



COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

A meeting of the Town of Boone Community Appearance Commission will be held on **Tuesday, June 26, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.** in the Planning and Inspections Department - Upstairs Conference Room located at 680 W. King Street. The following items will be on the agenda:

- 1. Adoption of Agenda**
- 2. Approval of Minutes**
 - April 24, 2018
- 3. Discussion of the Downtown Design Guidelines Workshop**
- 4. Committee Review**
- 5. Other Matters by Board Members or Staff**
- 6. Adjournment**

**TOWN OF BOONE
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2018
5:30 P.M.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Brian Williams, Vice-Chairperson Sarah Davis Cagle, Daniel Johnson, Jason Selong and Karyn Reid

COUNCIL LIASIONS PRESENT: Rennie Brantz and Sam Furgiuele

STAFF PRESENT: Jane Shook - Director of Planning and Inspections, Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Williams 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 5:30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Davis to approve the agenda as written.

VOTE:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Member Selong joined the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member Brantz made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Williams to accept the January, 23, 2018, March 20, 2018 and the March 27, 2018 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE:

Aye – (Brantz, Davis, Johnson, Selong, Williams)
Nay – None
Abstain – (Reid)

The motion passed.

Mr. Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist welcomed new Member Karyn Reid to the meeting and asked her to tell the CAC members about herself. She said is she majoring in Community and Regional Planning with a minor in Business at Appalachian State University and she will graduate in two years. She said that she hopes to live abroad in New Zealand in 2019 but she is looking at other options as well. Each CAC member introduced themselves to Member Reid.

UPDATE ON STOP-GAP LANGUAGE

Mr. Johnson explained that the main purpose of this meeting was to update the CAC members on the information that the Planning Staff presented to Council at their April 19, 2018 meeting regarding the Stop-Gap measures. He referred to the Staff Report in the meeting packet for CASE PL01390-032818 B1 Central Business Appearance Modifications UDO Text Amendment.

Mr. Johnson explained that the information in the Staff Report was presented at the Public Hearing on April 23, 2018. He noted that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed language in the Staff report.

Mr. Johnson explained that UDO Article 18 had been a reserved section in the UDO. He said it was decided to use UDO Article 18 to put the proposed language for all of the B-1 Central Business District similar to how the UDO Article 17, Wellness District was added to the UDO.

Mr. Johnson said the Staff included massing and scaling into the proposed language.

Mr. Johnson informed the CAC that UDO Article 18 was a reserved section of the UDO. He explained that previous discussions had decided that this UDO section would be used to place the language for the Central Business District similar to what was done with the language for the Wellness District. He said that when the Staff is working with applicants, they can direct them to UDO Article 18 for any changes or new construction in this district.

Mr. Johnson pointed out in UDO Article 18.02.02 Exterior Facades in the B-1 Central Business District are exempt from meeting the requirements in UDO Article 25.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that UDO Article 18.02.02 was broken out into two sections being UDO Article 18.02.02B which is for Design Standards for Renovation of Existing buildings and UDO Article 18.02.02C which is a new section Design Standards for Additions and New Construction.

Mr. Johnson explained the intent of the proposed language in UDO Article 18.02.02B on page two of the Staff Report. He reviewed this section of the UDO and talked about the preserving of existing materials on buildings and alternative materials on buildings.

Mr. Johnson read in UDO Article 18.0201 Purpose: For the Purpose of this Section the term “historic” shall mean any building, building material or feature fifty years or older as of May 1, 2018.

Mr. Johnson explained that in UDO Article 18.02.02C Design Standards for Additions and New Construction the Staff did elaborate on Orientation that refers to the direction in which the primary façade and the main building entry faces the public street. He said a section was added for rhythm and proportion to help with compatibility of surround buildings.

Chairperson Williams asked Mr. Johnson why a date was placed on what is considered “historic”. Chairperson Williams said it was his understanding that SHPO or the National Register uses the current date. Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections explained that because this is a stop gap measure the May 1, 2018 date may change in the fall of 2018. She said this date was used so people could not choose a newer building material for new construction. She added that the Historic Preservation Commission Design Guidelines may be slightly different than the guidelines in UDO Article 18.

Mr. Johnson said the goal in UDO Article 18.02.02[C,1,a,i] is to provide guidance for the massing and scale of the buildings and tie it to adjacent buildings. He said the Staff added proposed language for the placement and size of window and door openings, the relationship between building elements, additions will be differentiated from any historic building and compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, the same type of block of surrounding buildings.

Mr. Johnson said that the Staff added a new sections in Article 18.02.02[C,1,d and e] for additions and for larger buildings.

Mr. Johnson said that the Staff added a new section in Article 18.02.02[C,2,c] Exceptions for prohibited materials. He said this proposed language was added because of the questions on the stucco on the buildings.

Mr. Johnson explained that in the beginning of the review process the Staff would review the building materials to see if there is come historically accurateness to the building materials. He further explained that they Staff added this caveat that certain building materials were exempt so the Staff could spell it out for the acceptable and prohibited building materials. He said there could be building materials that are prohibited that could also be historically accurate.

Mr. Johnson referred to UDO Article 25.01.01[A] The article is applicable to the publicly visible portions of building facades, as defined herein. He explained that the Staff added clarification to this Section as a result of questions at previous Town meetings regarding the way that Staff had interpreted the publicly visible definition regarding the 70 percent. Mr. Johnson said a building façade shall be deemed publicly visible when more than thirty (30) of the façade is visible from any street or adjacent residentially zoned property. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the Staff removed from the previous proposed language of more than thirty percent (30) of a building façade is taller than the vegetative buffer at the time of planting.

Discussion ensued on building heights and stories in the B-1 zoning district. Chairperson Williams had a question on UDO Article 18.02.02,[C,1,e,ii] regarding breaking up the roofline of a large building into smaller components may help the perceived mass of large buildings. He asked if by exempting the roofline has it opened up the possibility of allowing pitched roofs by not specifically stating it is a requirement. Ms. Shook pointed out that there will be other text amendments that will change the height of buildings in the B-1 zoning district to 30-foot in some sections and 33-foot in other sections. It was noted that the 30-foot building height is only along King Street in the Historic Core and outside the Historic Core it is 33 feet and if it is not included they can have up to a four-foot parapet for a height of 37 feet. Chairperson Williams said there cannot be 10-foot high first floors and you cannot build a three-story building in 33 feet without a standard residential first floor. Ms. Shook said this could happen because you can get four-stories in 42 feet.

Member Furguele joined the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Member Furguele said in terms of defining the look of Howard Street; you can look at the ECRS building which is about 31 feet tall. He noted that the Farmers Hardware building is the tallest building on King Street. He explained that the building heights for the B-1 and B-3 are the same height of 45 feet including the setback. He said the building height on Howard Street is 55 feet in the B-1 zoning district which he feels will change the look of Howard Street.

Member Furgiuele talked about the incentives in tearing down a historical one-story building and constructing a new building with housing above the first floor. He said he felt that we do not want to create incentives for tearing down Historic buildings because there are a lot of buildings that can be saved on Howard Street.

Discussion ensued on the building height study. Chairperson Williams said that he had seen this study. It was noted that the Staff had done an average height study on the whole Downtown area by block. Ms. Shook reviewed the height study information called a Storybook at this meeting that showed an average by feet per block. Ms. Shook said this information was presented to Council at their March 2018 meeting and it can be found in the April 23, 2018 Public Hearing meeting packet. It was noted that the Staff looked at how other jurisdictions view their building heights. It was noted that there are a lot of one-story buildings in the Downtown area.

Discussion ensued on the building materials of the Downtown buildings. It was noted that some of the buildings had yellow brick on them.

Member Furgiuele explained the conditional district zoning process as it relates to building changes such as tearing down a building or if a building is enlarged. He said that conditional district zoning is unique in that do to conditions there has to be agreement. He said this can be an opportunity to talk about the building changes to facades.

DISCUSSION OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Johnson explained that the Staff is requesting to forgo the May 2018 CAC meeting to allow Staff to work on the Downtown Design Guidelines and bring that information to the June 2018 CAC meeting. Ms. Shook said the Staff needs more time to incorporate the stop-gap measure changes and other changes that were discussed.

Chairperson Williams clarified that the stop-gap measure is in the B-1 zoning district.

Chairperson Williams asked if there has been more discussion on the rezoning or overlay topics. Ms. Shook said at the last joint meeting the Staff had said that they would work on potential areas to rezone in the B-1 zoning district. She said that information and the CAC recommendations would be sent to Council for their consideration.

Discussion ensued on the timeframe for the CAC and HPC Design guidelines to be completed. Ms. Shook explained that both design guidelines do not have to be completed at the same time but for the least amount of confusion for property owners that are affected by both design guidelines, it would work best to have them completed enough to be able to communicate clearly to the property owners about the guidelines. Ms. Shook said in the past it was decided for the CAC to get their draft design guidelines to Council to be able to schedule public comment before the CAC moves forward with the design guidelines. Ms. Shook said the Downtown Boone Development Association has expressed interest and the CAC has sought their input with a survey two years ago.

Motion and Vote:

Member Johnson made a motion, seconded by Member Brantz to cancel the May 22, 2018 CAC meeting to allow Staff more time to work on proposed changes.

VOTE:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

Member Furguele asked if there had been discussion on this Commission regarding the Council Liaisons. Ms. Shook said no.

Member Furguele explained that he had proposed to Council to review all of the Town committees one by one. He expressed his concern for the quorum issues, the need to meet every month or just when there is a project to work on and if the memberships are adequate. He said he also felt that the Council members possibly influence the committee members on topics that are discussed.

Member Brantz agreed with Member Furguele regarding the need for the Council to review the size, purpose and direction of the Town committees.

Member Furguele said the reason he is mentioning the review of Town committees at this meeting is because he would like for the CAC to discuss it at their next meeting in June of 2018.

Mr. Johnson reminded everyone that the CAC does also serves the Tree Board and the Greenway Parks and Gardens committee as it relates to appearance.

Member Furguele noted that the way that Chairs and membership size is flexible and can be changed because these things are not UDO requirements.

Mr. Johnson explained that in the past the CAC had seven members on it and the Tree Board had four members on it and sometimes there were quorum issues. He said that having a larger number of members on a board is not always the best way to get a quorum for the meetings. He said the change to majority of members present really helped the Town committees to get a quorum.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to see the CAC be able to work on Greenway Parks and Gardens topics.

Member Brantz said how do other municipalities structure their committees. Member Furguele said that he had checked into this and some of the other municipalities do not have committees.

It was confirmed that there was a modification to the Town Code to make the Council Liaisons voting members in the Town committees.

Chairperson Williams asked how did the Council Liaisons become part of Town committees. Member Brantz said it was for educational purposes for the Council Members to be a part of Town committees to find out what they are working on and to share general ideas from the Council with the Town committees, if they are relevant to the discussion in the committee.

Member Furguele said that he remembered that the Council members had mentioned that they did not know what was being discussed in the Town committees. He said the Council would be put on the spot to take action on topics that they had no prior knowledge on. He said that the Council was not receiving the Town committee minutes prior to the Council meetings at that time.

Ms. Shook talked about the possible friction it may cause for the Council, if a Council Member votes for a certain topic in a Town committee but when they vote on that same topic at the Council meeting or they vote on it differently, because they learned more information about that certain topic at the Council meeting.

Ms. Shook noted that this topic may have to be discussed at the July 2018 CAC meeting.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

Member Furgiuele said there will be a special meeting on Thursday, April 19, 2018 with the Police Department. He said they will discuss community policing to help prevent situations like the Ferguson situation. It will be a public forum to discuss practices in certain areas of the Town.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Cagle to adjourn the meeting at 6:44 p.m.

VOTE:

Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Chairperson, Brian Williams

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary