

**MINUTES**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

7:00 pm, Town Barn

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Jessica Dockery, Vice Chair Mark Rhoades, Mark Bell, Joseph Council, and Holly Snyder.

**STAFF:** Planner Stephanie Trueblood.

**WITNESSES:** Jim Parker, Walton Deva.

**ITEM #1: Call to order, roll call, and confirmation of quorum.**

Ms Dockery called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m., and Ms. Trueblood called the roll and confirmed the quorum.

**ITEM #2: Reading of the Commission's Mission Statement.**

Ms. Dockery read the Commission's Mission Statement and provided information on the Commission's processes.

**ITEM #3: Additions to the agenda and agenda adjustments.**

Ms. Trueblood stated that regarding Item #11, Mr. Horton was out of town but Jim Parker had agreed to represent him. She said Mr. Parker had another meeting to attend tonight, and therefore was asking that Item #11 be moved up on the agenda and heard as the first item. The Board agreed by consensus.

**ITEM # 4: Approval of minutes from the May 7, 2008 meeting.**

Ms. Dockery said on page 5, bottom of page, the word in the motion should be "painted" rather than "unpainted." She said on page 7, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, the word "were" should read "should be." She said on page 13, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the word "said" should be "asked."

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to approve the minutes of May 7, 2008 as amended.

**SECOND:** Mr. Bell.

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**ITEM # 11: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for George Horton to install two wall mounted signs on the parking deck in bronze prismatic letters to match the letters at the Gateway Center at 106 Nash and Kollock Streets (TMBL 4.36.E.5B).**

Ms. Dockery swore in Jim Parker and Stephanie Trueblood. Ms. Trueblood stated the applicant was proposing to install two wall mounted signs on the parking deck in bronze prismatic letters to match the letters at the Gateway Center, with one reading "Public Parking" with 15" high letters and the other

reading "Parking" with 12" high letters. She said both signs were within the Zoning Ordinance requirements in terms of size.

Ms. Trueblood stated that the Standards that applied were C for materials, D for texture, I for exterior color, and O for appurtenant fixtures, and the Guideline that applied was for Signs.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

Ms. Snyder asked if the letters would be centered. Mr. Parker responded they would be centered on column.

Mr. Rhoades asked if the rationale for doing the letters in a vertical fashion on the Margaret Lane side was so that it would be visible because presumably the other buildings would block it otherwise. Mr. Parker said the way the panel was slanted, the sign would appear better if it were vertical.

**MOTION:**        **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the George Horton application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards C, D, I and O, and the Design Guideline for Signs.

**SECOND:**        **Ms. Snyder.**  
**VOTE:**            Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:**        **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.

**SECOND:**        **Mr. Bell.**  
**VOTE:**            Unanimous.

**ITEM # 5:        Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for John and Alice Seelye replace a rear asphalt shingle roof with a 5V metal roof to match the existing front 5V metal roof at 132 West King Street (TMBL 4.31.DS.8).**

Ms. Trueblood noted that the applicants were unable to attend the meeting but had asked that the HDC review the application in their absence. The Board agreed by consensus.

Ms. Trueblood provided a brief description of the property, and stated that the applicants were proposing to replace the rear asphalt shingle roof with a 5V metal roof to match the existing front 5V metal roof. She stated that the Standards that applied were H for roofing materials, and the Guideline that applied was Roofs.

The Board had no questions regarding the application.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

**MOTION:**        **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the John and Alice Seelye application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standard H, and the Design Guideline for Roofs.

**SECOND:**        **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:**            Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:**        **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.

**SECOND:**        **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:**            Unanimous.

**ITEM # 6:    Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for David Witsell to permanently remove the shutters (not original to building) at 106 North Churton Street (TMBL 4.30.B.9).**

Ms. Trueblood indicated she did not know if Mr. Witsell planned to attend this evening, but believed the application could be reviewed in his absence. The Board agreed by consensus.

Ms. Trueblood explained how the application had come about, noting that the painting of the building was a Minor Work, so she had approved the colors. She said in order to paint the building the shutters had to be removed, and she had indicated that they could not be removed permanently without HDC approval. Ms. Trueblood stated she had agreed to allow the shutters to be temporarily removed in order to paint the building, and the applicant was now requesting that the shutters be removed permanently.

Ms. Trueblood stated that the Standards that applied were F for architectural details and O for appurtenant fixtures, and the Design Guidelines that applied were Windows and Doors.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Bell asked if shutters were original to the building. Ms. Trueblood said she could not say, but the vinyl shutters recently removed were definitely not original to the structure, nor were the placement of the shutters around the door. Mr. Bell

said the Guidelines spoke to the historic presence of shutters, and the building on the right had shutters but the building on the left did not.

Ms. Dockery stated it was typical that commercial buildings of this period did not have shutters when that part of the downtown was built. Mr. Bell said he had no problem with the application if there was evidence that the shutters were not historic.

Mr. Rhoades said his only concern was that if shutters were placed there to revitalize the downtown, then that showed the evolution of the building. He said by allowing them to be removed, it would effectively take away a part of that evolution.

Ms. Trueblood stated the building was constructed before 1939, and since vinyl shutters were not manufactured until much later the shutters were not original to the building. She said that was not to say that wooden shutters may have been used at one point, but there was no evidence to substantiate that. She agreed with Ms. Dockery that commercial buildings did not typically have shutters.

Mr. Rhoades stated that he did not feel strongly opposed to removing the shutters since they were outside the period of significance, but did think that potentially by doing so the HDC would be neglecting that period of downtown revitalization.

**MOTION:**           **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the David Witsell application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards F and O, and the Design Guidelines for Windows and Doors.

**SECOND:**           **Mr. Bell.**  
**VOTE:**               Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:**           **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.

**SECOND:**           **Mr. Bell.**  
**VOTE:**               Unanimous.

**ITEM # 7:   Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Town of Hillsborough to replace the asbestos tile ridgeline with a ‘Galvalume’ galvanized metal ridgeline in black or brown at the Orange County Museum at 201 North Churton Street (TMBL 4.31.A.9A).**

Ms. Trueblood stated the applicant was proposing to replace the asbestos tile ridgeline with a ‘Galvalume’ galvanized metal ridgeline in black or brown at the Orange County Museum. She said the Standards that applied were H for roofing materials, and the Design Guideline that applied was Roofs. Ms. Trueblood

stated that because the request did not exactly fit the definition of a Minor Work, she had placed it on the agenda for review by the HDC.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Bell asked if they were proposing to replace the entire roof. Ms. Trueblood responded no, just the ridgeline.

Ms. Dockery commented she believed the brown would be less noticeable. Ms. Trueblood said the Town was agreeable to using either brown or black. She said if the HDC preferred brown, that would not be a problem.

**MOTION:**           **Mr. Bell** moved to find as fact that the Town of Hillsborough application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standard H, and the Design Guideline for Roofs.

**SECOND:**           **Mr. Council.**

**VOTE:**               Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:**           **Mr. Bell** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions, with staff to choose the color.

**SECOND:**           **Mr. Council.**

**VOTE:**               Unanimous.

**ITEM # 8:   Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Matt Fox to remove the existing sign letters from the building and install a black canvas awning with white letters at the Wooden Nickle at 105 North Churton Street (TMBL 4.30.A.8).**

Ms. Trueblood said she had not heard from Mr. Fox and was not aware if he planned to attend this evening. She said she did not believe he would mind if the Board wanted to move forward with the application. The Board agreed by consensus to review the application.

Ms. Trueblood stated the applicant was proposing to remove the existing sign letters from the building and to install a black canvas awning with white letters at the Wooden Nickle. She said the letters were 10" tall, and the total sign area was 10 square feet which met the sign requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Trueblood stated the Standards that applied were O for appurtenant fixtures and the Design Guidelines that applied were Signage and Store Fronts. She noted that the existing sign did not meet sign requirements, in that it was larger than allowed by the sign ordinance. Ms. Trueblood stated this proposal would bring that sign into compliance.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Rhoades said he was not opposed to the black, but it was not his personal preference. He said a softer color such as dark green or navy blue would be less bold.

Ms. Dockery said she believed the proposal was in keeping with the style of the district, and was glad the new sign was to be in compliance.

Mr. Bell said he would prefer to see some other color than black, noting he believed it would fade quickly and would not retain a neat appearance for very long.

Mr. Council said the materials and type appeared to fit the Standards and Guidelines perfectly, and believed the black and white color scheme was elegant and sophisticated.

Ms. Dockery asked if the Board wanted to specify a color change.

Mr. Council stated there was a dark green awning two doors down, and if the Wooden Nickle used a dark green awning, it may make the existing awning appear old and faded. He said he believed he preferred the black.

Ms. Dockery commented that it was nice to have different colors along the same street. Mr. Council stated that was a good point. The Board agreed by consensus not to specify a color.

**MOTION:**           **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the Matt Fox application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standard O, and the Design Guidelines for Signage and Store Fronts.

**SECOND:**           **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:**               Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:**           **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.

**SECOND:**           **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:**               Unanimous.

**ITEM # 9: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Susan K. Bryant to construct a 8 x 12 Highwall Style outbuilding with wood siding and solid wood frame windows at 110 West Orange Street (TMBL 4.19.A.16).**

Ms. Trueblood said she had not heard from Ms. Bryant and did not know if she had planned to attend tonight's meeting.

After some discussion, the Board agreed that questions needed to be answered by the applicant, and the application should be tabled.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to table the Susan K. Bryant application until July 2 or such time that the applicant or a representative could be present.

**SECOND:** Mr. Council.

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**ITEM # 10: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Walton Deva to amend the previous COA to allow for a reconfigured rear porch and the addition of decorative handrails at 127 West Corbin Street (TMBL 4.19.A.1).**

Ms. Dockery swore in Walton Deva. Ms. Trueblood stated that the applicant was proposing to amend the previous COA to allow for a reconfigured rear porch and the addition of decorative handrails. She said the handrails were required by Building Code and had been already been added, and were made of the same material as the siding on the house with a horizontal orientation. Ms. Trueblood said the change to the rear porch plan included changing from a wraparound style porch to one that had stairs down to the yard. She said the Standards that applied were C for materials, D for texture, and F for architectural details, and the Guideline that applied was for Decks.

Mr. Deva said the reason they had changed the configuration of the deck was because they decided after talking with the power company and the gas company that the utilities needed to be left where they were.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Council commented that he actually preferred the new version, in that it fit the house nicely.

Mr. Bell asked about the height of the deck. Mr. Deva replied the deck was exactly at the required height, which was 36".

Ms. Dockery asked if the handrails were painted. Mr. Deva responded it was stained and was of the same material as the house.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the Walton Deva application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standard C, D, and F, and the Design Guideline for Decks.

**SECOND:** **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.

**SECOND:** **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**OTHER:** Ms. Trueblood introduced Marshal Brown, one of the summer interns for the Town who was working on the scope of work set by the HDC. She then introduced Bill Whitmore, who she had asked to attend tonight's meeting because he was considering volunteering for the HDC. Ms. Trueblood said he was currently house hunting, and it was hoped that he would remain a resident of the Town and therefore remain eligible to serve.

Mr. Whitmore said he was holding back applying for the Board until he knew for sure that he would be able to find a home in Town.

**ITEM # 12: Interview David McCullough for HDC vacancy.**

Ms. Trueblood indicated that the Board at present had two vacancies. Ms. Trueblood introduced David McCullough.

Ms. Dockery stated that some of the challenges the HDC ran into were the dilemma of how to apply very strict guidelines to buildings that most people did not see as historic. She asked how he would respond to someone who had a building that was minimal traditional from the 1940's with vinyl siding and metal windows and that person wanted to put in new doors or windows. Mr. McCullough said he would actually be open to that, in that there was a natural evolution of buildings that should be allowed to take place. Ms. Dockery said unfortunately the Guidelines would not allow that.

Ms. Dockery stated that the biggest problem the Board had was with vinyl siding and vinyl windows, because of the energy efficiency of vinyl. Ms. Trueblood said in the near future it was their goal to make the language in the Guidelines speak more definitely to the use of such materials, so that eventually every decision the Board made could be directly tied to a Guideline.

Ms. Dockery said other challenges the HDC had faced were large additions to smaller houses, as well as infill. She said meetings were tense at times, because people did not want to be told what they could and could not do to their property.

Mr. McCullough asked if the HDC was rewriting its Guidelines. Ms. Dockery responded that Ms. Trueblood had been working to identify sections that needed to be rewritten. Ms. Trueblood said an example was massing and scale, noting that there were no Guidelines regarding massing and scale although they were listed in the Standards of Evaluation. She said they were working now on a staff recommendation for massing and scale definitions that could be added to the Guidelines. Ms. Trueblood stated that Section 21.6.3 would be looked at closely along with the rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance scheduled to begin shortly, and there likely would need to be a subcommittee of the HDC formed to help in that review and editing process.

Mr. Council said after talking with Mr. McCullough after last month's meeting and after reading his resume, he was convinced that Mr. McCullough knew what would be required as an HDC member. He said he would be happy to have Mr. McCullough as a member of the HDC.

Mr. McCullough asked if the HDC was involved in enforcement. Ms. Trueblood stated she often would get information from Board members or others that prompted a visit or inspection by staff, but the HDC itself was not involved in any other way.

Mr. Bell asked how long Mr. McCullough had lived in the district. Mr. McCullough replied for a year. Mr. Bell asked if he owned his home and was planning on staying in Town. Mr. McCullough responded yes.

Ms. Trueblood said as a point of information, there was a federal requirement that local commission members attend training at least once a year. She said they had not met that requirement over the last two years, so she was looking for any training that would satisfy that requirement. Ms. Trueblood said the HDC would actually meet that requirement this year, but she would continue to look for opportunities for the future. Ms. Dockery noted she believed there would be a training opportunity in Winston Salem in October.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to recommend to the Town Board appointment of David McCullough to one of the HDC vacancies.

**SECOND:** Mr. Council.

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**ITEM # 13: Commission and Staff Reports/Updates.**

Ms. Trueblood stated she had sent a letter to Faith Kiffney who lived in the house next to Turnip Patch Park giving her until July 1 to install the approved window, but she had not yet heard back.

Ms. Trueblood stated she had talked to Kevin McGraw about protecting his building on West King Street, and told him that he needed to put up plastic to which he agreed. She said he apologized for not having already done that, and had said he expected to begin work on the site in late summer.

Ms. Trueblood said she had talked with Robin Taylor-Hall about protecting her building, and Ms. Taylor-Hall indicated she was receiving bids for construction work and expected to get moving as soon as possible. She said she had reminded Ms. Taylor-Hall that it was a contributing building and the HDC was concerned about it, and it would be a candidate for Demolition by Neglect if it were not taken care of.

Ms. Trueblood said some time ago the HDC had talked about having a text amendment put into the Zoning Ordinance to establish the Design Guidelines as a binding document interpretive of the Standards of Evaluation. She said they were now at the public hearing stage where that could happen, so she would need a formal motion from the HDC to the Town Board and the Planning Board to put that text amendment forward.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Council** moved to recommend to the Planning Board and the Town Board consideration of a text amendment establishing the Design Guidelines as a binding document as interpretive of Standards of Evaluation as interpreted under Section 21.6.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**SECOND:** **Mr. Bell.**

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

Ms. Trueblood stated she would alert the HDC as to when that public hearing was scheduled so that they could attend if they choose. She said she believed it would be on the July public hearing agenda, adding that someone from the HDC needed to attend. Ms. Trueblood said once the text amendment was drafted, she would email it to the HDC for their information.

Ms. Dockery suggested making the use of vinyl shutters a Minor Work, since vinyl shutters were never historic. Ms. Trueblood said she was currently working on other issues and would prefer not to amend the Minor Works list at this time. She said she would rather that become a part of their materials discussion when that took place.

Mr. Council asked was there something intermediate they could do, because such cases were bound to come up in the coming months. He suggested putting a temporary motion in place until the ordinance rewrite was accomplished. Ms. Trueblood suggested that when such cases came up, to review it in a three to five minute session. She said that would be a much cleaner process than trying to amend the Minor Works list.

Ms. Dockery commented that the Chamber of Commerce's windows needed to be re-glazed, noting that all the glazing was coming off the front window. Ms. Trueblood commented that the Chamber were the tenants in that building. She said she would be happy to mention it to them.

Mr. Council said the former bank building several doors up from David Whitfield's building come use a layer of paint on the wood trim.

**ITEM # 14: Adjourn.**

Ms. Dockery moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m., seconded by Mr. Bell. The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Stephanie Trueblood, Secretary