

**TOWN OF BOONE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 17, 2023 3:00 p.m.
WebEx Video Conferencing**

Historic Preservation Commission Members in Attendance:

Chair Eric Plaag, Vice-Chair Bettie Bond, and James Sharp

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: Allison Meade-Town Attorney, Bill Dixon-Appalachian Architecture, Terry Moore-Facilities Manager-Mast General Store, Jodi Feimster

Call to Order

Chair Eric Plaag called the HPC Quasi-Judicial meeting, held via WebEx, on January 17, 2023, to order at 3:03 p.m.

Adoption of Agenda

Chair Plaag said he would like to add a non-quasi-judicial item to the agenda after the cases; the topic he would like to add is regarding scheduling an HPC-related event coming up next week.

Vice-Chair Bond made a motion, seconded by Member Sharp, to adopt the agenda as amended.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Chair Eric Plaag stated his full name and asked other HPC members, Vice-Chair Bettie Bond, and Member James Sharp, to state their names. He pointed out that Member Chuck Watkins could not attend this meeting. He also pointed out the Planning and Inspections staff members who support the HPC: Ms. Jessica Mitchell, Long-Range/Special Projects Planner, Ms. Christy Turner, Senior Planner, Ms. Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary, and Ms. Allison Meade, Town Attorney.

Chair Plaag swore in Ms. Christy Turner and Ms. Jessica Mitchell.

CASE Z05737-052522 – Wilcox Warehouse - COA – Modification of Previous COA

Ms. Jessica Mitchell, Long-Range/Special Projects Planner, explained that the applicant's legal representative contacted Staff, who requested that this case be tabled until the February 14, 2023, Quasi-Judicial meeting. Chair Plaag asked the HPC members if they objected to the applicant's request to table this case until February 14, 2023, or any such later date as may be necessary. Chair Plaag said hearing no objection, he would table this case until February 14, 2023, at 3 p.m. via WebEx or any such later date as may be necessary for the event that the February 14, 2023 meeting does not occur.

Case Z06278-112122 – Mast Store - COA

John Cooper, on behalf of Mast General Store, Inc., has filed an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to repair the wall on the western façade, which was taken down earlier this summer due to public safety reasons, with a hard coat stucco finish.

Chair Plaag asked the Historic Preservation Commission members three questions. Did any commissioner have a fixed opinion about the case that is not susceptible to change; does any commissioner have a conflict of interest regarding this case, including any financial interest in the outcome of the case or a close familial relationship with any person affected by the outcome of the case; and third, has any commissioner engaged in any undisclosed ex parte communication regarding this most recent application? There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag pointed out that his wife, Ms. Teresa Plaag, is an employee of Mast General Store, the applicant of this case, and Ms. Plaag is also an employee stockholder in the company. He asked if there were any objections from any of the HPC Members or any of the participants to him continuing in this case. Ms. Meade asked Chair Plaag if he felt he could render a decision in either direction on this case; he stated that he could do so. There were no objections to Chair Plaag continuing in this case.

Chair Plaag noted that he is a member of Digital Watauga. He said he and others at Digital Watauga were bombarded with requests from the community asking what is the ghost ad on the wall. He said he worked with others at Digital Watauga to research the history of that ghost ad. He said they pulled images and looked for the actual text, hunting in various places to develop a brief blog entry that they wrote on what they perceived to be the history of that ghost ad. He said that he did not directly communicate with the applicant as part of that research. He said that on several occasions over the last six months, various members of the Mast General Store in social settings had asked him what was happening with the wall. He responded that he could not talk about the wall because it would likely be before the HPC at some point. He noted that his brother had asked him about the wall, and he told his brother that he could not talk about it. He said he did not think these questions constituted a conflict. He asked if there were any objections from the applicant or the HPC members. There were no objections.

Chair Plaag confirmed that Mr. Bill Dixon from Appalachian Architecture and Mr. Terry Moore, the Facilities Manager from Mast Store, represented the applicant in this case. Chair Plaag swore in Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he intended to give an opening statement. Mr. Dixon said yes, he had intended to provide an opening statement for this case. Mr. Dixon asked, given that only three HPC members were present, he wondered if all three HPC members would have to vote to approve the COA case. Ms. Meade responded and said it would only require two HPC members with a quorum of three present, which would be a majority vote. Chair Plaag stated that this was his understanding of the HPC's role.

Mr. Dixon began his presentation of the case. He said that the applicant is proposing to repair the exposed brick wall on the western façade of the Mast Store with a hard coat, cement stucco finish. He said that at a later date, the applicant would like to apply for a "Certificate of Appropriateness" to have a mural painted on that wall. He said the meeting packet included the design standards to support the applicant's proposal.

Chair Plaag explained that there was generally an agreement based on the discussion that occurred in a prior case involving the building next door that the present ghost ad and the stucco that it is on is probably a very early stucco application that probably dates to the interior of the old Hodges Tire Building. Further, he stated it is at the least some subsequent application that occurred after Hodges trimmed their building back away from the sidewalk, maybe in the early 1940s. He asked Mr. Dixon if he agreed with this time period. Mr. Dixon responded that generally speaking, that is an accurate time period. Mr. Dixon thought

the existing stucco on the building probably represented the repairs that were done in the 1940s. Chair Plaag referred to the photo shown on packet page nine. He said if you compare this photo to some of the historical images from one image, possibly 1963, that shows the letters “shell” written out at the top of the wall. He said part of a “L” is visible at the very end of the south end or the right end as you are looking at the wall. He said most of this has been replaced with a newer concrete block that has obliterated the word “shell” portion of whatever was on the wall. He asked Mr. Dixon if this was a fair description of what was in the photograph. Mr. Dixon said it was a fair description, but he could not see the “shell” in his photograph. Mr. Dixon added that at some point, the concrete block was probably added to extend the height of the roof at a later date.

Chair Plaag added that the rest of the ghost ad is below the base of that newer concrete block that they applied a stucco finish to, that was used over what was the western wall of, what is historically known as the Jones block building, but is now known as the western wall of the Mast General Store building. He said what remains, generally speaking would be 15 percent to 20 percent of the stucco finish that was there on that western wall at one time. He asked Mr. Dixon if that was a fair assessment of the wall; Mr. Dixon said yes.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if it was his understanding that while the Digital Watauga team appeared to have identified what this ghost ad advertised, they have not been able to find an example of what the entirety of this ad would have looked like either through historical photographs or through other examples of this advertisement in print. Mr. Dixon said this is his understanding of what the Digital Watauga team has found in their research, and noted that he was not sure of the relevance of this research to this case.

Chair Plaag referred to packet page 50 and Design Standard 11.3:

- Installation of artwork that includes additional features such as signage, mountain hardware or lighting should be of compatible materials and should, as appropriate, be installed to be unobtrusive and screened from view as much as possible.
 - Historic signs, such as ghost ads or those painted on side walls, should be preserved in the historic district.

Chair Plaag said this raises an interesting problem for the HPC because this standard appears to direct the HPC to preserve something that cannot easily be preserved in its current state. He noted that the HPC does not know what it looked like, and probably 80 percent of its material is not existing. He said there is no original material to work with and what remains is in very poor condition.

Chair Plaag talked about what property owners in the City of Roanoke have done with murals. He said the city worked with the property owners to recreate a historic advertisement by repainting over what was still on the brick of their ghost ad. He said they found a way to bring it back to its full glory. He explained they were working with something that was largely intact.

Chair Plaag said he had seen examples in Columbia, South Carolina, where ghost ads were present but not entirely intact. He said they handled those, particularly on the old Confederate printing plant in Columbia, South Carolina, by working with the property owner to basically not do anything to erode them further, and to not do anything speculative in terms of bringing them back. He added that generally speaking, this was seen as the right way to handle this particular situation in the preservation community.

Chair Plaag requested Mr. Dixon, an architect, to speak to the integrity of the remaining stucco with the ghost ad pieces on it and the condition of the brick under it. Mr. Dixon responded that without getting on

a ladder and using a hammer and screwdriver to check the stucco, he could not say for sure. However, he explained from the photograph, it appears what is left of that stucco is falling or flaking off, subject to weather conditions, after most of the brick face was removed. Mr. Dixon said he guessed he could pull most of the recent brick façade off by himself with a hammer. He felt he could not trust the substrate to go back on and put new stucco on top of it. He said he felt the stucco and the brick were in horrible shape, as evidenced by the photograph. He said he thought all of that old material should be removed and a new substrate applied to attach the new hard coat cement stucco finish.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Moore to explain what the Mast General Store has done in evaluating the ghost ad wall. Mr. Moore said he had worked with the Town of Boone over the years, as witnessed by Ms. Turner, to monitor the deterioration of the wall. He said the transition of the ownership of the lawyers eventually led to the stucco being removed. He said he was surprised about the timing of the removal of the wall. He said that he gathered his information to get a plan together with Mr. Dixon and his team to help negotiate what needed to be done to address the concern about the condition of the wall, which included potential water intrusion into the building. He said the wall was put up in the beginning because of the deterioration of the wall and the stucco finish to cover up the wall. He added that with his history with Mast Store, something is usually not covered up because it is in good condition. He felt the wall had a double reason for being there. One reason is cosmetics for the law office building and structurally protecting that side wall to stop water intrusion.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Moore to explain the current condition of the approximate 20 percent or so of stucco remaining on that wall. Mr. Moore agreed with Mr. Dixon's assessment of the remaining stucco on that wall. Chair Plaag confirmed with Mr. Moore that the stucco would have been applied directly to the brick without a lathe or anything like that underneath it. Mr. Moore agreed with Chair Plaag and pointed out that was the typical installation when the building was built.

Chair Plaag opened the floor for the HPC to ask questions of Mr. Dixon or Mr. Moore. Vice-Chair Bond referred to the meeting packet on page 17 and stated that the photograph on this page showed an even clearer wall condition. She thought it was amazing that this photograph showed any of the original letterings. Member Sharp had no questions at this time on this case.

Chair Plaag talked about some design standards that discourage stucco application unless there is a historical precedent. He said there is a historical precedent in this situation. He said that back in the day, when stucco was applied directly on the brick without a lathe, it often trapped moisture and degraded the brick. He said it sounded like a balancing act of priorities was going on to apply the hard coat cement stock finish directly to the brick. He asked Mr. Dixon if this was correct. Mr. Dixon said it was not correct. Mr. Dixon explained that he had contacted a company in Charlotte, North Carolina, that dealt with stone restoration and Greene Construction, a local general contractor. He said both companies felt that scaffolding should be used to pull off any loose materials, which may include much of that cement block on the upper portion, and then infill the sunken areas in the upper right corner with another type of masonry. He said a lathe would be used to apply the stucco hard coat finish after installing the liquid waterproofing. He added that the wall would have to be evaluated to see if it might need to be furred out to get an even finish.

Chair Plaag pointed out that one of the reasons the wall was collapsing was because of the activity of the subsequent owners of the Hodges Tire and the way that the deeds read in terms of where the property line is. He explained that the veneer wall was put against the Mast Store, or the old Walter Jones Building western wall, to facilitate activities in the Hodges Tire building. He said the property line sat between the

veneer wall and the west wall of the Mast Store building. He asked Mr. Dixon if he had any conversations with the building owners to the west whether furring out would create an intrusion on their property or if they anticipate it being an issue. He also asked if this was something that would be worked out cooperatively. Mr. Dixon said this topic had not been discussed with the building owners to the west. Mr. Dixon said that he did not know if the property line was on the face of the brick or out an inch or two from the face. He said he felt like the attorneys and Mast Store have worked together for decades at that location. He said part of the Mast Store wall is behind the attorney's cement block wall and that that wall will be removed during the next few months. He said there would be communication and coordination with Mr. Moore and whoever works on the attorney's façade.

Chair Plaag explained that he did not want the HPC to approve a course of action and find out that the result of the HPC's decision, for the repair proposed, was going to overlap with the adjoining neighbor's property. Further, he expressed concerns that then the adjoining property owner disagrees with the repair, and the case has to go back before the HPC to figure out an alternative solution. He understood it was not the HPC's concern and that it was the applicant's problem because they knew whether what they had proposed as a solution was viable. He asked Ms. Meade her thoughts on this topic. Ms. Meade stated that the HPC should not be concerned with this topic. She said to some degree, it is not even a concern for the Town.

Council Liaison Roseman joined the meeting at approximately 3:43 p.m.

Chair Plaag confirmed with Mr. Dixon that the applicant does not intend to do anything with the stucco other than simply paint it a solid color. Mr. Dixon said that is correct, and they only plan to paint the stucco a solid color for now. Chair Plaag also confirmed with Mr. Dixon that at a later date, he anticipates that the applicant might make a subsequent COA request for some mural on that newly completed stucco finish. Mr. Dixon said he expects the applicant to apply for a COA for some type of mural.

Mr. Dixon said during this meeting that he had just received a text message from Ms. Chelsea Garrett, one of the adjoining property owners of the diSanti, Capua, and Garrett Law Firm. Ms. Garrett told Mr. Dixon that the law firm would have no problem working with Mast Store and working out a property line issue if there ever was an issue.

Chair Plaag referred to packet page ten and reviewed the drawing submitted by Mr. Dixon. He pointed out that there is an abbreviation of CMU at the top of the drawing, where the concrete block is present. He asked Mr. Dixon to explain what those letters meant. Mr. Dixon said they meant Concrete Masonry Unit. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if the letters CMU referred to what is presently there; Mr. Dixon replied yes, he was referring to what is presently there.

Ms. Meade referred to the design standard that Chair Plaag referred to regarding artwork. She said that from her perspective, she does not see this language suggesting that historic artwork or pieces of historical artwork (which are not articulated) are to be preserved under all circumstances. She thought that sentence envisioned that it still holds historic artwork and that you cannot tear down a façade or make a change without preserving it if that's reasonable. She said that sentence might be more of an issue if this whole mural was still in good shape and maybe part of the rest of the wall could be preserved, while preserving the mural may be an issue. In conclusion, she felt that the circumstances, as Chair Plaag had stated, showed no concern or conflict, but she thought the language was limited. Chair Plaag said it was not in his view that it was an issue. He said he was addressing it because he knew that the HPC was being observed by other people who might read it that way. Chair Plaag explained that the term "preservation"

is used in the preservation world and means many different things. He gave an example that there is a process where if there is a designated historic property that's been acknowledged by the National Park Service, either through the National Register or as a property being eligible for the National Register. He explained federal money is spent on a project that could have what is termed an adverse impact or an adverse effect on that historic property. He said there is a requirement for a Section 106 report to analyze the adverse impact. He said the adverse impact is evaluated, and suggestions are made on how to alter the project or property, if necessary, in order to mitigate the impact. He said that he had seen mitigation measures for things deemed not salvageable because of the circumstances over the project or the existing circumstances of the historic property. He said that sometimes mitigation means we can't save it but document it. He noted that the Historic American Building survey process is a mitigation measure used in Section 106 situations. He said that detailed measured drawings are made of the interior and exterior, and a consultant writes a historic resources survey of the property.

Chair Plaag stated that Digital Watauga has already documented the known history and made photographs. He felt that asking the applicant to go out and expend resources to repeat that process is not a good use of time or money because that documentation exists. He felt it would be nice for the Mast Store to think about having a little wall space that says there used to be a ghost ad on this side of the building, but he felt this was not something the HPC could require of the applicant. He said the applicant could do things to inform about what used to be there. He said it is his opinion that he did not think it would be appropriate for the HPC to require much more of the applicant in terms of what survives on that wall.

Chair Plaag noted that he agreed with Ms. Meade on the language in the design standards for artwork. He thought there was a very literal way of reading that standard that is not what is intended for the applicant. It would be unreasonable to expect that way from this particular applicant.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore if they had more information to add to their testimonies. Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore did not have more information to add to their testimonies.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he had any objections to the materials in the meeting packet. Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore said they had no objections to the materials in the meeting packet.

Chair Plaag asked the Staff if they had more information to present for this case. Ms. Turner said the Staff had no evidence to present at this time.

Chair Plaag asked the HPC if they had questions regarding this application for the applicant or Town staff.

Ms. Meade asked about the proposed future mural and had Staff discuss its potential possibilities with the applicant. Ms. Turner said the Staff briefly discussed the mural possibilities with the applicant. Ms. Turner referred to UDO 26.07 Signs Permitted in the B-1 Zoning District and read UDO subsection 26.07.02, which says a previously initially approved public art would require a Statement of Conformity process.

26.07.02 Each business is permitted two (2) signs chosen from the following categories: attached, canopy, or projecting. In no case may both signs be in the same category. Painted wall signs are prohibited in the B1 zone. Signs may be illuminated. Businesses are also allowed one sign from the following: Town of Boone Unified Development Ordinance Article 26 Signs 26-7 A. A projecting sign which may contain the name of the business and any logo which the business chooses to adopt. The sign may not exceed four square feet (4 ft2) in size. It shall display only the

name of the business and/or buildings which it is attached to and the building and/or business logo or logos and no more than one (1) per building. B. A freestanding sign which may be a maximum size of two feet (2') by two feet (2'), and the bottom of said sign shall display only the name of the business and/or building which it is located in front of, and the building and/or business logo or logos and no more than one (1) sign per building.

Ms. Turner said this mural was not previously approved, so it would require a COA process, and Mast Store has been told about the COA process. Ms. Meade stated that it would require a COA process whether it was technically a sign or not a sign. She said that murals are distinguished from art and not subject to regulation like signs unless they have a certain percentage of commercial square footage. She said there is some small allowance for the potential commercial message. She said either way, it would come to the HPC because of the impact on the streetscape.

Mr. Dixon talked about a private advertisement on private property. He asked when does an advertisement become artwork. Ms. Meade believed that the language gives murals a safe harbor as artwork. She said Town-wide murals are given the flexibility for private expression, but to a limit of a certain percentage that has a commercial message. She said if it is above that certain percentage, it is treated as a sign and would be regulated in the town.

Ms. Meade said that in the historic district, because of the impact of this on the streetscape, she thought whether it was called a sign, and is regulated as a sign, or artwork is probably not important, and it would still be subject to the COA process. She explained it would be subject to a COA because of the public streetscape effect, and the potential effect on the wall, and in many other cases, on potential architectural elements of a building. She thought that a proposal to paint the whole side of the building might be viewed differently than a proposal to paint a third of that building.

Ms. Turner pointed out that painted wall signs are only allowed in the B-2 and B-3 zoning districts. She said artwork is allowed in the Downtown area as long as it does not advertise the business on which it is being painted. She noted that proposed changes for the sign ordinance might affect what was stated for the painted wall signs. Ms. Meade agreed that the proposed changes to the sign ordinance might affect the language for the painted wall signs.

Chair Plaag pointed out to Mr. Dixon that on his drawing, there does not currently appear to be any functional coping on the wall. He asked Mr. Dixon what type of coping was proposed to cap the wall as part of this work. Mr. Dixon said that in the photograph he submitted, there is a white line indicating either a metal coping or the white rubber membrane roof extending over. Mr. Dixon explained that it protrudes out from the existing masonry. He believed that was the coping before the brick was removed. He said that once the stucco was applied, they would add a similar type of coping.

Chair Plaag said he did not think the membrane roof itself was an approved coping material. Mr. Dixon stated that using a metal coping is probably the better low-maintenance and long-term material for the top of a parapet wall. He added that at the HPC's request, they could use a terracotta type of parapet cap for the wall, keeping with the history of the building. He said there would probably be a rubber membrane and metal coping under the cap. He said the terracotta coping would be visible, just like on the current law office building. Mr. Moore added that currently on the front parapet wall of the Mast Store and around the corner of the wall is metal coping. He said he would have a roofer make the coping match on the front part of the building match any proposed changes to the coping. He said he would not recommend tiles be placed on the side of the building because they would not match any other surface

material there. Ms. Turner noted that in UDO Appendix D, Section 7.2, the coping should be replaced with like coping that was there before.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Moore what color the metal coping was on the front of the building. Mr. Moore responded that it is a galvanized metal of the same color that is on the Lost Province building. He said it would not be in contrast to the stucco finish. Chair Plaag confirmed that the coping on the Lost Province building has a metallic type finish-galvanized metal, and it has not been painted an odd color. He also confirmed with Mr. Moore that the coping that is currently on the building and what they are proposing to replace it with is in-kind. Mr. Moore stated that was correct, and they are proposing to replace the coping with in-kind materials.

Chair Plaag referred to UDO Appendix D, Downtown Boone Design Guidelines and Handbook, Section 7.2, and asked Ms. Mitchell to show this standard on the screen.

7.2 Whenever possible, deteriorated soffits, fascia, moldings, brackets, eaves, rafter tails, cornices, coping, and other important roof components should be repaired. If replacement is necessary, it should be completed using historic materials if possible, and at minimum with equivalent materials that replicate the appearance, configuration, size, scale, and composition of the original historic materials. Underlying roofing components are just as important. For example, tongue-and-groove soffit lumber should never be replaced with plywood, and whenever possible, damaged or deteriorated roof decking should be replaced with similar materials rather than modern materials that are not historically appropriate to the building.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Meade and the other HPC members if they had other questions or concerns regarding this case. There were no further questions from Ms. Meade or the HPC members.

Chair Plaag asked the following questions: is there any other interested party here to speak or present evidence in support of the application; is there any other non-party witness here to speak or present evidence in support of the application; is there any interested party here to speak or present evidence in opposition to the application; is there any other non-party witness here to speak or present evidence in opposition to this application. There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore if they would like to rebut any evidence or other material presented by the Town Staff or as part of the discussion by the HPC. Mr. Dixon said he did not want to rebut any evidence.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore if they wanted to give a closing summary or argument. Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore did not have a closing summary or argument for this application.

Chair Plaag asked the Planning Staff if they had a closing statement. Mr. Turner said they did not have a closing statement.

Chair Plaag opened the floor for the HPC to discuss the evidence at hand. He reminded the HPC that they would limit their discussion to the proposal and its relationship to the standards applicable to the case. He added that the HPC members are obligated to consider only competent material and substantial evidence when making findings of fact if any evidence that falls into the category of hunches, rumors, speculation, and irrelevancies will be rejected by the Commission and noted in the record as such.

Vice-Chair Bond stated that she thought the issues and concerns had been discussed for this case. She complimented Digital Watauga for their work on this case. She said Mr. Phil McGuire, a friend of hers, had shown some interest in this case. She asked if she could give him her meeting packet. Chair Plaag said that the meeting packet was a public record. She confirmed that she could send Mr. McGuire the meeting packet.

Member Sharp stated that he had no concerns to discuss for this case.

Chair Plaag noted that he had already asked his questions regarding his concerns for this case.

In summary, Chair Plaag said he does not see any practical, responsible and appropriate way to save the original material without further endangering the integrity of the building, particularly the brick wall on that side of the Mast Store building. He said there is no good way to recreate the ghost ad because we don't know what was contained in that ad beyond the speculation from Digital Watauga and the limited amount of information from what survives on that side of the Mast Store building. He said it comes down to a balancing of priorities. He said the applicant has proposed to stabilize the surviving brick wall, apply a hard coat stucco using a metal lathe, waterproof the building, and stabilize the brick wall for a more extended period than what might otherwise be available. He said he was in support of the proposal with no objection.

Chair Plaag referred to the meeting packet on page 55, and he read the three conditions that automatically apply for the approval of a COA. He asked Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore if they had any objection to accepting those conditions pro forma. Mr. Dixon and Mr. Moore said they had no objections to those three conditions. Chair Plaag asked the HPC members if they wanted to add any conditions to this case. No HPC members added any conditions to this case.

Motion and Vote:

Member Sharp made a motion, seconded by Member Bond, to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Mast Store, including the following conditions:

These conditions are automatically included and a part of any approval.

- Where there is a conflict between the application information (November 21, 2022), the plans control. Insignificant deviations may be permitted to comply with the requirements of the UDO.
- Any commitments and representations concerning the proposed exterior modification made by the applicant or its (his or her) representatives at the public hearing shall also become a condition of the permit, and a basis for a stop work order and/or permit revocation if violated.
- The applicant shall submit the necessary applications, plans, details and specifications which meet the requirements of the Town Code, UDO, Building Code and any other applicable codes for review and approval necessary to issue Zoning and Building Permits.

There were no other conditions placed on this application.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion was unanimous.

Chair Plaag closed the public hearing on this case at approximately 4:18 p.m.

Other Discussion by Board Members or Staff

Ms. Mitchell explained that the Planning Staff wanted to discuss with the HPC about the Council's Store Historical Marker unveiling event scheduled for Monday, January 23, 2023, at 1 p.m. She let the HPC members know that Member Chuck Watkins had been ill and was still recovering, which is why he did not attend today's meeting. She said the Planning Staff would contact Member Watkins at the end of this week to see if he feels he might be able to attend the Tuesday, January 24, 2023, at 3 p.m. Advisory meeting. She noted that Vice-Chair Bond had a possible conflict regarding attending this advisory meeting. She said the Planning Staff wanted to find out if a quorum would be present for this advisory meeting.

Vice-Chair Bond let the HPC know she cannot attend the January 24th advisory meeting due to a conflict with another meeting. She suggested moving the January 24 meeting topics to the February 7 Advisory meeting date.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Mitchell if there were Advisory agenda topics that required immediate attention or can those topics wait for two weeks. She said that the Planning Staff wanted the HPC to review the work plan document before the Planning Retreat occurred to make sure they felt comfortable with how the information was stated because it is the information that will be presented at the Planning Retreat.

Chair Plaag stated that he thought the HPC discussed all the work plan material. Ms. Mitchell said the input from the HPC was included in the work plan. She said there was a section near the end of the work plan that Planning Staff had discussed as lower priority tasks, such as future historic districts and architectural surveys. She said there are concerns about the workload that those kind of projects would particularly put on the Planning Staff. She thought topics like these could be put on a priority list, not necessarily to be completed for this upcoming fiscal year, depending on how many work plan tasks could be completed.

Chair Plaag asked the HPC if they had any objections to him working directly with the Planning Staff to resolve any questions about what will be presented in the document at the Planning Retreat. Vice-Chair Bond and Member Sharp had no objections to Chair Plaag working directly with the Planning Staff on said document. Chair Plaag added that if he is asked questions that he is not comfortable speaking definitely to, he said that the Planning Staff can indicate in the document that there is still an open question among the HPC about a particular issue. He said this way it enables the Planning Staff to submit what needs to be submitted to Council for the Planning Retreat.

Ms. Mitchell said she had been staying in contact with Ms. Ellie McCorkle, the HPC Intern. Chair Plaag said that Ms. McCorkle had recently sent him a draft report of the Rivers House, but he had not read it. He noted that the Planning Staff could add a discussion of the draft report to the February 7, 2023, Advisory meeting.

Ms. Mitchell pointed out to the HPC that they may have noticed that this month's Advisory meeting packet was separate from the Quasi-Judicial meeting packet. She said the Planning Staff, at this time, has found it was more efficient to make two separate meeting packets.

Ms. Mitchell said that the Planning Staff would like to ask the HPC at the next Advisory meeting about staff expectations and timing for the different processes involved with the HPC.

Chair Plaag said the HPC has the power to amend its agenda, including tabling the January 24, 2023, Advisory meeting to February 7, 2023. He said he did not have an objection to tabling the January 24, 2023 meeting.

Motion and Vote:

Vice-Chair Bond made a motion, seconded by Member Sharp, to table the January 24, 2023, at 3 p.m. Advisory meeting via WebEx to February 7, 2023 Advisory meeting at 3 p.m. via WebEx.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Chair Plaag asked what happened to Member Watkins. Vice-Chair Bond explained that Member Watkins had been hospitalized due to illness and is now improving and recovering at home.

Discussion ensued on the details of the Council's Store Historical Marker unveiling. Chair Plaag asked if the event would still occur on Monday, January 23, 2023, at 1 p.m. He wondered if the lower part of Grand Boulevard was being closed for the event. Ms. Mitchell said the plan is to close the lower part of Grand Boulevard. He said it is his understanding that he is to make some remarks at the event. He asked if the Mayor and other Council Members would be able to attend the event. Ms. Mitchell said she is in the process of contacting the Mayor. She said she had coordinated with the Public Works Department, who will install the marker and cover it for the unveiling. She said that because of the special meeting notice that has to be done, she wanted to know if all of the HPC members could attend the event.

Chair Plaag informed the HPC of the upcoming weather forecast. Ms. Mitchell reminded the HPC that they had recommended a rain date on February 3, 2023, in case of inclement weather.

Member Sharp stated that he might not be able to attend the marker unveiling event on Monday, January 23rd because he has a class at 1 p.m. so it would be difficult for him to attend.

Vice-Chair Bond confirmed that birthday cake would be served at the Jones House for the Town of Boone's 151st birthday celebration on January 23rd.

Council Liaison Roseman explained that she could not attend the marker unveiling event because of her work schedule. She suggested that the said event be moved to February 3rd because Member Watkins may not be well enough and Member Sharp has a possible attendance issue.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Mitchell if any publicity had been done for the event. Ms. Mitchell said that a press release had been posted for the said event. She also noted that it was possible that before the end of the week, she could try to publish an amended press release.

Chair Plaag suggested deciding about holding the event on Friday, January 20th, after checking the updated weather forecast for Monday, January 23rd. He asked Council Liaison Roseman if it was a fair compromise if it looks like there is going to be bad weather on that Monday that we go ahead and make the decision to move the said event to February 3, 2023, at 1 p.m. Chair Plaag noted that he had committed probably five or six months ago to meet a client out of town that day. He said he would contact his client and try to move that appointment.

Ms. Mitchell said that she would follow up on the weather forecast with Mr. Mark Freed, Director of Cultural Resources, hosting the other events on January 23rd, and let the HPC know via email and give the HPC a call on Friday, January 20th, regarding the decision to either have it on Monday, January 23rd or on Friday, February 3rd.

Adjournment

Member Sharp made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Bond, to adjourn the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Eric Plaag, Chair

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary