

**TOWN OF BOONE
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2020 at 5:30 P.M.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Brian Williams, Vice-Chairperson Sarah-Davis Cagle and Margaret Trumpower

TOWN COUNCIL LIASION MEMBERS PRESENT: Dustin Hicks

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Williams called to order the meeting of the Boone Community Appearance Commission, held online via WebEx, a video conferencing software at 5:33 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

VOTE: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.

BOARD TRAINING

Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections explained that Ms. Allison Meade, Town Attorney would be giving the board training on the Town of Boone gift policy. She explained that Ms. Meade was not able to attend this meeting and Ms. Meade would be providing information at the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Member Trumpower to approve the June 23, 2020 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.

CASE PL03370-112019 DRAFT TEXT (CREATION OF B1 DISTRICTS – UDO TEXT AMENDMENT)

Mr. Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist began reviewing the proposed changes made by the Planning staff to the draft Downtown Design Guidelines that were discussed at the last Community Appearance Commission meeting (permanently on file). He reviewed the proposed changes starting on page 47 Article 26.06.04(E)(1), added “cornices, doors.” On page 48 Article 26.06.05(B) Design Standards for Renovation of Existing buildings, “are” prohibited. In Article 26.06.05(I), added “previously” and “or altered”.

Discussion ensued on Article 26.07 Retaining Walls. Mr. Johnson explained that the text in Article 26.07 Retaining Walls, (F)(1)(2)(3) Landscape buffer required had been revised to help clarify the text in Table 26.07 Retaining Wall Landscape Buffer Standards.

Discussion ensued on Article 26.07 Retaining Wall Landscape Buffer Standards. Mr. Johnson explained that a ten-foot buffer is a Type A landscape buffer. Chairperson Williams asked about the plant materials being used between two retaining walls to reduce the buffer wall. Mr. Johnson explained the amount of plant material needed. Ms. Shook asked about the shrubs and deciduous trees, she noted that if a ten-foot landscape, a wide Type "A" landscape buffer is put in first, it would hide some of the plant material. She talked about requiring plant material that cannot be seen. She asked if you have a ten-foot landscape buffer and a ten-foot street yard, what kind of trees should be planted. Mr. Johnson noted that the ten-foot buffer allows width for a growing area for plant material. Mr. Johnson also talked about allowing a ten-foot buffer for a higher wall. Chairperson Williams noted that he felt that Article 26.07 Retaining Walls needs more research done on it. Ms. Shook agreed with Chairperson Williams.

Discussion ensued on the retaining wall at the Courtyard Marriott in Boone. Mr. Johnson said the Courtyard Marriott is a good example of a Type A buffer and tiered landscaped system. He said two ten-foot buffers, and two eight-foot buffers gives a soft landscaped appearance to a retaining walls. Mr. Johnson said for retaining walls in the Downtown area, we might need to limit the height and the six-foot buffers would be more appropriate. He noted that there are some steeper lots in the Downtown area on the back of King Street. He noted that there have not been many large retaining walls in the Town like the one at the Courtyard Marriott. He said that the Planning staff could research different wall layouts

Ms. Shook asked Council Member Hicks and Member Trumpower for their feedback on the retaining walls and landscape buffers. Council Member Hicks asked if the number of trees is a minimum or a maximum. Mr. Johnson said it is a minimum of trees. Mr. Johnson further explained that the minimum tree requirement causes a concern for a developer on determining what kind of plant material that they can use that will not compromise the retaining wall or root system.

Council Member Hicks asked if elevation was considered in the retaining wall and landscape buffer section. Mr. Johnson explained that the Planning staff can work on this section more.

Discussion ensued on the possible delay of moving the draft Downtown Guidelines forward to Council. Chairperson Williams stated his concern for possible revisions delaying the moving of the draft Downtown Guidelines document forward to Council, he said he felt like it was more important to move the bulk of the draft document forward to Council with the understanding that some revisions still need to be made. Ms. Shook agreed with Chairperson Williams on moving the bulk of the draft document forward to Council. She further explained that the Historic Preservation Commission will be ready to present the draft Historic Design Guidelines to Council in August of 2020. She noted that she preferred to present both documents to Council at the same time.

Discussion ensued on scheduling a special virtual CAC meeting to discuss the final draft Design Guidelines document. It was the consensus of the CAC members to have a special virtual CAC meeting on Wednesday, August 5, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

Discussion ensued on the number of shrubs located in Table 26.07 Retaining Wall Landscape Buffer Standards. Chairperson Williams talked about requiring more Evergreen trees and decreasing the number of Evergreen shrubs. Mr. Johnson suggested decreasing the shrubs to five in 100 feet of landscape buffer and put in other shrubs as well. Mr. Johnson suggested requiring four-foot shrubs. Chairperson Williams agreed.

Discussion ensued on massing and scaling. Mr. Johnson explained that the Planning staff had done some research and found two examples of massing and scaling one example from Waynesville, North Carolina and one example from Alpharetta, Georgia.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the New Commercial Building section of the Waynesville, North Carolina guidelines and referred to page 32 for new facades. He explained that in this example, it showed more height for each bay.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the New Commercial Building section of the Alpharetta, Georgia guidelines and referred to page 17 for the photo examples of the buildings. He explained the variations of width, height and rhythm of street-facing facades and how they are encouraged along any block face.

Mr. Johnson talked about how material changes can be used to create a fake look on the façade of a building and the fake look can be changed by changing the feature requirements.

Vice-Chairperson Cagle talked about the revising of the draft text with the things that the CAC do not want to see in the Downtown area. Ms. Shook said the Planning staff would review the draft document for these types of things.

At 7:05 p.m. Member Trumpower left the virtual meeting.

Ms. Shook said the Planning staff would revise the retaining wall and massing and scaling proposed text in the draft document and have it ready for the CAC to review on Monday, August 3, 2020.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION/OTHER MATTERS

There were no other topics discussed at this meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other topics to discuss, Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Cagle to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

VOTE: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.

Brian Williams, Chairperson

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary