

Minutes
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 7, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Kapp, Chairman, Max Preston, Vice Chairman, Barbara Church
Jessica Dockery (arrived at 7:06 p.m.), and Stephanie Trueblood,

ABSENT: Will Moye and Susanne Vergara, absence excused.

STAFF: Margaret Hauth

GUESTS: George Horton, Kevin McGraw, John Williams, Wylie Pamplin, Tom Stevens

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

Mr. Kapp called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and Ms. Hauth called the roll and confirmed the quorum.

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

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

Ms. Trueblood recused herself from discussion and consideration of Items #6 and #7. Mr. Kapp noted that if Ms. Dockery did not appear, then those issues would have to be tabled until next month.

ITEM #4: Approval of the minutes of the May 3, 2007 meeting.

Mr. Kapp asked for approval of the minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to accept the minutes as presented.

SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #5: Modification to previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for George Horton to reflect elevation and site plan modifications at the Gateway Center (4.36.E.16)

Mr. Kapp swore in Ms. Hauth, George Horton, and John Williams. Ms. Hauth provided an overview of the elevation and site plan modifications. She stated that the building had been modified to accommodate the Weaver Street Market as the first floor tenant, making the building rectangular in nature with some modified parking and the addition of a driveway to allow people to turn north. Ms. Hauth said the project had a new east elevation to provide an eating area for the Market, and emphasized that no materials had been changed.

Jessica Dockery arrived at 7:06 p.m.

Ms. Hauth said the existing building on the property was noncontributing. She provided drawings of the elevations and the changes in the footprint to accommodate the Market. Mr. Preston asked about the alley, and Ms. Hauth responded that originally

the building had been planned to be built very close to the property line, and now it had been pulled away to create an alley access for inbound vehicles only.

Mr. Preston asked had the parking plans been approved by the city. Ms. Hauth said yes, that this was the site plan that had been approved through settlement of the lawsuit, so this is the final plan. She said all of the standards of evaluation would apply to this application. Ms. Hauth said it would not apply to materials since no change was made from the previous application.

Ms. Church asked about landscaping. Ms. Hauth provided a map that indicated landscaped areas.

Mr. Preston asked if all the materials were essentially the same. Mr. Horton replied there was one change, and that was in roofing of the southern portion of building enclosed by windows. Mr. Preston asked if that was in the awning materials. Mr. Horton said that was correct. He said it was a tile roof at one point, and they had changed it to a copper standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Preston said the only concern he had was the large area of parking lot that the public would see as they came off the bridge before they even see the building. He wondered what was planned to make the site more appealing, noting that was something to be concerned about. Mr. Horton referred to the landscape plan, noting he was not prepared to talk about that aspect this evening.

Ms Hauth stated that the landscape make it more clear what was happening adjacent to the building than in the parking lot. Ms. Dockery said in essence it made this a very deep setback, and it would be important to screen that. Ms. Hauth pointed out some of the landscape areas noted on the plan around the building and the eating area, but noted the plan did not show individual trees. Mr. Horton said there was a large landscaped area that had been set aside that was shown on the plan.

Mr. Kapp noted the buffer area by the creek. Mr. Horton noted that was natural vegetation. Ms. Dockery asked if that landscaping continued into the bow, and Mr. Horton responded it did. Mr. Preston asked about the height of the landscaping. Mr. Horton said they were open for suggestions. Mr. Preston said trees and screening was important. Ms. Church asked about placing trees in particular spots to provide shade in the parking area. Mr. Horton said he was not sure that could be done without affecting the number of parking spaces, but he would be happy to look at that. Mr. Kapp said he would prefer shade trees in the parking area as well as a tree buffer in the parking area west of the front entrance.

Responding to a question from Ms. Church, Ms. Hauth said the intersection would be reworked because there would not longer a full-turning movement driveway. She said vehicles would be able to take southbound right out.

Mr. Kapp asked what was the checkerboard area to the north on the site plan. Mr. Horton said they were pavers that allowed grass to grow between them to accommodate the Fire Department and as an emergency exit. Mr. Kapp asked what kind of fencing would enclose the dumpster area. Mr. Horton said most likely a cyclone fence with plastic slats.

Responding to a remark from Ms. Church, Mr. Horton said he expected a portion of the site to be used for different purposes, such as picnics, some planned musicals or shows and things of that nature. He said there was some concern about the number of people who could be there, so they had introduced an iron fence to run along the edge of the grassed area between the sidewalk and the grass to make sure people did not wander into the street. Mr. Horton said by doing that they had focused the entrance and exit to Weaver Street into marked crosswalks.

Mr. Preston asked if the property to the south marked for parking part of Mr. Horton's property and not the city's. Mr. Horton stated it was his property. Regarding the west elevation, Mr. Kapp said the site plan showed something that looked like shed additions to the entrance with something that looked like doors. He asked what they were. Mr. Horton said they were to house plumbing and electrical meters, as well as the sprinkler. He noted that feature had been included with the original site plan as well.

MOTION: Ms. Trueblood 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 and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Dockery said she wanted to discuss the addition of tall trees around the parking lot to provide a buffer. She said the HDC had originally been concerned about the scale of the plans, and now that the building had been turned providing a buffer was even more of an issue. Ms. Dockery said the HDC needed to specify such landscaping. Mr. Kapp and Mr. Preston agreed. Ms. Church agreed, noting that as you come over the bridge you would want to see as much green as possible. Mr. Kapp said he would prefer having some trees added to the parking lot to create islands. Ms. Church said she understood that some parking spaces may need to be sacrificed, but to have just a few scattered about would be preferable.

Mr. Preston said he did not know to what extent tall trees would obstruct people coming out of the parking lot into the street, so there would have to be some latitude to allow the applicant to protect against that for safety. Mr. Horton noted he agreed with all that had been said, but did not want to lead the Commission to believe that they would be able to place trees in the parking lot. Mr. Preston said they would make that a recommendation only and not a stipulation.

Mr. Kapp suggested including in this new Certificate of Appropriateness that all the detailing previously submitted was to be included with the exception of the road.

MOTION: Ms. Trueblood moved to approve the application with the following modifications: that the landscape area on the southern parking lot include evergreen trees included in it so that the lot will be screened year round, that all the detailing that was previously approved with architectural detailing and materials that were previously approved with the exception of the shed roofing that will now be copper, and landscaping around the building will follow the approved plan

SECOND: Mr. Preston.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

Mr. Kapp said before moving to the next item, he wanted to note he had requested for their special meeting on the June 21 in regard to the County complex that the County furnish a model to show how the building addition worked to make it easier to understand the three dimensional aspects of that project. Ms. Hauth said the County did not feel that they were far enough along in the design process to do that, adding the County did not expect a decision at the next meeting since that meeting was a preliminary hearing. Ms. Hauth said they had stated their preference not to provide a three-dimensional model at this time. Mr. Kapp said he wanted to request again that there should be a three-dimensional model at that meeting.

ITEM #6: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Kevin McGraw to replace roof and windows, replace deck, install skylights, and convert two rear windows to doors at 420 W. King Street (4.29.D.16)

Mr. Kapp swore in Kevin McGraw. Ms. Trueblood recused herself and left the table. Ms. Hauth provided an overview, noting the house was contributing, as were the two neighbors to the east and two others to the north and two to the southeast. She said the siding had already been removed and was being replaced with cypress siding. Ms. Hauth said one option discussed with staff was removing the asphalt shingled roof and replacing it with a stained asphalt shingled roof, noting if the metal roof was not approved then the stained asphalt shingled roof would likely be used.

Mr. Kapp suggested that aspect of the application should be tabled for another discussion. Mr. McGraw said the roof suggested was the same as the house they had just completed on West Corbin Street. He provided some information on the condition and problems with the house, noting he did not yet know what the cost would be for the necessary improvements. Mr. Kapp stated he did not like to have an "either/or" situation when considering an application.

Ms. Hauth stated the application was asking for a change in the windows to six over six wood or vinyl. She said on the back of the house the existing deck would be removed and replaced with a larger footprint, all of wood. Ms. Hauth said there was a request to install three skylights, and with the way the roof was configured those skylights would

not be visible from another of the neighboring properties. She said two windows on the rear elevation needed to be changed to doors to access the new porch.

Mr. Kapp asked if Mr. McGraw would have a better idea of his budget next month. Mr. McGraw said he likely would. Mr. Kapp said it might be better to table this until then so that the Commission could provide a fair review of the application. He asked if that would be acceptable. Mr. McGraw said any delay would be costly, and he could not keep the project moving unless he knew what the Commission would approve regarding the roof, the windows and other aspects of the project.

Ms. Church said perhaps we could consider a staged approval. Mr. McGraw said he did have the option of replacing the windows with what had been there previously, but that was not his first choice. He said he did not want to have to come back before the Commission in a month and then have that decision made. Mr. McGraw said he could only assure the Commission that whatever was done to the house would be a vast improvement.

Mr. Preston confirmed that the two windows shown on the back of the house would be replaced with doors. Mr. McGraw said that was correct, noting he had proposed a 15 light door, with tempered insulated glass. He stated if the Commission did not want to approve the roof at this time, he would go ahead with the already approved color of the asphalt. Ms. Church said she had no problem with either the metal roof or the asphalt roof, noting she preferred the metal roof, and did not mind approving either one. Mr. Kapp said he did not want to set a precedent of approving either/or conditions. Mr. McGraw said if he could not get a decision tonight, he would put an asphalt roof back on, although his preference was metal.

Ms. Dockery asked if he was considering aluminum windows. She said if we approved the metal roof, would that affect whether or not the windows would be wood or vinyl. Mr. McGraw stated it was budget driven, but more than likely we would replace the two front windows with wood. Ms. Dockery suggested approving the application as Mr. McGraw had suggested, and then ask him to come back as needed if he needed to adjust anything. She said the Commission could approve the application as submitted, then if Mr. McGraw had to make alterations based on budget, he would come back with modifications.

Mr. McGraw said he wanted to be clear that his application was designed to give him some flexibility, but it appeared the Commission was not comfortable with that. He said he would not deviate from that application, noting that whatever option he could afford at the time was what he would do, and he would do the better of the options if he would afford to do it. Mr. McGraw said he did not see how that could be objectionable to the Commission. He said if he had to put back on the same type of materials previously used he would do that, but he would prefer to enhance the appearance of the house.

Mr. Preston said Mr. McGraw could replace the vinyl windows with vinyl windows, and could replace the roofing with the same type of asphalt shingles. He said if we approved metal roofing and wood windows, then he would be entitled to decide if he wanted to do that. Ms. Hauth said that was correct, and if that happened she would report that to the Commission. Mr. Preston said the only other issue was the three skylights, and Ms. Hauth had stated they would not be visible to the neighbors. Ms. Hauth said it was possible to see them from one neighboring house if you were appropriately situated.

Ms. Church said we would approve a metal roof and wood windows, and at some point if Mr. McGraw determined that it was not financially feasible he could opt out to the exempt list without returning before the Commission. Mr. Preston said that was correct, but it would have a proviso that he could not choose something else. Ms. Hauth said that was correct.

Mr. McGraw said in the application he had requested the flexibility of divided light and vinyl windows because it was truer to the house than the existing one over one vinyl windows.

Ms. Church said she believed the one over one or even two over two would be more consistent with the style of the house. Mr. Kapp agreed. Mr. Preston suggested approving the application with the exception of the roof and the skylights. Ms. Church said she believed they should approve everything except for the division of windows. Mr. Kapp said he was inclined to favor matching the existing windows, which was one over one, and to approve the patio doors in place of the windows on the rear porch, with one single light as well. Mr. McGraw indicated that was acceptable to him.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to find as fact that the McGraw application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Mr. Preston.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Preston said we needed to be clear that the option is only that of changing wood for vinyl on the one over one windows. Mr. McGraw said he understood that. Ms. Dockery asked if we were requiring wooden doors. Mr. Kapp said that was his preference. Mr. Preston said that should be made a part of the motion.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to approve the application as submitted with the modification of single light wooden doors in place of the two windows, one over one windows, preferably wood.

SECOND: Mr. Preston.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #7: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Cybele Kaufman to build an 18' by 14' rear screened porch at 321 W. Queen Street (4.29.B.3A)

Mr. Kapp swore in Wylie Pamplin. Ms. Trueblood recused herself and remained away from the table. Ms. Hauth provided an overview of the application, noting there were noncontributing structures on either side of the house in question, two contributing houses across the street and one on the southeast. The request is to build an 18' by 14' rear screened porch and deck, with asphalt shingles and sloped to match the main building. Ms. Hauth provided a site map, noting it was an extremely narrow lot so the setback was reduced to ten feet. Mr. Kapp asked if the applicant would have to obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Hauth said because the house sat on the lot at an angle, the back corner would be right at the 10-foot setback, so they were in compliance with the reduced setback. Mr. Kapp said the lot was nonconforming, so why does this not need to be reviewed by the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Hauth said because the applicant was able to meet the 10-foot setback requirement.

Mr. Preston asked what color the house was now painted. Mr. Pamplin said it was light gray. Mr. Preston asked if the porch and railings would be the same. Mr. Pamplin stated the property owner planned to leave them natural. Ms. Hauth said the new siding and the trim would match the house. Mr. Kapp wondered what the possibility was of staining the pressure-treated wood.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to find as fact that the Kaufman application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Kapp asked about the possibility of staining the wood. Mr. Pamplin said they were willing to do whatever it took to get this approved.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to approve the application as submitted with modification to include a requirement that the pressure-treated wood be protected with stain or paint.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hauth clarified that the staining would be to match the trim on the house.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #8: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for the Hillsborough United Methodist Church to make alterations at both 310 W. Tryon Street and 20-1 W. Queen Street (4.31.A.2, 4.29.C.3)

Mr. Kapp swore in the applicants and speakers: Nina Scott, David Brown, David Daniel, David Cates, Alvin Horne, Drew Blum, and Jill Heilman. Ms. Trueblood

returned to the table. Ms. Hawth suggested splitting the discussion, and began with the property on Tryon Street. She said the application was to install a handicap ramp accessing the old parsonage, and paving of two additional parking spaces and some repaving in another area to accommodate the ramp. Ms. Hawth said there would be some additional landscaping involved in screening the two additional parking spaces. Ms. Hawth said this sanctuary was a contributing building with a contributing building next door and on the corner as well as others nearby. She said this application included a brick foundation with a 14" rise and a metal railing painted to match the existing trim, and a three-foot door with side lights.

Ms. Dockery asked about the door. Mr. Cates said it was an angle bottom with individual side glass lights. Mr. Kapp asked if he had any profiles or information regarding the new railing. Mr. Cates said they planned to match as close as possible the hat existed on part of the structure. Mr. Kapp asked if the railing would meet ADA requirements. Mr. Cates said the railing would meet the appropriate standards. Mr. Kapp asked if they were going to match the brick. Mr. Cates said that was their intention, to the extent possible.

Mr. Preston said there had been talk about the trees in front of and between the street and this railing, essentially obscuring the railing. He asked if that would continue to be the case. Mr. Cates said that was their intention. Ms. Church asked where the parsonage was previously located. Mr. Horne noted it had been at this location, but that house was moved north to Union Street. Mr. Kapp asked if they would lose any of the existing trees between the house and the sanctuary. Mr. Cates said they did not plan to. Ms. Church asked if they planned to landscape around the ramp. Mr. Cates pointed out on the map the location of the ramp, noting it was essentially an on-grade site. He said they had located the ramp in that area because it had the lowest level of grade change on the property.

Jill Heilman requested that site plans be included along with the notifications, noting it was difficult to understand the proposed changes without that. She asked if the large magnolia on Tryon Street as well as surrounding trees was proposed to screen the ramp entrance. Ms. Church said as well as four added camellias. Mr. Cates said there was existing shrubbery in the front as well as other trees, and we were added four more plants at that location.

Ms. Church asked how long the railing would be. Mr. Cates responded that it would extend out to the end of the ramp plus one foot, which was required by Code. Mr. Blum noted it would be no longer than twenty feet.

Mr. Kapp said on the map there was new handicap ramp next to the existing one. Mr. Cates said when we added the fellowship hall and courtyard, we included an accessible ramp from the parking lot, and the new ramp provided easier access with level changes and without having to enter the asphalt surface of the parking lot. He said that would allow someone to exit the fellowship hall and enter the parsonage without having to

traverse the parking lot or driveway. He said Orange County would not have required that, but they believe it better accommodated their congregation.

Mr. Kapp asked if railings would be provided on both sides of the ramp. Mr. Cates said that was correct, and they would be matched with the existing railings which were painted black. Mr. Kapp said the brick would be matched as well. Mr. Cates replied yes. Mr. Kapp asked if they would provide some landscaping in between that area and the covered walkway. Mr. Cates said there was an existing tree and a mulched area so if anything they would add a small seasonal planting.

Ms. Trueblood commended the applicant for the planned plantings as well as the addition of the ramp that was not required by law. Mr. Cates said their goal was to provide better accommodations for their congregation.

Nina Scott, a neighbor, stated she was not in favor of the two parking spaces, which were planned adjacent to her property. She said it would take much of the existing grass in front of the memorial garden, which abutted the property line. Ms. Scott said the applicant had said there was a 20-foot setback, but there was no setback from the memorial garden. She said the two parking spaces would be right in front of that memorial garden. Ms. Scott said the foot traffic and the noise had increased tremendously, and that area was never used for parking except for loading and unloading. She said she did not understand why it had to be paved when it was rarely used.

Mr. Kapp said pavers that allowed grass to be grown in between might be appropriate there to provide for some green space. Mr. Preston said it appeared that behind that area was the memorial garden running to the property line. Ms. Hauth said there was a screening of cypress trees along the property line. Ms. Scott reiterated that there was no setback because the garden ran to the property line. She said it was a permanent fixture. Mr. Preston said that garden was not an issue that was under consideration, because that feature was not a part of the application.

Ms. Trueblood asked if the setback applied to on grade. Ms. Hauth responded the setback only applied to structures, and parking spaces were considered structures per our ordinance. She said there were no structures within the memorial garden so it could run to the property line. Ms. Scott said because of the configuration of that area, the Boy Scouts frequently ran across onto her property to get around the building. Mr. Cates said they would be willing to remove the parking spaces from the site plan if it was an issue. Ms. Scott said she believed that her property would be devalued if there were parking spaces within twenty feet from the edge of their porch. Mr. Kapp said if the applicant was willing to withdraw those spaces from the plan, then the issue would be resolved. Ms. Scott said she had no problem with them continuing to use the grassed area.

Mr. Kapp requested that the railings be painted a dark color to blend in with the landscape. Mr. Cates said they were willing to do that. Ms. Trueblood noted that the

existing railing was painted white. Mr. Cates said there was an existing entryway into the building that had white railing, which was in plain site of the other railing. Ms. Church said the new railing would be out in the landscape, and if painted dark it would blend more readily with the landscape. Mr. Cates asked if they would be able to choose from the approved colors.

Ms. Trueblood asked if there was any existing railing on the porch where the new handicap ramp was being installed. Mr. Cates said there was a window with white trim that would be removed and door installed.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to find as fact that the United Method Church application as relates to the portion on the old parsonage property and the sanctuary property at 201 W. Queen Street is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery.

VOTE: Unanimously adopted.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to approve the application as modified with the deletion of the two parking spaces and the associated screening, and that the railing would be painted a consistent dark color, and that the door by a wood door with a glass-top panel as agreed to.

SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

Mr. Kapp then moved the discussion on to the second part of the application, the parsonage at 130 W. Tryon Street. Ms. Hauth provided overview, noting the site plan had been revised around the basketball pad to accommodate the Neuse River buffer. She noted there was also an existing fence that would be relocated. She said there were no proposed changes to the elevation of the front. She said the new proposed rear elevation would include the installation of rear windows and a door, with wood siding.

Ms. Trueblood asked Ms. Hauth to explain the vicinity map. Ms. Hauth said it was a noncontributing structure, a contributing house to the east on the corner and across the street, and two contributing buildings behind.

Mr. Kapp asked what would the new barn be used for. Mr. Cates said the barn would be used for youth meetings as well as one night a week it would be used for Scout meetings.

Nina Scott said that the neighbors were told that the Scouts would not be moved over to the barn because the space was not large enough. Mr. Cates responded it was not big enough for the Cub Scouts, which was a much larger group. Ms. Scott said the 130 or so Scouts who meet there had increased the foot traffic and noise level she was experiencing. Ms. Scott asked for clarification regarding how often the Scouts would use the facility David Daniel replied said the church sponsored a Cub Scout pack and a

Boy Scout troop, both meeting separate nights. He said the Cub Scouts would continue to meet in the fellowship hall once a month, and the Boy Scouts, numbering 20, would be using the barn on Tuesday evenings each week from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. Mr. Daniel said they believed the landscaping would reduce the noise level. He said they had approximately 20 youth who would use the facility on Sunday afternoons from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. He said the addition noted in the plans was to provide a space for a refrigerator and other necessities to feed the youth, as well as bathroom facilities.

Ms. Scott said it was her understanding that a 50-foot setback was required when a stream was involved. Ms. Hauth said that was correct, when there was a change in the use of the property, which was defined as the addition of impervious surface. She said that was why we see the addition being built on the concrete pad. Ms. Hauth said the County Erosion Control Office had reviewed and approved this plan. Ms. Trueblood said then it was compliant with the Town's Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Hauth said that was correct, and that was what the 20-foot setback was showing.

Ms. Scott said if the existing pad was where they were proposing to build a kitchen and bathroom, then it should be checked if that met the specifications for building a structure on top of the pad rather than serving as a pad. Mr. Kapp said that was something that the building inspector would be responsible for.

Mr. Kapp asked how many basketball courts were in the area. Mr. Daniel said they had done some research on that, noting in the Historic District there were no public courts, only private courts consisting mostly of poles in yards or driveways. Ms. Hauth said the only court she knew of was at the Baptist Church. Mr. Daniel said there were many instances where basketball poles were much more visible than the one they were proposing. He said it was in the rear of the lot at the furthest point from either street and any neighboring property. Mr. Daniel said the additional screening of the leaning cypress trees and the moving of the existing fence the sight issue and noise issue would be minimized and possibly eliminated in some cases.

Mr. Daniel pointed out that a 20' by 35' court was not a full court or even a half court, and their intention was only to serve the youth. Mr. Kapp asked if there were other places nearby that would serve that purpose. Mr. Daniel said by keeping the youth on church property they had much more direct supervision and control over the youth, because each time any of the facilities were used adults would be present. He said they would be able to monitor and discipline if necessary the users of the facility.

Ms. Trueblood asked if it would be visible from the street. Mr. Daniel said it would be difficult to see it, because of the screening and the privacy fence. He said the fence already existed and would be relocated as part of this application. Mr. Preston asked if this lot was still designated as residential. Ms. Hauth said churches were permitted in all residential districts, which meant it was acceptable for the church to own and operate church activities on this property. Mr. Preston asked if that included basketball. Ms. Hauth said yes. She said that basketball was tied to the activities of the youth.

Mr. Kapp asked if the basketball pad would also serve as parking. Mr. Daniel responded no. Mr. Kapp said he did not see how that basketball pad was congruent to the Historic District. Ms. Trueblood said she did not see how it was not. Mr. Kapp said it was one thing to have a basketball goal in your driveway, and another to have a designated court. Mr. Daniel said it was residential property, and the addition of a basketball goal in the front of the property would be allowed. He said they were trying to minimize the impact of where children would be playing and remove it from the street front and place it in a location that they believe had the most minimal impact on the lot.

Mr. Kapp said he would want to see a lot more landscaping. Mr. Daniel said the existing grouping of Dogwoods was fairly significant. Ms. Dockery said the end for the driveway looked to be about the same size as the proposed basketball pad, and asked had they considered paving that area. Mr. Daniel said that area was in the buffer, and it would cause them to lose some of their parking. Mr. Kapp asked if they were adding parking to that area. Mr. Daniel said it was an existing gravel area and at most would only have two cars parked there during meetings. He said most of the youth do not drive, and the Scout master or youth leader would use that area for parking.

Mr. Kapp asked if any additional lighting was being proposed. Mr. Daniel said not at this time, noting there was a security light already present. Mr. Kapp said he believed they should consider some sort of lighting on the building, and staff should look into how that lighting level would work. Mr. Daniel was said the existing light was on a pole and was maintained by Duke Power, and was one from dusk to dawn. He said having a light added at the entry door could be accommodated. Mr. Kapp said he would like for the Town staff to look how that lighting would impact the neighbors. Mr. Daniel said anything mounted would be a wall-mounted sconce-type fixture, like a carriage light. He said nothing stronger would be needed because this property would not be used after hours, and the existing security light was adequate. Ms. Hauth said they could include that in the permitting and look at the type of fixture with an eye towards trespass.

Ms. Trueblood asked if they would be using matching materials on the addition. Mr. Daniel said that was correct. She asked if the door would be wood. Mr. Daniel said they proposed that the new door match the existing wood door. He said the roof would be asphalt and the siding would match the existing structure.

Mr. Kapp asked for an explanation of the holly bush to be taken down. Ms. Trueblood asked if the holly bush was in public right-of-way. Ms. Hauth said it was, and it had been reviewed and approved by the Tree Board, noting it was not high enough to trigger this Commission's review. Responding to a question from Ms. Trueblood, Mr. Daniel noted that the fence was eight feet tall.

Ms. Church said she had a drawing that showed a 60-foot right-of-way to the street, but in the Town there were 66-foot right-of-ways within the Historic District. She wanted to make sure that was noted in regards to future use of this property. Ms. Church also

said she had been told by a Church member that they were putting in a driveway pipe at 20 feet to build a foundation for what might be done later. Mr. Daniel said no driveway was proposed at this time, and was not shown on any plans. He said he could not say that one would not be proposed at some future date.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to find as fact that the Hillsborough United Method Church application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Preston wanted on record the query that somehow, somewhere there had to be a way that you could not have a church or any other type of thing that came into a residential area and utilized the property for many purposes. He said this was a residential neighborhood and he wanted to safeguard against what the next piece of property might be used for. Mr. Kapp agreed. He said they were moving forward on the merits of this application and believed the church was cognizant of this, but there needed to be some reasonable limitations. Ms. Church said we had to be diligent. Mr. Kapp said he wanted the church to cautious and cognizant to the Historic District that they were located in, and not become a blight.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to approve the application as presented with the conditions that the windows match the existing, and the door be wood.

SECOND: Mr. Preston .

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM 9: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Tom Stevens and Debbie Simmers to replace the two wood columns on the front porch with matching fiberglass columns (4.29.F.7)

Mr. Kapp swore in Tom Stevens. Ms. Hauth provided a brief overview of the application, noting the structure was located at 213 West Tryon Street with contributing resources to the east and west and a few to the north. She said that there were wood columns existing on the front of the structure now, and Mr. Stevens was proposing to replace those with in-kind fiberglass columns.

Mr. Stevens described the columns and provided a drawing of a sample. He said the present columns had moisture damage and needed to be replaced. Ms. Hauth noted she had received an email in support of this application from neighbors on West Tryon Street.

Responding to a remark by Mr. Kapp, Mr. Stevens said that so much water spilled off the covered porch that periodic replacement was necessary. He said he was in favor of keeping as much natural appearance was possible, but he preferred to replace the wood columns with vinyl. Mr. Preston said the question was if the fiberglass would appear

the same. Mr. Kapp said he did not believe fiberglass would be congruent with this building. Ms. Trueblood noted the Commission had approved fiberglass columns in the past. Mr. Stevens noted he believed that this material change was fairly standard.

Ms. Dockery wanted to go on record to accept fiberglass but recommended wood.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to find as fact that the Stevens application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Dockery repeated her statement that the Commission would accept fiberglass but recommended wood. She also wanted the record to show that it was a noncontributing building. Mr. Kapp said there had been a precedent set of accepting fiberglass columns. Ms. Dockery said she did not believe what the Commission had approved in the past necessarily bound them to approve such features in the future. She said she was swayed by the noncontributing status of this building.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery moved to approve the application as submitted.

SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #10: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Alexandra Givens and Mort O’Sullivan to build a wood fence along the front and side of the driveway at 122 E. Queen Street (4.31.B.6)

Mr. Kapp swore in Alexander Givens. Ms. Hauth provided an overview, noting there were noncontributing houses on either side, and contributing structures across the street. She said the proposed was to build a wood fence along the front of the property along E. Queen Street and down the side of the driveway. She said the fence would be an open picket-type fence.

Ms. Givens said the fence would be all white and built on-site, and the building had built several fences in her neighborhood previously. She said the gate would be six feet wide in keeping with the front of the house, and then a smaller three-foot gate in another location. She said the fence would be 42” high. Ms. Givens noted the fence pickets would not go down to the ground, in order to allow for adequate drainage.

Mr. Preston asked about the relevant history of fences in front yards in the historic district. Ms. Church noted the Nash house had a fence in the front yard in 1890. She said white picket fences of that era had a horizontal board across the bottom. Mr. Preston said we don’t want the fence to give a sense of altering the period in which this

home was built. Mr. Preston asked if there was a sidewalk between the street and the fence. Ms. Hauth said there was not a public sidewalk on East Queen Street.

Mr. Kapp asked how would that work with this fence, asking would it be right on the right-of-way. Ms. Givens said there was a gravel area there, and the fence would be between the gravel and the brick of the house. She said the fence would be built at an angle in one location to move around a Dogwood tree.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to find as fact that the Givens/O’Sullivan application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation and based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery.

DISCUSSION: None.

MOTION: Mr. Preston moved to approve the application as submitted.

SECOND: Ms. Trueblood.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #11: Interview of John MacAulay, a volunteer to serve on the Historic District Commission.

Ms. Hauth introduced John “Mac” MacAulay, noting he had volunteered to serve as a member of the Historic District Commission. She noted that another applicant, Mark Rhodes, had also applied but had not been able to attend tonight’s meeting.

Mr. MacAulay provided an overview of his background and credentials, submitted to the Commission as part of tonight’s packet of materials. He emphasized his reasons for moving to Hillsborough, and noted his education and previous work experience. He noted his reasons for volunteering, stating his desire to make a difference to the character of this community, and that it stay as true to the historic character as possible, but at the same time recognizing how the world changed. He added he was now a permanent resident of Hillsborough, residing at 104 W. Queen Street, the former home of Dr. Moore.

Several clarifying questions were asked of Mr. MacAulay, to which he responded. He stated he believed he would be effective working within the environment of this Commission.

Mr. Kapp stressed that attendance was key. Mr. MacAuley said it was his intention and desire to attend all meetings. He informed the Commission that his family had previously scheduled a vacation in September, and would miss that meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Preston recommended Mr. MacAulay’s name be submitted for membership to the Commission.

SECOND: Ms. Dockery.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #12: Updates.

Ms. Hauth responded she did not believe there were any updates. Mr. Kapp reminded Ms. Hauth that he would like to see a model for the June 21st special meeting.

Ms. Trueblood noted this was her last meeting, as she would soon become a member of the staff of the Planning Department. She said she would like to see the Commission move forward in dealing with some of the issues raised at the May 17 training. Mr. Preston noted that as staff, she would be able to put before the Commission certain recommendations, and encouraged her to do that. Ms. Trueblood she was concerned about the powers of the Commission and the way certain things were phrased, adding that this Commission was charged with a lot more than just reviewing applications. She said keeping the design guidelines up-to-date and the standards up-to-date was also the purview of this Commission. Mr. Kapp said the idea of preliminary staff review that Ms. Trueblood had recommended in the paper she had submitted to the Commission was something that should be considered and would be beneficial. He said he wanted more guidance from the staff. Ms. Trueblood said having submittal requirements was something that should be adopted by the Commission, so that it just did not fall on staff to make these things happen.

Mr. Kapp said he believed the next step should be to put all of these ideas into writing, and stated that the Commission wanted better application standards. Then, he said, they could look at other issues, such as demolition by neglect.

Ms. Hauth stated that as time became available on agendas, they could begin to put one or two of those items forward and get some things endorsed. Ms. Trueblood said that was reasonable in order to put things forward for comment. Mr. Kapp believed they were going in that direction and should continue to do that.

ITEM #13: Adjourn.

Mr. Kapp adjourned the meeting at 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Hauth, Secretary