

MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Wednesday, September 3, 2008
7:00 pm, Town Barn

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Mark Rhodes, absence excused.

STAFF: Planner Stephanie Trueblood.

WITNESSES: Mark Bell, Linda Ostrand, Michael Moylan, Christine Watt, Dewitt Hamilton, and Wes Cook.

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

Ms. Dockery called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., and Ms. Trueblood called the roll and confirmed the quorum.

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

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

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

Ms. Trueblood noted that earlier today Wes Cook had requested to be placed on the agenda as an emergency works application for a property at 121 East Tryon Street. She said the proposal was to remove pine trees prior to the storm expected this weekend. Ms. Trueblood added that this item could be placed at the end of the agenda, and at that time the Commission could decide if the request met the definition of an emergency. She said she had hand-delivered notices to affected property owners 6 hours prior to this meeting

ITEM #4: Approval of minutes from the August 6, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Council stated that on page 12, there appeared to be some comments that did not make it into the minutes, and asked if anyone had concerns about that. Ms. Trueblood determined from the Commission members that the gist of the conversation was included and no changes were required.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to approve the minutes of August 6, 2008 as presented.

SECOND: **Mr. Bell.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #5: **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Ken and Linda Ostrand to remove existing lattice fencing and install 70' of wood picket-style fencing with a varying height between 48"-54" behind and along the east front line of the house to connect with existing wire fence along the east and north property lines at 158 West Margaret Lane (TMBL 4.36.A.4).**

Ms. Dockery swore in Linda Ostrand and Stephanie Trueblood. Ms. Trueblood provided some brief information regarding the application and the architecture of the structure, noting that the proposal was to remove existing lattice fencing and install 70' of wood picket-style fencing with a varying height between 48"-54" behind and along the east front line of the house to connect with existing wire fence along the east and north property lines. She stated the fence would be 54" tall in the front and 48" tall in the back and painted white after the wood cures. Ms. Trueblood stated the new fence would tie into an existing wire fence along the back property line to complete closing in the backyard for a pet.

Ms. Trueblood stated that the Standards that applied were C for materials, F for architectural details, and Q for walls, and the Design Guideline that applied was Fences and Walls.

Ms. Ostrand stated that the proposed fence was very similar in style to that depicted in the photo that had been provided, adding she would like to add posts with caps as well.

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.

Ms. Snyder asked about the difference in height. Ms. Ostrand stated that the existing fence was almost six feet high, and she was attempting to match the height of the lattice in front of the crawlspace. She said she was attempting to make it look symmetrical from the front.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the Ken and Linda Ostrand 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, F, and Q, and the Design Guideline for Fences and Walls.

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

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

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

ITEM #6: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Michael Moylan to demolish the existing non-contributing structure at 406 West Queen Street (TMBL 4.18.F.7).

Ms. Dockery swore in Michael Moylan. Ms. Trueblood provided some brief information regarding the application and the architecture of the structure, noting that the proposal was to demolish the existing non-contributing structure at this location. She said that the Design Guideline that applied was Demolition to Existing Buildings.

Ms. Trueblood displayed photos of the house and pointed out some of the significant damage to the structure.

Mr. Moylan stated that they had opened the walls up a couple of years ago, and one wall on the east side was completely termite-ridden so there were not even any supports. He stated they had provided support, and then found that under the house the termite damage was massive. Mr. Moylan stated they wanted to demolish the house primarily so that it did not pose a transient issue for neighboring houses.

Ms. Dockery asked did he have plans to rebuild on the property. Mr. Moylan responded not at this time, noting ideally they would like to sell the property although with no road frontage that might be difficult. Ms. Trueblood added that it would remain a buildable lot.

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.

Ms. Dockery said that the Guidelines stated if there were plans available they would be reviewed, but since no plans existed then the Commission could proceed with a decision.

Mr. McCullough stated there was something in the Guidelines requiring a written statement. Ms. Trueblood stated that was the Commission's choice, but if the Moylan's or any future property owner wanted to develop the property it would have to receive a COA.

Mr. Bell commented that this structure appeared to be a good candidate for demolition.

MOTION: **Mr. Bell** moved to find as fact that the Michael Moylan 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 the Design Guideline for Demolition of Existing Buildings.

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

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

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #7: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Pamela Williams of Branching Out to remove the existing sign and install a 5.38 square foot awning-style metal sign above and to the right side of the door at 116 South Churton Street (TMBL 4.30.C.7A).

Ms. Dockery swore in Christine Watt. Ms. Trueblood provided some brief information regarding the application and the structure, noting that the proposal was to remove the existing sign and install a 5.38 square foot awning-style metal oval sign from a metal bracket above and to the right side of the door and to add press-on letters in the window. She said the metal sign design would be green with white lettering.

Ms. Trueblood stated the Standards that applied were C for materials, F for architectural details, and O for appurtenant fixtures and the Design Guideline that applied was Signage. Ms. Trueblood stated that the proposed sign met the requirements of the Sign Ordinance. She stated that the applicant planned to add stenciled letters in the window, although that feature was exempt from ordinance regulations but information had been included for the Commission's information only.

Ms. Watt commented that the metal bracket shown in the photos was not an exact replica, noting the bracket to be used was standard. She said the lettering would be black, not white.

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.

Mr. Council expressed concern about the size of the sign. He said although it fit the requirements, 38.64 inches was almost a meter and that seemed a bit large for the size of the building. Mr. Council said there was a large sign likely that wide on the opposite side of the street up half a block or so, but that was a much larger building. He wondered if the applicant would consider using a shorter sign more in scale with the building. Ms. Watt responded they could perhaps consider scaling it down if the Commission offered some advice as to what size it wanted. Mr. Council stated that particular size seemed a bit large to him for a narrow, short building. Ms. Watt stated they had proposed the sign based on the guidelines.

Mr. Bell said in the past they had seen examples of what signs would actually look like, superimposed on a photo so that the Commission could see a real-life example. He said that would have been helpful, that is, to have a more visual context of what the sign would look like.

Mr. Council stated there was a sign in front of the Saratoga Grill, and asked how this sign would compare in size. Ms. Watt stated she had not measured it so she would not know.

Ms. Dockery stated she believed the Saratoga sign was likely between 24" and 30" long, and about 18" to 24" tall. Ms. Dockery stated it was likely a very standard awning size sign, that the difference was that compared to other buildings this one was shorter but it was still a part of the street wall.

Mr. Council noted that the large oval sign in front of Dallas Pritchard's building was a large sign, but that building was much wider and much taller and had a much more imposing façade that could figuratively and literally carry the sign. He said that was his concern here, in that could the side of this building really carry a sign that was that large as compared to the sign in front of Saratoga.

Ms. Dockery noted that most of the signs they were talking about seemed to be about 24" long rather than 3 feet. She asked was that closer to that Mr. Council thought the building could handle. Mr. Council responded yes, more like the Saratoga sign.

Ms. Trueblood explained that the way the measurement was defined in the Ordinance was for a wall sign, because the Zoning Ordinance did not speak to hanging signs. She said hanging signs had been interpreted as wall signage, so this sign size was the calculation as if the sign was flat against the wall. Ms. Trueblood said that may be why in this circumstance the sign seemed somewhat out of scale, but there have been other hanging signs approved using this same calculation by the Commission. She said if the applicant decided to retain a larger sign but wanted to consider wall signage, perhaps the Commission would think that larger scale was more appropriate flat against the building.

Ms. Dockery said she believed flat on the wall the sign was a perfectly acceptable size, but agreed that as an awning sign it would be very large. She asked Ms. Watt if the applicant would be amenable to coming back with a slightly smaller scale sign. Ms. Dockery stated the Commission could put a range on the approval and leave it to staff to approve as a Minor Work, if the Commission was comfortable with that.

Mr. Council suggested that the sign be under 3 feet, but as close to the size as the neighboring Saratoga sign as possible.

Mr. Bell stated he wanted to point out that the name of this proposed company had more letters than the Saratoga sign, noting that if the sign was made too small the lettering might be compromised.

Mr. Council asked if 28" would be sufficient, or perhaps 30". Ms. Watt responded that given the name of the business, 30" would be more legible. Ms. Trueblood stated she believed the Commission was considering approving the application with the condition that the sign be 30" or less, and giving staff the ability to approve it as a Minor Work so that it would not have to come back before the Commission for further approval.

Ms. Dockery asked if that was acceptable to the applicant, noting the alternative was that the Commission could vote on the application as it was submitted.

Mr. Council said he was willing to say 30" to 32" was acceptable. Ms. Watt said she would have to determine how the lettering would work, and if it did not then she would come back with another proposal.

Mr. McCullough stated that not all signage was uniform, and he did not believe having the sign the same size as the Saratoga sign would work in this case, as that was much too small.

Ms. Dockery summarized by saying the Commission was proposing that the sign be no more than 32" in length and no more than 20" tall, and that if it met that condition then the sign could be approved by staff as a Minor Work. She said if that was not possible, then the applicant would come back before the Commission with another proposal.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the Pamela Williams 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, F, and O, and the Design Guideline for Signage.

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

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as modified with the conditions that the sign will be no more than 32" in length, no more than 20.08" in height as originally proposed, and the new design can be approved by staff as a Minor Work.

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

ITEM #8: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Dewitt Hamilton to install a 12' x 8' x 9' 'Tackroom' outbuilding with T-111 siding, a wood frame window, a cupola, and a skylight at the rear of the property at 229 Thomas Ruffin St. (TMBL 4.19.I.9).

Ms. Dockery swore in Dewitt Hamilton. Ms. Trueblood provided some brief information regarding the application and the architecture of the structure, noting that the proposal was to install a 12' x 8' x 9' 'Tackroom' outbuilding with T-111 siding, a wood frame window, a cupola, and a skylight at the rear of the property. She stated the applicant had several changes to the information provided in the packet.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the only real change was the French doors, which would be solid wood, and there would be no window on the side. Ms. Trueblood stated the applicant had selected the larger style window, and rather than the door noted in the information she was now proposing French doors with no window on the side. She said there would be dimensional shingles on the roof rather than a flat shingle, a wood cupola, the skylight on the rear, and the foundation would sit on concrete blocks with a veneer of fieldstone.

Ms. Trueblood stated the Standards that applied were A for height, C for materials, D for texture, F for architectural details, G for roof shape, H for roof material, J for proportion of window openings, K for general form and proportion, L for orientation, and O for appurtenant fixtures. She said the Design Guideline that applied was New Construction of Outbuildings and Garages.

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.

Ms. Hamilton noted that there were be no steps, but a small ramp that came off the building.

Ms. Dockery asked why the structure was diagonal to the building. Ms. Hamilton said because that was her preference. She said it was coming off at a 45 degree angle and she believed it fit better, noting that there was a grape vine growing behind there with an empty lot behind that, and placing it at a 45 degree angle allowed for screening from the neighbor's backyard. Ms. Hamilton said it also provide for more design opportunities.

Ms. Dockery asked was the cupola functional or just decoration. Ms. Hamilton said it was decoration and she would be fine with removing it. Ms. Dockery said she would prefer that it be removed, since there were not many to be found in the historic district.

Ms. Dockery asked about the T-111 proposed. Ms. Trueblood stated the Commission had approved the use of T-111 very recently for outbuildings. Ms. Trueblood stated that T-111 was like plywood with vertical grooves.

Ms. Trueblood asked was the applicant proposing shutters. Ms. Hamilton responded yes, she was proposing wood shutters. She noted the window was also proposed as solid wood frame.

Mr. McCullough commented it did not appear that the building would be very visible from the street. Ms. Hamilton stated she did not believe it would be visible from the street at all, since it was in the very northwest corner of the property.

Ms. Dockery asked what color the building would be. Ms. Trueblood noted the color would be approved as a Minor Work.

MOTION: **Ms. Snyder** moved to find as fact that the Dewitt Hamilton 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 A, C, D, F, G, H, J, K, L, and O, and the Design Guideline for New Construction of Outbuildings and Garages.

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

MOTION: **Ms. Snyder** moved to approve the application as modified with the conditions that the cupola will be removed, the shutters will be wood, the French doors will be wood, the window will be wood and will be larger, that fieldstone will be placed around the foundation, and the skylight will be on the rear.

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

ITEM #9: **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Mark Bell to replace asphalt shingles on the rear addition roof with galvanized 5V metal roofing in matte black to match the roofing on the remainder of the house at 168 West King Street (TMBL 4.31.D.11).**

Ms. Dockery indicated that Mark Bell would need to be recused as he was the applicant for this Certificate of Appropriateness. She noted that with Mr. Bell recused, there continued to be a quorum of the Commission present.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to recuse Mark Bell from consideration of this item as he was the applicant for this Certificate of Appropriateness.

SECOND: **Ms. Dockery.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

Ms. Trueblood swore in Mark Bell. Ms. Trueblood provided some brief information regarding the application and the architecture of the structure, noting that the proposal was to replace the asphalt shingles on the rear kitchen addition roof with galvanized 5V metal roofing in matte black to match the existing roofing on the remainder of the house. She stated that the Standards that applied were H for roofing materials, and the Design Guideline that applied was Roofs.

Mr. Bell stated they believed that the addition was likely built in 1817 when the house was expanded, and was connected to the main structure in 1889 by about a 10-foot connector with a shed roof, which was also 5V. He said all of other roofs had wood shakes underneath, but this one had four layers of asphalt.

Ms. Dockery determined that there were no other HDC members who 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 Mark Bell application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standard H, and the Design Guideline for Roofs.

SECOND: **Ms. Dockery.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved (with Mark Bell recused).

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

SECOND: **Ms. Dockery.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved (with Mark Bell recused).

Ms. Dockery noted that Mark Bell had returned to his position as Commission member.

ITEM #10: Emergency Application from Wes Cook to remove pine trees located at 121 West Tryon Street prior to the storm expected this weekend.

Ms. Dockery swore in Wes Cook. Mr. Cook noted that he rented the house and the tenants had not taken care of the yard. He stated there were 10 pine trees in the back that were planted about 30 years ago that needed to be removed and the landscaping improved. Ms. Trueblood noted that Mr. Cook was concerned that with the predicted storm, the trees needed to be removed to prevent them falling. She stated that Mr. Cook had submitted his application for emergency review, which was a provision in the Ordinance that allowed the Commission to hear work of an emergency nature. Ms. Trueblood stated it was up to the Commission to determine if the request fit the description for emergency review. She added

that a notification letter had been hand-delivered to property owners in the vicinity to alert them of Mr. Cook's request.

Ms. Trueblood stated she had taken photos of the trees, which were yellow pines, noting that most were over 12" in diameter. She said from the front of the house you had to look into the rear yard to see the trees.

Ms. Dockery asked how close were the trees to the house, or any other structure on the property. Mr. Cook responded they were a good ways away, noting that if they were to fall they would not destroy the house but it would certainly create a "mess" and the trees would not be useable if they were blown down and broken up.

Ms. Trueblood provided a description of the property for the Commission's benefit as well as the structure. She stated that the Standards that applied were E for landscaping, and the Design Guidelines that applied were Site Features and Plantings. She also mentioned that there were other hardwood trees in the vicinity of the pine trees that the applicant was not requesting to remove.

Mr. Cook remarked that the expense of removing the trees now would be much less than having to clean them up after a severe storm or hurricane.

Mr. Bell asked if Mr. Cook had any reason to believe that the trees were in danger of coming down. Mr. Cook responded they were not in danger of coming down until faced with some event such as the storm expected this weekend. He said a pine tree's life was only 30 to 40 years because of pine beetles, and these trees were already better than 30 years old. Mr. Cook stated he had already landscaped along the creek, and he planned to landscape the rest when the trees were removed.

Ms. Snyder asked when Mr. Cook said he wanted to landscape, did that mean he was considering planting more trees. Mr. Cook stated he wanted to landscape the yard so it could be mowed and cared for. He said he would prefer that the yard be big and open, which was the way it used to be before the trees were planted. Ms. Snyder said then this was something that he would likely have requested sooner or later, but was being requested now because of the impending storm. Mr. Cook agreed, noting that he really hated to have to clean them up if this or any other storm took them down.

Mr. McCullough asked if the trees could be sold as timber when they were taken down. Mr. Cook said yes, if they were not damaged. He said if they were blown down, that would likely not be possible because they would likely be broken up.

Mr. Bell asked if those 10 trees were all the pine trees on the property, or were there others. Mr. Cook stated there were no other pine trees, but there were three

Oak trees in the front, an apple tree on the right-hand side, and in the far back was a pecan tree that was 3 to 4 feet across.

Mr. Bell stated normally the Commission was given much more notice and was able to pay a site visit in order to contextualize the request. He said he did understand the concept of thinning and harvesting trees as well as the life of a tree, and was sympathetic to Mr. Cook's concern. Mr. Cook stated if the trees were blown down they would be of no value and would create a financial burden to remove.

Mr. Bell asked if Mr. Cook had enough time to remove the trees prior to the predicted storm this Friday. Mr. Cook said possibly, if he could get a loader onto the property tomorrow. He said if not, he would take them down at the first convenient time.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved to find as fact that the Wes Cook application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standard E, and the Design Guidelines for Site Features and Plantings.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved to approve the emergency application as submitted with no conditions.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #11: Commission and Staff Reports/Updates.

Public Hearing re Text Amendment related to Design Guidelines

Ms. Trueblood said that Mr. Council had asked about the public hearing regarding the text amendment that would add the Design Guidelines as an interpretive document and referencing them in the Zoning Ordinance. She said in a court case that would allow them to use the Design Guidelines to back up the findings of fact. Ms. Trueblood stated that text amendment was going to public hearing Thursday, October 16, at 7:00 p.m. She strongly suggested that someone from the HDC be present at that public hearing to speak about the importance of that text amendment. Ms. Trueblood indicated she would advise the Commission regarding the location of that public hearing as soon as she got that information, but it would likely be in one of the courtrooms.

Ms. Trueblood stated that public hearing was a joint hearing before the Planning Board and the Town Board, and anyone who wanted to speak would be allowed to do so at that time. She said the Boards would either close the hearing after all

speakers had finished, or could elect to hold the hearing open to obtain more evidence or information. Ms. Trueblood stated then it would go to the Planning Board for deliberation, and the Planning Board would then make a recommendation to the Town Board. She said it would likely be December before it was placed on the Town Board's agenda.

Ms. Trueblood stated the Commission could coordinate and several members speak at the hearing, although Mr. Council had already expressed an interest in attending. She noted she would not be present at that hearing.

Mr. Council suggested that if any other Commission members wanted to coordinate with him, to please contact him.

Colonial Inn Complaint

Ms. Trueblood stated that last month she had reported that they had received a complaint letter citing a Demolition by Neglect complaint against the Colonial Inn, and she had believed it would be on tonight's agenda. But in looking at the ordinance, there had to be a 30 to 60 day notice after the site visit, so that meant it would be on a future Commission agenda. Ms. Trueblood stated that last month the Commission had indicated that she could limit the number of applications accepted for that meeting since they knew the Colonial Inn issue would take up some time, and asked that she be given that same flexibility for that meeting.

The Board agreed by consensus to allow Ms. Trueblood to limit the number of applications placed on that agenda due to the length of time they expected would be needed for the Colonial Inn complaint.

Ms. Trueblood stated that the notices were already done as well as the staff report and the site visit.

326 West Margaret Lane

Ms. Trueblood stated that Faith Kiffney's property at 326 Margaret Lane remained in Notice of Violation regarding the window that was out of compliance, and she had no new updates.

Other

Ms. Trueblood noted that the PNC annual conference was coming up in October if any of the Commission members were interested in attending, adding that it was in Winston Salem this year. She said she would be attending.

Ms. Trueblood stated she would like to set up a fall training session for HDC members. She said she had an interest in inviting Bob Hornik to come and go over some simple strategies for improving motions and findings of fact, and did not believe that would take very much time. Ms. Trueblood asked the Commission to consider an additional meeting time and send their ideas to her,

adding she did not believe the training would take more than an hour to an hour and a half.

Ms. Dockery suggested a weekday meeting beginning at 7 p.m., but not on the day of their regular meeting. Ms. Trueblood said she would look at the meeting room availability as well as Mr. Hornik's schedule, and email out some potential dates for the members to respond to.

Mr. Council asked what happened with Judith Hauser's application and the issues with the Preservation Fund. Ms. Trueblood stated she believed they would be hearing back from Ms. Hauser, because right now the Preservation Fund still felt strongly that their suggestions for improving the design were better. She said the architect had drawn plans based on that suggestion, and she understood that once Ms. Hauser saw those plans she was dissatisfied and now either wanted to go with her first design or not do the work at all. Ms. Trueblood stated that Ms. Hauser thought the flattening of the roof really changed the appearance, and right now it was out of the HDC's hands unless Ms. Hauser wanted to make a change.

Mr. Council asked had the Preservation Fund seen the drawing. Ms. Trueblood said they had, but she was not sure that from the drawing it was easy to see what was happening on that back roof line, unless you were accustomed to looking at that type of drawing. But, she said, the Preservation Fund was concerned how it would look from a bird's eye view from the back of the house and how the roof tied in.

Mr. Council asked about the gas station. Ms. Trueblood stated that the demolition request for Freeland's Garage had been withdrawn.

Ms. Dockery asked about Robbin Taylor-Hall. Ms. Trueblood stated she had heard nothing on that property. Ms. Dockery said someone needed to write a Demolition by Neglect complaint letter. Ms. Trueblood stated that Ms. Taylor-Hall had indicated that work on the property was coming along so quickly that she did not want to put up plastic to protect the building. Ms. Trueblood she did not remember for sure, but believed it had been about a year ago. She said the COA allowed for one year to do the work, but if you came to staff after that year and staff could determine that there had been no changes to the plans and no real procedural or precedent changes on the Commission, then staff could approve a continuation of that COA for another year. She said that had not yet been done in this case, but technically Ms. Taylor-Hall would be eligible for that.

Mr. McCullough asked had Ms. Taylor-Hall planned all along to do a total rehab of the structure. Ms. Trueblood stated yes, that what the Commission had approved was a total restoration to the original style of the building. She said if the building was open, she would have to secure it. Mr. McCullough stated that building was not secure at present. Ms. Trueblood responded then that was a

Code Enforcement issue that needed to be addressed, and she would follow up on that with the Code Enforcement Officer.

Ms. Trueblood stated that the Commission had elections for Chair and Vice Chair coming up next month, and said if anyone wanted to make nominations they could email them to her. She asked Ms. Dockery if she was interested in continuing to serve as Chair. Ms. Dockery responded she would be happy to do so.

Ms. Snyder asked Ms. Trueblood had she had an opportunity to look at the house at Hassell Street where they had approved a front porch. Ms. Trueblood said that Ms. Snyder had brought to her attention Mike Kirby's house across from the Rec Center on North Hassell Street, which had a rear addition and a side portico porch approved. Ms. Trueblood stated if you looked at the drawings submitted, it said an 84 square foot porch, but if you looked at the scale that was submitted on the drawings it did not measure out to be 84 square feet. So, she said, there was a contradiction in the drawings, but neither matched what had been built. Ms. Trueblood said she had visited the site and the porch was larger than 84 SF. She said the way she had decided to deal with that issue was that the application required a Zoning Permit and a part of that permit was that there had to be an as-built survey turned in before the Certificate of Occupancy was issued. Ms. Trueblood stated when the applicant came forward with that as-built survey, they would make it clear that what was on the as-built survey did not match the plans. She said that would mean that the applicant would have to come back before the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for that porch.

Ms. Snyder asked if the lesson here was that they could not trust the drawings provided with applications. Ms. Trueblood said it appeared that they would need to double-check the measurements when plans were submitted. She said in this case, the square footage was put in narrative form and the drawings were in plan form, and she had not caught the discrepancies, either. Ms. Trueblood said the narrative did not match, the plans did not match, and what was built did not match the drawings, so there three completely different things happening at that site. She said there were other questions that needed to be answered as well, such as was that porch now too close to the property line, was it in the setback line, etc. Ms. Trueblood stated they would have to wait until the as-built survey was sent in to address the issues, and then figure out how those issues would be corrected. She said eventually, the applicant would have the same options as anyone else who had built something that was not approved.

ITEM #12: Adjourn.

Mr. McCullough moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 p.m., seconded by Mr. Bell. The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Trueblood, Secretary