

**TOWN OF BOONE
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2018
5:30 P.M.**

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

COUNCIL LIASIONS MEMBERS PRESENT: Rennie Brantz

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections 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 5:30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Member Brantz 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 September 25, 2018 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

DISCUSSION OF THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Chairperson Williams began discussion by noting that he has been working with the Town of Boone Planning Staff to combine the Unified Development Ordinance Draft Article 25 Community Appearance Design Standards, current revised UDO language for the design guidelines and the stop-gap measures language into one draft document.

Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections noted that the Planning Staff will go through the draft combined document and make revisions and provide a clean draft document for the Community Appearance Commission members to review at the next Community Appearance Commission meeting in November of 2018.

Ms. Shook pointed out the need for discussion on the Interface subdistrict to identify a description for the Interface area. She said additional language is needed to distinguish between the Interface area and the Downtown Core.

Ms. Shook asked the CAC members what they visualized between the building and the street as it relates to setbacks- landscaping, parking, hardscape, pedestrian orientation etc. She explained that the lot size in the B1 has a minimum of 5,000 square feet. She asked are these standards going to remain the same in the Interface area as in the Downtown core.

Ms. Shook pointed out the need for discussion on the Interface area features and what additional architectural features should be allowed. She said there are only three architectural features listed in the current draft document which are large glass windows, metal detail roof elements and Corian garage style doors. She asked if there were other architectural features that the CAC would like to add to this list.

Chairperson Williams talked about possibly increasing the actual percentage of allowed glass on the upper floors both the Downtown core and the Interface area. He said the CAC members may need to review photos of windows. Ms. Shook said that the Planning Staff can provide the CAC members with a link to the story map that was created by the Planning Staff to record building heights in the Downtown area to help them identify additional features.

Discussion ensued on windows. Chairperson Williams talked about the top of windows minimum height being 30 feet inside and the 33 feet outside including the parapet. Chairperson Williams talked about the height being no more than eight feet above the sidewalk which would only allow for a two story building. Ms. Shook pulled up the online story map in the B-1 Central Business District that shows the building heights of the Downtown buildings for the CAC members to review the roof top structures and parapets. Ms. Shook reviewed the requirements of the UDO for them. Ms. Shook said she would ask the building inspectors what the amount of space is between floors. Ms. Shook asked the CAC members if they wanted to do research on other additional architectural features that they may want to allow within the Interface area. It was the consensus of the CAC members to look at language that would relax the standard in the Interface area as it relates to the rhythm portion. Chairperson Williams said the windows at the Turchin Center is an example of what he is suggesting.

Discussion ensued on setbacks and subdistricts. Ms. Shook said that the Planning Staff should be able to find some language to use from other cities for the setback and subdistrict language. She pointed out that the Haywood Road District in Asheville, North Carolina has a lot of subdistricts and the Planning Staff might can use their setback language.

Discussion ensued on the setbacks for storm water. Vice-Chairperson Cagle suggested having further discussion on the landscaping around the storm water areas.

Discussion ensued on storm water retention. Ms. Shook noted that putting storm water underground is not always the best solution. She suggested looking for low-impact ways to accommodate storm water on a lot, it should be considered depending on lot size. She pointed out under state law, it is a requirement to allow landscaping islands in a parking lot. She said the Town is looking at adding a green infrastructure section to the Comprehensive Plan to encourage more storm water in low-impact ways. Discussion ensued on stormwater controls in the downtown area.

Discussion ensued on the setback for street-yard buffers. Ms. Shook explained said the CAC members may need to review the regulations regarding the percentage to allow for the buffer.

Ms. Shook talked about the CAC members making a recommendation on increasing the tree canopy to include shade trees requirements. She pointed out that shade trees take larger tree wells and the species selected would need to be salt tolerant.

Discussion ensued on allowing incentives on 25 foot setbacks to offset the amount of lost square footage. Ms. Shook said this topic could be a future discussion. She further stated that there has been discussion by Council regarding the change in building height to lessen the feel of the mass of the building adjacent to a sidewalk.

Member Brantz asked about the specifying the types of trees to be put in. Ms. Shook noted it is easier to put in the specified trees during new construction. She said it is more difficult during renovations because of the size of the tree well need for shade trees. She also noted that you have to be careful with selecting the tree species as well. She explained that a well thought out plan is needed for the drainage facilities beneath the sidewalk.

Discussion ensued on parking areas in the Downtown area. Chairperson Williams said he preferred the parking on the side of the building and not in the front of the building. Ms. Shook explained that parking is allowed as a use in the B-1. She also said the Town is discussing parking structures.

Chairperson Williams asked about remodeling buildings and the tier system in the UDO. Ms. Shook explained how the four tiers in the UDO work.

Discussion ensued on lighting. Ms. Shook explained the lighting requirements in the UDO. She noted that there needs to be a future discussion on lighting for the Downtown area.

Discussion ensued on UDO Article 18. Chairperson Williams asked if Article 18.02.02C related to new construction. Ms. Shook said yes.

Ms. Shook explained that the Planning Staff would email to the CAC members for the next meeting with the agenda, a clean digital copy of the combined draft document for their review. She said the draft document would have the highlighted areas determined by the Planning Staff that still need

work. She said the Planning Staff would also include a revised map that would include the Warehouse district and the Downtown core and the B-1 Height Analysis.

Discussion ensued on the increase of architectural features. It was noted that the range of 30 percent to 70 percent allowance for windows is a very large percentage. Ms. Shook noted that perhaps Mr. Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist could do a scaled drawing to include the proposed percentages of windows to help the CAC members to review and discuss the amount of percentage of windows to be allowed.

Chairperson Williams talked about adding the actual pictures of the field materials to the draft document. Ms. Shook noted that she preferred to describe the materials of historic buildings and noted she was worried about the use of photos.

Ms. Shook told the CAC members to email Mr. Johnson or herself their questions on the draft document.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

Vice-Chairperson Cagle confirmed that the next CAC meeting is on Tuesday, November 27, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. She noted that at the November meeting the CAC should discuss changing the December 25, 2018 scheduled meeting date because of the Christmas holiday. Ms. Shook said the Planning Staff would have a list of December meeting dates available for the CAC members to choose from at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Member Brantz to adjourn the meeting at 6:36 p.m.

VOTE:

Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Chairperson, Brian Williams

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary