site. For example, it is not appropriate to introduce period lighting fixtures predating the landmark in an attempt that serves to create a false historical appearance.

2.7.6. Locate new exterior lighting carefully to maintain the overall historic character of the landmark and site. In reviewing a proposed location consider the height, direction, brightness, and color of the light source. It is not appropriate to indiscriminately light a landmark site or to over illuminate a landmark facade.

2.7.7. Locate lighting for security and safety discreetly and in ways that are consistent with the historic character of the landmark and site. Consider low-level lighting sources to meet safety or security needs. If needed, locate footlights, recessed lighting, post lights or directional lights unobtrusively so they do not diminish the character of the landmark or site. For most landmarks, it is not appropriate to install security lights on standard height power poles.

New Construction & Additions

4.4.2. Introduce new outbuildings and accessory buildings, if necessary, that are compatible with the historic character of the primary historic building, any contributing secondary buildings, and the site. Consider compatibility of a proposed structure in terms of location, form, roof shape, height, size, scale, materials, detail, and finish. Introduce simple, utilitarian structures, if needed, only in locations that will not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark building and site.

4.4.3. Locate new outbuildings and accessory buildings carefully to maintain the overall visual and spatial character of the landmark site. Consider the relationship to the primary landmark building and any accessory structures in terms of setback, spacing, and orientation. It is not appropriate to introduce a new outbuilding or accessory structure in a location that will require the removal of a significant site feature, planting, or building element.

4.4.4. Avoid damage to significant site features, including archaeological resources and mature trees, by limiting excavation and grading related to the new construction work. Protect such site features from damage due to the use of heavy equipment or other construction-related activities as well.

4.4.5. Design new secondary buildings to be compatible with but differentiated from the primary historic building and any historic secondary buildings on the site. It is not appropriate to attempt to make a new secondary building duplicate a historic secondary building unless an accurate reconstruction is undertaken.

Staff recommended approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, finding that the proposed garage and driveway meet the applicable Principles and Standards and will not diminish the overall historic character of the landmark or site.

With no further questions from the commission and no speakers in favor of or opposed to the application, the public hearing was closed.

With no discussion, Ms. Beach offered the following motion:

"I move that the WCHPC find and conclude that the construction of a new secondary garage building and installation of a tar and chip driveway at the John B. and Nancy Strain House is (is not) in accordance with the following Wake County Principles and Standards for *Setting & Site Features and New Construction & Additions* as fully read into the record by staff:

- 2.1.1.**
- 2.1.2.**
- 2.1.3.**
- 2.1.4.**

2.4.6.
2.4.7.
2.4.8.

2.7.5.
2.7.6.
2.7.7.

4.4.2.
4.4.3.
4.4.4.
4.4.5.

Findings and Conclusions:

- 1) The new secondary building will be a detached two-car garage measuring 24' x 24' with a second-story accessory dwelling unit and will be compatible with the historic character of the primary historic building and the site.
- 2) The new secondary garage building is designed to be compatible but differentiated from the primary structure while echoing the architectural style, materials and details of the historic house. Pine siding, a brick foundation, a standing seam metal roof, and exterior doors will match the primary historic building.
- 3) The new secondary garage building will not diminish, conceal or detract from the character of primary historic building and the site.
- 4) The driveway will be constructed of tar and chip to mimic a natural path and will not diminish or substantially alter the overall historic character of the landmark site.
- 5) New gooseneck exterior garage lights will be installed on the new secondary garage building, which have their origin in 1930's agricultural settings for barns and farmyards and will be compatible with the historic landmark and site in character and scale."

Upon a second by Mr. Turner and with no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Beach offered the following motion: "Based on the preceding findings and conclusions derived from the relevant Wake County Principles and Standards, I move that the Commission grant (*does not grant*) a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new secondary garage building and installation of a tar and chip driveway at the John B. and Nancy Strain House."

Upon a second by Ms. Prince and with no discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

N.B. Mr. Roth noted that the commission should keep this COA in mind when discussing alternative materials with the consultants. This was just approved with everything as wood under the current Wake County Principles and Standards.

(Mr. Hastings arrived at the end of the public hearing)

5. Principles and Standards Draft Review and Discussion w/Consultants Katie Cook & Cassandra Talley, Loggia, LLC via Zoom

The consultants presented the structure and organization of the draft document, noting that the existing "Things to Consider" and "Standards" sections had been merged into streamlined, numbered standards with introductory text.

New sections added to the draft include architectural styles, adaptive reuse, evaluating changes over time, maintenance, disaster preparedness and resiliency, pools and accessory site features, storm windows and shutters, and streetscapes and alleys. The consultants explained that the guidelines are intended to function primarily as a digital document with a linked table of contents and color-coded sections for ease of navigation.

Commission members provided detailed feedback on the organization and substance of the draft. Significant discussion focused on the treatment of maintenance standards, with members expressing concern that routine maintenance items not requiring Certificates of Appropriateness may be more appropriately framed as best practices rather than enforceable standards.

Additional discussion addressed alternative materials, with consensus that alternative materials should only be considered after repair or restoration options and must closely match historic materials in appearance, scale, texture, and finish. Commission members emphasized that approval of alternative materials is discretionary and not precedent-setting.

The masonry section prompted discussion regarding the use of Portland cement in historic brickwork. Commission members reiterated that Portland cement should be discouraged for pre-1940s masonry and that lime-based or Type N mortar is more appropriate for historic brick.

Driveway and paving materials were also discussed at length, including the appropriateness of tar-and-chip, pavers, stamped asphalt, and stamped concrete depending on the age of the property. Plain asphalt and plain concrete were generally noted as inappropriate for properties constructed prior to World War II.

Commission members were encouraged to submit written comments through the shared Dropbox document. The comment period will remain open through the end of November, after which consultants will prepare the next draft for commission review.

6. Staff Report

- A. Reappointments to the WCHPC: Mr. Roth reported that several commission member terms will be expiring in the coming year. Staff will confirm term expiration dates with the County and provide guidance to current members regarding the reappointment process and required timelines. Additional information will be circulated once confirmation is received from the Clerk to the Board of Commissioners.
- B. Preservation Celebration May 3, 2026 – Good Hope Baptist Church, Shotwell: Mr. Roth reported that planning is underway for the 2026 Wake County Preservation Celebration, scheduled for Sunday, May 3, 2026, at Good Hope Baptist Church in Shotwell. Staff noted that coordination will continue with church representatives

and the event outreach committee regarding site logistics, program format, and setup needs. Commission members were encouraged to reserve the date.

- C. Potential Landmark Candidates: Mr. Roth encouraged commission members to continue identifying and sharing information on potential landmark candidates throughout the county, particularly properties that may be vulnerable to redevelopment or deterioration. Members were asked to forward any recommendations to staff for preliminary evaluation.
- D. CLG Training: Mr. Roth noted that upcoming Certified Local Government (CLG) training opportunities will be shared with commission members as dates become available. Members were encouraged to participate as part of continuing education and compliance with CLG program requirements.

(Mr. Feters arrived during the Staff Report)

- E. New Procedural Changes: Mr. Roth provided a brief update regarding implementation of new procedural requirements under NCGS 160D, including the requirement for formal signed orders for Certificates of Appropriateness. Staff stated that internal procedures are being reviewed to ensure consistency and compliance moving forward.

7. Old Business: None.

8. New Business: Mr. Turner stated that he has informed Staff of the dates and times that the Governor's Mansion would be open in December for tours to those that are interested.

9. Other Business: None.

10. Chair's Report: Mr. Hastings wished everyone a wonderful Thanksgiving and safe travels.

11. Adjourned: Hearing no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:42pm.

Jeremy Bradham
Secretary