

**GUILFORD COUNTY  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room  
First Floor, Old Guilford County Courthouse  
301 W Market St, Greensboro, NC 27401

**March 17, 2026**

**Regular Meeting**

**6:00 p.m.**

**I. Roll Call**

Chair Dowell called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Mr. Moss called the roll of members in attendance:

**Present:** Sean Dowell, Chair; Abigaile Pittman, Vice Chair; Terry Hammond; Jerry Nix; Keisha Hadden; Louis Gallien; Haley Moloney

**Absent:** Cory Rayborn (excused); Christie Lee (excused)

The following Guilford County staff members were also present: Jason Hardin, Planning and Development Deputy Director; Avery Tew, Senior Planner; Troy Moss, Planner I; Joel Almquist, Zoning Compliance Officer.

**II. Agenda Amendments**

None

**III. Approval of Minutes: January 20, 2026**

Mr. Gallien pointed out a small error on page 5, paragraph 7, sentence 2: there was a typo in the word "brochure."

Mr. Gallien moved to approve the minutes, as corrected. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hammond. The Commission voted unanimously, 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Dowell, Pittman, Hammond, Nix, Hadden, Gallien, Moloney. Nays: None.)

**IV. Rules and Procedures**

Chair Dowell read and explained the Rules and Procedures followed by the Historic Preservation Commission.

**V. Old Business**

None

**VI. New Business****Legislative Hearing Item(s)****A. LANDMARK DESIGNATION CASE #26-01-HPC-00001: 803 HOOD PL, GREENSBORO, NC 27408 (ALICE FAIRCHILD & JOHN K. VOEHRINGER, JR. HOUSE) (POSTPONED TO APRIL 21 MEETING)**

Chair Dowell asked if any of the Commission members had any conflicts of interest regarding this case? Ms. Moloney stated that she is the consultant who prepared the landmark report for this property, and she would be giving the presentation on behalf of the owner. She requested to be recused.

Chair Dowell asked the Commission members if Ms. Moloney presenting the landmark designation application would prevent them from making an impartial decision on the request. Each Commission member confirmed that they would be able to make an impartial decision.

Chair Dowell moved to recuse Ms. Moloney, as requested. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Pittman. The Commission voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Dowell, Pittman, Hammond, Nix, Hadden, Gallien. Nays: None.)

Mr. Tew presented the staff report regarding the landmark designation request. He stated that the subject property is located at 803 Hood Place (Guilford County Tax Parcel #9831), approximately 270 feet north of the intersection of Sunset Drive and Hood Place and comprises approximately 0.89 acres. The proposed designation includes the entire 0.89-acre lot, the exterior of the house, and specific interior features including exterior doors, entryways, grand staircase, and French doors.

Haley Moloney, 6260 Ledbetter Road, Climax, NC, stated that the property owners are requesting to designate the lot, the exterior of the home, and interior elements including the exterior doors, entryways, grand staircase, and French doors. The property is located directly across from the golf course in Irving Park. It is listed as a part of the National Register nomination for Irving Park Historic District. The house is primarily in the Tudor Revival style, but it does have some French Provincial refinement. The structure material is stucco with half-cut timber showing the Tudor Revival side of the design. The house is significant in that it was commissioned by John K. Voehringer and his wife. He was one of the heads of the Mock, Judson, Voehringer Company Hosiery Mill. His wife was a predominant socialite in Greensboro and a co-steward of the house. The house is culturally significant to the area with the period of significance being 1936 through 1953. The exterior is intact and well taken care of. The owners have kept to the original design and color scheme. The garden has linear sections as would an English townhome, thereby following the Tudor Revival style. The main entryway is exemplary of the Tudor Revival style, with big, heavy woodwork. The owner also has the original mailbox. She pointed out the diamond casement windows on the side. For the main entryway, Ms. Moloney stated that the paneled wood on the interior, which was original to the home, was most important. The secondary entrance shows French Provincial design, with slate on the exterior walk, as well as on the interior of the entryway. She pointed out the grand staircase in the main foyer, which is original to the design and shows all the architectural elements that fit the time period. The home is all very well kept and there have been no major changes. The French doors on the rear side of the home are all original and have been well maintained.

