

**Minutes**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**October 4, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Acting Chair Max Preston, Barbara Church, Jessica Dockery, John MacAulay, Will Moye, and Susanne Vergara.

**ABSENT:** None.

**STAFF:** Stephanie Trueblood.

**WITNESSES:** Jennifer Barger, Cheryl Sadgrove, Matt Sadgrove, Ms. Mann, Demetric Potts

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

Mr. Preston called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m., and Ms. Trueblood called the roll and confirmed the quorum.

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

Mr. Preston read the Commission's Mission Statement and provided information on the Commission's processes. Mr. Preston swore in Demetric Potts and Stephanie Trueblood.

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

Ms. Trueblood noted that Item #9, an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Walton Deva, was removed from the agenda to allow Mr. Deva time to produce updated architectural drawings. Ms. Dockery suggested that the debriefing of the September 25 training session be postponed to November. There were no objections to either change. Mr. Preston determined that there were no additional adjustments to the agenda.

**ITEM #4: Approval of minutes from the September 6, 2006 meeting.**

Ms. Dockery said on page 3 near the bottom just prior to the last motion, the name should be changed from Ms. Church to Ms. Dockery. She said on page 16, second paragraph, it stated "Ms. Dockery disagreed." Ms. Dockery said she did not believe she had said that. Ms. Trueblood stated she believed she had made that statement. Ms. Dockery said on page 17, the last vote should be changed to Ms. Church and Mr. Kapp voting nay, since she had switched sides.

Mr. MacAulay commented that he had not attended that meeting, but the minutes had captured the discussion in a comprehensive way. He complimented the stenographer.

Mr. Preston said on page 15, the paragraph that started "Mr. Preston said all the houses on the south side were noncontributing, but the one's across the street were noncontributing." Mr. Preston said that second "noncontributing" should be "contributing."

Mr. Preston said he wanted the members to consider using the term “witnesses” rather than “guests” for those testifying. There was no objection from the members.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to accept the minutes with the noted corrections.

**SECOND:** Mr. Moye.

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**ITEM #5:** **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Orange County Housing to install front porch railings made from pressure-treated wood at 216 W. Union Street (Tax ID 4.18.D.9)**

By consensus, this item was delayed until later in the meeting, to become new Item #10.

**ITEMS FROM THIS POINT FORWARD THE AGENDA WAS RENUMBERED.**

**ITEM #5:** **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Town of Hillsborough to install a 42” satellite dish behind the Police Station to be used for emergency operations and construct a 6’ by 8’ wood privacy fence for screening at 127 N. Churton Street (Tax ID 4.30.A.1)**

Ms. Trueblood provided a vicinity map of the site, noting there was an even mix of contributing and noncontributing structures in the vicinity, but the property in question was noncontributing. She said it was built in 1995 and was a two-story, brick veneer structure. Ms. Trueblood said the Town of Hillsborough was proposing to install a 42” satellite dish behind the Police Station, mounted on a 3-foot pole, to be used for emergency operations. She said the total height of the dish and the pole would be 48” tall.

Ms. Trueblood said the Town was also proposing to construct a fence around the satellite dish and the existing utility boxes in that location. She said the fence would be either 6 or 8 feet tall and made of pressure-treated lumber. Ms. Trueblood said no contact had been received from nearby neighbors. She noted that the standards that applied were C for exterior materials, F for architectural details, and P for structural soundness. Ms. Trueblood then displayed a picture of what the dish would look like.

Assistant Town Manager/Public Works Director Demetric Potts said since this application was filed, he had additional conversations with the Chief of Police, and because of those conversations wanted to make a modification to the actual proposed fence. He said there was a window at the back of the building, and the Police Chief had a concern about security if the fence was placed where originally planned and made it 8 feet high. Mr. Potts said the Police Chief had requested that the fence be started behind the window and move it further over. He said the green utility box would not be screened if they did that.

Mr. Preston said but for security purposes you would prefer that the utility box not be screened. Mr. Potts said that was correct, because to place the fence where first proposed would not allow the Police to have a clear line of sight from the window nor

would it allow for the maximum amount of natural light to travel through the window. He said it would mean moving the fence over about 5 feet.

Mr. MacAulay asked why there was uncertainty between 6 and 8 feet. Mr. Potts said they were not sure about the exact height of the generator. But, he said, if the HDC had preference they would be willing to agree to that.

Mr. MacAulay said in that others were beginning to look at improvements to the backs of properties, he believed this was a good addition and was in favor of it.

Ms. Church asked did they intend to stain the fence or let it weather naturally. Mr. Potts said they would take any recommendation from the HDC. Ms. Church said she was not in favor of paint because of its maintenance.

Ms. Vergara asked if the pressure-treated wood would eventually age into a grayish color. Mr. Potts said it would. Mr. Preston said often it was suggested that it not be painted but rather stained, which would be his preference.

Mr. Moye said he would prefer to allow the fence to age naturally rather than staining.

Ms. Dockery said the sake of consistency she would prefer staining. She said the color was not important to her.

Ms. Church stated that pressure-treated wood had a greenish cast that she would like to see covered. She suggested staining the wood gray since that would be its color once it weathered.

Mr. Potts noted that another option might be to use cedar, which would age nicely but would cost significantly more. He said they would prefer the less expensive pressure-treated wood.

Ms. Church asked how long the fence would be. Mr. Potts said approximately ten feet long.

Ms. Church said considering the purpose for which this would be used and the fact that it would be completely screened from view, she was in favor of it.

Ms. Dockery suggested adding a stipulation that the height of the fence be limited to the minimum height needed to screen the generator.

**MOTION:**        **Ms. Dockery** 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.

**SECOND:**        **Mr. MacAulay.**

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.  
**MOTION:** **Ms. Dockery** moved to approve the application as modified to move the fence approximately five feet to place it behind the window, to stain the fence an appropriate color to be approved by staff or either allow the fence to age naturally, and to limit the height of the fence to the minimum height needed to screen the generator.  
**SECOND:** **Mr. MacAulay.**  
**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**ITEM #6: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Hillsborough Wine Company to hang a 19' x 20' wall sign, made of wood, in the recessed panel above the main entrance at 118 S. Churton Street (Tax ID 4.30.C.7E)**

Mr. Preston swore in Jennifer Barger, and Cheryl and Matt Sadgrove. Ms. Trueblood said this application was the new location for the Hillsborough Wine Company at 118 S. Churton Street. She said there was a mix of contributing and noncontributing structures in the vicinity with the majority contributing. Ms. Trueblood said this structure was not now listed in the inventory, but a re-inventory would take place shortly.

Ms. Trueblood said the application was to hang a 19' x 20' wall sign in the recessed panel above the main entrance. She said it would be wood and painted with the exact logo on their existing building. Ms. Trueblood said the square footage of the new sign would be 31.6 square feet, which complied with current zoning regulations. She said there had been no contact from neighbors regarding this application, and the standards that applied were C for exterior materials, I for exterior colors, and O for pertinent features.

**MOTION:** **Ms. Church** moved to find as fact that the Hillsborough Wine Company 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.

**SECOND:** **Ms. Church.**

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:** **Ms. Vergara** moved to approve the application as submitted.

**SECOND:** **Ms. Church.**

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

Mr. MacAulay commented on a sandwich board on the street in front of the Nationwide Insurance Office at 114 S. Churton Street, adding that the building had multiple tenants. Ms. Trueblood noted that the current Zoning Ordinance does not mention sandwich boards. Mr. MacAulay said he did not want to see several sandwich boards placed in front of each building.

**ITEM #7: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Cheryl and Matt Sadgrove to add a dormer to the west elevation that will match the dormer on the east elevation and remove paint from the brick foundation using a pressure washer at 229 E. Queen Street (Tax ID 4.19.I.10)**

Ms. Trueblood said this property was in the inventory as a contributing structure even though it had vinyl siding, with both contributing and noncontributing properties around it, the majority of which are noncontributing. She said it was a 1920's 1-½ -story side gable bungalow with a small front porch. Ms. Trueblood said there was Craftsman-style detailing, with the second story windows two over two sash and the others six over one.

Ms. Trueblood displayed pictures of the structure, and noted the proposal was to add a dormer to the west side of the house to match an existing dormer located on the east side. She said the applicants were proposing the dormer to allow them to build an interior bathroom upstairs, and needed the additional space the dormer would provide. Ms. Trueblood said the windows of the dormer would be wood framed and would open inward to match the existing dormer on the east side. She said the siding would also match the existing vinyl siding.

Ms. Trueblood said the applicants were also requesting to remove the gray paint from the foundation, which was brick, and let it regain its natural color. She said that would be done using a pressure-washing system. Ms. Trueblood displayed photos of the existing dormer on the east side. She said there had been no contact from neighbors in the vicinity, and the standards that applied were C for exterior materials, D for texture of materials, I for colors, J for proportion of openings, K for general form and proportions, and Q for walls.

Mr. MacAulay said he believed the proposal was consistent with the existing house and saw no issues with it.

Ms. Church said she had no objection to what was proposed. She wondered if there were plans to replace the fluted columns on the porch. Ms. Trueblood said that was not proposed in this application.

Mr. Moyer said the additional dormer appeared to be consistent with the house, and he believed it would be a nice addition.

Ms. Vergara said she had no objections.

Mr. Preston said one of the drawings showed that the dormer would be located just at the slope of the bottom of the roof. Mr. Sadgrove said because of the siding, there was about an 18" to 21" overhang of the roof, about 3 or 4 feet above the valley.

Mr. MacAulay said he had noticed there was a tree on that side of the house, and wondered if any surgery would be necessary to the tree in order to add the dormer. Mr. Sadgrove said they did not believe so.

- MOTION:** **Ms. Dockery** moved to find as fact that the Cheryl and Matt Sadgrove 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.
- SECOND:** **Mr. Moyer.**
- VOTE:** Unanimously approved.
- MOTION:** **Ms. Dockery** moved to approve the application as submitted.
- SECOND:** **Mr. Moyer.**
- VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**ITEM #8: Application for Jason Mann to demolish the existing house and construct a 2-1/2 story, 2,200 square foot new house at 408 Calvin Street (Tax ID 4.35.G.6)**

Mr. Preston swore in Ms. Mann. Ms. Trueblood said nearly all the houses in the vicinity were contributing with the exception of one new construction next door. She said the home in question was considered contributing. Ms. Trueblood said the existing structure was a one-story home with six over six sash windows, a full-width front porch with replacement posts and railings. She said the applicant was proposing to demolish the existing structure and replace it with a new 2,200 square foot house in a similar footprint.

Ms. Trueblood displayed a site plan, noting that the new home would be placed in approximately the same footprint as the existing house. She said the new home would be 2-1/2 stories, three-bay front gable with two over two vinyl-clad windows. Ms. Trueblood said the main roof would be asphalt shingles but the porch roof would have standing seam metal. She said the siding would be hardy plank, the shutters would be vinyl fiber, and the doors would be wood and glass. Ms. Trueblood said the foundation would be brick with a sand finish. She said a front wall one to three feet high was proposed to protect the tree roots and to hold the grade, and would be made of stacked stone.

Mr. Preston asked if the stacked stone would be flat stone. Ms. Mann responded that the fence would be very similar to one located about a block away. Ms. Trueblood said it would likely be mortared stone. Ms. Mann said the fence was definitely going to be used to hold grade since that area needed leveling.

Ms. Trueblood said a fence was planned for three feet tall in the side yards and six feet tall in the rear yard. She said it would be wood and a boundary fence in front and a privacy fence in back.

Ms. Trueblood said in February of 2002 the applicant had asked to demolish this house, and at that time the HDC had delayed the demolition for one year, at which time the COA for demolition was issued in February 2003. She said the COA was effective for only one year, so it had now expired. Ms. Trueblood said the minutes from 2002

indicated the HDC had denied the original request because it considered the proposal for the new house to be incompatible.

Ms. Mann noted that the house originally proposed in 2002 was similar to the home next door, and the currently proposed home was very different. Ms. Trueblood said she had been contacted by one neighbor, Art Rainer of 218 S. Occoneechee, via an email, in which he had stated support of the demolition since the house had deteriorated to the point that it could not be saved. She said Mr. Rainer went on to say he believed the new home would be a welcomed addition.

Ms. Trueblood noted that the standards that applied were A for height, B for setbacks, C for exterior materials, D for texture of exterior materials, F for architectural details, G for roof shape and proportion, H for roofing materials, J for portion and fenestration, K for general form, and L for orientation, M for scale, N for facade proportion, P for structural soundness, and Q for walls.

Mr. MacAulay asked if there was any information as to why this house was allowed to deteriorate to this point. Ms. Trueblood said the Demolition by Neglect ordinance was not in place in 2002. She said that the demolition of the house was folded into this application on the Town Attorney's advice. Mr. Preston stated that the Commission would have to deal with the demolition aspect first.

Mr. MacAulay said given the condition of the house he saw no other alternative than to demolish it.

Ms. Church agreed that the condition of the house suggested demolition, as well as the proposed replacement. She said she had no objection to the demolition but did have some issues with several of the details of the proposed replacement structure.

Mr. Moye said he agreed that demolition was necessary, considering the condition of the existing house.

Ms. Vergara agreed with the demolition, and noted the replacement house seemed to be more in keeping with the historic district than the one originally proposed house from 2002.

Ms. Dockery agreed, as did Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston asked the Commission members to now consider the proposed new structure.

Ms. Dockery said she would like to see the windows as wood rather than vinyl-clad. She asked if vinyl fiber shutters were what you would put on a vinyl sided home. Ms. Mann said yes. Ms. Dockery said she would rather see the shutters be wood. She said vinyl were great as far as maintenance, but they were easily broken.

Ms. Vergara agreed with Ms. Dockery about the vinyl shutters, noting they should be wood. She said she was okay with hardy plank since this was a new construction. Ms.

Vergara asked what the porch columns were made of. Ms. Mann said she assumed they would be wood. Ms. Vergara asked about the stairs leading down from the porch. Ms. Mann said they would be wood as well.

Mr. Moyer restated that the materials for the stairs would be wood as well as the columns, the railings on the porch would be wood, and on the left side elevation the top left quadrant over the porch would be aluminum as well as the roof over the bay window. Ms. Mann said that was correct.

Ms. Dockery asked if the chimney would be a wood frame as noted in the application. Ms. Trueblood said that was most likely regulated through the building code.

Mr. Moyer said with the hardy plank siding, there were different kinds with different textures. He asked Ms. Mann if she was willing to agree to have smooth hardy plank. Ms. Mann responded she would agree to that.

Ms. Church said she believed the application read wood lattice foundation enclosure. She asked if that applied as well to what was under the side porch shown on the right side elevation and under the bay window. Ms. Mann said yes, noting they would be consistent all around the house. Ms. Church asked about the color of the roofing. Ms. Mann said they had not discussed that because she believed the color was not something they had to present. She said that would be decided when they chose a color for the house.

Ms. Church said some of the metals for the roof come permanently colored, and asked if Ms. Mann could check back later with Ms. Trueblood regarding the color chosen. Mr. Preston noted that color was an important factor. Ms. Mann said she would do that. Ms. Trueblood said paint color usually is staff review, and if the color chosen was outside the acceptable range then it would come back before the Commission. She briefly outlined the regulations regarding color. Ms. Church said she agreed that a house that would be this attractive when finished should have wood shutters rather than vinyl.

Ms. Church asked what had been the standard in the past regarding wood vinyl-clad windows. Ms. Trueblood responded that it had not been approved on buildings that previously had wood windows. She said on new construction, people sometimes used wood, but we had seen aluminum clad windows in the past six months as well. Ms. Church said she wanted to make sure the Mann's used "true" divided light, two over two windows. She asked if the wood fence would be painted or stained, or allowed to naturally weather. Ms. Mann said she was thinking painting it white. Ms. Church said if they were unsure about the finish on the fence and the yard then Ms. Trueblood could approve that later.

Ms. Trueblood said the large oak tree in the front of the property was partially in the public right-of-way, but it was appropriate for them to build the wall and protect the tree. Ms. Church said when they placed the stone wall around the tree, she wanted them

to be sure and leave enough space to help fend off encroachment by maintenance people.

Ms. Church said regarding the color of the foundation, the proposal stated “brick, sand-finished gray tone.” She said she did not know what that meant. Ms. Mann responded that the proposal was that the brick would have a gray-sand-colored finish.

Responding to a statement regarding the setbacks, Ms. Trueblood said this was already a nonconforming structure so the new structure could be built with reduced setbacks as outlined in the ordinance.

Mr. MacAulay said he had serious concerns about the large oak tree in the front. He said the scale shown on the plans was not accurate, noting the tree was only about ten feet back from the edge of the pavement. Mr. MacAulay said his concern was that the plan to adjust the slope coming up from the street and putting in a wall would put you in the position of a backhoe potentially chewing up the roots of the tree. He said secondly, it appeared that there was a substantial limb of approximately 12 inches in diameter that heads out towards the northeast and was already over the existing house. Mr. MacAulay said when you put a two-story house on that lot you would have to do major surgery on a major limb of that tree.

Mr. MacAulay said that tree was a heritage tree, and the limb in question was quite large. Ms. Mann asked what would the Commission propose they do, since their plan called for a two-story house. Mr. MacAulay said he wanted the tree protected. Ms. Mann responded that might mean not building the house. Mr. MacAulay responded that was their problem to deal with. He said they were proposing to do two things that he believed would impact the long-term well being of the tree, which had likely been there several hundred years.

Ms. Church asked how far the tree was from the outer edge. Mr. MacAulay said he had paced it off today, and the tree was ten feet from the edge of the pavement. Ms. Mann said hypothetically if someone was living in that home now and that branch was deemed a hazard, what would be recourse to protect the home or the residents within. Mr. MacAulay said safety rules were different, noting that that the proposal was an arbitrary attack on the tree.

Ms. Church said given the setback of the front porch, how far was it from the main body of the house as it was proposed. She said perhaps it was possible to shift the house back somewhat on the lot. Ms. Mann said that was not an option due to the setback requirements.

Mr. MacAulay said before he could support the proposal, he would like to see at minimum the Tree Board offer their opinion on this. Ms. Trueblood said this would be a Tree Board issue in any case because it was in the public right-of-way. Mr. MacAulay asked if the Tree Board could review this issue. Ms. Trueblood said she did not know what their policy was regarding pruning limbs, but she would be glad to check

into it. She said the Tree Board could certainly offer advice to help the homeowners protect the tree.

Ms. Dockery suggested moving ahead and adding a stipulation that the Mann's check with the Tree Board before any pruning was done. Mr. MacAulay said he wanted some assurance that these buildings activities could not compromise the health of the tree. He said that tree was a southern red oak and was massive, and it added to the real historical character of our district. Mr. MacAulay said he was deeply concerned that its root system might be interrupted which would weaken the tree, and that a substantial limb might be removed, leaving the tree subject to insects and drought and other things.

Ms. Mann said she understood completely the remarks, and they would treat the tree with as much care as humanly possible. She asked if the Commission was asking that no structure be placed there. Mr. MacAulay said a one-story structure would not harm the tree. Ms. Mann said for them, that was not negotiable. Mr. MacAulay said he would be happy with any proposal they had as long as that tree was protected.

Ms. Church suggested that the building be approved with a condition of consulting with and getting approval of the Tree Board regarding the large oak tree.

Mr. Preston said hardiplank was not normally approved for a historic house. He said he believed the Commission had agreed to approve it in this case as long as smooth hardy plank was used. Mr. Preston the Commission also asked that the Mann's use wood corner boards, trim, and wood fascias. He said the stucco chimney bothered him, noting the configuration of it looked almost too modern for this house.

Ms. Church related information she had been given from a contractor regarding stucco chimneys and the possibility of catching on fire if a large fire was built. Ms. Mann noted that their intention was to use gas logs, so any fire would be moderate. Ms. Church said she would prefer the stucco finish to some others.

Mr. Preston asked if the Mann's would be willing to put in a brick chimney. Ms. Mann said she was unable to answer that question at this time. Ms. Church said there was a considerable difference in cost. Ms. Mann agreed, noting that concerned her.

Mr. MacAulay said when built this would be one of the premier houses in that area. He encouraged Ms. Mann to consider using a brick chimney, since that would add to the quality of the district. Ms. Mann agreed to consider it. Mr. MacAulay said the other choices were unacceptable, noting that the Commission's criteria should be what else was present in the district. He said while stucco might be fine elsewhere, in the Hillsborough historic district the chimneys were predominantly red clay brick. Mr. MacAulay said given the quality of this house and its contribution to the overall character of the district, he believed it should be consistent with other homes in the district.

Ms. Mann asked for a short break to contact her husband so that a decision could be made on the use of brick for the chimney. She asked if there were any other points of contention.

Ms. Dockery said so far the issues were the vinyl shutters, the chimney, the divided windows, the corner boards and fascia instead of all hardy plank, the use of smooth hardy plank, and the use of wood for the stairs and handrails.

Mr. Preston noted the Commission would move on to the next item until Ms. Mann returned with a response to the Commission's concerns.

The item was temporarily tabled.

**ITEM #9: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Orange County Housing to install front porch railings made from pressure-treated wood at 216 W. Union Street (Tax ID 4.18.D.9)**

Ms. Trueblood said no representative was present from the County, possibly because this was a simple application for a handrail. She indicated she would be willing to answer questions since she had worked with them on this application.

Ms. Trueblood said the structure was noncontributing and was a one-story three-bay concrete block house with a hipped roof and built in the 1950's. She said this was property that Orange County was improving for use by the property owners, and the County was contributing the work to improve the property. Ms. Trueblood said the railing was being added for the safety of the residents, to be made of pressure-treated wood that would be painted white. She said the railings would be four x four posts and the pickets would be two x two. Ms. Trueblood said that no contact had been made by nearby residents, and the standards that applied were C for materials, F for details, and P for structural soundness.

Ms. Trueblood displayed a photo of the house and pointed out the location of the addition. She said the railing would be a traditional porch railing that would go around the perimeter of the porch and then come down the stairs. Ms. Church noted that there was a white stain available that looked like paint but did not peel. Ms. Trueblood said that could be added as a condition, and if the applicant wanted to protest it then they could come back before the Commission.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to find as fact that the Orange County Housing application is in substantial compliance with the overall character of the district and substantially 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.

**SECOND:** Mr. Moye.

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to approve the application with the recommendation that white stain be used in place of paint on the railing.

**SECOND:** Mr. Moye.

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved

**ITEM #10: Debrief training session from September 25 and discuss how it affects the HDC.**

By consensus, this item was moved to the November agenda for discussion.

**ITEM #12: Review schedule for updating documents and procedures of the HDC.**

Ms. Trueblood stated that there were two issues she wanted to bring forward, which were the Scope of Work and the schedule for addressing recommendations. She said the recommendations came out of the Commission's May meeting, where she had put forward a list of recommendations based on research she had done regarding issues that the Commission needed to deal with. Ms. Trueblood said the recommendations as well as recommendations included by the Commission were listed as items 1-15 in the materials. She said the first four were either completed or in some stage of work towards completion, meaning they still had 11 left to go. Ms. Trueblood said she would like to complete the other 11 this year.

Ms. Trueblood stated she believed the 11 items left on the list could be completed if they stayed on target. Ms. Trueblood said she had produced a schedule for every month from now until July of 2007, showing what topics she would like to have the Commission cover each month. Mr. Preston said that schedule may have to change somewhat. Ms. Trueblood agreed that the Commission may not always complete each item, but that could be dealt with.

Ms. Church said she believed the schedule was well done. She said there was one item she wanted looked at before Ellen Turko, the consultant, began her work updating the inventory. Ms. Church said she wanted the Commission to agree on what they thought contributing and noncontributing should be, noting that had been a problem with previous inventories. She said that had been a problem in the past, in that the person conducting the inventory was asked to decide what was contributing and what was noncontributing, and the Commission should be deciding that.

Ms. Trueblood suggested having consultant provide what she used to determine those two categories for the Commission to consider. She reminded the Commission that anything constructed after 1939 could not be considered contributing, because the period of significance was up through 1939. Ms. Trueblood said the other ingredients had to do with architectural character, heritage, materials, and any historical significance to Hillsborough. She said the consultant had been contracted for only 75 properties, not the entire district. Ms. Trueblood said the consultant would be looking at only the houses that were currently missing information on in the inventory, the ones that the Commission had questioned, and others that for some reason had been modified in some way.

Ms. Church said she wanted the consultant to be asked specifically about houses that have vinyl siding over the entire house. Ms. Trueblood said she would ask her for a statement on what she did with vinyl and aluminum siding and then she would email the response to the Commission.

Mr. Moye asked if we would be able to adjust the schedule if there was any question about the standard for contributing properties. Ms. Trueblood said that development standards for noncontributing properties was not the same as the question of why a property was noncontributing. She said that meant that for houses that were noncontributing, the question was how would we deal with them, in terms of the windows, materials, and other things.

Ms. Trueblood indicated that Ms. Mann had rejoined the meeting.

## **RETURN TO**

### **ITEM #8: Application for Jason Mann to demolish the existing house and construct a 2-½ story, 2,200 square foot new house at 408 Calvin Street (Tax ID 4.35.G.6)**

Ms. Mann offered her apologies, noting her husband had informed her that the chimney would be brick. She said the wood corner boards and the trim would be wood, as well as the stairs and handrails. Ms. Mann said the smooth hardy plank was acceptable as well. She said the issue was the windows was that they had not yet priced them, and as long as the price difference was not more than 20% they would be willing to agree to that. Ms. Trueblood said a condition could be added that the applicant use true divided light, and if it turned out that they did not want to proceed with that they could come back to the Commission and present their reasons.

Ms. Mann said it was their intention to keep the fence natural, so there would be no colored stain or paint. She said they would also use wood shutters rather than the vinyl fiber. Mr. Preston said there would still be the proviso that the Tree Board review the protection plans for the large oak tree. Ms. Mann said they would agree to that. Mr. Preston encouraged the Mann's to approach the Tree Board as soon as possible. Ms. Trueblood said this could be added on their next agenda for consideration, and if the Tree Board did not approve the plans for some reason, the Mann's could come back before the Commission.

Ms. Church asked Ms. Trueblood to notify whoever was in charge of paving in that area, then whenever the next paving was scheduled that they hold the pavement where it was now located and do any widening on the other side.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dockery moved to find as fact that the Jason Mann 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. Moye.

**VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

- MOTION:** **Ms. Dockery** moved to approve the application for demolition as submitted with conditions that hardy plank siding with six-inch reveal would be smooth, that all other trim would be wood, including eaves, fascia, and corner boards, that the doors would be wood and glass as specified, shutters would be wood, windows would be true divided lights with vinyl clad as submitted, roofing as submitted, foundation as submitted, the rock wall as submitted, the fence would be natural or if painted with color to be determined by staff, the chimney would be brick rather than stucco as submitted, the porch columns, railings, styles and stairs would be wood, and that the Tree Board approve the Mann's plans for protecting the tree.
- SECOND:** **Ms. Church.**
- VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**RETURN TO**

**ITEM #12: Review schedule for updating documents and procedures of the HDC.**

Ms. Trueblood said her understanding was that she receive information from the consultant about how she determined what was contributing, that at the Commission's November meeting they would start the conversation about how they talk about materials for noncontributing houses. She said they needed to move to a set of standards that were legally defensible.

- MOTION:** **Ms. Dockery** moved to accept the calendar as submitted by Ms. Trueblood.
- SECOND:** **Mr. Moye.**
- VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

**ITEM #11: Hold annual elections for officers.**

Mr. Preston moved that Jessica Dockery be nominated as the Chair. He then moved that nominations cease and that Ms. Dockery be appointed by acclamation. The Commission appointed Ms. Dockery as Chair by acclamation.

Ms. Dockery moved that Max Preston be reappointed as Vice Chair. The Commission appointed Mr. Preston as Vice Chair by acclamation.

**ITEM #13: Adjourn.**

Mr. Preston adjourned the meeting at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Stephanie Trueblood, Staff

