

**TOWN OF BOONE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 6, 2023, 3:00 p.m.
WebEx Video Conferencing**

Historic Preservation Commission Members in Attendance:

Chair Erick Plaag, Vice-Chair Bettie Bond, Chuck Watkins, and James Sharp

Student Member: Riley Ziegler

Council Liaison: Virginia Roseman

Town Staff in Attendance:

Jessica Mitchell-Long-Range/Special Projects Planner, Christy Turner-Senior Planner, and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

Others in Attendance: Jodie Feimster

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Plaag called the Boone Historic Preservation Commission meeting via WebEx to order at 3:02 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Member Sharp made a motion, seconded by Student Member Riley, to adopt the agenda as written.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Plaag requested to table the approval of April 12, 2023 CLG meeting minutes and the May 2, 2023, Advisory meeting minutes until the next advisory meeting.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

No individuals requested the opportunity to speak during public comment.

SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL IN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT/APPENDIX D DISCUSSION

Chair Plaag began the discussion on the substitute material. Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections, informed Chair Plaag that Ms. Allison Meade, Town Attorney, had wanted to attend this meeting, but it did not work out with her scheduling. Ms. Shook asked Chair Plaag if it was possible to table the main part of this discussion until Ms. Meade could be a part of the discussion. Ms. Shook suggested in this meeting that Chair Plaag have an initial discussion on the topic of substitute material.

Chair Plaag said the substitute material information started on packet page 24. He explained that he had emailed Ms. Jennifer Cathey from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding their input on

the thin-set brick veneer cavity wall system issue and asked for feedback on that material. Ms. Cathey responded in an email to Chair Plaag (permanently on file). He explained her recommendations included that the Historic Preservation Commission take advantage of the NCPres ListServ because the members have many years of experience with materials. He continued that she also suggested that the HPC should be specific with their queries and state the building type and location, nature of the historic district setting, and proposed use of the veneer. Chair Plaag agreed that considering the NCPres ListServ would be an opportunity for the HPC to learn how other communities handle materials of this type in their historic districts. He said this would help the HPC decide how to revise the Downtown Historic District Standards. He said this type of discussion on materials would be to review the appropriate and inappropriate materials in the district for the period of significance, considering the technological changes. He noted that he made it clear while the HPC reviewed the Watauga County Parking Deck – Certificate of Appropriateness case that he did not think that thin-set brick veneer was appropriate on primary and secondary elevations. He said that Ms. Cathey agreed with Chair Plaag that further discussion on using this type of veneer system was valid.

Chair Plaag confirmed with Ms. Shook that the HPC would need to wait until Ms. Meade could be present before the HPC made any decisions on the materials. Ms. Shook explained that Ms. Meade wanted to participate in the meeting to hear the HPC's concerns about possibly using newer technology. Chair Plaag stated that he recognized Ms. Shook's request to table the rest of the substitute material discussion until Ms. Meade could participate as long as there were no objections from the other HPC members. There were no objections from the HPC to table the said discussion.

Chair Plaag talked about a statement in the email from Ms. Cathey regarding the National Park Service (NPS) not specifically approving a specific material or product, and he added there was a time that NPS did approve substitute materials. He reminded the HPC that in the past, he had given the example of a problem with structural glass in specific applications as an acceptable substitute for Vitrolite and Carrara glass. He pointed out that when a seal of approval was put on something it is making that endorsement, not knowing how that material will perform over a more extended period. He said that the NPS is less willing to approve substitute materials or make recommendations on what they thought was a suitable material, which should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Shook informed the HPC that Staff had some information on materials they would like to present to the HPC, but she didn't know how long it would take. She asked Chair Plaag if he wanted to cover other agenda items before Staff began discussing the materials. Chair Plaag said he would like to cover the other agenda items first, then ask Staff to present the information on the materials. He suggested moving the topic of substitute materials to after HPC Member Updates.

Motion and Vote:

Vice-Chair Bond made a motion, seconded by Student Member Ziegler, to amend the agenda to move the Staff's discussion on substitute material to after the HPC updates.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

BOONE CEMETERY INTERPRETATIVE PANEL DRAFT PANEL TEXT AND DESIGN

Chair Plaag referred to packet page 28, and he said he incorporated the HPC's feedback from their last advisory meeting regarding Panels #1 and #4. He made some minor changes, tried to address the concerns, specifically on the issue of the soldiers fighting for an end to slavery or not fighting for an end to slavery, and provided some new photographs with better images for those particular panels.

Chair Plaag explained the process for the interpretative panels. He said the goal was to have the text and images for the four panels turned over to a designer at the company selected by Town staff. He explained that the HPC would approve the final draft content for the individual panels subject to the Town Council's review. He added that if Town Council approves the funding for the interpretative panel project, Staff would send the panel information to the designer at the panel company to do a mock-up of the panels, and Staff would send the mock-up back for the HPC to review and make further changes. Ms. Mitchell suggested sending the panel information to the panel company at the same time as it is sent to Town Council for their consideration. Chair Plaag pointed out that the panel company might want payment before they review the panel information. He asked Ms. Mitchell to ask the panel company to see if they do a review before having a contract with them.

Discussion ensued on Interpretative Panel #1 Boone Cemetery. Member Watkins pointed out that "burial" was used several times and suggested that some synonyms be used in its place. He also pointed out that the sentence starting with "By the 1880s" talked about the 1880s being the late 19th century. He said that Chair Plaag had done an excellent job reducing the word count, but he thought it could be reduced by about 20 percent more. Chair Plaag explained that the challenge with those two sentences was that the evidence for it being seen as the Town cemetery comes from the Watauga Democrat, which was not published until 1888. He said there were no reliable records before 1888 to see when people began discussing it being the Town cemetery. He said that by the early 1890s, there were appeals in the Watauga Democrat from the Editor saying we needed to maintain our cemetery better because it was overgrown. Member Watkins suggested that Chair Plaag explain the cemetery's condition at that time in fewer words on the panel. Chair Plaag agreed that he would work on those sentences for clarification purposes. Vice-Chair Bond suggested that Chair Plaag change the timing of the last sentence and not designate it as the late 19th Century.

Ms. Shook asked when the First Baptist Church was formally involved with the cemetery. Chair Plaag thought that the First Baptist Church was established in 1882. He said there were already burials there much earlier than that timeframe, but it was not designated as the First Baptist Church cemetery. Chair Plaag stated that the involvement of the First Baptist Church in discussions about the maintenance of the cemetery in recent years was driven by many church members having ancestors buried there, but many people are buried in this cemetery there who were not associated with the First Baptist Church.

Chair Plaag said that other than reworking the second sentence by changing one of the “burial” words and the last two sentences in the first paragraph, there was a general consensus of the HPC that they were satisfied with the content of Panel 1.

Chair Plaag discussed the use of the two images for Panel 1. He did not think there was an issue with using the survey image from the State of North Carolina because it was a public record. He said the other print from the Palmer Blair Collection should not be an issue, but as the Chair of Digital Watauga, he would ask the Palmer Blair family (digital partner) about the Town wanting to use it. He said that Digital Watauga would authorize that use without compensation.

Council Liaison Roseman voiced her concern about the Palmer Blair Collection image being blurry. She asked Chair Plaag how he thought it would translate into print. Chair Plaag said a couple of other aerial images show the cemetery that he could compare for clarity. He added that most of the Palmer Blair Collection has some motion blur because they were taken from an aircraft, a standard for aerial photography in the 1950s. He pointed out that the image of the cemetery was a cropped version that made the grain more visible, creating a type of blur that is more of a grain blur. Council Liaison Roseman asked if this was the type of image that could be cropped differently to reduce the blur. She asked if an outside source could crop the image to keep some of its integrity intact as it is blown up. Chair Plaag said it is not an issue of blowing the image up. He explained that it is a very high-resolution scan and that what you saw was the grain of the film itself. He said that there are filters in Photoshop that can be used to eliminate some things, but it would create a very unnatural look to the image, and often you can lose more detail than you can gain. He said he would look through the Digital Watauga Collections for other aerial images from roughly this period that show the cemetery to see if there was an image with a little less motion blur. Chair Plaag added that Civil War Trails markers have the same issues which lack fine detail.

Member Watkins referred to the image in the meeting packet on page 29 and asked Chair Plaag about the image, specifically what the handshake imagery means on the tombstone. Chair Plaag explained that handshaking is usually a symbol of matrimony, and if you look at the sleeves, one of them should appear feminine, and the other one should appear masculine. He added that if the sleeves appear to be gender-neutral, the hands represent a heavenly welcome or an earthly farewell. Council Liaison Roseman and Member Watkins wanted this image and description added to the panel. Chair Plaag emphasized that this tombstone was not an 1865 stone, but it is probably a mid-1870s stone. He said that some of the tombstones were installed after the war when funding was more available to buy them, and the marble for the tombstones was possibly available as far away as Wilkesboro, North Carolina. Ms. Mitchell suggested that if Chair Plaag found other images, they could be used as backup images. Chair Plaag agreed that multiple backup images could be available for the designer to choose from, which may mean, depending on the circumstances having individual captions for each image to describe that image. He mentioned that the designer might be interested in the backup images as a form of a screened image where the opacity is reduced so that it bleeds through the text behind it but is not in the forefront of what you see.

Chair Plaag said Panel #1 would be placed at the front gate in the white section of the cemetery, and next to it would be a panel on how to use the Boone Cemetery that would include safety information while in the cemetery. He said it was not his intention to have an image along with the text on this panel, which is why the text is longer. He said it would be helpful to have a reasonably bright screen image behind the text to make it more visually attractive.

Discussion ensued on Panel #2, How to Use the Boone Cemetery. After reviewing the text, Member Watkins stated that his preference would be for the text to be less specific on the use of the cemetery and written more towards a citizen's aspect of appreciating the cemetery. Chair Plaag stated that the HPC discussed the subject matter for the panels about a year ago, and he had responded to what the HPC as a whole wanted at that time when creating the wording for the panels. Chair Plaag stated that maybe the HPC had now rather see different text than the rules on the panel, and he was open to suggestions. Student Member Ziegler explained that from her student perspective, doing some background on the panel would be better than doing a graphic because graphics tend to draw vandalism. She added that graphics are the easiest for people to draw faces or spray paint on. She said using graphics tends to attract attention, and using one or two graphics depicting what should not be done in the cemetery was a good idea. In the first bullet point, she pointed out that "prosecuted accordingly" should include the type of prosecution that would apply to the trespassers.

Discussion ensued on the timespan of the interpretative panels. Ms. Shook asked Chair Plaag about the expected timespan for the information on interpretative panels. She referred to one of the terms in bullet point five, "rock out," and asked about the ability to make future text changes to the panels as necessary. Chair Plaag deferred Ms. Shook's question to Ms. Mitchell because she had contacted the panel design company. Ms. Mitchell said the panel company did not give her a specific timespan, and she would have to contact the panel company to find out. She pointed out that in a past discussion, the HPC had discussed the most durable materials for the panels and chosen the framework where the panel could be changed. Ms. Shook suggested keeping the text that would not have to be changed as often on the panels.

Council Liaison Roseman said that the shorter the bullet point, the better, and suggested that the bullet points be concise. She said that with the extra room from shorter bullet points, there could be room for the Circus Girl information. Chair Plaag explained that he might be able to include the vandalism of the Circus Girl stone in the panel text and explain that she was a fascinating person who was in the cemetery. He stated that we almost lost our record of her because of people who vandalized the cemetery. Chair Plaag suggested having a series of six short bullet points below the description of the Circus Girl that outline the important safety points while in the cemetery. He said this would also help justify using QR codes in the cemetery. Vice-Chair Bond agreed with Council Liaison Roseman about reducing the text and making shorter bullet points. She pointed out that this would be the first panel visitors to the cemetery would see, and having the QR code with more detailed information would make it more interesting for visitors entering the cemetery. Member Sharp suggested having one line in the text that explained why this place of reverence was important to students and town residents. Chair Plaag suggested including a sentence that says, "Boone Cemetery is an opportunity to understand better and experience our Town's history, our community's history, including many local residents and people associated with Appalachian

State University.” He added that this could be the introductory sentence to the safety bullet points. Vice-Chair Bond said that we did not have to identify that some people here belong to the university and some people belong to the Town because we have the paragraph that states the Boone Cemetery contains a great deal of black and white associated family history.

Member Sharp asked if there was signage at the entrance to the cemetery regarding the hours the cemetery is open for visitors. Chair Plaag responded that there is a small sign that says something like the cemetery is open from dusk to dawn. Student Member Ziegler said the signage might say police enforce it. She suggested that the letters on the sign be made bigger and bolder because some people do not take the sign seriously. Chair Plaag added that there was a dog bag station at the entrance to the cemetery.

Discussion ensued on QR codes. Ms. Mitchell reminded the HPC of their discussion regarding the Public Works Department making a QR code for the panels. She asked the HPC if they wanted the QR code to be located next to a pamphlet holder. She asked the HPC if they wanted to leave the QR code where the panel text called it out, knowing we would have a QR code at that location or have the QR code on the pamphlet holder knowing that people are more likely to scan a QR code. Chair Plaag responded that the HPC had decided to have one pamphlet holder among all the panels. He explained that the idea was for each panel to have a QR code that led to a different set of online information. Chair Plaag suggested a mounting area for the QR code sticker that can be applied, and when something needs to be changed, we get a new sticker. Student Member Ziegler explained that some people might not be comfortable scanning a sticker, thinking it might not be a sticker placed there by the Town. She said there are stickers with QR codes that, if scanned, can give viruses, shut down a phone, or steal credit card information. She said this was her only concern about the sticker versus a QR code imprinted into the panel. Ms. Mitchell talked about the Public Works Department using a reflective type of durable material similar to a vinyl sticker material. It might be more feasible to use because of its mounting material. She said she would check with the Public Works Department to see if it is still doable.

Council Liaison Roseman stated that not all college students would abuse the cemetery but would appreciate the history of preserving our community’s legacy.

Discussion ensued on Panel #3, A Divided Cemetery. Chair Plaag explained that he tried to cover all the important details of the boundary line within the cemetery. He noted that the footnotes in this particular panel would not be on the panel itself, but were intended for the HPC to know why he made the statements in the panel language. He asked the HPC for their feedback on the text for the panel. Vice-Chair Bond said the panel text was well done. She said a QR code was unnecessary for this panel because there was much information on it. She said if people wanted more information, there were other ways to get it. Member Watkins pointed out that this panel repeats information in Panel 1. He asked Chair Plaag if he intended for Panel 1 to be a general introduction. Chair Plaag explained it was the plan when the HPC first discussed the panels to let Panel 1 be the general introduction. He also explained that some people would not read the first panel and later on would read another panel but have missed the introduction provided in Panel 1. Member Watkins suggested that Chair Plaag reduce the text where it talks about the separation of the cemetery in Panel 1. He said he was cognizant of the fact that we always try to keep the

word count approximately the same in a set of panels. Member Sharp asked if, in the third paragraph, the second line stating “Boone mayor Gordon Winkler,” if “mayor” should be capitalized. Chair Plaag responded that if he were being addressed as a title, Mayor Gordon Winkler, “mayor”, would be capitalized, but the way it was written, it does not need to be capitalized.

Council Liaison Roseman asked Chair Plaag if the photo on packet page 33 was a duplicate of an earlier photo and why this photo was chosen. Chair Plaag responded that this was the only photograph that he knew of that showed most of the run of the fence. He said there are other photographs still in copyright that were taken that show part of the fence and some survey photos that show the fence far away. He said there are some articles that are referenced that show a little bit of the chain link fence, but they are on microfilm and have poor quality. Council Liaison Roseman suggested that if the panel was to line up to where this photograph lined up with the fieldstones, she thought it would help to show the line of segregation.

Chair Plaag explained where the HPC had discussed placing this panel. He said that in this photograph, you could see the white concrete boundary wall near the center, which is close to the Hardin family plots, and to the left of that slightly up the hill and near where the telephone pole is located, is where this panel would be placed straddling the line. He said as someone stands to read the panel, they would be standing in both sections of the cemetery on that line. Council Liaison Roseman stated that the panel should be at the other end, so you are looking directly out at the line. Vice-Chair Bond noted that she could clearly see the fence in the photograph, and having a photograph of the gate did not help tell the segregation story; Chair Plaag agreed with Vice-Chair Bond that the photograph of the gate would not be helpful in telling the said story.

Discussion ensued on Panel #4, Boone’s Union Dead. Chair Plaag stated that he had not attended the last meeting when the HPC had discussed Panel 4, but he had taken the issues of concern from the draft meeting minutes. He had rewritten this panel's draft text, including Member Watkin's concern about a contradiction between the two places. He explained that he reworded the sentence that precedes footnote three to help explain what he meant that the Councill family may have perceived that these men were fighting for slavery as opposed to the question of whether they were or were not. He said he provided evidence that throughout the South and the North, there was a perception that, particularly in the back half of the war that white Union soldiers were fighting as allies to enslaved people in some way. He added that they were fighting for the end of slavery, and thus the epithet often used to describe them.

Chair Plaag opened the floor for feedback on the proposed text for this panel. Council Liaison Roseman asked Chair Plaag if the footnote would be in the QR code. Chair Plaag responded that the text had yet to be written, and the HPC could choose what they wanted to do with this particular QR code. He had intended to include the broader particulars in context with Stoneman's Raid. He added that he had researched the five soldiers who died in Boone, and he intended to provide as many details as he could about these soldiers. He said the information on the soldiers does not belong on the panel, but people might be curious to know about, for instance, Henry Evans.

Member Watkins stated that a way to capture some of the footnote material and make it available to the public could be through the QR codes. Chair Plaag explained that the different QR codes would probably be hosted on the same website as the Boone Walking Tour content, containing a specific link associated with this particular information. He added that we have the ability, with the story map process, which is the platform for the walking tour, to build a network of links within any given site that can take people to new information. Ms. Mitchell asked Chair Plaag who is hosting the website for the Boone walking tour. Chair Plaag responded that the Watauga County Historical Society was hosting the website. He added that the historical society is currently working on getting that funded separately. Ms. Shook said that the Planning and Inspections Department has used story maps. Chair Plaag told Ms. Shook he might need her department's assistance in creating the story maps; Ms. Shook said that Ms. Mitchell could help him if needed.

Chair Plaag addressed the HPC's concern about the 1885 image on the panel. He explained that he had used it as a placeholder image because he was working on options. He said the image of the map in the packet was from the Library of Congress, showing the Stoneman's Raid route from the Tennessee line to Boone. He added that the image was from somebody on that march keeping track of the daily mileage. He said if the image was enlarged to an appropriate size on the panel, it was a good contextual clue for people to understand how the troops got here when the raid occurred.

Member Watkins pointed out that the word "burial" was repeated, and there needed to be a substitute word used for it in the last sentence of the second paragraph and the last sentence of the third paragraph.

Chair Plaag said the next task was to revise the proposed text for the four panels. He said he would try to complete the revisions by the following advisory meeting.

Ms. Mitchell reminded the HPC that near the time the panels are ordered, she and someone from the Public Works Department, and a designated HPC member, would need to meet at the cemetery and discuss the locations of the panels. Chair Plaag said he would go with another HPC member to discuss the locations of the panels. In general, Chair Plaag explained that one of the locations for the panels is an empty spot when you first walk into the gate and to the left, which would be a good spot for the first two panels. He said that Panel 3 would go on the divided line as previously described, and Panel 4 would be placed between the two trees just above their grave sites because there was no known gravesite at that location.

Ms. Shook stated that she had contacted the Public Works Department regarding photos from when the Town first took over the cemetery, and they took down the fence. She said they would look for photos and get back to her on what they may have found.

STONEMAN'S RAID INTERPRETATIVE PANEL DRAFT PANEL TEXT AND DESIGN

Chair Plaag requested that the Stoneman's Raid Interpretative Panel Draft discussion be tabled to the next advisory meeting because the draft was incomplete. It was the consensus of HPC to table this agenda item to the next advisory meeting.

Ms. Mitchell pointed out to Chair Plaag that Staff had seen a marker at the Watauga County Courthouse that talked about Stoneman's Raid or a similar topic. She said Staff was curious how that marker would correlate to the interpretative panel that the HPC was working on. Chair Plaag reviewed the text on the interpretative panel at the Watauga County Courthouse. Vice-Chair Bond asked Chair Plaag who was responsible for the marker at the courthouse. Chair Plaag responded that the marker was completed by The Department of Conservation and Development in 1940. He read the courthouse marker text, "Stoneman's Raid, on a raid through Western North Carolina, General Stoneman's US Cavalry fought a skirmish with the Home Guard at Boone, March 28, 1865." He said it is part of the North Carolina Historical Marker Program, and the marker was placed at the courthouse site because it was the direction from which they generally came into Town. He said the reason for installing an interpretative panel at the Downtown Boone Post Office location is that is where James Council's house was located and where the shooting started. He said he knew from multiple sources that the Post Office location was where the shots were fired by the home guard or at the home guard, depending on which side you believe fired the shots.

HPC INTERN LANDMARK REPORT UPDATE

Ms. Mitchell began the discussion on the landmark report. She pointed out that the draft report in the meeting packet was from the April HPC Advisory meeting and included in today's meeting packet because she did not receive another report that incorporated the comments made at the May HPC Advisory meeting. She noted that she had included the April draft report in the meeting packet in case the HPC would like to further comment on it.

Chair Plaag informed the HPC that Ms. Ellie McCorkle, HPC Intern, could not attend this meeting. He explained that Ms. McCorkle had resigned from her position at Digital Watauga. He said she had accepted a full-time position doing survey and architectural history work with a company in North Carolina. He said he had yet to be able to communicate with Ms. McCorkle to find out what she could or could not do regarding her commitments to the Town.

Chair Plaag explained that he had communicated with Ms. Shook briefly about the funding for the HPC internship. Ms. Shook told him that the funding for the two local landmark designation reports, the Jones House and the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House, would expire at the end of June 2023 and not be carried forward to the Town's new fiscal year. Ms. Shook added that the intent was for the work on these two designation reports to be completed by the end of June 2023.

Chair Plaag told Ms. Shook that if Ms. McCorkle could not complete the two designation reports, he would complete the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House report because it was near completion. He said he would present the final draft to the HPC for their consideration. He asked the HPC if one of them wanted to volunteer to complete the Jones House local landmark designation report. He pointed out that the HPC had completed several of these types of reports before, and there was a template for how the HPC does these local landmark reports. He said the volunteer service on the report from the HPC would be much appreciated.

He understood there were no budget dollars for the next fiscal year to hire an intern for this purpose. He said in the coming fiscal year, if the HPC wants to complete these types of reports, they, as a Commission, would have to do them and not an intern.

Student Member Riley asked the HPC if they would consider an unpaid intern to work on the draft reports. She explained that she knew a lot of students in the ASU History Department, and she thought one of these students would consider an unpaid internship just for the experience of it. Chair Plaag responded that it was his impression that the Town had been reluctant to employ unpaid interns. Ms. Shook explained that, historically, we had one or two paid intern positions for the Town. She said that if someone wanted to volunteer for experience and met the qualifications needed to write the report, we would consider it.

Chair Plaag explained that in his view, when any of the HPC members, in their volunteer capacity, took on sole responsibility for drafting a report, it was fair game for them to list themselves on their resume as the author of, for instance, the Jones House local landmark designation report, if they are doing the bulk of the work. He said the other HPC members would provide feedback and suggestions for revisions. Ms. Shook noted in the Planning and Inspections Department that we always credit everybody who works on a report.

Chair Plaag told Student Member Ziegler that he was not volunteering her, but she had stated that she had never done a local landmark designation report. Chair Plaag said it would be great to add to her resume that she had completed a local landmark designation report. Student Member Ziegler stated that she would be interested in writing the report. However, she was preparing to write her senior thesis this upcoming semester, and it seemed like a lot of work to be done simultaneously.

R.L. CLAY (RIVERS) HOUSE LOCAL LANDMARK DESIGNATION DRAFT DESIGN STANDARDS

Chair Plaag referred to packet page 54 and asked Student Member Ziegler what strategy she used and how she began to work on writing the standards for the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House Local Landmark Designation draft design standards. Student Member Ziegler explained that she pulled her information from Appendix D, and she put a lot of emphasis on windows, doors, awnings, and masonry because these things seemed to be going on at this time. She was open to feedback on any changes that needed to be made. She noted that there were some sections she crossed out because she thought there were only some things to be included.

Chair Plaag pointed out that one of the most challenging things about this kind of work was moving from the historian to the bureaucrat mode. He said the Planning Staff works differently than historians in terms of what they talk about and how they present it. He added that when you are creating standards like this, you are writing legal code.

Ms. Shook suggested that Staff work with Student Member Ziegler by providing her with a template for writing the standards. Chair Plaag asked Ms. Shook if she wanted to review the template information in this meeting. Discussion ensued on how standards would be formatted in context of Appendix D. Chair

Plaag and Ms. Shook spoke of having landmark property standards included within Appendix D as separate sections to maintain it as part of the UDO. Ms. Shook asked the HPC if Staff worked directly with Student Member Ziegler on this topic after July 1, 2023. Chair Plaag agreed with Ms. Shook's suggestion to help Student Member Ziegler when the staff could schedule a time.

Ms. Shook added to the conversation regarding a soft approach conversation with Council regarding the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House and bringing this report to them, as the current Council was not the Council that authorized the HPC to work on the report. Chair Plaag added that the conversation has been started previously, but the biggest concern would be what the Town could do, as the property owner, within the historic district and as a landmark property.

Student Member Ziegler thought it would be helpful to see a basic layout and have direction. She said the feedback she had received from the HPC would be a good place for her to start working on. Chair Plaag expressed his gratitude for Student Member Ziegler volunteering and taking on this responsibility, particularly since she had never done it before. Ms. Shook thanked Student Member Ziegler on behalf of the Town for taking on this responsibility.

STAFF UPDATES

Ms. Mitchell began by thanking everyone for their involvement with the Hayes-Bryan-Greene Cemetery Marker Unveiling Ceremony that occurred on June 2, 2023. Chair Plaag expressed his thanks for Vice-Chair Bond speaking at the event, and Vice-Chair Bond was appreciative of seeing family members present at the event. Ms. Shook added appreciation for the Public Works Department, including their installation of the new sidewalk.

Chair Plaag asked Staff to give the monthly "Statement of Conformity" Report. Ms. Turner stated one was for the Ben and Jerry's building at 671 W. King Street. She said some brick and mortar was coming out from the brick in the alleyway and not on the primary façade. She said to repair it, they had to take the brick out, re-mortar the brick, and put it back. She said the repair had been completed, the final inspection had been called in, and Staff would inspect it.

Chair Plaag mentioned an email he sent last month regarding the foam seeping out from around the windows on the Qualls Block. Ms. Shook introduced Mr. Darrell Pulliam, Town of Boone Building Inspector. She said he was Ms. Turner's team member and project manager liaison for building permits in the Downtown Boone area. She thought it would benefit Mr. Pulliam to hear the discussions to understand when things are brought to him and how he might react or direct them to the appropriate resources. Mr. Pulliam explained that he had spoken to Mr. Greg Lamb, the owner of the Qualls Block building, and Mr. Lamb re-foamed the windows where the foam had seeped out. He said Mr. Lamb would work on cleaning up the foam on the windows. He said that when he spoke with Mr. Lamb, he was unaware that the foam had seeped out, and that he would follow up on this issue. Chair Plaag asked if the replacement of those windows was permitted before the adoption of the Historic District. Ms. Turner said the replacement of the windows occurred in 2019, before the adoption of the Historic District.

HPC MEMBER UPDATES

Chair Plaag showed photos of signs within National Register Historic Districts that he visited on his recent trip to Missoula, Bozeman, Livingston, Butte, and Kalispell, Montana. He said their buildings are contributing resources to the district, and also for some that are special buildings to the district. He said they put together a panel attached to the building that gives a history of the building and its significance, including its tenants and architecture. He added that seeing people stopping to read these signs was great. He felt they had done a good job interpreting the buildings in their historic districts.

He suggested that the HPC do something similar to what the cities in Montana had done by working with the Downtown Boone Development Association (DBDA) on funding the signs for the Boone Downtown Historic District. He said these signs would be mounted on the particularly significant buildings in the Town's local historic district.

Chair Plaag said this was not a topic for the HPC to vote on in this meeting. He showed these to the HPC as to what these signs could look like in the Downtown Historic District.

Ms. Shook pointed out that there had been many internal discussions on ways to incentivize or promote the Historic District. She said that Ms. Mitchell had discussed with Ms. Paige Henderson, the former Downtown Boone Development Coordinator, about ways to incentivize. She thought the signs were a great idea to promote the Historic District and would create a talking point among the property owners. She said she would like to investigate the cost of the signs for the Historic District. Vice-Chair Bond said working with the DBDA, using the story map, combining the Downtown Boone Walking Tour, and identifying the significant key buildings would mean a lot to the Downtown area. Ms. Shook added that this would be a good opportunity to collaborate with the DBDA on the proposed sign project.

Chair Plaag asked Council Liaison Roseman to ask Council for some direction on what the Council might need from the HPC to start a proposed sign project. Council Liaison Roseman agreed that the proposed sign project was a great idea but would need funding. She thought one location for this type of sign was on the brick wall in front of the Daniel Boone Condos on King Street. She would consider it because she loved history and paying homage to historical places. She also thought if the cost were right, the other Council members would consider it in certain areas. She thought of another place of significance for a sign would be the old underground barber shop on King Street.

Ms. Shook said when the planning for the district was occurring, they did not plan how they would promote and support the district. She said she would like to advocate for promoting and supporting it now to help create a sense of place and try to get buy-in and figure out how to market it. She also thought determining the benefits of promoting the district would be helpful. She thought there might be funding for historical-type things like flags with a logo that has been discussed to help the district succeed in the long run.

Chair Plaag said the HPC could discuss something similar to the National Register Historic District signs at a future date.

SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL IN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT/APPENDIX D DISCUSSION

Ms. Shook began discussing some of the lessons learned from past quasi-judicial meetings. She explained that Staff meets with the applicant to identify what they need to review that applies to a project and which of the three elevations (primary, secondary, or tertiary) or façade they propose to work on. She said that based on the current definition in Appendix D, when the staff reviewed the Southend Brewing Company COA application, they decided the proposed work was on the secondary façade. She said in Staff's second review of the application and based on more information from the applicant, Staff realized that the proposed work was on the tertiary, or the rear, elevation of the building. She added that Staff tried to explain in the Staff Report why they made the first decision and changed their decision regarding the elevation of the building between the first and second HPC meetings.

Ms. Shook explained in the second part of the review of this application, Staff would decide which standards would apply to the proposed work. She said Staff looks at all new additions as new construction. She said that Article 14 contains the appearance standards for additions and new construction for the Downtown Core.

Ms. Shook said in Section 13 of Appendix D, the standards talked about new construction related to the building already on the lot. She said there is no language in this section of the standards that says the addition has to be attached, which means there can be an addition to the property. She said there was language for new construction concerning the district or adjoining properties. She said Staff decided it was an addition to the property because the new and existing buildings were separate, and Staff thought it was important to focus on the relationship of the new building with the existing building. She said during the meeting Ms. Meade had suggested that applying Sections 13 and 14 would work the best in applying the standards to this case. Ms. Shook added that the proposed shipping container building did not cleanly fall into category of additions or new construction standards. She said Staff told the applicant that they were applying both standards to their proposal, and the applicant based their presentation upon this guidance from Staff. She added that the decision to apply both standards needed to be clearly stated in the Revised Staff Report, and it needed to be clearly explained in the meeting.

Ms. Shook suggested making the language in Appendix D more explicit regarding the definition of adjacent public streets; Chair Plaag agreed with Ms. Shook regarding the rewrite for clarity. He also mentioned to Ms. Shook that when he drafted the text for additions, he was thinking in terms of things that are connected to existing buildings, as opposed to some new construction of an outbuilding or a new building on a lot that is separate from an existing historic building. He said the term "additions" was meant for someone who wanted to add a wing or build another story on top of a building.

Ms. Shook talked about combining Sections 13 and 14 and explained the difference between additions attached to a structure and additions built on a lot.

Ms. Shook talked about a temporary or permanent structure and why the term "temporary" was so important to the Southend Brewing Company applicant. She thought the HPC and Staff should discuss the temporary or permanent use of a structure and if it made a difference in the standards. She said that

calling it a temporary structure seemed false because it was a building, whether it was a shipping container attached to plumbing and electrical, and that in this case it was misleading to call it a temporary structure.

Ms. Shook talked about accessory structure. She said that the accessory structure standard in Appendix D applied to the Southend Brewing Company case; however, she explained that accessory use standards in the rest of the UDO did not apply to it. She explained that it was not a shed or carport, and the activity in this building is the same as in a small principal building. She said that the UDO treats accessory structures differently than a principal structure, they get a reduced setback, and different things are allowed in accessory structures. She said in any other zoning district, she would not call that type of structure accessory because it would not be wanted seven feet from the property line. She said from an appearance standpoint, she could see why someone would consider it an accessory structure, but for every other standard, it would not be considered an accessory structure.

JULY ADVISORY SESSION MATERIAL

Chair Plaag suggested that the following items be placed on the next advisory meeting agenda: Boone Cemetery Interpretative Panel Draft Panel Text and Design, Stoneman's Raid Interpretive Panel Draft Panel Text and Design, R.L. Clay (Rivers) House Local Landmark Designation Report status.

Chair Plaag asked Student Member Ziegler to update the HPC at the August 2023 meeting on the material that Staff would cover with her regarding drafting the R.L. Clay (Rivers) House Local Landmark Designation Draft Design Standards.

Chair Plaag asked the HPC if they knew someone interested in possibly working on the Jones House Designation Report. He said to let Ms. Shook or Ms. Mitchell know who it is or be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Shook when she wanted to address the items from the Appendix D discussion. Ms. Shook said she would like to make recommendations for the proposed definition changes that Staff could prepare rather quickly. She added that for the other topics discussed, she would like to have more in-depth conversations with HPC and her comments are her recommendations for the HPC on the solution to the new construction and additional sections of the standards.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Council Liaison Roseman pointed out that the July 2023 HPC Advisory meeting fell on the Fourth of July holiday. Discussion ensued on another date and time to reschedule the next advisory meeting. The HPC, Council Liaison Roseman, and Staff decided on Monday, July 10, 2023, at 4 p.m. for the next HPC Advisory meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Bond made a motion, seconded by Member Sharp, to adjourn the meeting at 5:33 p.m.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None
The motion passed.

Eric Plaag -Chair

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary