

**TOWN OF BOONE
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2019; 5:30 P.M.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Brian Williams, Vice-Chairperson Sarah Davis Cagle and Jason Selong
TOWN COUNCIL LIASION MEMBERS PRESENT: Sam Furgieuele
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections 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 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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member Furgieuele made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Cagle to approve the November 26, 2019 Community Appearance Commission as written.

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

CASE PL03370-112019 Creation of B1 Districts - UDO Text Amendment

Chairperson Williams opened the floor for discussion on the handout of the draft Downtown Design Guidelines now referred to as Case PL03370-112019 Creation of B1 Districts – UDO Text Amendment dated December 10, 2019 (permanently on file). The Community Appearance Commission members reviewed pages 20 through 68 of the draft document in this meeting; they discussed the highlighted areas of the draft text and made proposed changes. On page one of the draft document, Ms. Shook pointed out that the new proposed text is underlined in blue, existing text to be deleted is marked with red strikethrough, changes from one draft to the next draft are highlighted in yellow, references that need numbering verification are highlighted in blue and items that need work outside of the CAC recommended changes are highlighted in green.

Ms. Shook referred to page 20 of the draft document in Subsection 26.02.(B) Relationship to Other Regulations, she noted that the text highlighted in yellow is new proposed text. Member Furgieuele asked if the word “Staff” is capitalized everywhere in the draft document. Ms. Shook said she could check on it. Ms. Shook explained that the Staff did check with other jurisdictions regarding their requirements in their historic and primary fire districts. She said the other jurisdictions use a lot of expensive materials such a fire retardant types of wood. She explained that in the application process the applicant will have to provide up front the type of material they are proposing to use, when they apply for the permit.

Ms. Shook referred to page 27 of the draft document in Subsection 26.05.06(A), she noted that the CAC was in agreement for the Staff to add this new proposed text. She said the Staff will add a graphic in this subsection. She also said that the goal of the Staff is to insert graphics all through the draft document where necessary. She noted the Staff will try to seek outside help on the inserting of the graphics.

Ms. Shook referred to page 44 of the draft document in Subsection 26.04.04(1) and (c), she said that the Staff had removed the reference to Appendix D across the board in the draft document because it has been removed from the most recent version of the North Carolina Building Code. She pointed out that the noncombustible wood frame awnings are allowed in the B1 Interface district.

Ms. Shook referred to page 66 of the draft document and pointed out that she had added a new definition for Additive Massing.

Discussion ensued on exterior doors in Subsection 26.06.04(C). Ms. Shook said the Staff will add a section for doors into the draft document. She said that she will separate the renovation and new construction doors, when the Staff creates the new section on doors. She suggested going through the photos of the doors that the Staff has taken in the Downtown area to decide what doors are acceptable or not-acceptable. She also said the doors should be of a wood frame finish and architecturally compatible or sympathetic. She explained that the windows can be wood. She said that according to the North Carolina Building Code the trim material around windows and doors is regulated and it must be the non-combustible wood or treated wood. She said that windows and doors are exempted from the building code.

Ms. Shook suggested that when the Staff meets with applicants that part of that first discussion should be how the spaces are going to be used in the buildings.

Chairperson Williams suggested a proposed change on page 40 in Subsection 26.06.04(C)(5)(c) in the first sentence change "off of" to "accessing".

Discussion ensued on taking more photos of acceptable doors. Ms. Shook asked the CAC members if they wanted to review the photos (over 90 photos) that the Staff has already taken to help decide what doors would be acceptable. She said once it was decided which doors are acceptable, the Staff would make more photos of those types of doors. The CAC reviewed all of the photos previously taken by Staff. Member Furguele suggested that the Staff take photos of second floor balconies that would be compatible. Ms. Shook said that the Staff does not have a photo of every door in the Downtown. She noted that the Staff did not make photos of the doors on Howard Street. She explained that on some of the photos of doors, a disclaimer may need to be added that the photo is an example of the door only and not the color or surrounds of the door. Chairperson Williams suggested that the Staff take photos of acceptable doors at the Lowes Improvement Center to include the draft document.

Discussion ensued on the acceptable types of exterior doors in the Downtown Area. The CAC members were in agreement that the doors at 815 W. King Street, 593 W. King Street, Jones House are acceptable.

Discussion ensued on the unacceptable types of exterior doors in the Downtown Area. The CAC members were in agreement that the doors at 599 W. King Street are not acceptable.

Discussion ensued on door handles and knobs. Vice-Chairperson Cagle asked if the CAC members should be reviewing the door handles and knobs. Ms. Shook said that she would check with the building inspectors on this topic because of the possible ADA requirements.

Discussion ensued on frosted glass windows in doors. Ms. Shook explained that the sign regulations may have a different standard for frosted glass for privacy. Member Furguele talked about the doors with frosted glass and he noted that if there is a business name on the frosted glass, you know that it is a commercial space. He also said with a solid door it is difficult to know, if it is residential or commercial door. Chairperson Williams asked if frosted glass would meet the 70 percent VLT requirement. Ms. Shook said no, it would not but there could be a different standard for doors to allow frosted paint on a door.

Discussion ensued on glass doors. The CAC members were in agreement with the glass in the doors depending on where the glass is located on the door. The CAC members liked the glass in the door located at 683 W. King Street.

Discussion ensued on separating the use for exterior doors between the Downtown Core and the Interface. Ms. Shook explained that the Staff can include this information in the draft document, if the CAC members want to include it. She noted that there are additional categories for the Interface and other areas.

Discussion ensued on the maintenance of exterior doors. Member Selong pointed out that salt and wind can cause damage to doors, if they are not set back into the building.

Discussion ensued on screened doors. The CAC members reviewed the photos of screened doors.

Discussion ensued on exterior door issues. Ms. Shook asked the CAC members for clarification on how they would like to proceed with metal, solid and wood doors. She noted that more research would need to be done on the metal trim, if the CAC members wanted it. Member Furguele said if the doors are set back from the street, can the door material be seen as well. Ms. Shook said that for new construction the doors will have to be recessed. Member Selong said that he would not encourage metal doors in the Downtown Core but he would encourage them in the Downtown Interface Area. Member Furguele agreed with Member Selong on this topic. Chairperson Williams suggested requiring wood doors in the Downtown Core. Ms. Shook suggested that an example be shown of the acceptable doors.

Member Furguele pointed out that because the draft document has to go through the Planning Commission and Council for their consideration and approval, there could be proposed changes to the draft document that could be less restrictive. His suggestion is for the CAC members to be more restrictive with their proposed requirements in the draft document.

Vice-Chairperson Williams said he would rather not see wood-grain doors in the Downtown Core. The CAC members also talked about the high cost of wood doors.

Ms. Shook asked the CAC members what they thought about the bronze metal trim versus a metal trim. Member Selong suggested no gold color or shiny brassy look, he prefers a matte-type finish for trim. He said it also depends on the context as to which would look better.

Chairperson Williams asked about use of cornices and he confirmed that this topic was previously removed from the draft document.

Discussion ensued on the use of metal trim in the Downtown Interface. Ms. Shook noted that in the B1, metal trim is currently not regulated.

Ms. Shook explained that the Staff will revise the draft document and have it ready for review at the next CAC meeting. She also suggested that the CAC members talk about Article Seven and the tier-system regarding the 75 to 50 percent change. She also noted that the Staff needs to add new categories for renovation and new construction. Ms. Shook asked the CAC members to email her any proposed changes that they might want included; while reviewing the draft document.

Discussion ensued on a date and time for the next CAC meeting. Chairperson Williams suggested having the next meeting on January 7, 2019. He also noted that due to tax season approaching, it would more difficult for him to attend some future meetings due to childcare issues.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

Ms. Shook noted that the next Community Appearance Commission meeting will be on Tuesday, January 7, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in the Planning and Inspections Department – Upstairs Conference Room located at 680 W. King Street.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Williams made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Cagle to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

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

Brian Williams, Chairperson

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary