

**TOWN OF BOONE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 6, 2024, 3:00 p.m.
Planning & Inspections Department & WebEx Video Conferencing**

Historic Preservation Commission Members in Attendance:

Vice-Chair Bettie Bond, Jerry Williamson, Krystal Carter, and Vardell Smyth

Council Liaison: Virginia Roseman

Town Staff in Attendance:

Jane Shook-Director of Planning & Inspections, Jessica Mitchell-Advanced Planning Specialist, Brenda Henson-Board Secretary and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

Others in Attendance: Allison Meade-Town Attorney, Riley Ziegler-Former Commission Member, Mark Freed-Director of Cultural Resources

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Bond called the Boone Historic Preservation Commission meeting via WebEx to order at 2:59 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Carter, to adopt the agenda as presented.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Council Liaison Roseman joined the meeting in person at approximately 3:33 p.m.

TOWN ATTORNEY DISCUSSION INVOLVING ADVISORY CONSULTATION WITH POTENTIAL COA APPLICANTS

Ms. Allison Meade, Town Attorney, explained that she and the Staff wanted to discuss with the HPC members the possibility of having pre-application consultations when requested by the applicants. She said this would occur before applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). She stated this would allow an applicant to appear before the HPC members in an informal way to seek advice or direction on how they might proceed with a proposed case.

Ms. Meade said that previously, she and staff had thought that the HPC members should not have these types of consultations because they could be considered ex parte discussions in advance of a quasi-judicial hearing, which are generally not appropriate. However, substantial desire and need for them had become clear, and there were a number of other jurisdictions that had similar pre-application opportunities for prospective applicants to engage with HPC members as well as staff. She felt comfortable with the policy change, so long as applicants signed a waiver specifically acknowledging and waiving any arguable impairment of their due process rights vis a vis a subsequent COA hearing. She said we would try to be very clear with applicants that the fact they have met with the HPC members does not guarantee anything; it is just a courtesy for the applicant to help ease the COA process. Experience with the COA process thus

far demonstrated that applicants had little interest in fighting or drawing the cases out; they just wanted to know what they needed to provide for approval.

Commission Member Smyth and Vice-Chair Bond agreed with Ms. Meade that a pre-application consultation would be helpful for the reasons she stated. Vice-Chair Bond pointed out that the consultations reduce the time spent reviewing the case by the applicant hearing various options that help support their case.

Ms. Meade asked the HPC members to let her know if they had any concerns regarding possibly having a pre-application consultation with the applicants. She also asked the HPC members and Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections, about the potential workload because the applicant or the Staff might need to locate photographs and identify the applicable standards. She said any question regarding the relevant standards should be presented to the HPC members to discuss what might be applicable. She stated the applicant should come to the consultation prepared to provide some proposal or alternative proposal. She said it was inappropriate for an applicant to go to a consultation and state they were demoing a building and wanted to rebuild it and ask the HPC members what they wanted it to look like.

Ms. Shook explained that there would not be a full staff report at the consultation because a full application would not be available with the details the Staff usually would receive. She pointed out that the Staff still does not have access to the image library yet to pull photographs. She added that some applicants might be looking for direction on how some of the standards have been interpreted in the past. Further, she explained that the applicant might hope to work out potential issues when the staff and HPC members interpret the standards differently before they submit their application. She said that the HPC members and Staff could determine from the applicant's information if they are proposing a renovation, new construction, or a demolition. She said the applicant may have specific or general questions, and the Staff will try to prepare with the information they have.

Vice-Chair Bond stated that the consultation would not be an applicant requirement. Commission Member Smyth indicated that it would be helpful for the HPC members to know what might be coming before them at some point for their review. He added that reviewing the standards and figuring out how they apply takes some time. Commission Member Williamson told Ms. Meade he would like to see the draft agreement she mentioned earlier in the meeting. Ms. Meade stated that she had yet to draft the draft agreement because she and Ms. Shook wanted to discuss it with the HPC members first.

Ms. Meade noted that depending on the information the applicant prepares in advance, we may have to adjust how we handle it. She confirmed with Ms. Shook that the applicants wanted to speak with the HPC members before filing a COA application.

Ms. Shook explained that before the adoption of the historic district, the Staff did a lot of the pre-application consultations. After the first few cases, she said we decided we shouldn't have them, and they stopped. She stated that applicants are still interested in having them. She said when the meetings began regarding the rewriting of Appendix D, this topic was discussed again, and they discussed how to bring it back up. She stated that recently someone expressed interest in possibly appearing before the HPC members and Staff in March, and she decided to bring this topic to the HPC for discussion. She needed to clarify the information to be brought to the meeting.

Ms. Meade suggested the HPC members and Staff try the pre-application consultation and see how it goes. Based on what is learned at this meeting, she and the HPC members and Staff can further discuss it and be more specific about requirements.

Commission Member Williamson asked Ms. Shook to describe her reasoning when the Staff decided they may have needed to have a pre-application consultation. Ms. Shook responded because it was technically quasi-judicial, and one of the staff members had learned that other jurisdictions had done this type of consultation before hearing a case, and it seemed like a good idea. She said it was adopted before it was put into practice, and after a couple of cases, we decided to reconsider them because they were quasi-judicial. She told the HPC members that it seemed the applicant and the board appreciated having a pre-application consultation. She added that the Staff was trying to figure out the right thing to do.

Commission Member Smyth stated that his concern would be what type of training or knowledge the HPC members need before meeting with the applicants. He said the HPC members would need to ensure they don't imply or promise something to the applicant during the consultation. Ms. Meade responded that this is why a strong draft agreement would be necessary and suggested making a statement beforehand that clarifies it in the opening quasi-judicial meeting script.

Commission Member Smyth supported the idea of the pre-application consultations because it should help streamline the COA process and help ease some of the potential confusion.

Ms. Shook asked Ms. Meade if she would need to be present at the pre-application consultations. Ms. Meade responded that it would be beneficial for her to attend these consultations until HPC members and staff become more grounded through trial and error in the consultation process and to help articulate the standards.

Ms. Shook asked Ms. Meade if the pre-application consultations should not be held on the advisory meeting agenda. Ms. Meade responded that by keeping the consultations separate from the quasi-judicial hearings and emphasizing that this is a different role and does not affect COA decisions, she said the consultations should at least start on the advisory meeting agenda. Ms. Shook asked Ms. Meade if it worked for her to attend these meetings. Ms. Meade responded that to the extent that the HPC members are willing to accommodate these matters and have her first on the agenda, she can attend them.

Ms. Shook asked Ms. Meade if the Staff needed to limit the time to 30 minutes for a person to discuss their matters in an advisory meeting. Ms. Meade agreed that 30 minutes should be the maximum time for discussion. Ms. Meade asked the HPC members for their feedback on limiting the time. Commissioner Member Smyth said it was good to set a limit, but if the HPC members want to continue discussing it, they can decide during the meeting. Ms. Meade said it would be essential to keep the time limit under control because the HPC members have other agenda topics to discuss at their advisory meetings.

Commission Member Smyth asked the Staff if the HPC members would receive information in the meeting packet regarding the applicant's topic for discussion. Ms. Shook responded that some thought would have to be put into how much information could be in the packet without crossing the line into the quasi-judicial part of the process. Vice-Chair Bond said at least the type of project could be disclosed along with some of their concerns, standards that might be applied, location of the property, and possibly photographs. She said they should be made aware of the information available to them, like Digital Watauga. Ms. Shook stated that as we feel out this new process, we will become more aware of the minimum amount of information needed for the advisory meetings to be productive.

Vice-Chair Bond asked Ms. Shook if the pre-application consultation topic could be added to the March 5 advisory meeting agenda. Ms. Shook said someone is already interested in having a consultation at that meeting. Vice-Chair Bond suggested that at the March advisory meeting, the HPC discuss the consultation process and the draft agreement that Ms. Meade and Staff would create, then have the first consultation meeting at another advisory meeting. Ms. Shook confirmed with Ms. Jessica Mitchell, Advanced Planning Specialist, that there will not be a quasi-judicial meeting on March 12 because there are no cases. Ms. Meade confirmed that instead of having a quasi-judicial meeting on March 12, it would be a second advisory meeting for that month. She stated that she could be available for that March 12 advisory meeting. It was the consensus of the HPC members to have the first pre-application consultation on March 12.

Ms. Meade asked the Staff if they remembered the other jurisdictions that had the pre-application consultations. Ms. Shook responded that Ms. Christy Turner, Residential Zoning and Sign Administrator, had done that research. Ms. Mitchell said she would try to find this information for Ms. Meade. Ms. Meade said it would be helpful to see that information. She added that it is important to ensure the applicant is doing the work, which should differ from the work for a pre-COA meeting for Staff.

Ms. Shook pointed out that the General Statutes require the COA to follow the quasi-judicial process, which causes us to handle it differently than any other process. She added this is why it is important to work on making this process successful within legal bounds.

Ms. Shook stated that the Staff would inform the people wanting a consultation that the HPC members and the Staff are considering having a consultation meeting on March 12 but will not fully decide until the March 5 advisory meeting. Ms. Meade added that we will have the draft waiver for the people to agree to by March 12.

Ms. Meade and Ms. Shook left the meeting at approximately 3:22 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Williamson, to approve the December 12, 2023, meeting minutes as written.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Commission Member Smyth made a motion seconded by Commission Member Carter to approve the January 2, 2024; meeting minutes as written.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No individuals requested the opportunity to speak during public comment.

JONES HOUSE LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION REPORT UPDATE

Ms. Mitchell referred to packet page 33 and welcomed Former Commission Member Riley Ziegler to the meeting via Webex. She pointed out that the draft report in the meeting packet is based on the comments she received over the last few months. She explained to the HPC members that in considering the HPC's future action, would be a recommendation for approval for Staff to send the draft report to the Town Council and, upon Town Council's approval, send it to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to begin their review process for the local landmark designation. She further explained that the HPC members do not necessarily need to make a recommendation at this meeting because Ms. Ziegler needs more time to complete the draft report.

Ms. Ziegler stated that she had included most of the recommended changes in the draft report. Still, she had edits to make to be more specific about what Dr. Eric Plaag wanted. She stated that she emailed Dr. Plaag the current draft and is awaiting his feedback. She hoped to provide the HPC members with the final draft report by next month's advisory meeting. She had researched dates for when the Jones House changed hands, when the mini-golf course was there, and when the Jones's started taking in boarders. She noted that she was unsuccessful in finding those dates, but Dr. Plaag is helping her with them. She stated that Dr. Plaag has suggested that she move some of the paragraphs around so that the next draft may look different.

Vice-Chair Bond referred to packet page 41 and the second paragraph. She was intrigued by this statement about the passageway, "It's unsure when and why this passage was added." Ms. Ziegler noted that she had gone through newspapers to find information about the passageway, and she and Dr. Plaag had agreed that there was no purpose for the passageway so far. It might be better to remove this statement. Vice-Chair Bond agreed that removing that statement would be clearer if no information is found to support it.

Vice-Chair Bond referred to packet page 41 and the second paragraph. She read this paragraph aloud and asked Ms. Ziegler if this site was an empty lot at that time or if residences were located there. Former Commission Member Ziegler responded that before Dr. Jones owned it, multiple things were on the property, including a schoolhouse on a portion of the lot, but she recalled that the area where they built the house was an empty lot.

Vice-Chair Bond referred to packet page 42, the third paragraph, and the last sentence. She suggested that this sentence read, "Dr. and Mrs. Jones would raise two children in this home." and in the fourth paragraph and the second sentence to read, "He was taken to Knoxville, Tennessee to receive treatment, but died on January 14, 1925."

Vice-Chair Bond referred to packet page 43, the second paragraph, and the last sentence regarding Mattie Jones moving to a nursing home in Greensboro. She asked when Mattie Jones passed away.

Council Liaison Roseman joined the meeting in person at approximately 3:33 p.m.

Ms. Ziegler replied that Mattie Jones passed away around 1976. Vice-Chair Bond suggested this information be added to the end of the second paragraph on packet page 43. She noted that the photographic work in the draft report was very well done.

Ms. Mitchell asked Ms. Ziegler if she wanted further comments from the HPC members on the draft report. Ms. Ziegler said she would accept further comments but is focusing on Dr. Plaag's remarks. Ms. Mitchell stated that the Staff would include her final draft report on the agenda for the March advisory meeting.

Ms. Ziegler left the meeting at approximately 3:43 p.m.

TABLED DISCUSSION ON STONEMAN'S RAID

Ms. Mitchell explained to the HPC members the difference in the separate documents listed on the agenda, including working drafts by Commission Members Smyth and Williamson, and the images with citations previously discussed in December 2023 by Former HPC Chair Plaag, which the HPC members decided then to continue using those images. The last item she explained was the Civil War Trails (CWT) program information that included the application and other paperwork for Staff to complete and provided examples of panels that the CWT program has done before. She added the examples can be used as a reference. Commission Member Smyth asked Ms. Mitchell to show these examples to the HPC members at some point for discussion. Ms. Mitchell said the HPC members' discussion ended in January at the next steps for this historical marker.

Commission Member Smyth discussed using the Best Practices and Sign Style Guide and What Makes a Good Sign. Vice-Chair Bond noted that more discussion was needed regarding the Stoneman's Raid historical marker in front of the Watauga County Court House because that marker and the marker that the HPC is working on are two different signs. Commission Member Smyth explained that Stoneman's Raid was the cavalry from Tennessee that came upon the Boone Guard assembled at the current courthouse's location. Ultimately, there were two locations where the raid occurred: one was at the current courthouse and the other one at the Council House, which is now the location of the Downtown Boone Post Office. Commission Member Smyth illustrated on the whiteboard a concept of a map that would include a simple Downtown Boone map with streets that showed where the troops came through town, how it could have a "You are Here" label, and could include where the horses were placed at night. He said half of the troops went to Deep Gap to defend that area. He stated the troops were only in this area for about 24 hours. He suggested having a larger map that would include the more significant movement of activity, such as where Sherman and Lee's troops came through the area.

Vice-Chair Bond pointed out that much of this proposed information could eventually be put on a QR code. Ms. Mitchell said the HPC members had discussed using a mounted QR code and referencing the courthouse sign. She mentioned that the CWT program might have some information on maps, and she would try to contact Mr. Drew Gruber, CWT Program Executive Director, about it.

Commission Member Smyth referred to using the map and image with Captain Myles Keogh, and Council Liaison Roseman pointed out that the image was an opaque overlay and could take away from some of it. Ms. Mitchell noted that she had encountered the same issue with the Boone Cemetery interpretative panels. She suggested asking the CWT program people if they would also allow a modified version overlay to be used with the original.

In conclusion, Commission Member Smyth suggested having the Angelo Wiser map, a smaller map showing the raid in Boone with an overlay, and a larger map to reveal the whole story. Ms. Mitchell explained that the HPC members are to finalize the proposed text and include the agreed-upon images. The CWT works on the design of it, and she thought it might be helpful to provide a conceptual idea. She would contact the CWT program, let them know of the HPC's discussion on maps, and see if they could provide any resources.

Ms. Mitchell referred to the map on packet page 93 and noted that we have the citation for Stoneman's Route from Beech Mountain to Boone, March 28, 1865, from the Library of Congress and that more information might be found from that source.

Ms. Mitchell referred to packet page 95 and explained the process and steps the HPC members and staff should follow when adding a site to the CWT program.

Mr. Mark Freed, Director of Cultural Resources, left the meeting at approximately 3:58 p.m.

Ms. Mitchell estimated that when the HPC members were ready to send the proposed text and maps to the CWT program for their review, the Staff would first present it to the Town Council to give them an update on the progress the HPC has made on it and coordinate on the financial part of it. At the 2024 Planning Retreat, she informed the Town Council that the Stoneman's Raid Interpretative Panels would be carried over to the next fiscal year budget, so it could potentially be discussed at the 2024 Budget Retreat. She added that the Watauga County Historical Society preliminarily agreed to pay \$750.00 of the \$3,000.00 cost per panel. She said the Town would have to cover the rest of the amount for the panels. She pointed out another cost, which is a \$200.00 annual fee with the CWT program. She reminded the HPC that the annual fee is for maintenance, such as correcting panel language if needed, and for CWT to advertise it in their brochures. She noted that the CWT program would include wording that draws people to look at the marker.

Vice-Chair Bond talked about the timing of the CWT program Stoneman's Raid marker being placed at about the same time as the North Peak Trail would be going from Boone and over Elk Knob, as well as the Downtown Boone Historic Walking Trail. Commission Member Smyth asked if the "You are Here" would be helpful on some of the other signs in town.

Ms. Mitchell pointed out that the draft text would need to be reworked and asked the HPC members how they wanted to pursue it. Commission Member Smyth said that he and Commission Member Williamson could continue to work on reducing the word count to 275. He asked if the words in the captions were

included in the word count. Council Liaison Roseman confirmed from the packet information that the text consists of all text in caption, sidebars, quotes, and punctuation. She added that words inside a box with an image do not count toward the word count. Ms. Mitchell pointed out that the citation caption must be included on the image of Captain Keogh because of receiving that image from the museum source.

Vice-Chair Bond noted that the HPC members would review the revised draft at the March advisory meeting. Commission Member Smyth asked if elements of the panel would be colorized and if they wanted to include the Stoneman's Raid banner and overcoats from one of the resources he found. He suggested using a QR code to put information they might reduce from the text. Ms. Mitchell suggested saving some time in the process by keeping additional material separate that can, over time, be added to the Town website so they could finish up the proposed marker text. She said the Staff can build a subpage on the HPC page for the additional information. She suggested not using the words QR code in the proposed marker text. Commission Member Smyth said a second sign could be beside the marker to add more information, and Vice-Chair Bond suggested adding a link to provide more details. Council Liaison Roseman asked about the current word count, and Ms. Mitchell noted that Commission Member Williamson had 238 words in his draft. Council Liaison Roseman and Commission Member Smyth agreed that bullet points would be helpful in the proposed text.

Commission Member Williamson referred to packet page 91, his draft of the proposed text, and he asked the HPC members for their feedback on the next to the last sentence in the first paragraph; he read, "General Stoneman himself briefly requisitioned the Council House for his headquarters. The foraging and the killing of Jacob Council long embittered local Confederate families." He stated that this information was outside the provided draft text, but it was taken from interviews he had conducted in the 1970s with Gordon Winkler and the elder Mr. Mast. He explained that he had given all his interview notes to a reporter who used only some of the information he had shown him. He stated that this information was not in a history book; he added it to the draft text because it was information that he knew about this history, which is part of the tension. Council Liaison Roseman stated her suggestion not to include those two sentences in Commission Member Williamson's draft, and Commission Member Smyth agreed with Council Liaison Roseman. Ms. Mitchell stated that as we learned by gathering research on the Boone Cemetery Interpretative Panels, it was necessary to have the documentation to back up everything that is stated.

Commission Member Smyth noted that at some point, there should be some sign about the occupation of Boone, which is a separate topic for future discussion. Vice-Chair Bond agreed that would be a future topic of conversation to capture that time and history. There was consensus from the HPC members for Commission Members Smyth and Williamson to continue to work on the proposed text.

DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTION FOR FORMER COMMISSION MEMBER CHUCK WATKINS

Ms. Mitchell reminded the HPC members that Former Chair Plaag had suggested that the HPC prepare a resolution for Former Commission Member Watkins. Commission Member Smyth agreed to the HPC working on this resolution. Commission Member Williamson suggested including Former Commission Member Watkins's time as the Director of the Museum and said that Vice-Chair Bond knew the most

about him of the current HPC members. Vice-Chair Bond volunteered to work with Ms. Mitchell on the resolution. Ms. Mitchell said she could provide a copy of a recent resolution for working on this resolution. It was the consensus of the HPC members for Vice-Chair Bond and Ms. Mitchell to work together on this resolution.

UPDATE ON R.L. CLAY (RIVERS) HOUSE LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION - SHPO

Ms. Mitchell referred to packet pages 105 through 107 and explained the difference in the separate documents listed on the agenda. She noted an email from SHPO with updated information about the review letter regarding the proposed designation of the property, comments about the designation report for the HPC members to review, and the designation confirmation form for the property. She explained the meeting packet included the draft report that was sent to SHPO for their review and a flowchart from SHPO of the landmark designation process. She referred to packet page 154 and expounded on “The Basic Local Landmark Designation Process” flowchart that it is for the HPC to decide if the report establishes the property’s historical significance. Further, the HPC is to decide whether to recommend or not recommend designation based on the SHPO’s comments. She said that SHPO is suggesting some edits to the designation report, and she asked the HPC members to voice any differences they see from SHPO’s comments on the report. She explained that the HPC considers the report to be fine as it is, and the HPC would want to recommend landmark designation; the motion would need to include that and why the HPC feels that way.

Ms. Mitchell contacted SHPO and asked for specific suggestions regarding their comments in the email, which included that the report needs a strong statement about all aspects of the property or landmarks. She added that their comments suggest being clearer about what is and isn't part of the designation of the property and if there are any specific interior features. She said that on report pages seven and eight, there is a section called Boundary Justification 115 and 116, and she thought this section covered the out parcels that were designated. She contacted Ms. Kristi Brantley at SHPO and discussed the information in the Boundary Justification section. She added that Ms. Brantley suggested that in considering future Commissions, to reference the information in the General Information section, which can be copied and pasted from the Boundary Justification section. Ms. Mitchell said the HPC members could discuss the best place to put the information for future reference of what is being designated, like the house, wall, garage, outbuilding, monument, and tree.

Ms. Mitchell referred to packet page 125, talked about a reference to the interior of the house, and read aloud the last sentence in paragraph two, “While no part of this proposed designation, even the interior floor plan of the R.L. Clay House appears to be largely unchanged from its original design.” She stated that the SHPO is suggesting that this sentence be made clearer and that the interior is not part of the designation of the property. She explained that the SHPO meant that in reference to a future Commission or Staff, they could interpret what this Commission indicated in the designation.

Commission Member Smyth asked if the property is designated or just the bounds of the property containing the specified items. He questioned if the designation limits what can be done with the property. Ms. Mitchell explained that once the property is designated, Appendix D standards would have

to be considered for any proposed work on the property, and it would be subject to the Statement of Conformity or Certificate of Appropriateness processes for minor or major work to the property.

Council Liaison Roseman asked if Rachel's Meadow was being considered part of the designation, and Ms. Mitchell said it was part of the second parcel for designation. Council Liaison Roseman wondered if it would tie the Town's hands to do things on the property. Ms. Mitchell stated that it would restrict what was allowed in terms of what was allowed in the standards. She explained that for previous historic landmark properties, the HPC chose UDO Article 8 and Appendix D as the standards for the property. She briefly reminded the HPC of the previous conversation regarding Appendix D revisions to include landmark properties within the revised Appendix D. She said it would cause the Town to go through a process if they wanted to do things on the property. Further, she stated that the Commission needed to decide which standards to apply to this property with the landmark designation.

Ms. Mitchell explained to the HPC that their next steps would be to make a recommendation for the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House to be a local landmark designation. Then, Staff would prepare for a joint Public Hearing and Planning Commission meeting to consider historic landmark designations as a zoning map amendment to the property. Additionally, she added that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation have also applied to landmark properties. Council Liaison Roseman asked about the proposal for this property; Ms. Mitchell responded that the property is not currently in the historic district, but if it is designated as a local historic landmark with Appendix D standards applied, it would have to go through the process under the historic district standards.

Commission Member Smyth asked if the HPC has a role in reviewing Rachel's Meadow. Ms. Mitchell responded that the HPC would have to look at the property's period of significance. She added that if the property became a local landmark, the HPC would have to look at its integrity. Vice-Chair Bond stated that today she received a can of film from Phil McGuire that was labeled Downtown Boone 1938 that she would share with Digital Watauga. She added that it would be easy to work with the integrity of that property. She said the focus so far has been on the house. She asked why we call it the Clay House rather than the Rivers House. Ms. Mitchell stated some information in the early research named it the Clay House. Vice-Chair Bond was all right with the Clay House name, but she did not know anyone who would see that house as the Clay House.

Ms. Mitchell asked if the HPC was interested in modifying the report or leaving it as it is following the SHPO's comments. It was suggested to copy and paste from the Boundary Justification section two sentences that include the parcel numbers:

The proposed boundaries of the designation follow the surveyed boundaries for all listed parcels: 2900-78-3934-000, 2900-69-9070-000, and 2900-79-0308-000.3 These parcels include the house, the garage, a portion of the drive leading to the house and garage (Clay House Drive), the Daniel Boone Monument/Rivers Park, land along the ridgeline to the north and northwest of the house, "Rachel's meadow," and "Baby," the North Carolina state champion sugar maple

Ms. Mitchell suggested adding this information to the General Information as item I. Statement of Property Designation, adding that the interior of the house and garage outbuilding is not included.

Ms. Mitchell stated that SHPO does not need to review the draft report again if the HPC members make changes because, after the public hearing and following Town Council approval, SHPO would see the final version of the report.

Ms. Mitchell reminded that they would need to make a motion to recommend or not recommend the designation of the property as a local historic landmark. She suggested that the HPC members discuss what standards would apply to the property. She reminded the HPC of what has been previously done for a local historic landmark property, UDO Article 8 and Appendix D, and then broadly used the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Motion and Vote:

Vice-Chair Bond made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Smyth, to recommend local historic landmark designation to begin the process for a public hearing, regarding the discussed standards for the property, and to agree to make the discussed changes following the comments from SHPO.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

STAFF UPDATES

Ms. Mitchell referred to packet page 155 and updated the HPC members on the Statement of Conformity Report; she stated one project from September 2023 and one from December 2023. She noted that these are open projects in the permitting system and are assigned to Mr. Mike James, Commercial Zoning Administrator.

Council Liaison Roseman asked about the mural on the ECRS building and if it was in line to be reviewed as a COA project. Ms. Mitchell said she had not heard about this proposed project but could ask. She said the mural was vandalized.

Ms. Mitchell updated the HPC members on the Boone Cemetery Interpretative Panels. She sent the higher-quality images to Vacker Sign Company, and they thought these images would work well. The sign company sent Ms. Mitchell an estimate to be signed by the Town Manager for her to move forward with the panels. She reiterated that the financial aspect of the panels would be carried over to the next fiscal year.

Ms. Mitchell did not have an update for the HPC members on Dana Folk Way. She said that Ms. Lane Moody, Downtown Boone Development Coordinator, was making progress with the public art program, and those projects may coincide with projects that the HPC members are working on. She reminded the HPC members that their part of the Dana Folk Way project was to discuss the proposed text for an interpretative sign, a flat sign, to install on the building.

Ms. Mitchell stated that the HPC Chair Position and the H.W. Horton Building Local Landmark Designation action request were submitted to the Town Council agenda for next Wednesday. She reminded the HPC members that the action request for the H.W. Horton Building was for approval for Staff to send the designation report to SHPO. She reviewed the progress of the current local historic landmark projects: the Jones House Designation Report is still being reviewed by the HPC members before it can be sent to the Town Council for their consideration; SHPO has reviewed the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House Designation report; and the HPC members just recommended that it be sent to the public hearing process. She informed the HPC members that she had suggested at the Planning Retreat that one public hearing would be held for at least the H.W. Horton building and R.L. Clay (Rivers) House local historic landmark designation cases.

Ms. Mitchell updated the HPC members on the direction the Staff received from the January 2024 Planning Retreat. She said overall there was consensus on the HPC work plan as it was presented by finishing the in-progress items one task at a time.

Ms. Mitchell mentioned a new item that former HPC Chair Plaag had mentioned before he left the Commission in December 2023, which is the Winkler Creek Dam site. She stated this was a Town Council-directed project, and the HPC was to finish one of the ongoing projects first and then take on the research for this project. She would continue to monitor the progress of the projects on the work plan and figure out when the HPC members can begin the research on it, and she added that the Commission should work on this item within the next six months to one year.

Council Liaison Roseman told the HPC members this project was directed to them because there might be some recreation facility, such as a bike park or a hiking trail. If it happens, the Town Council would like to know the historical significance of the property so they know how to use the land appropriately and would need to know if it was worth preserving. Ms. Mitchell said that the Staff had some preliminary research from Former HPC Chair Plaag, who had mentioned this topic at an HPC meeting.

Ms. Mitchell said the discussion about an HPC logo was favorable at the Planning Retreat. Town Council Member Carter suggested slowing down that thought process, and the decision was that the Town Council would consider Town branding overall to have consistent logos with color, font, and style before boards would individually make a logo for markers and documents.

Ms. Mitchell informed the HPC members that the resolution ceremony for Dr. Rennie Brantz would be presented on Wednesday, February 14, 2024, at 9 a.m. at the Town Council meeting held in the Council Chambers. She said she would inform Former Commission Member Watkins of the resolution ceremony.

HPC MEMBER UPDATES

Commission Member Smyth said at the Boone Cemetery, one of the Williams gravestones has been on its side for about two years, and the top has been knocked off of one of the Dougherty gravestones. He added that anyone entering the cemetery would think the Town wanted to avoid taking care of it. He said the Town should take better care of this cemetery.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Ms. Mitchell announced that there would not be a quasi-judicial meeting on February 13, 2024. She stated she would inform the HPC members that March 12, 2024, is the second HPC advisory meeting. Commission Member Smyth said he would work on the Stoneman's Raid draft text and send it to Commission Member Williamson for review. He confirmed Ms. Mitchell would research the maps for the Stoneman's Raid proposed text.

ADJOURNMENT

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Carter, to adjourn the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Bettie Bond, Vice-Chair

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary