

**MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
January 4, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Kapp, Chairman, Max Preston, Stephanie Trueblood, Susanne Vergara., Barbara Church, Jessica Dockery

STAFF: Margaret Hawth

GUESTS: Stephen Roberts, Larry Carroll, Jr., Ken Garrison, Brenda Garrison, Bill Lacy

ITEM #1: Call to order and confirmation of quorum.

Mr. Kapp called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Hawth called the role, confirming all members as present.

ITEM #2: Reading of the Commission's Mission Statement and process introduction.

Mr. Kapp read the Commission's Mission Statement and described the meeting process.

ITEM #3: Additions to the agenda & agenda adjustments.

- Ms. Hawth advised that Ms. Dockery had reminded her that a brief word was needed on the quarterly meetings under Staff Updates at the end of the Commission's meeting.
- Mr. Kapp requested a statement from Ms. Hawth regarding Ms. Trueblood's role in the Planning Department. Ms. Hawth reported that Ms. Trueblood had begun work as a part-time temporary employee in the Planning Department and will be working on Monday and Wednesday afternoons helping with administrative tasks. It is possible that she will work with applicants who come before the Commission, but it will be made very clear to the applicants that she is temporary staff, but they will also see her at the meetings. The Town Attorney had been consulted, and he had said that there is nothing which prevents Ms. Trueblood from remaining on the Commission and being part-time temporary staff. She expressed gratitude for the help and hoped that the endorsements previously expressed by the members were still good.

Mr. Kapp stated that he was very glad that Ms. Trueblood had agreed to take on the added task, and, speaking for the Commission, added that they were very confident that she will do the job with as much zest and diligence as she does in her service on the Commission. He thanked Ms. Trueblood.

- Mr. Kapp then added that the North Carolina Building Council had approved the use of the North Carolina Rehabilitation Code as the State Code for Existing Buildings. He felt that this is a great accomplishment and will be a great tool for people who are rehabilitating both historic buildings and existing buildings throughout the state. He encouraged everyone to consult the Rehab. Code online at www.ncrehabcode.com.

MOTION: Mr. Kapp made a motion that the Commission have staff write a letter on its behalf to the Orange County Building Inspections Department, stating that it is happy that the Rehab. Code is becoming a building code in North Carolina.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Preston for understanding restated that the Commission was not recommending the Code but simply saying that it is happy it's being adopted.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #4: Adoption of the minutes:

Mr. Kapp requested approval of the Minutes from the December 7, 2005 meeting and asked for any needed revisions.

Ms. Trueblood noted that under Item #5 where it says, "small decorative spear," it's actually sphere. Also under #6 on page 4 of 8 in the third paragraph, the word "value" was left out and should be added to reflect the correct meaning of the sentence. Ms Vergara noted that her name was misspelled.

Ms. Hauth asked the Commission members if they felt the minutes were too detailed or if, as they had requested at a previous meeting, they wished to have only the topics, findings of fact, and motions recorded. Ms. Trueblood commented that the Zoning Ordinance called for the recording of discussions. Ms. Hauth commented that she felt the detailed minutes would prove more useful in the long term as a historical document and when questions arise. Mr. Kapp added that he had been a little uncomfortable with the detail but had been convinced by Ms. Trueblood.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to accept the minutes as amended.
SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.
VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #5: Consideration of application from Stephen Roberts to replace second floor windows with metal clad wood frame casement windows at 105 W. King Street (TMBL 4.30.C.2&2a)

Ms. Hauth and Mr. Roberts were sworn in by Mr. Kapp. Mr. Kapp asked if anyone else was present to speak to the application and no one came forward.

Ms. Hauth presented the details of the property at 105 W. King which is actually two parcels. The upstairs windows are what are in question to be replaced. The adjoining properties to the east and south are contributing as well as two properties across the street. The property itself at 105 is not listed as a contributing structure as the inventory notes that it is probably a replacement storefront. The request is to replace the existing metal frame windows with metal-clad, wood frame casement windows. The project would involve three double windows and a single window altogether.

The relevant guidelines are storefronts on Pages 30 and 31 and windows on Pages 18 and 19. Relevant standards of evaluation per Ms. Hauth would be materials, which is "C" and "F" details with width and height of windows. There is no proposed change to the opening size. There would be custom windows that would be replacement.

Mr. Kapp inquired of Ms. Hauth if there had been any statements, and she responded that there had not.

Mr. Roberts showed the Commissioners a window sample which he had brought. He informed the members that it was a Monarch metal-clad window, casement. Ms. Dockery asked if it would be painted. Mr. Roberts stated that the window would be white. Mr. Kapp called the Commission's attention to the fact that attached to the application were cut sheets showing the window light configurations for each of the windows. No decision had been made on keeping the shutters. Mr. Kapp expressed his preference that the shutters be removed, and Mr. Preston stated that he was fine with the shutters staying. Mr. Roberts commented that he had put the shutters up about 15 years ago, and if they are kept, there might be a desire to change the color. Ms. Church asked if the windows operated with a crank on the inside, and Mr. Roberts confirmed that they did.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved that the Commission find as fact that the Roberts application is in keeping with the overall character of the district, and it complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussion of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery
VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to approve the application as submitted.
SECOND: Ms. Vergara
VOTE: Unanimously approved

ITEM #6: Consideration of application from Larry Carroll, Jr., to replace shingles with 3-tab architectural shingles in "weathered wood" and add sign face to existing brick sign at 241 St. Mary's Rd (TMBL 4.31.C.5)

Mr. Larry Carroll, Jr., was sworn in by Mr. Kapp. No one else was present who needed to be sworn in in order to speak on behalf of or in opposition to the application.

Ms. Hauth introduced the application as being for 241 St. Mary's Rd., a former dentist's office. The only contributing property in the immediate vicinity is the Minis house across Thomas Ruffin at 305 St. Mary's. Cameron Park School and St. Mathews are across the street but outside the local district. The building is modern construction and non-contributing. The relevant guidelines would be roof and signs. The roof guidelines on Pages 21 and 22. The signs are on Pages 56 and 57. The sample that is relevant is weathered gray. The relevant standards of evaluation would be texture as it is a change from standard three tab to architectural shingles, roof materials, color, and appurtenant features to cover the sign. She pointed out to the members that they had been provided in their packets with a drawing of the sign that would go within the existing brick sign structure. There were no comments from any of the neighbors.

Mr. Kapp summarized the application as a roof material replacement of existing three tab shingles with architectural shingles and a new wood sign to be placed in the existing sign holder. He called for questions to Ms. Hauth or the applicant.

Mr. Preston asked about what the appearance difference in the shingles would be. Mr. Carroll responded that the new shingle would be a dimensional shingle, a heavier shingle, with more texture, with more of the appearance of a shake. It is exactly like what is on the houses to the left, rear, and right of the property. The current shingles are regular white asphalt shingles. The new shingles would be thicker with a more shadowing look.

Mr. Kapp asked about the colors for the proposed sign and was told they would be black and white. It will be placed on the brick where the existing sign is located.

Mr. Kapp called for a motion of the finding of fact.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved that the Commission find as fact that the Carroll application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussion of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

SECOND: Mr. Preston
VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved that the application be approved as submitted.
SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.
VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #7: Consideration of modifications to an approved application from Ken & Brenda Garrison to change window and door configurations and install tin roof over dining room rather than asphalt shingles due to low pitch at 117 E. Queen Street (TMBL 4.19.F.8)

Ken and Brenda Garrison and builder, Bill Lacy, Jr., were sworn in by Mr. Kapp. No others were present to speak for or against the application.

Ms. Hauth showed a map of the property and informed the Commission that the surrounding properties are evenly split between contributing and non-contributing. Presented were some changes to the approved window layout, windows and doors, and the change in the roof over the dining room. She then proceeded to show what had been approved and what the modifications being requested represented. Guidelines involved are window and roof, Pages 18, 19, 20, and 21. Relevant standards would be details, roof materials, and width and height of door and window openings.

Ms. Hauth advised that there are no changes to the front facade. Continuing, she explained that what had been approved on the rear facade were two single windows in each of the dormers, two pair of French doors in the dining room addition, and then the windows on the back side. The modification is three casement windows together and a French door with sidelights and the same three windows across the back.

Mr. Garrison commented that what was desired was three windows and that they would be somewhat smaller in the same space but with multi-lights. Ms. Hauth added that the type of window was not changing in terms of construction materials. The windows proposed would change from double-hung to casements on the upper story, but basically all the changes are in new construction as the addition and dormers are new. She also showed the change in the dining room roof to metal because of the low slope.

Ms. Church inquired about the location of the new portion and was informed that the dining room is new but in the same footprint as the old house. Mr. Lacy explained that there had been a lot of rot damage and there was no crawl space, so when it was renovated a crawl space had been dug, a foundation put in, and the wall constructed on the old footprint. Mr. Lacy then showed a photograph of the back side of the old dining room and explained that materials had been salvaged when the room was reconstructed and the saltbox dormer added. The roof is a totally different pitch from what had been about a 3 1/2 or 4:12 and is now a 2:12 pitch which cannot be shingled. The plan is to do a peel and seal with standing seams and no exposed nailheads.

Mr. Lacy further explained that they were awaiting approval to go forward with the two French doors with sidelights, and if it was not approved, they would have one door with two sidelights. Ms. Garrison commented that there was not enough wall space on the inside, so they wanted to go with the two sidelights. Mr. Garrison told the Commission that the French doors would have panes which would match the single doors.

Ms. Hauth advised the members that most of the activity was on the back and showed side elevations and the new east elevations. She stated that the old one only showed a double French door in the back. The same kind of windows are on both sides in the new construction. The roof would be completely new with a different pitch from the old. The windows and doors would be larger but of the same type.

Ms. Church asked how it would fit into whatever was behind it that has an almost flat slope, the dining room. Mr. Kapp noted that it was slightly detached. Ms. Hauth explained that there was just a small connection.

Mr. Garrison stated that they had wanted to open the windows in the older part of the house as it had been originally. There were windows closed up and one area made into a bathroom, and they wanted that older section of the house to be as it was when it was built.

Mr. Kapp asked if the metal roof would be painted. Ms. Hauth responded that it would be painted to be similar in color to the shingles on the house. Ms. Garrison said it was a cedar color. Mr. Garrison stated that it was a sealed look that they thought would blend more with the weathered look of the shingles.

Mr. Kapp summarized that the application was a second follow through of an application which had been approved. The windows have been changed. The facade geometry has been changed. And the roof pitch has been changed to be a flatter slope. Ms. Dockery suggested that when a motion was made, it should be clearly stated that rear of the kitchen/Laundry room addition was modified to have three matching windows rather than the two previously approved. Ms. Hauth stated that she had treated the request as a new application and had sent notices to the neighbors. Ms. Trueblood clarified that the roof pitch had not changed since the last application but only the material had changed. The pitch had been approved previously but with shingles which could not be used. Mr. Lacy commented that the other part where he could get a 3:12 would be shingled.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved that it be found as fact that the Garrison application is in overall character of the district and follows all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussion of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

SECOND: Mr. Preston

DISCUSSION: Ms. Vergara asked if the window material had been approved at the last meeting as it said vinyl-clad window on the materials in the agenda packet. Mr. Lacy commented that the spec sheets must be incorrect because they are going with wood windows, as approved. He said they would have the sheets corrected. He further stated that on the existing house, they are building all the old windows that are in there, so they can keep the old depression glass in the old part. New windows will only be used on the new parts. Ms. Garrison advised that they would specify wooden windows.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to approve the application as submitted with the specification that the doors and windows are wood not vinyl clad, that the windows on the drawing which are three, in fact, match the one on the side, and that the color shown is the one used on the metal roof.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Church asked if the windows had true divided lights, and Mr. Garrison responded that they were not but had real, permanent, applied, wood mullions inside and out. So there is the appearance of divided lights.

SECOND: Mr. Preston

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #8: Updates from staff:

▪ **Meeting calendar**

The meeting calendar had been distributed, and Ms. Hauth reported that no meetings were impacted by holidays. Ms. Vergara stated that she found very informative the agendas for the different boards with projects. Ms. Hauth commented that Chairman Kapp had requested a little more coordination about what was going on in the rest of town, so her monthly reports will cover information on the boards.

Ms. Vergara also noted that Weaver Street wants to move to the Gateway building. Ms. Hauth reported that if Weaver Street received Board of Adjustment approval, the Historic District Commission would see some revised elevations. No decision has been made. Ms. Trueblood

noted that her understanding was that if Weaver Street signs on, the footprint of the building would change. Ms. Hauth added that there would be more lawn area on the south side of the building. She further stated that the Board of Adjustment has some concerns about safety, traffic, and pedestrian issues. The number of parking spaces would not change.

- **Website updates**

Mr. Preston spoke regarding the website proposal stating that some things about it seemed confusing and noted portions regarding exempt work, minor work, printing of the application, and information following consulting the 1996 architectural inventory. Ms. Hauth noted that she would make those adjustments and appreciated the review.

Ms. Hauth advised the members that anything underlined was intended to be a link to other sites. She is working with the clerk on whether that can be done easily.

Mr. Preston and Mr. Kapp thanked Ms. Hauth for the terrific work she is doing on the website proposal and stated that it is a clear piece of work.

- **Discussion of work tasks for 2006**

Ms. Hauth reported that she was getting volunteers from the various boards to work on the Prevention of Demolition by Neglect Ordinance and requested a volunteer from the Commission. She expressed her hope that much of the work could be done by e-mail with a few early evening meetings. Staff will be giving the group a lot of help. Ms. Dockery offered to try although her upcoming evening availability would be limited.

Mr. Preston commented that there was a question about new materials and how the Commission might assess the real quality in the real world. He advocated developing some experts about whether the new materials are bonafide. He posed the question of whether the Commission could be rigid or could they find true quality in the materials and be knowledgeable about the truth of those materials and assess them in some manner. Ms. Church asked if a short workshop could be held for the Commission sometime on materials. Mr. Kapp was agreeable to doing that. She suggested that with some new materials there might be a five-year delay in approval. Mr. Preston stated that he would be more than happy to have the education and asked if there might be a time when they needed to de-list materials.

Mr. Kapp asked how that would translate to the zoning ordinance from a legal perspective. Mr. Preston commented that it might be done with proper notice but questioned whether that was the desired direction to go. Ms. Trueblood suggested that a single answer which would fit all properties was not likely to be found, so a long-range vision in which vicinity is a major concern and comparisons are made with houses that are comparable rather than close by. Ms. Vergara commented that even in new construction, the desire was that materials true to the original style be used. Ms. Trueblood added that she would like to see the Commission have the flexibility to make those judgments rather than one answer. Mr. Preston and Mr. Kapp cautioned against not setting a clear path. Ms. Trueblood agreed but stated that she wanted it to be along historically appropriate lines.

Mr. Kapp said that he saw a two-part workshop looking at how the ordinance can be more inviting, more focused but at the same time more interpretive. Ms. Church commented that that was quite doable. The problems are related to the way the town was developed. Also the town was changing from being the center of Orange County. She suggested that perhaps the Commission could devise a way to have as the "comparables" those properties similar in age, size and importance as the one being considering. Ms. Trueblood said that she thought the Commission needed a brainstorming session to deal with vicinity and materials after it goes

through the education on materials. Mr. Kapp added his concern regarding the change of massing in the district and that he felt that they needed to be prepared to show how that is going to change.

ITEM #9:

Adjourn

Mr. Kapp adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m. for discussion of potential workshop and training session dates.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Hauth, Secretary