`

COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION
MEETING AGENDA

A meeting of the Town of Boone Community Appearance Commission will be held on **Tuesday, January 22, 2019 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. **Call to Order**

2. **Adoption of Agenda**

3. **Approval of Minutes**
   - November 27, 2018

4. **Election of Officers**

5. **Discussion of the Downtown Design Guidelines**

6. **Other Matters by Board Members or Staff**

7. **Adjournment**

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:	Chairperson Brian Williams, Vice-Chairperson Sarah Davis Cagle and Jason Selong
COUNCIL LIASIONS MEMBERS PRESENT:	Rennie Brantz and Sam Furgiuele
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

---

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Brian 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 5:32 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Member Cagle to approve the agenda as written.

VOTE: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Cagle to approve the October 23, 2018 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

DISCUSSION OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist explained that the Planning Staff has combined the draft design guideline documents into one draft document and it is included in this meeting packet from page six to page 51 for the Community Appearance Commission members to review. Mr. Johnson further explained that the draft document changes are reflected on page 27 through page 51 in the meeting packet.

Mr. Johnson explained some of the proposed changes that had been made to the draft document since the last CAC meeting. He said the Planning Staff revised the sub-district map to reflect the changes from the previous CAC meetings which included setbacks in the interface area and retaining the street yards. He referred to Table 18.04 on page 13 of the meeting packet and explained that in the interface area, they left a 10 feet minimum street setback. He read that draft language that was added on page 14 of the meeting packet in 18.04.04.

Discussion ensued on more proposed changes to the draft document. Member Furgiuele asked about Section 18.01.02 A. B1 Downtown Core Subdistrict, he asked why it reads: especially along King Street because it is saying that the whole district has the greatest concentration. He said he is concerned about it because he would not want other streets to be viewed as unimportant to the Downtown core. Mr. Johnson noted that in the Section 18.01.02 B. B1 Downtown Interface Subdistrict, at the end of this paragraph it is noted that the standards need to be completed to finish this description. It was the consensus of the CAC members to remove: especially along King Street from the draft language.

Discussion ensued on density. Mr. Johnson noted the two future districts will be similar in density. He said he was alright with removing this proposed language.

Discussion ensued on orientation. Member Furguiele asked if this proposed language was talking about orientation toward the primary streets. Mr. Johnson said on page 17 of the packet, it is highlighted at the bottom of the page in 1. New construction should be compatible with the dominant architectural characteristics of nearby buildings (same block or block across the street) in the district. He said the Planning Staff's concern was being compatible with nearby buildings in the same blocks. Mr. Johnson agreed that we want the buildings to face the primary street. Mr. Johnson talked about revising Section 18.03 A. Member Furguiele suggested just keeping these words: historic pattern of building orientation.

Discussion ensued on getting a variance for building orientation. Member Furguiele noted that it should be in the Unified Development Ordinance that in addition to the variance that the other requirements still must be met. Mr. Johnson suggested defining the language for the buildings to face the primary public way. And Member Furguiele wanted to include the word "perpendicular" as well.

Member Furguiele showed concern for the use of the word "nearby" in Section 18.03 A. He said one person's definition of nearby could mean something different to someone else. Mr. Johnson suggested putting in a graphic in the draft document to help explain the proposed language. Member Furgiuele agreed. Chairperson Williams suggested revising the draft language to: each building's facade must be parallel to every public way that they front.

Member Furguiele showed concern for the use of the words "architectural emphasis" Section 18.03 C. He asked for an explanation on the intent of these words. Chairperson Williams said it is a term that specifically relates to the types of architectural emphasis that is referenced in Section 18.06.02

B. Design Standards for New Construction and Additions. Mr. Johnson made a note for the Planning Staff to review this concern.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.04.01 Building Setbacks. Member Furguiele said that we want the buildings in the Downtown core going up to the sidewalk. Mr. Johnson said possibly there could be a larger right of way. Mr. Johnson said the intent is to keep the existing building façade line. Mr. Johnson said that the Planning Staff has run into instances where the sidewalks really did not determine the building setback.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.04.01 C regarding substantial structures. Member Furgiuele asked about the nine feet fence height. He asked do we want to exempt opaque fences. Mr. Johnson said this proposed language is referencing a taller fence than nine feet being considered a structure rather than a setback. Member Furguiele said this language is saying that the building is to the sidewalk, when it is not. Mr. Johnson suggested that the Planning Staff reverse this language and exempting it or not allowing it in the Downtown core.

Member Furguiele asked do we want to invite heat pumps, generators, air conditioning units and pad-mounted transformers into the setbacks. Mr. Johnson said the Planning Staff would review changes to the Section 18.04.01.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.04.02 regarding the word “appendage”. He asked if this term could be defined in the draft language. Mr. Johnson said the Planning Staff would review this section.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.04.01 C.3 regarding retaining walls. Chairperson Williams suggested including building materials for the retaining walls into the draft language. Mr. Johnson suggested requiring similar façade materials also for the retaining walls. Chairperson Williams said whatever material is chosen would be for the Downtown core and Interface area. Mr. Johnson pointed out that modular block is a very nice block and it does cost more.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.04.02 in Table 18.04 regarding interior setbacks. Chairperson Williams asked for the reason for the proposed 10 feet interior setback in the rest of the district. Mr. Johnson explained that the 10 feet minimum street setback was proposed to provide adequate space for a hardscape plaza environment. Mr. Johnson said he thought the 10 feet minimum would give the space for street trees and he also thought this topic warranted further discussion.

Discussion ensued on the setbacks and fire requirements. Member Furgiuele asked about firewall requirements for fire department access. Mr. Johnson said there are fire code requirements that need to be met. Chairperson Williams said he is in favor of taking the interior lot line to zero. Member Furgiuele asked should the street setback be more than ten feet minimum to make sure there is space for the street trees. Mr. Johnson said this is a good point; because in the past the Town was not able to plant certain trees due to not having enough space with the sidewalk in relation to the building. Mr. Johnson said if larger trees need to be planted 15 feet of space is needed and at the same time the larger trees can cause larger problems over time. Chairperson Williams and Mr. Johnson agreed that a detailed tree planting list needs to be created. Mr. Johnson said the

Planning Staff is working on said list now to try to locate more appropriate trees. Mr. Johnson confirmed that ten feet is enough space to plant a medium size tree. Member Furgiuele agreed with allowing 15 feet of space for street trees and going with a zero-interior setback. Mr. Johnson said that the size of the space for trees can be revised with further discussion, if we feel the space needs to be wider.

Discussion ensued on the concrete band brick pavers. Mr. Johnson noted there has been some issues with the pavers in front of the Mast General Store on King Street. Mr. Johnson said the brick pavers topic warrants further discussion.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.04.04 and the words "building modulation". Member Furgiuele asked if sidewalk cafes would be allowed with this proposed language. Mr. Johnson said the main definition needs to be expanded for plaza space or open space and a graphic included to show a consistent look for hardscape-streetscape. Mr. Johnson said the trees should be chosen that will survive in the area. Member Furgiuele explained that creating spaces for activities that are not associated with what is going on in the building. Mr. Furgiuele used the deSanti law firm building as an example, he said if the flowers were taken out and benches put in for the public to use. Mr. Johnson said the Planning Staff will review the activities.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.05.01D. Member Brantz asked why 33 feet was used for the Queen Street elevation. Member Brantz showed concern for the 33 feet of building height possibly towering over King Street. Member Furguiele said that the building height can be revisited at the Council level.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.05.01 B.1 regarding the word "view". Member Furgiuele asked for this standard does it matter which direction you are viewing from. Mr. Johnson said the intent was to be 20 feet from the structure and in front of the structure. Mr. Johnson said if it is a corner lot, it would be accessed the same way.

Member Furgiuele pointed out a typo in Section 18.05.01 D. in the last line of that paragraph "if" should be "of".

Discussion ensued on Section 18.06.01. A1 for the words "in same block or the block across the street in the district". Member Furgiuele said for the Downtown Core could a particular-block or half of a block be referenced.

Discussion ensued on Section 18.06.01 C on the words in the first line "rhythm of nearby buildings". Member Furgiuele suggested replacing those words with "historic buildings".

Discussion ensued on Section 18.06.01 C. on the words "Varied façade wall planes, differing materials, stepped back upper levels and irregular or additive massing help mitigate the impact or larger buildings on the existing area." Member Furgiuele showed concern on the differing materials and asked does this mitigate the impact of larger buildings. Mr. Johnson said the rhythm of the

buildings sets the tone for the Downtown core. It was the consensus of the CAC members to further discuss the materials and the stepped back upper levels.

Discussion ensued on parking structures. Mr. Johnson said parking structures need to be discussed from an appearance and zoning standpoint while going through this process. He said he would discuss this topic with Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

Mr. Johnson explained that the Planning Staff would work on the proposed changes discussed at the meeting and they would get the updated draft document to the CAC members for their review in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Johnson reminded the CAC members that the next scheduled CAC meeting is on Christmas Day on Tuesday, December 25, 2018. It was the consensus of the CAC members to forgo the CAC meeting in December. Mr. Johnson noted that the next scheduled CAC meeting would be on Tuesday, January 22, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Member Selong to adjourn the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

VOTE:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

_____ _____

Chairperson, Brian Williams **Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary**