

MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Wednesday, November 5, 2008
7:00 pm, Town Barn

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Jessica Dockery, Mark Bell, Joseph Council, David McCullough, Holly Snyder, and Zachary Vernon.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Mark Rhodes, absence excused.

STAFF: Planner Stephanie Trueblood.

WITNESSES: Martha Pengelly.

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

Ms. Dockery called the meeting to order at 7:01 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 adjustment.

There were no additions or adjustments to the agenda.

ITEM #4: Approval of minutes from the October 1, 2008 meeting.

Ms. Dockery stated that on page 10, 2nd paragraph, "irrespective of" should be "in respect to."

MOTION: Mr. Bell moved to approve the minutes of October 1, 2008 as amended.

SECOND: Mr. Council.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #5: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Martha Pengelly to install a 6' tall, wood, privacy fence along 57' of the west property line (to replace an existing deteriorated privacy fence) and 7' over to the northwest corner of the house and to connect at the back to a 4' tall, picket style, wood, perimeter fence at 305 West Queen Street (TMBL 4.29.B.4)

Ms. Dockery swore in Martha Pengelly and Stephanie Trueblood. Ms. Trueblood said that the request was to install a 6 foot wood privacy fence along 57 feet of the west property line, to replace an existing deteriorated privacy fence, and a 7 foot tall fence over to the northwest corner of the house to connect at the back to an approved Minor Works 4 foot tall picket style wood perimeter fence. She stated that this was proposed to provide a dog enclosure for the family pets, and then

displayed a drawing of the proposed and existing fence as well as other photos of the property and various fence styles.

Ms. Trueblood said that the Standards that applied were C for materials, D for texture and Q for walls, and the Design Guidelines that applied were Fences and Walls. She stated that all of the work could be approved as a Minor Work except for the 7 foot tall section of fence and the gate at the northwest back corner of the house.

Ms. Dockery determined that none of the HDC members had a conflict of interest with the application. 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 Martha Pengelly 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 and Q, and the Design Guidelines for Fences and Walls.

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

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

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

ITEM #6: Review of a complaint letter and staff report regarding a charge of Demolition by Neglect toward the property owner of the Colonial Inn at 153 West King Street (TMBL 4.36.A.4A)

Ms. Dockery stated that this item was a staff report to the Commission, and was not a public hearing. She said after the staff report, the Commission would make a judgment as to whether or not the site may be experiencing Demolition by Neglect, at which point the HDC would make a decision as to how to proceed. Ms. Dockery stated there was no need for public input, but if someone felt very strongly that they must speak she would allow two minutes only per person for comments.

Ms. Trueblood read the following staff report into the public record and presented a Powerpoint presentation with accompanying slides of the site investigation.

“This staff report includes a history of the occurrences and actions taken regarding a citizen’s complaint charging the property owner of the Colonial Inn at 153 West King Street with Demolition by Neglect. I will go through a timeline of

events beginning when the letter was received and explain staff findings from the site visit investigation.

July 28, 2008: Staff received a complaint letter from Joe Rees - Hillsborough resident. The complaints included the following 9 items

1. A leak in the roof of the front porch has caused rotting of the boards on the second floor of the porch.
2. Guttering throughout the building's eaves has deteriorated to the point where leaks are damaging wood under the eaves and paint is peeling. In particular, the downspout on the front of the building allows water to damage the posts which can lead very quickly to lack of their stability as they are slender and have little footing area.
3. A window is missing on the west side of the addition to the building. Some outside windows also have broken panes.
4. Boards are missing from the outer wall of the south and west sides of the west addition.
5. Bricks have fallen from the top of the southeast chimney leaving remaining bricks open to the elements.
6. Paint has peeled from the boards throughout the outer walls of the building.
7. The building is not secure from access by potential vandals; for instance the door to the west addition upstairs is quite open to intruders.
8. The bricks above the west interior chimney are coming loose and the chimney seems to be on the verge of buckling.
9. The downspout beside the column mentioned in item 2 is no longer there and the brick and concrete footing under the column has come loose.

These nine items are the complaints that drive the complaint investigation. All of the items listed are exterior items; staff did not enter the interior of the property.

August 4, 2008: Staff responded to Joe Rees in written form explaining that his complaint letter had been received and describing the next steps in enforcement as laid out in the Zoning Ordinance Section 21.7

Also, staff contacted the property owner, Francis Henry, for permission to access the site for the investigation and was granted approval. Staff also contacted Orange County Building Inspector Don Knight to request his presence and expert opinion at the site visit in regards to the structural integrity and the deterioration of building fabric.

When I say "staff" I'm talking about myself, Stephanie Trueblood. I am not an Orange County Building Inspector; I don't have a Building Inspector's License. My feeling was I could give a very informed opinion about the integrity of the architectural features of the building but not necessarily the structural features, which was why Don Knight was asked to accompany me on the site visit.

August 22, 2008: Town of Hillsborough Planning Department Staff (Stephanie Trueblood) conducted the site visit accompanied by Francis Henry and Don Knight to investigate the complaints. The site visit included a thorough investigation of the exterior elements of the building in regards to each complaint listed in the initial letter.

I (Stephanie Trueblood) met Don Knight and the property owner at 10:00 am at the site and distributed copies of the nine complaint items to Mr. Knight and the property owner and suggested that we walk the property addressing each complaint individually. I carried a digital camera in order to document the conditions. The site visit lasted about 1 hour. The following section of this report includes a description of the staff findings for each item listed in the complaint letter

Complaint #1: Leak from the front porch roof and rotting floorboards (4 slides).

Findings: Staff witnessed an area of the second floor porch where water had obviously entered in the past. The ceiling of the second floor porch, the floorboards of the second floor porch, the ceiling of the first floor porch, and the front wall of the building adjacent to the leak all show signs of water damage such as peeling paint and rotten wood. The wall also shows some signs of buckling, possibly due to water damage. Building Inspector Don Knight proposed that the curve in the wall had been present for a very long time as evidenced by the fact that the second story porch had been built to the curve. The property owner offered that there had been a leak in the roof above this area but said that the roof had been fixed to mitigate the problem. It was a clear day so there was no way of verifying during the site visit whether or not the leak had been fixed. There was obvious evidence of rotten wood elements in this area.

Complaint #2: Deteriorated and missing gutters and downspouts; rotten wood in eaves (2 slides).

Findings: Staff witnessed multiple areas where gutters and downspouts are missing or disabled and water damage is occurring to wood structural components and architectural features. For instance, water damage to the fascia, eaves, and corner boards is apparent in the following locations: the east elevation adjacent to the exterior chimney, the northeast corner of the front porch, around the second floor front porch on the north elevation, and in the gable ends. Downspouts are completely missing in some locations including the center and the northeast corner of the front porch. In other areas gutters that have not been cleaned or properly maintained may be causing water damage and rot to adjacent wood features.

Complaint #3: Missing and broken windows (3 slides).

Findings: Staff witnessed three windows on the west addition that have felt paper tacked to the outside, presumably to keep rain and weather out of broken panes. The felt material is coming undone and does not, even if installed correctly, provide long term protection from the elements. Staff also witnessed two broken window panes not covered by weatherproof material. In addition, staff saw that rot and deterioration to window sills and frames from weather and water damage, particularly on the west elevation, had progressed to a point where water may be able to enter the interior of the building around the windows. The deterioration and rot to the window frames and sills is evident especially along the west elevation which has more exposure to weather.

Complaint #4: Missing and deteriorated boards and siding (3 slides).

Findings: Staff witnessed multiple areas on the south and west sides of the west addition and the south elevation where there is broken, buckling, or missing siding. Staff saw missing siding below window sills on the west elevation where interior framing is exposed to the elements and a large expanse of interior framing exposed at the bottom edge of the siding on the south elevation of the west addition. Don Knight noted that years of neglecting the upkeep of exterior siding could cause structural issues to the wall behind the siding that might not be evident until the siding was removed. He also noted that the exterior plumbing pipes located on the west elevation of the west addition were leading to major damage by directing water runoff down the wood features and would need to be removed to protect the wall. Staff also witnessed siding damage at the gable end of the south elevation of the kitchen addition, which was built without an overhang.

Complaint #5: Missing bricks and deteriorated mortar on east side chimney (1 slide).

Findings: First, it is impossible to get an accurate picture of this problem though it is visible on site. Staff witnessed that bricks had fallen from the top of the exterior chimney on the east side of the structure. It was apparent that the mortar had worn away from the masonry joints. The property owner noted that a large tree limb had been repeatedly knocking against the chimney and pushing the bricks off. He explained that the tree was located on the adjacent property and that he would need to prune the limb to stop the problem. Don Knight also indicated that the chimney would likely need to be rebuilt because of missing mortar.

Complaint #6: Peeling paint and unprotected wood features (3 slides).

Findings: Staff witnessed that paint was peeling on all exterior wood surfaces including siding, eaves, fascia, corner boards, window sills and frames, door

frames, banisters, railings, and architectural features. It was evident to staff that in many places the paint is worn to the point that the naked wood is exposed and therefore unprotected from weather. Many of these exterior wood elements show signs of water damage and rot.

Complaint #7: Unsecured access to site (1 slide).

Findings: Staff asked the property owner if any exterior doors were unsecured and he noted that all exterior doors could close and lock. However, one door on the west side of the second floor porch appears to be unsecured because the door does not meet the frame. The property owner explained that this door leads to an exterior porch, not to the interior of the building. The property owner further explained that it has been difficult to keep inquisitive members of the public from climbing the fire escape to the second floor porch. In response, he has since installed pieces of plywood at the top of the stairs blocking the entry.

Complaint #8: Deteriorated mortar and loose bricks in interior chimneys (1 slide).

Findings: Staff noticed that the mortar joints had deteriorated on both interior chimneys, which are visible from the west elevation, and in some places sunlight could be seen coming through the joints. Additionally, the interior chimney visible from the front façade shows signs of buckling. Don Knight noted that the top of the chimneys were in such poor condition that they would likely need to be completely rebuilt. The Public Works Department recently installed barricades around the front portion of the building to protect the public and property from damage should the chimney located above the front porch give way and fall into the public right-of-way.

Complaint #9: Missing and deteriorated downspouts and gutters and broken and deteriorated column bases (2 slides).

Findings: Staff noted that the downspout is missing from the central set of columns on the front porch and witnessed water damage and rot on the wood columns and loose bricks at the column base. The property owner noted that the downspout had been removed because it was completely nonfunctional. Moreover, a downspout is missing from the north east corner of the front porch. Don Knight noted that the both of the wood elements of the column would need to be completely rebuilt to be structurally sound.

Roof (last slide): In addition, it was determined at the site visit that much of the damage noted in the original complaint letter could be attributed to water damage from the deteriorated roof. As part of the comprehensive restoration of the building the roof will need to be repaired or replaced in kind. The property owner currently has a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the roof with a standing seam black or gray metal roof.

Staff Report Conclusion

The results of the site visit suggest to staff that the Colonial Inn may be experiencing Demolition by Neglect.

The next step for the Historic District Commission (HDC), as laid out in Section 21.7.3 of the Zoning Ordinance, is to review the complaints and the evidence in this staff report to determine if the structure may be experiencing demolition by neglect. If upon deliberation the HDC finds that the structure may be experiencing Demolition by Neglect, the HDC shall file an order to the Planning Director to require the corrective action. If the HDC determines that the evidence does not suggest the structure may be experiencing Demolition by Neglect then no further action is required. The following are the events taking place after the site visit.

August 29, 2008: Staff sent an initial notification to property owner about Demolition by Neglect investigation and process.

September 12, 2008: Staff sent formal notification from staff to the property owner and the HDC members including staff report; findings and pictures from the site visit. At this time staff also included to the property owner a description of the Demolition by Neglect review process, including the actual Prevention of Demolition by Neglect Ordinance, and information about how the issues can be resolved and a list of financial resources available to the property owner including information about State and Federal tax credits.

October 17, 2008: The property owner submitted a written request to Orange County Building and Inspections Department for building permits for repair work including replacement of deteriorated features and repairs. The first permit requested was for work to be completed on the front porch area, both on the street level and the second story porch; repair any columns as necessary and rework the brick supports; replace any wood as necessary in porch floor; and, remove gutters and eaves. The second permit was to replace all rotten wood on the west side of the building addition, including the windows which may be removed as a temporary measure and reworked prior to replacement; and, open spaces from removal will be covered by wood during the construction process. The third permit was that all chimney works to be re-pointed and repaired

October 20, 2008: Property owner requested (via phone) to Town staff (Stephanie Trueblood) for Minor Works approval for the repair and replacement items listed on the Building Permit request to Orange County. Staff noted that a Zoning Compliance Permit not required for repairs and replacement “in kind”.

October 23, 2008: Staff granted Minor Works approval for repairs and “in kind” replacement materials on north and west elevations as per letter to Orange County. Because the repairs and replacements noted did not require any change to the footprint, then no Zoning Compliance permit is required by the Town. But,

the Orange County Building Permits cannot be released until the Town signed off, so that was what the Minor Works approval letter was for.

October 29, 2008: Orange County Building Permit was issued for repairs and replacement of items listed in letter.

November 5, 2008: HDC regular meeting which includes an agenda item to hear the staff report and evaluate the evidence submitted in the staff report to determine whether or not the building may be experiencing Demolition by Neglect.”

Ms. Trueblood indicated that her staff report was concluded.

MOTION: Ms. Snyder moved to recuse Mark Bell from discussion and action on the Demolition by Neglect issue at 153 West King Street due to a conflict of interest.

SECOND: Mr. McCullough.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

Ms. Dockery determined that no other HDC members had a conflict of interest with the application. She also determined that there were no members of the public present to speak for or against the issue.

Ms. Dockery asked the HDC members to turn to Section 21.7.2 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Demolition by Neglect, calling attention to the end of the first paragraph which said that the following conditions were examples of defects which may constitute or result in a finding of Demolition by Neglect:

- a. Deterioration of exterior walls, foundations, or other vertical support which results in leaning, sagging, splitting, listing, or buckling;
- b. Deterioration of flooring or floor supports, roofs, or other horizontal members which results in leaning, sagging, splitting, listing, or buckling;
- c. Deterioration of external chimneys which results in leaning, sagging, splitting, listing, or buckling of the chimney;
- d. Deterioration or crumbling of exterior plasters or mortars where there is evidence that such condition exposes structural elements to decay;
- e. Ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, and foundations, including broken windows or doors or broken or malfunctioning gutters;
- f. Defective protection or lack of weather protection for exterior wall and roof coverings, including lack of paint, or weathering due to lack of paint or other protective covering;
- g. Rotting, holes, and other forms of decay where there is evidence that such condition has exposed structural elements;
- h. Deterioration of exterior stairs, porches, handrails, window and door frames, cornices, entablatures, wall facings, and architectural details that causes delamination, instability, loss of shape and form, or crumbling;

- i. Deterioration of contributing accessory structures;
- j. Overgrown plants/landscaping features which threaten the structural integrity or relevant, significant architectural detail of a structure.

Ms. Dockery said that she would say that according to the staff report received this evening, the Colonial Inn had met condition “i.”

Mr. Council suggested that item “d” had been met as well.

Ms. Dockery stated she believed the HDC had a clear case to proceed with filing an order with the Planning Director to require the corrective action as laid out in the Prevention of Demolition by Neglect Ordinance.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved that, supported by Standards in Section 21.7.2 and based on evidence in the staff report, the Historic District Commission finds that 153 West King Street may be experiencing Demolition by Neglect and commands staff to file an order directing the Planning Director to take corrective action and call an enforcement hearing.

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

Ms. Dockery indicated that Mark Bell had now rejoined the HDC meeting.

ITEM #7: Annual election of officers - Chair and Vice Chair.

Ms. Trueblood stated she had received nominations for Jessica Dockery to remain Chair, and for Mark Rhoades to remain Vice Chair. She said that Mr. Rhoades would be continuing his membership on the HDC and would not be stepping down as previously stated. Ms. Trueblood stated at the time Mr. Rhoades had stated he would step down she had received a nomination for Joseph Council to serve as Vice Chair and Mr. Council had stated his willingness to do so.

Mr. Council said he would like to submit his name for consideration as both Chair and Vice Chair. Ms. Trueblood stated then they had two nominations for Chair, Ms. Dockery and Mr. Council, and two nominations for Vice Chair, Mr. Rhoades and Mr. Council.

MOTION: **Mr. Bell** nominated Jessica Dockery as Chair.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

VOTE: The vote was 5-1, with Mr. Council voting nay.

Ms. Dockery was elected to remain as Chair for an additional year. Ms. Trueblood stated that Ms. Dockery had two years remaining on her present term on the HDC.

MOTION: Ms. Dockery nominated Mark Rhoades as Vice Chair.
SECOND: Mr. Bell.
VOTE: The vote was 4-2, with Mr. Council and Ms. Snyder voting nay.

Mr. Rhoades was elected to remain as Vice Chair for an additional year.

ITEM #8: Commission and Staff Reports/Updates

Design Guidelines Text Amendment:

Ms. Trueblood stated that the Design Guidelines text amendment went to public hearing, with Mr. Council providing convincing comments as to why the Design Guidelines should be included by reference, as did Ms. Dockery. She said the issue would now go to the Planning Board in November for discussion, and the Planning Board would in turn make a recommendation to the Town Board. Ms. Trueblood stated that hopefully the Town Board would make a decision in December.

Mr. Council stated that Mac MacAulay, a former member of the HDC, had given a presentation, noting that he gave an argument against including the Design Guidelines by reference in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that Mr. MacAulay's reasons for opposition basically came down to a distinction between what was described a lawyer's approach and a layman's approach, which was "the simpler the better." Mr. Council said if it was said "thou shall not" in black in white then that was a straightforward approach. He said he had argued from a lawyer's perspective that the more detail you gave someone the more they had to work with.

Ms. Trueblood said she believed that Mr. MacAulay may have thought that what was happening was that the Design Guidelines were actually being incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance, which was not the case. She said if adopted there would be a text amendment made to the Zoning Ordinance that referenced the Design Guidelines as an interpretive document.

Ms. Dockery said she believed Mr. MacAulay thought doing so would be too limiting for the HDC and would not allow discretionary choices. Mr. Council said in his opinion Mr. MacAulay liked the fact that the HDC was limited in its discretionary choices. He said in his view, as a Commissioner on this Board he was there to try to help people do what they wanted to do with their property within certain parameters.

326 West Margaret Lane:

Ms. Trueblood stated there had been no change in regard to 326 Margaret Lane. She said there was a Notice of Violation sent several months ago, and the Town Attorney had also sent a letter indicating that the next stage of enforcement included the possibility of levying fines. Ms. Trueblood stated the property owner had not responded, and that item would be on the Town Board's agenda in

January to decide what the next step should be. She said this issue was regarding the one window that was out of compliance because the pane configuration had not been approved by the HDC. She said she would keep the HDC updated as this issue moved forward.

Robbin Taylor-Hall Issue:

Ms. Trueblood stated that Robbin Taylor-Hall had erected a construction fence on the site. She said Ms. Taylor-Hall had been sent a Code violation letter on October 1 stating that she had until October 10 to secure the site. Ms. Trueblood stated that the construction fence was sufficient to secure the site, so the Code enforcement item had now been cleared. She said that did not necessarily deal with the concerns raised by the HDC in terms of the structural integrity of the wall, but Ms. Taylor-Hall had stated that the restoration was about to begin and she had already hired a contractor. But, Ms. Trueblood said, if that did not happen, this building was a contributing structure and therefore was a candidate for Prevention by Demotion by Neglect, and if a complaint was lodged it would be investigated.

Other:

Ms. Trueblood provided some brief information regarding Wayfinding signs, noting that she and Elizabeth Reed, Director of the Alliance, the Visitor's Center, and other committees, had learned about a Preserve America designation and grant program. She said that Ms. Reed had learned that now was an opportune time to apply for those federal grants, and in order to apply the Town would also have to apply to be a Preserve America designated community. Ms. Trueblood said she and Ms. Reed had been working to put together a designation application and a grant application, both of which were due November 18. She asked that the HDC consider supporting the designation requesting the grant application, which would allow her to write a letter in support to be included as supplemental information with the application. Ms. Trueblood stated the letter would basically say that the HDC felt that the Wayfinding program did contribute to historic preservation efforts in the Town and that being designated a Preserve America community also benefited Hillsborough from an historic preservation standpoint.

MOTION: **Mr. Bell** moved to direct staff to write a letter of support for the Preserve America designation application and grant application from the Town of Hillsborough.

SECOND: **Ms. Dockery.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

Ms. Trueblood stated she would write the letter and have Ms. Dockery sign it on behalf of the HDC. Responding to a question regarding the Wayfinding program, Ms. Trueblood explained that the Wayfinding Signage Task Force was a group of volunteers who for the last six months had been working on a Wayfinding signage plan which would recommend various signage to replace existing sign clutter that were designed to get people to key destinations, such as the Orange County

Offices, the Visitor's Center, the Chamber of Commerce, Town Hall, and the like. Ms. Trueblood said the Wayfinding program was to erect coordinated signs that were aesthetically beautiful, that had historically appropriate materials that reduced sign clutter and hopefully enhanced the environment, and made it easier for visitors to find their destination. She said the program included pedestrian kiosks and highway signage that had an attractions logo/icon. Ms. Trueblood noted that once the design team came up with their three suggested design schemes the plan was to send it to the HDC for review, likely in May because many of the signs would be installed in the public right-of-way in the historic district.

Ms. Dockery stated they had talked about doing a CLG grant, and asked could that be put together. Ms. Trueblood replied she would need to have the Commission give her direction as to what it wanted to apply for. Ms. Dockery asked if she had time to take that on. Ms. Trueblood stated she was willing to work on it provided some clear direction.

Ms. Dockery stated that the existing National Register nomination did not include an inventory, noting they had used Ruth Little's inventory that was done in 1996, but it was not official and had never been sent to the National Parks Service and approved. She said right now the restoration and tax credit specialists were making a case-by-case decision, and it would dramatically ease their work load and constituents paperwork if they could use the inventory to see what had been designated contributing or noncontributing. But on the other hand, she said, that inventory was very old by National Park standards. Ms. Dockery stated they had the option of sending that in as additional documentation and having it added to the nomination and then it became official, or, if they were going to resurvey, they could delay and send the entire survey in at one time. She said there were CLG grants every year that could pay for these, and asked did the HDC want to look into that again.

Ms. Trueblood stated it was important to also note that it was a 60/40 grant, which meant that 40% of the money spent would have to come from the General Fund, and that was a Town Board decision. She said if they applied this year, she did not know how that would fit into the Town's budget since they had not yet asked for the grant to be considered. Ms. Trueblood stated it would likely be better to ask the Town Board at its workshop in January to consider the project and then apply for the grant next year.

Ms. Dockery asked if the HDC was interested in conducting a resurvey of the current district, or would they want to survey other areas. She said you did not have to have owner approval to survey properties or to have them listed with the NC Study List. Ms. Dockery said if they wanted to do some of the mill village on the west end, they could have it surveyed and have them noted. She said if they were put on the study list they would come up on the map, so if there was anything that would trigger a Section 106 review, those properties would be noted

and have some protection. Ms. Dockery stated if they wanted to institute a local historic district then they would run into meeting the 50% interest of owners requirement. But, she said, if they were going to do the inventory they may want to investigate a resurvey and an expanded survey, and do it all at one time. She said it may be worth looking at it this year in preparation for next year.

Ms. Trueblood said that these grants were due in early January and considering that they had never talked about this project before, the chance of getting everything done by early January was slim. She wondered if it would be a good idea for the HDC to form a subcommittee of two or three members who would be willing to get together and talk through the options and then bring a recommendation back to the full Commission. She said then it could be added as an item for next year's round of grants. Ms. Trueblood stated it was an important project and believed they should go after it, but they needed to do that in a more informed way.

Ms. Dockery agreed that sometime in the near future they needed to apply for the grant, but they needed to do the legwork first. Regarding any cost for a resurvey, she said it may be as simple as a "windshield" survey to update the Ruth Little inventory which would not be very expensive. She said if you expanded beyond that then you would have to do a more comprehensive survey in certain areas that warranted more study, and that would be expensive. Ms. Trueblood stated that would likely be anywhere between \$20,000 and \$90,000 total, of which the Town would be responsible for 40% of the cost.

Ms. Dockery stated the suggestion of creating a subcommittee was well taken, and asked who would be interested in investigating the cost and effort of resurveying the downtown district as well as the potential for other historic districts. Mr. Vernon stated if the mill village would be involved, he would be interested. Mr. Bell stated he had spent a fair amount of time researching the survey and was familiar with it as well as the need for an update, so he would be glad to serve. Ms. Trueblood stated if the three of them could get together and discuss the options and try to come up with a recommendation, she would be happy to help with that. Ms. Dockery, Mr. Vernon and Mr. Bell agreed to do so.

ITEM #9: Adjourn.

Ms. Dockery moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 p.m., seconded by Mr. Bell. The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Trueblood, Secretary