There are also French doors in another room in the home, which are also original. Ms. Moloney added that the Voehringers played a big role in the textile history of Greensboro.

Mr. Gallien asked about the chain of title for the property. Mr. Sanders Cockman, 803 Hood Place, Greensboro, NC, the owner of the subject property, said the property had been gifted by the Berry family to the First Presbyterian Church, and that he had purchased the property from the Church. Mr. Gallien asked whether a parson had ever lived at this house? Mr. Cockman responded that he was not aware of a parson residing on the property.

Ms. Moloney pointed out that the Alice Voehringer was associated with the First Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Gallien said that the Ellison House, which used to be the Saperstein House, was another house of the Tudor Style which was built around the same time as the Voehringer House. He asked if the two houses were designed by the same architect as the Voehringer House? Mr. Cockman responded that it was not.

Ms. Moloney stated that what made the Voehringer House unique compared to other Tudor Style houses is that it also has French Provincial elements.

Mr. Gallien asked whether the French doors were original to the home? Ms. Moloney responded that she thought they were. Mr. Cockman said that the French doors toward the rear of the home were original.

Mr. Gallien asked about the extent of renovations by previous owners? Mr. Cockman responded that the kitchen had been redone and the hardwood floors had been refinished. The upstairs bedroom and bathroom had been redesigned almost into a hotel room. The previous owners had also converted a section of the garage into a separate apartment.

Chair Dowell mentioned that the Irving Park Historic District National Register nomination dates to 1994. He asked whether there had been substantial changes to the property since that time? Ms. Moloney responded that there had not been. She added that any changes that had taken place since that time were restorative in nature, rather than renovative.

Mr. Cockman stated that some of the glass on the back of the home was not original, owing to damage that had occurred over the years.

Ms. Hammond pointed out that there were two sets of French doors on the home. She asked whether the designation application was intended to include both sets of French doors? Ms. Moloney responded that the two sets had distinct designs, but the application was intended to request designation of all French doors on the home.

Ms. Hammond asked for clarification on what elements of the lot were proposed for designation. Ms. Moloney responded that the application requested designation of the entire lot that the home sits on, so exterior features like the driveway and garden structures would be included.

Mr. Nix asked for clarification on what components of the exterior of the home were included in the request. Ms. Moloney responded that the request was to designate the entire exterior of the home, including elements such as the windows, doors, stucco, and half-timber frames.

Mr. Gallien asked whether the timber in the sunroom would be included in the designation. Ms. Moloney responded that that was not included in the request. The interior features included in the request are limited to the exterior doors, entryways, grand staircase, and French doors.

Mr. Nix asked why the request did not include more interior features? Mr. Cockman responded that he and his wife wished to leave the upstairs portion of the house out of the designation. He added that they also did not wish to designate the kitchen because if someone else were to move into the house, they may want to change the kitchen.

Mr. Nix said that designating additional interior features was an effective way to preserve historic elements from changes by future owners. Mr. Cockman responded that he would defer to his wife on that question. Ms. Hadden added that designating additional interior features may result in a greater tax deferment. Ms. Moloney stated that much of the interior of the house was not included in the designation request because it had been redone. She considered the entryways and exterior doors to be integral to the style of the home, which was why they were included in the request.

Vice Chair Pittman asked whether the interior trim was original? Ms. Moloney responded that it was original. Mr. Cockman clarified that the trim was original in some places, but not all. The upstairs trim was not original.

Vice Chair Pittman asked whether the fireplaces and mantels were original? Mr. Cockman responded that one was original and three were not.

Mr. Gallien asked about the process of adding additional interior features to the designation. Mr. Tew responded that if the property were to be designated as requested in the current application, then the applicant could return at a later date to request an amendment to the designation to add additional interior features. Mr. Gallien asked if the property owner could add features to the request at the meeting? Mr. Tew asked whether the property was jointly owned by Mr. Cockman and his wife. Mr. Cockman confirmed that it was. Mr. Tew stated that both property owners should consent in writing to the changes.

Chair Dowell asked if Mr. Cockman would discuss adding additional interior features to the designation with his wife? Mr. Cockman said he would like to move forward with the current request, but he would discuss it with his wife.

Chair Dowell suggested that designating additional interior features would have a direct impact on the resulting tax deferment for the property. Mr. Hardin clarified that historic property tax deferments are administered for local historic landmarks by the Guilford County Tax Department based on what is listed as designated in each landmark's designation ordinance. He said he could not speak to how much of a tax deferment this property would receive based on the list of features to be designated, as that calculation is performed by the Tax Department and not a function of the landmark designation application which is reviewed by the Commission.

There being no other speakers, Chair Dowell closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Chair Dowell stated that he had asked staff to include information about the Mock, Judson, Voehringer Company Hosiery Mill. This building is another Guilford County local historic landmark, and it is also listed in the National Register. It is located near the University of North Carolina at Greensboro campus and was designated for its impact on industry. John Voehringer was associated with both the mill and the house. There is only one other local historic landmark in the neighborhood, the Alexander Worth McAllister House, located at 700 Country Club Drive, constructed in 1918 in the Colonial Revival style. The period between 1936 and 1941 was the second busiest time period for construction in the neighborhood and included the construction of the Voehringer House. He felt that this property was an important representative of that time period.

Ms. Hammond mentioned that there was not a lot of information about the architect included in the landmark report. She noted that he was also the architect for the J. Spencer Love House, which no longer existed. The architect had also designed other homes in Greensboro and the region. He had studied with Charles Hartmann, who had designed the Mock, Judson, Voehringer Company Hosiery Mill building. She said the landmark report was important because it would be sent to the governing body and included in the County's files, so she thought it should include as much information as possible.

Mr. Nix pointed out that the significance of the Voehringer House was enhanced by the fact that it was constructed during the Great Depression. It was unique that a building like this was constructed in Greensboro at that time, and Voehringer and his company, were associated with important historical events such as the shift from an agrarian economy to a more industrial one. He thought it was important for the landmark report to include a chain of title for the property, historic photos, and biographies of the owners.

Mr. Gallien asked where Alice Voehringer was from and her maiden name? Ms. Moloney responded that she thought Ms. Voehringer was from Greensboro and her maiden name was Boyd.

Ms. Hadden felt that she had to dig for information that should be presented up front in the landmark report.

Chair Dowell stated that the Commission could recommend approval or denial of the request, as submitted, or they could vote to continue the case to the next meeting. He asked how each Commission member felt about how this application should be handled?

Mr. Nix thought the case should be continued because the Commission needed additional information to be included in the landmark report, including historic photos, a chain of title, and information about the property owners, architect, and landscape architect. Additionally, he felt that the applicant should consider adding additional interior features to the designation request.

Ms. Pittman stated that the report should include information about other examples of structures designed by the architect of the Voehringer House. She agreed that the case should be continued.

Mr. Gallien said that he would vote to recommend approval of the designation request as submitted. He said that the property owners had put a lot of time and money into the property and he did not want to discourage them from seeking landmark designation. He felt that the application was complete. The property owners could come back with another application to amend the designation to add additional interior features if they chose to.

Chair Dowell thought there was a case to recommend designation of the property, but there is a better case to continue the case in order to allow additional information to be included in the report. He said he would like to see a stronger story told through the report, including connecting the Voehringer House to other designated landmark properties.

Ms. Hammond said she would like to see more information included in the report. She thought that if they did not ask for more information it would not be provided. However, she pointed out that the report, as submitted, included the information listed as required in the application. She also understood that continuing the case could be interpreted as changing the rules in the middle of the game, and it was always possible for the report to be improved. Ultimately, she said she thought the Commission should vote on the application as-is. If the property owners came back with another application to amend the landmark designation to include additional interior features, then they could ask for more detail in the landmark report at that time.

Chair Dowell asked how an application to amend the landmark designation would work? Mr. Hardin responded that it would be processed the same way as any application for landmark designation. There would be review by staff for application completeness, submission to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for comments, and then the request would be presented to the Commission.

Ms. Hadden stated that the information being requested was required in the application. She said that a better application had a better chance of being approved by the State. Mr. Tew clarified that the role of the SHPO was to review the landmark report and offer advisory comments prior to the HPC's consideration of the designation request. He said that he had already sent the report to the SHPO and their comments stated that they felt the application was sufficient to guide the Commission in making an informed decision. Ms. Hadden thought the request should be continued to allow the applicant to include more information in the report.

Chair Dowell asked staff for input. Mr. Tew stated that the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) allows the Commission to make a recommendation of approval or denial or to postpone the decision for a period of up to 60 days. As a result, the Commission could postpone the decision to the April 21 regular meeting, but not the May 19 meeting.

Ms. Hammond moved that the Commission continue the case until the April 21, 2026, regular meeting to be held in the Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room at 6:00 p.m., in order to gather more information, including: older pictures of the house, if available; biographies of the owners; additional information about the landscape architect; more information about the significance of the architect, as well as who he studied with and other homes he designed; the link to the Mock, Judson, Voehringer Hosiery Mill; information about how the home was built during the Great Depression and how that impacts the home's significance; and a summary paragraph at the beginning of the report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Nix. Mr. Gallien stated that he would abstain from this vote.<sup>1</sup> The Commission voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Dowell, Pittman, Hammond, Nix, Hadden, Gallien. Nays: None. Recused: Moloney.)

At this time, Ms. Moloney returned to her seat for the remainder of the meeting.

## **VII. Other Business**

None

## **VIII. Staff Updates**

### **A. Landmark Index Project Update**

Mr. Moss stated that he was still working on the landmark index project, but he had not been able to add any additional landmarks to the index since the last meeting. He added a column to the index tracker provided in the meeting packet showing which landmarks had been added each month.

Mr. Gallien said he had not been at the last meeting, but he had read through the minutes. He asked if he was interpreting the minutes correctly that Ms. Moloney had volunteered to perform some of the inventory work. Ms. Moloney responded that she was already working on putting together information about historic properties for America 250 NC. She planned to pull out the section about landmark properties and turn it into a book, but this was different from performing a historic resources inventory.

Mr. Hardin pointed out that the landmark index was started in an attempt to investigate and provide more context for past landmark designations and is separate from Ms. Moloney's project.

Chair Dowell asked if any conversations about previous interior designations would need to wait until the landmark index was completed? Mr. Hardin responded that it is staff's goal to complete the landmark index by the end of the year. Chair Dowell said he appreciated how much work was going into the landmark index, and he emphasized that it would be very useful once completed.

Mr. Gallien asked whether there was a systemic issue with staff workloads, and if the Commission could request that an additional staff member or intern be hired? Mr. Hardin responded that there had not been any discussion about hiring an intern at this point. Mr. Gallien asked if the HPC could make a formal recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to include an additional hire in the County budget? Mr. Hardin said it was the responsibility of department directors to make budget requests in coordination with the County Manager's Office. He said he will investigate possible staff support options for the project. Possibly, an intern position as Ms. Moloney had pointed out in partnership with High Point University. Mr. Hardin asked Ms. Moloney to send him the contact information for the contact with the university he could contact regarding their program. She responded that she would send that information over.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 5.6.2.B of the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission Rules of Procedure states, "A failure to vote by a member who is physically present at the hearing, or who has withdrawn without having been excused or recused by the HPC, shall be recorded as an affirmative vote."

Ms. Hammond asked if a volunteer could help with some of the administrative work? Mr. Moss stated that the relevant files were located in the shared drive that the HPC members have access to if they wish to assist. Ms. Moloney suggested that they could make use of students. Mr. Hardin stated that he would look into it and reach out to the contact person with High Point University.

## **B. Review Revised Landmark Application and Bulletin**

Mr. Hardin mentioned that the landmark designation application form had been brought to the HPC previously for review, and staff got feedback that there should be more detailed explanation of the process. There is an existing landmark designation bulletin that staff have updated to correct some outdated information. The bulletin is intended to provide greater context for the application, whereas the application form itself is only intended to outline the general requirements. The bulletin has been provided for review by the Commission, as well as the updated application form.

Mr. Nix stated that there needs to be communication between whoever is going to write the application and staff about what is required. The application should provide a detailed list or outline so there is no need to guess about what documentation is required. It would also be nice for the Commission to have a discussion about a landmark designation request before an application is submitted, in order to bring out important facts to explore prior to the final application.

Ms. Moloney suggested that landmark designation requests could come before the Commission for a preliminary review during the SHPO's required comment period of up to 30 days. Chair Dowell stated that staff send landmark designation applications to the Chair and Vice Chair to determine whether a preliminary review would be necessary. Ms. Hammond mentioned that she did not think applications should receive preliminary review from only the Chair and Vice Chair.

Chair Dowell asked whether applications could be shared with the Commission prior to the public hearing. Vice Chair Pittman responded that she did not think it would be appropriate for Commission members to discuss the application over email. Chair Dowell suggested that each Commission member could individually send their comments to staff in order to avoid a group discussion. Mr. Tew responded that a pre-application review where each Commission member submitted individual review comments might undermine the goal of objective, straightforward application requirements.

Mr. Hardin stated that if the Commission wished to have input earlier in the process, his suggestion would be to go back to the previous process where there were two meetings for each landmark designation request. Mr. Tew said that the procedure for landmark designation describes an initial HPC application review for landmark designation requests, to be held at staff discretion. Following discussions with the Chair and Vice Chair at the time, there was an interest in streamlining the landmark designation application process. Therefore, the initial application review meeting had not been required for some time. He said the initial application review meeting could be reimplemented if the HPC found it valuable.

Ms. Moloney mentioned that she liked the idea of streamlining the application process. However, any changes to the landmark designation application should be implemented on a calendar year basis to avoid abrupt, unexpected changes to submittal requirements. Chair Dowell responded that the requirements were being clarified rather than modified.

Mr. Hardin stated that some procedural requirements and formatting had changed on the application, but the requirements had not been changed. Mr. Tew added that the updated application was still in draft form and had not gone live for distribution, yet. If someone wanted to apply for landmark designation today, they would not receive the updated application form.

Ms. Hadden thought it would be helpful to include an example of a landmark report in the application.

Chair Dowell felt that the application should emphasize that applicants need to make their case for landmark designation before the Commission. He also thought the application should clarify that the governing board of the applicable jurisdiction would make the final decision on the application. He added that the application could include a link to the National Park Service.

Chair Dowell asked about the need for a pre-application meeting with staff? Mr. Hardin clarified that the purpose of the pre-application meeting was for staff to explain the requirements for a complete application. Chair Dowell asked whether staff only reviewed for completeness or whether they also looked at the content of the application during these meetings? Mr. Hardin responded that staff's role was to determine completeness, but it was up to the Commission to decide whether the content of the application was sufficient to warrant designation.

Chair Dowell mentioned that the application could also inform the applicant about resources like Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. Ms. Moloney noted that the Sanborn maps do not show every building.

Vice Chair Pittman pointed out that the application states that "maps may be on separate sheets." She thought the maps should be required to be on separate sheets.

Ms. Moloney thought that the application should include an example of a map that has not been prepared by a professional, which would be prohibitively expensive for some applicants. Mr. Hardin responded that the application includes an example of a map taken from the County's GIS map, which is a more accessible example. Mr. Nix mentioned that in the early days of the HPC it was not uncommon to have hand-drawn maps. Later, it was realized that a more precise legal description was necessary in some cases.

Mr. Nix stated that he felt that the Commissioners should be given an opportunity to visit each property that is requested for landmark designation.

Chair Dowell suggested that the application could include a section for the applicant to indicate the reason why the property is significant, similar to how National Register nominations are required to indicate the specific criteria they meet. Mr. Tew responded that the application requires the applicant to document the property's significance and integrity as laid out in State Statute. Ms. Moloney asked whether the significance ultimately had to be tied back to architecture.

Mr. Tew responded that his understanding was that it was not necessary for a historic landmark to be architecturally significant. For example, a site could be designated as a historic landmark for its association with important historic events even if it was not outstanding in terms of its architecture. Ms. Moloney suggested a more structured section of the application where the applicant could indicate why and how the property is significant.

Ms. Hadden said there should be a brief summary of the application presented as a single sentence or paragraph at the beginning of the landmark report.

Chair Dowell stated there were contradictory instructions on how photos should be labeled as part of the application.

Mr. Nix thought the application and report should be self-contained, and any supporting information should be supplemental to the application, rather than being necessary to understand the request.

Chair Dowell requested that applications list nearby historic landmarks. Ms. Moloney said that an average homeowner was unlikely to know of nearby landmarks. Maybe if they hired a consultant they would be able to provide that information. Ms. Hammond thought that information on nearby landmarks would not necessarily impact the Commission's decision. Vice Chair Pittman pointed out that this information could be included by staff in the staff report, rather than in the application. Mr. Hardin asked about the criteria for including information about nearby landmarks. Should the staff report include all landmarks within a one-mile radius or other distance? Chair Dowell responded that the staff report should list the three closest landmarks, regardless of distance.

Mr. Hardin stated that he had spoken with SHPO staff about potential projects for a Certified Local Government (CLG) grant application. Publication was not an allowable cost for CLG funds. If there is an architectural survey, CLG can pay for the costs to compile the document, but not the physical publication of it. There are several ongoing architectural surveys around the state, and they indicated their intent to prioritize surveying the western part of the state and places affected by Helene which do not have an architectural survey. SHPO staff were unsure if a survey would be funded for Guilford County this year, but staff can still submit an application. Ms. Moloney thought SHPO staff probably have a good idea of what would be funded. Mr. Hardin asked for the Commission members' opinions on whether staff should try to move forward with a grant application. Ms. Moloney responded that grant writing would take a significant amount of time, and she felt staff's time would be better spent on other projects like the landmark index. She added that there were ongoing architectural surveys in the City of Greensboro and possibly the City of High Point, so she thought it might be more difficult to acquire funding for the unincorporated areas of the County. Ms. Hammond agreed that staff resources would be better directed toward other work. Consensus of the Commission was to not move forward with a CLG grant application in 2026.

Mr. Nix asked whether there had been any further discussions between the County and the City of Greensboro about how landmark properties within one of the City's historic districts would be handled. Mr. Hardin responded that there had been a meeting several months ago, and the County Attorney's interpretation was that the City's Historic Preservation Commission would have review authority within their historic districts for landmark properties.

He said this was still an active interpretation. Mr. Nix asked whether the City's HPC would review interior work. Mr. Hardin responded that he was not sure, but the County Attorney's interpretation was that the County HPC did not have review authority within the City's historic districts including landmark properties. Ms. Moloney said she thought there might be disagreement between the City and County on this issue.

Mr. Nix asked whether staff had any updates about landmark properties that have been annexed into the City of Burlington. Mr. Hardin responded that he had attempted to reach the City of Burlington within the past week and over the past several months and had not heard back. Mr. Nix said that the John B. Low House was completely surrounded by a new distribution center development within the City of Burlington. He was concerned about the Low House property being annexed. Mr. Hardin clarified that previous legislation in 2011 eliminated involuntary annexation, so any annexation of the property would require the property owner's consent.

Chair Dowell stated that there were several properties that needed to be inspected for deterioration or violations. Mr. Hardin responded that he had sent a list of potential violations, as submitted from the Commission, on landmark properties to Joel Almquist, Zoning Compliance Officer to investigate.

#### **IX. Commissioner Updates**

Ms. Moloney stated that the America 250 NC time capsule dedication would take place on April 18 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the High Point Museum, and all are welcome to attend. Any donations or additions to the capsule should be submitted soon. They are not sealing the capsule on April 18, but they are beginning to fill it at that time, after which it will be stored at the High Point Museum. They need volunteers to help with the event if anyone is interested.

Vice Chair Pittman asked whether the Commission members would have funding to attend the Preservation NC conference in High Point later this year. Mr. Hardin responded that the budget was still in development by the County Manager and Board of Commissioners, but we did submit a request for that funding in the initial budget request.

Chair Dowell stated that the Minneola Manufacturing Company Cloth Warehouse was designated as a local historic landmark by the Gibsonville Board of Aldermen.

#### **X. Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Commission, Chair Dowell adjourned the meeting by acclamation at 8:57 p.m.

***The next regular meeting of the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission is scheduled for April 21, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room, located on the first floor of the Old Guilford County Courthouse, 301 W Market St, Greensboro, NC 27401.***