

**TOWN OF BOONE
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 2018
5:30 P.M.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairperson-Sarah Davis Cagle, Daniel Johnson, and Jason Selong (arrived at 6:13 p.m.)

COUNCIL LIASIONS PRESENT: Rennie Brantz and Sam Furgiuele

STAFF PRESENT: Brian Johnson-Urban Design Specialist, Jane Shook-Director of Planning & Inspections, Christy Turner-Senior Planner, and Brenda Henson-Administrative Support Specialist

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Cagle called to order the meeting of the Boone Community Appearance Commission, held in the Planning and Inspections Department upstairs conference room located at 680 W. King Street at 5:40 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Commission Member Johnson made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Brantz, to adopt the agenda as written.

VOTE:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commission Member Johnson made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Brantz, to approve the January 23, 2018 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

DISCUSSION OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Brian Johnson began by stating he felt further direction was needed following the workshop. He noted that boundaries for the Downtown District were agreed upon but stated there was some concern about using the Secretary of Interior's standards as a stop-gap measure.

Ms. Christy Turner stated she had spoken with Annie McDonald from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Ms. McDonald advised against using the Secretary of Interior's standards as a

stop-gap measure. However, if the SOI standards must be used, she suggested using only the Rehabilitation section found on page 75 of the standards. Ms. Turner stated Ms. McDonald directed her to speak with Amanda Bartos or Adam Lovelady for further direction. Ms. Turner stated Ms. McDonald also suggested not using the word “should” when creating standards or guidelines.

Ms. Jane Shook noted there were no guidelines for new construction, only renovations or additions.

Mr. Johnson stated there was concern with how to enforce page 260 of the document.

Commission Member Furguele suggested requiring any new construction be architecturally compatible, name specific buildings, and have projects come to the CAC for analysis. Ms. Shook replied that plan review was recently removed from the Commission’s authority. Commission Member Furguele stated the review would only be an advisory analysis. Ms. Shook felt that façade reviews could be done at a staff level. Commission Member Furguele stated there was expertise on the committees that could discuss compatibility.

Ms. Shook stated Town Council’s direction was to use the Secretary of Interior’s standards but the document was so large it did not seem feasible. She felt it might be best to take some of the language from the SOI standards and craft some of our own language to present to Town Council at their next hearing.

There was discussion of the 10 items listed on page 76 of the SOI standards. Ms. Shook noted that the first one would need to be removed because the Town could not regulate use. Commission Member Johnson felt the remaining items seemed pretty straightforward.

Mr. Johnson suggested taking standards 2-10 on page 76 and discussing them with Historic Preservation Commission Chairman Eric Plaag and possibly craft some standards to add to those nine.

Commission Member Furguele suggested applying the standards to buildings built before a certain year and require buildings built after a certain year to meet compatibility requirements. Commission Member Furguele felt the standards should be incorporated into the UDO.

Commission Member Johnson asked if the Downtown had received a historic designation and Ms. Shook replied that it had not.

Commission Member Selong arrived at the meeting at 6:13 p.m.

Ms. Shook stated she did not know how Town Council would view the recommendation that the Secretary of Interior’s standards not be used. Commission Member Furguele suggested she go back to Town Council and tell them the document is too big and would not be feasible to use as a stop-gap measure.

Commission Member Furguele asked why project review was removed from the CAC. Ms. Shook replied it was determined that CAC did not have the authority to review projects under their charge as a Commission. Mr. Johnson explained that CAC was essentially granting variances to the UDO and only the Board of Adjustment could grant variances. He added that decisions of the CAC offered no avenue for appeal. Commission Member Furguele felt the CAC could give an analysis to staff, the Board of Adjustment, Town Council, or the Historic Preservation Commission regarding compatibility, architecture, and aesthetics. Ms. Shook asked if all projects in the B1 would go before

the Community Appearance Commission. Commission Member Furgieuele felt staff should have discretion to determine if board input was needed.

Mr. Johnson asked if the Commission would like to move forward with using the nine standards in the Secretary of Interior's standards, look at other standards to incorporate, specify buildings in the standards, and include board review of projects in the B1.

Ms. Shook noted there would only be two weeks to complete these recommendations if they were to be sent to the April public hearing.

Ms. Shook explained that the Community Appearance Commission has the authority to review adopted Town plans to apply to specific projects but does not have the authority to review specific project plans. She stated that the Historic Preservation Commission has the authority to review plans for projects in a historic district or for historic designation.

There was discussion about how to get notice to the public of potential projects. Ms. Shook suggested including information about projects going for board review on the Town's website. Commission Member Furgieuele suggested sending emails to CAC and HPC members notifying them of potential projects.

Ms. Shook suggested looking at the Warehouse District at the next meeting. Mr. Johnson asked members to look at the Phoenix Warehouse District as a good example.

Motion and Vote:

Vice Chairperson Cagle made a motion for staff to pull together, using the Secretary of Interior's Standards of Rehabilitation on page 76, excluding #1, to use that language to include photos in a comparison of compatibility of that component, get a list of buildings from Eric Plaag of examples for the compatibility piece, and put in language from the standards regarding what materials we do not want. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Brantz.

VOTE:

Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Commission Member Furgieuele made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Brantz, to adjourn the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

VOTE:

Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Sarah Davis Cagle, Vice Chairperson

Brenda Henson, Admin. Support Specialist