

**TOWN OF BOONE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

December 12, 2023, 3:00 p.m.

Planning & Inspections Department & WebEx Video Conferencing

Historic Preservation Commission Members in Attendance:

Chair Eric Plaag, Chuck Watkins, Vardell Smyth, and Riley Ziegler

Council Liaison: Virginia Roseman

Town Staff in Attendance: Jane Shook – Director of Planning and Inspections, Jessica Mitchell-Advanced Planning Specialist, Mike James- Commercial Zoning Administrator, and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary, Amy Davis-Town Manager, Todd Moody-Director of Public Works, Justin Stines-Deputy Public Works Director, Lane Moody-Downtown Boone Development Coordinator, George Santucci-Sustainability and Special Projects Manager, Mark Freed-Director of Cultural Resources, and Laney Wise-Administrative Support Specialist/Communications

Others in Attendance: Allison Meade-Town Attorney, and JC Feimster

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Eric Plaag called the HPC Quasi-Judicial meeting, held in person at 680 W. King Street, Suite C and via WebEx, on December 12, 2023, to order at 3:02 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler, to adopt the agenda as amended by moving the Approval of Minutes to the end of the agenda.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Chair Plaag introduced himself as the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission and Commission Members Watkins, Smyth, and Ziegler.

Chair Plaag introduced the Staff members as Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections, Ms. Jessica Mitchell, Advanced Planning Specialist, Ms. Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary, and Ms. Allison Meade, Town Attorney.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No individual took the opportunity to speak during public comment.

CASE A23-0404 – TOWN HALL FAÇADE RENOVATION – COA

The Town of Boone has submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work for 567 W. King Street (Town Hall), located in the Downtown Boone Local Historic District, to modify the

primary façade of Town Hall. The work includes the removal of the existing planter along the brick façade and the addition of two new doors to access two new public restrooms.

Chair Plaag swore in Ms. Jane Shook and Ms. Jessica Mitchell.

Chair Plaag disclosed that on at least four occasions, various Town staff members had started a conversation with him regarding adding public restrooms in Town Hall, and then stated that they probably should refrain from talking to Chair Plaag about the restrooms. He said those conversations were terminated.

He also disclosed another communication over six months ago about the restrooms. He stated to that person that he had a preference, and he explained it to that person. Then, he told that individual that he should not have this conversation. He stated that his opinion has since changed based on his knowledge about that preference. Having disclosed this information, he asked the HPC members if they thought he could not be objective about this case; he stated that he could be completely objective about this case.

Chair Plaag asked the Historic Preservation Commission members if any commissioner had a fixed opinion about the case that is not susceptible to change; if any commissioner had 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. There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag stated that he would soon be employed by the Town of Boone, but today, he does not have that conflict.

Chair Plaag asked if any commissioner had engaged in any undisclosed ex-parte communication regarding the application. Commission Member Smyth disclosed that he had walked by the Town Hall building, but did not speak with anyone there. There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag asked for a motion and vote regarding if the HPC thought he should be recused from this case.

Motion and Vote:

Commissioner Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler, that Chair Plaag should not be recused from this case because he was impartial.

Vote: Aye – (Smyth, Watkins, Ziegler)

Nay – None

Abstain – (Plaag)

The motion passed.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Meade if she was presenting this case on behalf of the Town of Boone. Ms. Meade clarified that her role in this meeting was to provide counsel for the HPC if needed. She stated that the Staff was presenting this case. Chair Plaag asked Ms. Meade if she had advised on preparing the materials for this case or in preparing the meeting packet, and she replied no.

Chair Plaag asked the Staff to clarify who was presenting this case. Ms. Shook stated that she had prepared the staff report and could present the request, but Mr. Bill Dixon from Appalachian Architecture was available to present this case. Chair Plaag stated that he would ask Mr. Dixon to present this case because the procedure states to proceed with the applicant's representatives.

Chair Plaag affirmed Mr. Bill Dixon. Chair Plaag confirmed with Mr. Dixon that he was representing on behalf of the applicant on this case and not otherwise represented by counsel. Mr. Dixon responded that was his understanding. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he had any objections to the material in the meeting packet, and Mr. Dixon responded no.

Mr. Dixon gave a brief opening statement. He said that the Town Hall Administration Department had been working on a location for public restrooms. He said the Administration Department decided on the Town Hall location because it is centrally located on W. King Street. He said they propose putting the public restrooms in the location of the old Northwestern Bank vault, which is large enough to have two handicap-accessible restrooms. He explained that the proposal to install the two public restroom doors would only affect the primary façade. He said there was plenty of room to accommodate the opening and closing of the two doors. The planter and the Town of Boone signage would have to be removed in front of Town Hall, and holes would be cut into the red brick wall to the left of the entry doors.

Chair Plaag asked Town Staff if they wished to give an opening statement other than what was contained in the meeting packet, and Ms. Shook responded no. He asked the applicant if they wanted to provide any evidence in support of the application and specifically tie that evidence to standards.

Mr. Dixon stated that he had reviewed the Design standards for Commercial Properties, and most of them did not apply to this request, but the following design standards do apply as provided in the Staff Report:

Design Standards for Commercial Properties

4. **Masonry:** Many commercial properties in the historic district are composed of brick or stone masonry, and it is imperative that original masonry materials—many of which have a weathered appearance reflecting the history of the building—remain preserved whenever possible.
 - 4.3 Re-pointing of masonry should also be completed using materials that duplicate the existing mortar in appearance, texture, and color. Colored sands or mineral-pigmented mortar can be used to achieve a match with the existing mortar. Portland cement should be avoided in mortar, as it may produce a mortar stronger than the surrounding masonry, potentially causing the masonry to crumble.
 - 4.5 When repairing or replacing masonry or mortar, take care to maintain the alignment, bond pattern, joint spacing, color, texture, and size of the original masonry.
6. **Windows, Doors, and Awnings:** The arrangement of doors and windows on an historic property is one of the most important elements of building design. It is imperative that these arrangements be preserved in order to maintain the integrity of individual historic properties and the integrity of the District.
 - 6.1 The pattern, arrangement, location, size, and shape of windows and doors contribute significantly to a building's historic character, and their consistency within the district helps unify

the buildings in context to one another. For this reason, it is always preferable to repair damaged windows and doors rather than replacing them. Furthermore, it is imperative that the fenestration pattern of the door and window openings on the building and of the doors and windows themselves (muntin width, number of lights per sash, etc.) be maintained when repairs to or replacement of elements is underway. It is never appropriate to introduce new features, such as vents, bays, windows, or door openings, in exterior walls if they diminish the historic character of the wall or damage historic materials.

- 6.2 Whenever possible, the original window and door hardware should be preserved and maintained, as these components are also vital elements of historic properties.
- 6.3 Whenever possible, other original window and door elements, such as sashes, glass, sills, frames, casings, weather-stripping, lintels, architraves, surrounds, and shutters, should be repaired rather than replaced. This includes sidelights and fanlights on both doors and windows, which are vital architectural elements that help identify the style and period of a particular property. Snap-in muntins are not historically accurate and should always be avoided.
- 6.4 Unless restoring the appearance of a building to its original, historic context, the pattern, arrangements, and dimensions of doors and windows on principal elevations should be retained. On tertiary elevations not visible from the street, new door or window openings should be proportionate to existing ones and include matching design elements.
- 6.16 New construction, additions, and renovations to existing historic buildings or properties within historic districts should maintain established proportions and spacing of window and door openings.

Mr. Dixon noted that there needed to be direction in the Design Standards for the applicant to follow regarding designing a public restroom door. He pointed out that visibility and security were primary concerns when designing the door. He explained there was a concern for the storefront door because the applicant could not make a door like the one the HPC recommended. He said, in his opinion, we should use hollow metal doors for security and maintenance and try to make them blend in by painting them the color of the red brick on the building.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he wanted to speak about what the exterior cladding of this elevation of the building was during the period of significance when it was constructed in 1960, and why this change is justified, given later changes to this elevation. Mr. Dixon referred to packet page 86 and an image of the Northwestern Bank building with crab orchard stone removed in the mid-1980s, the addition of the archway, and the windows added to the corner of the building. He stated that various changes had been made to the building since its period of significance.

Chair Plaag asked Town Staff if they wished to present any evidence not contained in the meeting packet pertinent to the application, and Ms. Shook replied no.

Chair Plaag asked the HPC if they had any questions for the applicant. Commission Member Watkins asked Mr. Dixon if an opaque door was installed, how would the opacity be achieved, or would the glass be tinted? Mr. Dixon responded that they are proposing no glass in the commercial hollow metal doors, and you could not see through them. Chair Plaag confirmed that the doors would be made of metal that is not translucent and is less opaque.

Chair Plaag referred to the image of the front of the Northwestern Bank on packet page 86 and noted it was from around 1965. He asked Mr. Dixon about what appears to be crab orchard stone on the left side and if the brick veneer survives underneath the current veneer. Mr. Dixon said he did not know for sure, but based on the plane of the brick, it seems to be continuous and does not bump out at that location. He felt confident that the crab orchard stone was probably removed when the façade was renovated and the archway was installed.

Chair Plaag pointed out to Staff that using a current image in the meeting packet of any property that the HPC would review in a case would be helpful. He said the image could be taken by Staff or Google Street View if available. He stated that he had emailed Ms. Mitchell a link to a Google Street view of this property. Ms. Mitchell screen-shared the image, and Chair Plaag compared the images and asked Mr. Dixon to look at the second-floor where it joins the Appalachian Theatre to the east, and compare that to the image from around 1965 found in the meeting packet. He said the depth we see in the present-day image is more proud than in the image from around 1965 of the Appalachian Theatre façade. He made this conclusion because the crab orchard stone was a veneer over brick as shown in the 1965 image and it shows proud also. He asked Mr. Dixon if he would interpret this to mean that because of the difference in depth and how proud the Appalachian Theatre stands compared to the applicant's building that probably the crab orchard stone was removed. Mr. Dixon responded that it is difficult to know if it was removed because of the renovations to the Appalachian Theatre façade. He said it appears that the crab orchard stone was removed, the building was re-bricked, and those two smaller windows were removed in that process.

Chair Plaag referred to the 1965 image and asked about the two small vertical windows in the center that are no longer present in the current building. He saw evidence of those windows being bricked in, and he asked Mr. Dixon if it suggested to him that the existing brick veneer on the second floor of the applicant's building is a newer veneer treatment than what was originally on there in 1965. Mr. Dixon replied that it does not appear that the windows were bricked in, and a whole new façade was done on the first and second floor probably during the 1980s. He added that those two vertical windows were bricked over continuously versus being bricked in. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he would agree that the first-floor configurations of the door and windows were mostly similar to what is in the current building on this elevation. Mr. Dixon responded that it appeared to be the case.

Chair Plaag asked if the Town had any plans to remove the archway from the Town Hall building, or if the removal of this item was not part of this application. Ms. Dixon replied that the arch canopy would stay on the front of the Town Hall building. He said the only things that would be removed in this request are the planter, Town signage, and notification board.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he had an image of the proposed door style. He said there are standards regarding doors for the historic district, and there are separate standards in the Town's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) that list approved door types specifically in the B1-Zoning District. Mr. Dixon stated that because of security issues, the best option would be to have the doors opaque and blend in with the rest of the building. He said that the Staff noted that the UDO needs to give the applicant direction about making the doors opaque and providing security.

Commission Member Smyth asked Chair Plaag for clarification on the question that Chair Plaag had asked earlier if the Town proposed removing the archway on the Town Hall building. Chair Plaag clarified that he was asking about the arch way removal as it relates to this application, and he did not think that the HPC could not ask the Town to commit to anything beyond what is in this application. Commission Member Smyth told Ms. Meade that he thought that part of Chair Plaag's question was the Town removing the archway at some point, and if they were removing it, they would be compelled to restore it. Ms. Meade stated that the HPC might need to consider whether this is relevant information to the application. Commission Member Smyth said this would not change the decision the HPC might make regarding this application in this meeting.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he wanted to respond to this question regarding the possible removal of the arch way or if he should ask a Town Staff member to respond. Mr. Dixon responded that he did not feel empowered to answer the question, but he presumed that it would remain in place because of the climate of Boone, but he was not sure. Chair Plaag asked Ms. Shook to respond to this question, and she noted that Ms. Amy Davis, Town Manager, and Mr. Todd Moody, Director of Public Works, would be able to answer this question.

Chair Plaag swore in Ms. Davis. He asked her if the Town plans to remove the arcade in front of the Town Hall at some point; Ms. Davis responded no.

Chair Plaag referred to some examples of exterior doors in the door galley in the UDO for the B1-Downtown zoning district (Subsection 14.19.06 (H)(3)(e) and Subsection 14.19.06 (H)(4)). He pointed out that this door gallery should not be intended to mean these are the only acceptable doors. He pointed out that some wooden door examples have more significant and lesser amounts of glass. He said that there are some examples of six-panel wooden doors with a metal kick-plate on them that would be opaque and could provide security and could be painted to roughly match the color of the brick. He read that metal is only acceptable on window and door trim listed as an excluded material except on window and door trim as trim material, and metal is prohibited field material for larger surfaces on a building.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon to comment on whether a traditional six-panel wooden solid core door would suit the purpose for the exterior entry doors. He noted that a metal kick plate would be acceptable on the entry doors. Mr. Dixon responded that he would not recommend a wooden entry door because of the cold weather, the use of salt on ice, and humidity in the summer because these things would cause an ongoing town staff maintenance issue. He said a six-panel metal door would be preferred, and it would replicate a wooden door. It could be painted to match the brick color, and this type of door would address privacy and security issues.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Shook if the HPC were to approve a metal door would the Town have to go through some process to install it on one of its buildings because it might be a possible violation of the UDO. Ms. Shook responded that when the Community Appearance Commission reviewed acceptable doors, they anticipated that there would be some metal doors.

Chair Plaag referred to packet page 75, **Design Standards 6.16:**

New construction, additions, and renovations to existing historic buildings or properties within

historic districts should maintain established proportions and spacing of window and door openings.

Chair Plaag stated there were not and there have never been two doors on this portion of this elevation. He said the exterior cladding materials have changed, but the actual fenestration pattern has mostly stayed the same except on the second floor. He asked Mr. Dixon to comment on why the applicant does not think that the Design Standards 6.16 would not apply to this case. Mr. Dixon responded that the necessity and need would overrule established proportions and spacings of existing window and door openings. He added that the Town has established a real need for public restrooms in the Downtown area, which outweighs some of the historic concerns on the façade. He noted that the façade had been changed numerous times since its period of significance.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if the Town had explored the possibility of having one entrance in the vestibule area between the outer Town Hall door and the inner Town Hall door, cutting into the vault through that wall, and having an entrance to two separate bathrooms inside that space. Or did the Town explore having one unisex bathroom with two toilets that could be accessed similarly? Mr. Dixon stated that would potentially create an accessible issue in that vestibule by adding a third door because there is no room to add a third door. He said it makes more sense to access the restrooms from the sidewalk. Chair Plaag clarified that there has to be a 36-inch turning radius within any confined space. Mr. Dixon stated a 36-inch door opening and a five-foot, six-inch turning radius would be required, and that would be impossible to install in the vestibule per the building code.

Chair Plaag asked if there were other questions for the HPC or for Town Staff. Mr. Dixon noted that he had seen some wood-grained fiberglass doors in the door gallery. He said this type of door might be an option for consideration, and they could be made with six panels. He pointed out that fiberglass could require less maintenance than hollow metal doors because of the tendency for metal doors to rust because of the salt, freezing, and thawing. Chair Plaag pointed out that this option felt more like vinyl to him than the metal door. He said vinyl is not generally permitted in the historic district and did not want to encourage it. He said he would be more comfortable with the metal door than the vinyl door. Mr. Dixon noted that he preferred the fiberglass doors because they would be more durable.

Commission Member Watkins asked about the architectural style of the current Town Hall building. He said when he thinks about six-panel doors, he thinks of 18th-century architecture. He said vinyl doors are meant to mimic wood. He asked what the six-panel door would look like against the rest of the openings on the lower level of the Town Hall building. Mr. Dixon said the Town Hall building is a more contemporary modern style building except for the low arches. He stated a six-panel door because he thought this was the direction that Chair Plaag suggested. He said the hollow metal solid doors would disappear and blend into the building, but they may not be appropriate for this building.

Chair Plaag explained to Mr. Dixon that in his line of questioning, he was addressing any potential conflict that the HPC might be creating in reviewing the door gallery in the UDO and trying to avoid a likely variance process for the applicant. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he would agree that the original style of the Town Hall building in 1960, particularly as a result of the stacked-stone band, could arguably be an example of an international-style building and a six-panel door was not something you would typically find on this style of building. Mr. Dixon said that is correct for both questions.

Commission Member Watkins voiced concerns about security and dents in metal doors from people kicking them. He asked if the Town had made provisions for maintaining the public restrooms. Mr. Dixon stated that he did not know how the security would be handled for the public restrooms and that Town Staff should answer those questions.

Chair Plaag swore in Mr. Todd Moody, Director of Public Works. Mr. Moody stated that the Town Staff would handle the maintenance. He explained they have contracted with restroom cleaners for electronic locks on both doors that will lock on their own at night and unlock in the morning. He continued that there will be a panic bar inside each restroom to allow a person to exit the restrooms; there will be a capture security camera running 24/7 on the outside of the restroom doors.

Chair Plaag noted that it may be outside the purview of the HPC, but would it be possible to have an emergency alarm. Ms. Meade told Chair Plaag that he was going beyond the HPC's purview. Chair Plaag explained that he was asking these questions because Commission Member Watkins may have been leaning towards suggesting a frosted glass with less opacity that would allow for someone on the outside of the restroom door to see that there was someone inside the restroom. He said the opaque glass would concern the HPC from an appearance standpoint. Ms. Meade explained that the restroom would be a single open bathroom. She told the HPC that if the Town was asking for greater latitude, the HPC could grant it, but forcing them to go beyond something that has no basis is problematic. Mr. Dixon stated from a public person's standpoint, he would not want to be in a bathroom that has a door with frosted glass and you are able to see shadows inside the restroom. Chair Plaag asked Commission Member Watkins if his questions had been answered, and he said yes.

Commission Member Ziegler stated that we live in a college town with a concern for graffiti and vandalism on the metal doors, as well as ongoing maintenance to remove the graffiti. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Moody how quickly the maintenance staff would react to these types of issues on Town property. Mr. Moody responded that maintenance staff are in the downtown area every day of the week, and how quickly they remove it depends on the type of vandalism. Chair Plaag confirmed with Mr. Moody that there would be a security camera to capture whoever committed the vandalism, and Mr. Moody said yes. There were no more questions for the applicant or Town Staff.

Chair Plaag asked if there were any other interested party who is here to speak or present evidence in support of this application? Is there any other non-party witness who is here to speak or present evidence in support of this application? Is there any interested party who is here to speak or present evidence in opposition to the application? Is there any other non-party witness who is here to speak or present evidence in opposition to the application? There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag asked the Town Staff if they had received any written comments from the public regarding this particular case. Ms. Mitchell stated that she had not received any written comments for this case. Ms. Shook said that the Town Staff received one written comment after the meeting packet was republished from Ms. Jodie Feimster, and she generally supported the request. Chair Plaag noted that since Ms. Feimster did not make herself known when he asked if there was any non-party witness that wanted to speak, he asked Ms. Feimster if she wanted to speak or present evidence, either in support or opposition of this case; Ms. Feimster replied no.

Chair Plaag asked the applicant if they would like to clarify or correct anything in the HPC's case discussion. Mr. Dixon responded no and stated that he appreciated the HPC's time and involvement in the case.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Dixon if he wanted to give a closing statement or argument or defer until the Town Staff had had a chance to provide a closing statement or argument; Mr. Dixon replied no. Chair Plaag asked the Town Staff if they wanted to give a closing statement or argument; Ms. Shook answered no.

Commission Member Smyth asked what is historic about the Town Hall building, and does it become historic because what is there has been there for 30 years? Chair Plaag replied no and explained that the period of significance for the historic district was 1918 to 1964. He referred to packet page 71 and explained that the "CH" listed on that page relates to the contribution of the building to the historic district based on its historical significance, not its architectural significance. He explained that the HPC would weigh architectural changes more significantly than a building that has historical significance.

Chair Plaag voiced his concern for the fenestration of the building because of what has stayed the same on the first floor looks like the framing and windows are not original and it generally keeps the original proportions. He said someone could make an argument that the archway mutes the importance of it. He said there were changes to the second-floor fenestration pattern that impaired the integrity of the building architecturally.

Commission Member Smyth said if the HPC approved the doors, he would rather see the doors blending into the brick wall. He added that mortar lines could be drawn on the doors to make them blend more into the brick wall. Commission Member Ziegler agreed with Commission Member Smyth about the restroom doors blending in with the rest of the building and not being seen from the street. She said her preference would be to have the restroom entry doors go into the building through the vestibule area, but it was stated earlier that it was impossible.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Meade about an exception for public health and safety issues that was utilized to remove the brick veneer wall on the west side of the Mast General Store building when it was in danger of collapse. He asked Ms. Meade to remind the HPC how that exception would apply to a situation where there were public restrooms in Town Hall, and for reasons of public safety, those are no longer accessible to the public. However, he added there is still a public health need to provide public restrooms in the Downtown area, particularly during the day. Ms. Meade responded that this exception does not apply in this situation. She explained that in the case of the Mast General Store building, the materials physically posed a danger to the public. She was not concerned about the fenestration of the Town Hall building. She said when the original building had the crab orchard stone, the fenestration was different and purported to make itself a separate section of the building apart from the Appalachian Theatre and the Northwestern Bank building. She said that the building had been changed so many times that the section where the stone had been absorbed and expanded by the bank storefront along with the archway become one building and not two separate sections differentiated by the different materials. She talked about the concern that the HPC had discussed about preserving the fenestration pattern for that section of the building that no longer exists. From an architectural standpoint, Chair Plaag noted that the crab orchard stone is not considered part of the building's fenestration. He said that fenestration only applies to door and window piercings. Ms. Meade stated that, in her view, a fenestration pattern only has a meaning relative to the overall building. She said the building was supposed to be set apart as two separate architectural structures, but it is now just one building. She said the fenestration pattern has been erased

or absorbed into the new singular presenting brick building. She said the standards say to preserve the fenestration pattern, but the architectural features have been erased in the renovations of this building over time. She said there is no purpose in adhering to this fenestration preservation mandate in this particular context.

Chair Plaag noted that he disagreed with Ms. Meade's statements, but he said the better argument is that the archway and its rounded arches create a whole new set of piercings on the building that themselves obscure the original fenestration pattern of the first floor. He noted that the clad band had been removed. He pointed out that the better argument was what the applicant initially tried to make in the meeting packet, that the elevation has so radically changed architecturally to the nearly unrecognizable point.

Commission Member Smyth referred to packet page 81 and the Criteria for Conditions, regarding the applicant needing to promote the use and conservation of the district for education, pleasure, and enrichment of the residents of the Town and/or the State as a whole. He added that having public restrooms in the Downtown area is very important and promotes the enrichment of the residents of the Town. He stated that if this is the only location where public restrooms can be installed where the public can use them, this is where they need to be. He said the HPC could ask the Town staff to make the public restrooms look as best as possible based on whether the HPC thinks they should stand out or not. He stated that the public restrooms are needed, and they should not be seen from the street and blend in with the color of the brick on the building.

Chair Plaag added that the HPC should consider whether the proposed public restrooms are congruous with the historic district. Commission Member Watkins stated that the architect's elevation represents the greatest initiative the HPC can have because Boone needs a visitor center. He added that the Downtown area needs public restrooms, and the archway does help camouflage anything under it. Chair Plaag pointed out that creating a new doorway in the vestibule to meet ADA requirements would dramatically alter the Town Hall building more than what is being proposed. He said he did not see an alternative other than what is opposed. He disagreed with Commission Member Smyth's suggestion to paint a brick pattern on the doors to help hide them from the street; he said he would rather that the applicant pick a red metal door, which is what the applicant proposed.

Motion and Vote:

Commission Member Vardell made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler, that the proposed development is congruous with the special character of the Downtown Boone Local Historic District and recommended it be approved subject to the standard conditions as follows:

Conditions of Approval:

The following conditions are automatically included and a part of any approval:

- Where there is a conflict between the application information and the plans (October 24, 2023), 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 to 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, detail 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.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Chair Plaag closed this case.

At approximately 4:17 p.m., Ms. Amy Davis, Ms. Lane Moody, and Mr. Todd Moody left the meeting.

At approximately 4:17 p.m., Chair Plaag called for a short break; he reconvened the meeting at approximately 4:20 p.m.

CASE A23-0460 – JONES HOUSE PICNIC SHELTER – COA; 605 W. KING STREET

The Town of Boone has submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work for 604 W. King Street (Jones House), located in the Downtown Boone Local Historic District, to add a concrete sidewalk and pad for a solar picnic shelter to the eastern side of the building (secondary elevation; toward Grand Boulevard). Chair Plaag pointed out that this case began on packet page 146. He asked Ms. Shook who would be presenting this case. Ms. Shook noted that Staff assisted Mr. George Santucci, Sustainability and Special Projects Manager, with this particular process. She asked for the HPC to give some leniency to Mr. Santucci as he presented this case, and she said she could assist him if needed. Ms. Meade agreed that they could present this case as described. Ms. Meade reiterated that her role was to be the counsel for the HPC, if needed and not the Staff's attorney on this case. She disclosed that she had a short discussion with Ms. Shook on this case and expressed her opinion that this would only be appropriate for considering the new concrete being added to the property as potentially a landscape change. She said that the structure is considered only for safety reasons because it is not permanently affixed. She said the fixture is personal property, not within the HPC's purview.

Chair Plaag swore in Mr. George Santucci, Sustainability and Special Projects Manager.

Chair Plaag asked the Historic Preservation Commission members if any commissioner had a fixed opinion about the case that is not susceptible to change; if any commissioner had 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. There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag asked for a motion and vote from the HPC to allow him to hear this case.

Motion and Vote:

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler, to allow Chair Plaag to hear this case.

Ms. Meade explained that as a point of order if Chair Plaag recused himself or someone wants to make a motion to recuse Chair Plaag, it is optional for there to be a motion to allow Chair Plaag to hear this case. Chair Plaag noted that the motion was rescinded.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Santucci if he had any objections to the materials in the meeting packet, and he replied no.

Mr. Santucci gave the following opening statement for this case. He said with his position for the Town, his goal is to reduce greenhouse gases and promote green and renewable energy sources for the Town. In this case, he continued that the proposal is one way to add to his goal. He said the Jones House is a centralized and well-visited location to have a "Haven Solar Picnic" shelter, and it speaks volumes to the Town's commitment to sustainability. He said it is a quality product because it has proven itself in other locations and will endure in the elements.

Chair Plaag noted that the part that the HPC would be reviewing is not the picnic shelter but the permanent modification to the ground. He asked Mr. Santucci to describe what that would involve. Mr. Santucci explained that the request is to install a concrete path approximately five feet by 18 feet to a ten by ten concrete pad to enhance ADA compliance and allow people with disabilities to use the picnic table. Chair Plaag confirmed that the HPC would only consider the concrete path and pad.

Chair Plaag asked the Staff if they had an opening statement beyond what is contained in the staff report, and Ms. Shook replied no. He asked Staff if they wished to provide an opening statement besides what was in the meeting packet, and Ms. Shook replied no.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Santucci if he wished to present any evidence pertinent to the application beyond what was contained in the meeting packet. Mr. Santucci responded that the information in the staff report was sufficient. He said the request was to add the concrete to make the ramp in compliance with the standards, and it needed to meet the American Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility guidelines.

Chair Plaag asked Staff if they wanted to present evidence pertinent to this application beyond what is contained in the staff report. Ms. Shook pointed out that the design standards began on packet page 150, and the staff report began on packet page 177. She added that Staff assisted Mr. Santucci with this information. Chair Plaag noted that the design standards for this case are also on packet page 187.

Chair Plaag asked the HPC if they had questions for either the Staff or the applicant on this case. Commission Member Watkins asked if it was sustainable to pour 190 square feet of additional hardscape and introduce it into what was essentially farmland and if this was an encroachment into a historic district. Ms. Shook stated that the Jones House has existing sidewalks for public access, which furthers the use of a picnic area already in use at the Jones House. She said the proposal makes the same area accessible and still meets the requirements within the staff report.

Chair Plaag explained that in a new development, there has to be consideration for capturing the stormwater runoff from new impervious surfaces. He said this is outside the purview of the HPC, but Staff can speak to whether this would have to meet those requirements. Ms. Shook stated that the request does not trigger stormwater requirements. She said there is an exception for certain square footage, and the request falls into it. She added that the Town has always been responsive to addressing stormwater

issues in public facilities. Ms. Shook said Mr. Justin Stines, Deputy Director of Public Works, could better answer any questions on this issue.

Chair Plaag swore in Mr. Justin Stines. He asked Mr. Stines to explain how the Town would deal with a stormwater issue if it arose. Mr. Stines replied that the Town is very responsive in capturing storm water runoff and providing green infrastructure.

Chair Plaag referred to Design Standards for Historic Streetscapes, Landscapes, Monuments, and Other Resources:

Streetscapes: 1.13 New paving and sidewalk materials, especially new accessibility features, should be designed to be consistent with the character and appearance of historic paving materials.

10. Parks and Public Spaces:

- 10.1 Preserve historic landscape features that are critical to site identity and form, including landforms, topography, roadways, pathways, trails, trees and other plantings (both natural and planned), fences, and other resources.
- 10.2 Preserve and protect significant views into, out of, and within parks and public spaces. Carefully weigh the impact on both visitors and nearby residents and businesses when adding or removing landscape features, trails, walkways, and roadways.
- 10.3 Preserve, protect, and maintain significant primary and accessory structures, including pavilions and fountains, that are essential to the identity of the cultural landscape. When planning new accessory structures, including monuments, public art, interpretive signage, memorials, and similar features, weigh their potential impact on historic views associated with the park and the general character and aesthetics of the public space in its historical context. Necessary accessory structures used for service purposes (maintenance sheds, restrooms) should be as unobtrusive as possible and designed to blend into the park's historic landscape.

Chair Plaag asked Commission Member Watkins if these standards altered his question. Commission Member Watkins stated that, unfortunately, an obtrusive walkway has already been introduced into the site. He described the area as already having picnic benches on the lawn of the Jones House, and people walking to and from have eroded the grass. He said that the issue he objected to was outside the purview of the HPC. Chair Plaag confirmed that Commission Member Watkins did not fully support the solar picnic structure, and Commission Member Watkins said it was inappropriate for the Jones House property. He said for the concrete pads there was precedence for them at that location. He said all the material being introduced in this request takes away from this site.

Ms. Shook added that the Jones House is a Town facility used for many public events. She asked how do we make these spaces available to all of our public, if we don't add these pathways. She said the standards listed in the staff report support them, and Mr. Santucci and Mr. Stines confirmed this statement.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Mitchell to screen share the information from meeting packet page 154, that showed the site plan of the solar picnic table. Chair Plaag pointed out a space on the other side of the gazebo to the north that could accommodate what is proposed. He asked Mr. Santucci to explain why that site was not preferred for the solar picnic table. Mr. Santucci said that the site map does not show

the tree in the corner of the parking lot, which would hinder the site's solar generation. He noted that the purple square on the site map is the sunniest spot on the property besides the parking lot. He pointed out that if the Town gave up parking spaces for the "Haven Solar Picnic" shelter, they would lose revenue from those downtown parking spaces.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Mitchell to screen share a Google Maps street view from King Street that he had provided for this meeting. He pointed out that the "Haven Solar Picnic" shelter, would be on the other side of the pine tree seen from this view, and the concrete pad would not obstruct the view of the Jones House because they would be at ground level.

Chair Plaag asked if there were other questions for the Town staff. Commission Member Smyth asked whether the treatment inside the walkway would be the same brick within the concrete. Mr. Santucci replied that it is proposed to be solid concrete. Commission Member Smyth asked if the HPC approved the current sidewalk or if it was installed prior to the establishment of the historic district. Chair Plaag referred to packet page 208, which shows an image of the all-brick walkway on the east side of the Jones House. He said this concrete was updated with concrete on the outside and brick in the middle probably around the time the first redoing of the Downtown sidewalks was being done around approximately 2018, and Mr. Stines confirmed that year. Chair Plaag stated that Commission Member Smyth wondered if something similar could or should be done with the concrete. He added that if it could be done like the existing concrete and brick, it would create a continuity of appearance or possible cost, logistical, or ADA issues. Mr. Stines said that it would be an insignificant cost issue and it would be more aesthetically pleasing. He added that either way is optional. Chair Plaag asked Ms. Meade if there was an issue with the HPC recommending the concrete and brick treatment for the sidewalk, assuming there is no accessibility issue created by using that treatment for both the landing pad for the table and the walkway to the table. Ms. Meade responded that she saw no issue with the HPC making recommendations on the treatment as long as they do not purport it to be binding.

Commission Member Watkins asked why the HPC was not commenting on the structure itself. Ms. Meade explained that it was personal property and not fixed to the property, making it real estate or a permanent fixture. She added that the HPC does not have jurisdiction over personal property. Chair Plaag explained that the Secretary of Interior Standards encourages alterations to historic properties in the least obstructive way, in order to encourage ADA compliance.

Chair Plaag asked if there were other questions or comments for Town Staff.

Chair Plaag asked if there were any other interested party who is here to speak or present evidence in support of this application? Is there any other non-party witness who is here to speak or present evidence in support of this application? Is there any interested party who is here to speak or present evidence in opposition to the application? Is there any other non-party witness who is here to speak or present evidence in opposition to the application? There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag asked Ms. Mitchell and Ms. Shook if they had received any written comments regarding this application, and they both replied no.

Chair Plaag stated that no opposition was received for this application. Still, he had to ask Mr. Santucci if he had a rebuttal to anything that had been discussed on this application, and Mr. Santucci replied no.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Santucci if he wished to give a closing statement, and he replied no because he was satisfied with the presentation of this application. Chair Plaag noted that because the Town assisted with this application, they would not be allowed to give a closing statement, and Ms. Shook agreed.

Chair Plaag opened the floor for the HPC to discuss the any evidence they might have. Commission Member Ziegler stated that even though the concrete and the brick would be better for continuity, she had no qualms about just using concrete for the sidewalk. She said this because the concrete pathway up to the house is solid, and then it veers off to the concrete and brick pathway.

Chair Plaag stated that in Planning Commission cases, they can impose conditions in a Conditional District application, and the applicant has agreed upon them. He said if there is a concern about the appearance of the pad and whether it is discordant with the property and the district as a whole, he asked Ms. Meade to clarify if it was possible for the HPC to impose conditions, and Ms. Meade replied yes.

Ms. Shook asked Chair Plaag to ask Mr. Santucci, Mr. Stines, or Mr. Mark Freed, Director of Cultural Resources, about other possible solutions.

Chair Plaag swore in Mr. Freed. Chair Plaag stated that he had heard from at least two other Commission members, and he agreed with them that if there is not an impact on accessibility in making these two proposed pads, the walkway and the landing pad match the existing walkway design on that side of the Jones House would be less discordant than what is proposed. He asked Mr. Freed if he had an objection on the condition that it does not affect accessibility or that for any other reason than cost. Mr. Freed said the sidewalk makes sense, and it would look congruent. He explained two other pads on the property are solid concrete pads. He said one is for handicap accessibility, and the other pad was initially built for a sculpture pad. He said a solid concrete pad where the table would sit would make sense because, over time, brick becomes uneven. He added that because there is no sidewalk from the parking lot or over to Grand Boulevard, people constantly walk across that property area. He stated that even though this is not a part of this proposal, having a path going all the way to the Grand Boulevard sidewalk makes sense. Ms. Stines noted that the brick is a maintenance issue. Concrete is easier to maintain, and it handles salt better than brick does, and either one of them is ADA accessible.

Chair Plaag asked Mr. Stines if he would agree with Mr. Freed that it would make more sense to do just the pathway to the pad instead of covering the pad with that pattern with the brick in it. Mr. Stines responded that they typically put a brick band with a wider concrete area on the Town's wider sidewalks, where they use the brick pattern for the five-foot sidewalks. Chair Plaag asked how wide the existing path at the Jones House is. Mr. Stines replied that it was roughly eight to ten feet wide. Chair Plaag confirmed that it is a wider path than this application's proposed path. Mr. Santucci mentioned that the smaller band that Mr. Stines referenced can be seen on the King Street sidewalk of the Jones House.

Commission Member Smyth noted that this is a secondary path, and it may not need to have the same width because it may not have the same amount of foot traffic. He added that having the pathway go through to the connecting street may be a good idea, but this is currently outside the HPC's purview.

Commission Member Ziegler added that if there were other concrete pads on the property, she had no concerns with the pad or walkway being concrete, and they would be more congruous if the pad and walkway were concrete. Commission Member Smyth said if the pad is going to have a picnic table sitting on top of it, you cannot see if there is brick under it, and he was not concerned with the pad being concrete. He said it would look nicer if the walkway also had the brick, but because the walkway in the front of the Jones House is solid concrete, he could go with the brick or with the solid concrete.

Commission Member Watkins said if the HPC were going to vote on the entire discussion, he would vote no because it uses elements entirely incongruous with the site. He said it would be nice if all of it matched.

Commission Member Smyth asked if the Town would replace the sidewalk from the Jones House to King Street at some point, and Mr. Stines replied there are no current plans to replace the sidewalk. Commission Member Smyth said if the Town replaces this sidewalk in the future, it would be in position for it all to match if it were bricked.

Chair Plaag noted that during the period of significance, there was an 18-hole putt-putt golf course on the Jones House property for about three years.

Commission Member Smyth asked the HPC about the material for the path. Commission Member Ziegler stated that she supported the concrete pad and pathway because the Town has no plan to change the sidewalks, and Chair Plaag agreed with Commission Member Ziegler.

Motion and Vote:

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler, that the proposed development is congruous with the special character of the Downtown Boone Local Historic District and is approved subject to the standard conditions.

Conditions of Approval:

The following conditions are automatically included and a part of any approval:

- Where there is a conflict between the application information and the plans (October 24, 2023), 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 to 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, detail 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.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Mr. Santucci and Mr. Stines left the meeting at approximately 5:07 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commission Member Ziegler made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Smyth, to approve the September 20, 2023, meeting minutes as amended below:

- Minutes page 1, sixth paragraph, first sentence change: "Watkins's: to "Watkins"
- Minutes page 2, seventh paragraph, first sentence change: "August of 2022" to "August 2022" and "April of 2023" to "April 2023", and to remove comma after "such as"
- Minutes page 3, third paragraph three, first sentence change: "Appendix" to "Appendix D"
- Minutes page 3, fifth paragraph, fourth sentence change to read: "Chair Plaag clarified that when we talk about other jurisdictions and how they handle multiple historic districts, a lot of times the way these things evolve is you are expected to write a set of standards that are district-specific or landmark-specific."
- Minutes page 3, fifth paragraph, sixth sentence change: "He continued that it places on burden" to "He continued that it places a burden"
- Minutes page 3, fifth paragraph, seventh sentence change: "contradictions in them that" to "contradictions in them; that"
- Minutes page 3, seventh paragraph, first sentence change: "specially" to "especially"
- Minutes page 4, second paragraph, seventh sentence change: "It was" to "Ms. Turner"
- Minutes page 5, first paragraph, second sentence change to "Ms. Mitchell said that the introduction for the general provisions will apply to all properties, then specific district standards applying to any local landmark for any historic district property would apply."
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, second sentence change: "next thing the" to "next thing is"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, fifth sentence change: "He stated that a grant could potentially enable you" to "He stated he had been hired on projects funded by those grants"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, fifth sentence change: "consultants do" to "consultants to"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, eighth sentence change: "Death-Ridges" to "Deathridge's"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, tenth sentence change: "Chair Plaag clarified the restrictions" to "Chair Plaag clarified claims about racial restrictions"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, twelfth sentence change: "reply" to "bid"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, thirteenth sentence change: "He said that it is harder to do that here because there is not enough work, therefore," to "He said that it is harder to do that here because there is not enough work in the area; therefore, it is not sustainable for a consultant to focus only on Watauga County"
- Minutes page 5, third paragraph, first sentence change: "Blue Ridge Tourist Court as" to "Blue Ridge Tourist Court is"
- Minutes page 6, second paragraph, third sentence change: "entirely of the landmark" to "interior of the landmark being designated"
- Minutes page 6, third paragraph, fifth sentence change: "structure glass" to "structural glass in the Downtown buildings other than the theatre"
- Minutes page 6, third paragraph, last sentence change: "old Crest Dime Store used to be had the red" to "old Crest Dime Store used to be, which had the red"
- Minutes page 7, fourth paragraph, seventh sentence change: "versus the structure" to "versus temporary structure versus accessory building."
- Minutes page 8, second paragraph, first sentence change: "addresses" to "addressed" and in the sixth sentence change: "it was" to "it was not"
- Minutes page 8, third paragraph, first sentence change to: "Ms. Mitchell added to the discussion regarding materials and referred to Packet Page 80, Section D2.04.23, Artificial Materials; she discussed the proposed revision added to this section that states the materials not to use."

- Minutes page 8, third paragraph, second sentence change to: "She said in the existing commercial standards it includes materials such as kiln brick, wood, trim, structural glass, and other coverings on buildings."
- Minutes page 8, fourth paragraph, fifth sentence change: "existing on the building the period" to "exist on the building outside the period"
- Minutes page 9, first paragraph, second sentence change: "Watsonna" to "Watsonnatta"
- Minutes page 9, fourth paragraph, last sentence change: "She" to "He"
- Minutes page 10, second paragraph, second sentence change: "He" to "Commission Member Watkins"
- Minutes page 10, third paragraph, fourth sentence change: "Ms. Shook asked if there was process" to "Ms. Shook asked if there was a process"
- Minutes page 11, first paragraph, fourth sentence: "modified to fit," to "modified to fit"

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler to approve the October 3, 2023, meeting minutes as amended below:

- Minutes page 6, second paragraph, second sentence change: "Councill's" to "Councils" and change: "Daugherty" to "Dougherty"
- Minutes page 7, fourth paragraph, third sentence change: "leader" to "leaders"
- Minutes page 7, sixth paragraph, second sentence change: "He said it was completely believable that the burials" to "He said it was completely believable that the location of the burials was determined by Union officers occupying Boone at that time"
- Minutes page 8, second paragraph, fourth sentence change: "Jones Houses" to "Jones House"
- Minutes page 8, second paragraph first sentence change: "Stoneman's Raid interpretative panel. She said the Civil War Trails Program indicated" to "Stoneman's Raid interpretative panel, they indicated"
- Minutes page 10, fourth paragraph, first sentence change: "relative of the Jones'" to "Jones' relative"

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Commission Member Ziegler made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Smyth to approve the October 17, 2023, meeting minutes as amended below:

- Minutes page 2, third paragraph, second sentence change: "Norman" to "Warman"
- Minutes page 5, sixth paragraph, first sentence change: "an interview process for about 60 people" to "an oral history interview process for the Appalachian Theatre for about 60 people"
- Minutes page 5, sixth paragraph, seventh sentence change: "Ms. Mary Hong Cole" to "Ms. Mary Helen Cole"
- Minutes page 6, first paragraph, first sentence change: "defamatory language for the individuals" to "defamatory language and highlighting specific individuals"
- Minutes page 7, fourth paragraph, eighth sentence change: "Dr. Burn's" to "Dr. Burns's"

- Minutes page 11, second paragraph, fourth sentence change: "Councils'" to "Councils" and remove the word "buried"
- Minutes page 11, fifth paragraph, thirteenth sentence change: "to count possible" to "to count, possibly"

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Ziegler to approve the November 7, 2023, meeting minutes as amended below:

- Minutes page one, under Approval of Minutes change: "cases" to "minutes"
- Minutes page one, under Public Comment in the fourth paragraph, third sentence change: "Council" to "Council" and change: "mediation" to "meditation"
- Minutes page 2, first paragraph, second sentence change: "Council" to "Council" in third sentence change: "Council" to "Council" and change: "rational" to "rationale" and change: "Commission Members Watkins" to "Commission Member Watkins's"
- Minutes page 2, fifth paragraph, first sentence change: "statements made because" to "statements made about her"
- Minutes page, paragraph seven, third sentence change: "there is no documentation" to "there is no clear documentation."
- Minutes page 3, first paragraph, third sentence change: "Council's" to "Councils"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, second sentence change: add a period at the end of this sentence
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, first sentence change: "National Register Areas of significance, A, B, C, and D" to "National Register Areas of significance, A B C and D."
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, second sentence change: add a period at the end of this sentence
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, fourth sentence change: "architectural history of Watauga County," to "Architectural History of Watauga County Book,"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, fifth sentence change: "she would" to "she should"
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, sixth sentence change: "Jones family that" to "Jones family."
- Minutes page 5, second paragraph, last sentence change: "15" to "past"

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Commission Member Ziegler made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Smyth, to approve the November 14, 2023, meeting minutes as amended below:

- Minutes page 3, first paragraph, first sentence change: "Candidate" to "Candidates"
- Minutes page 3, second paragraph, third sentence change: "Maricela" to "Maricle"
- Minutes page 3, second paragraph, fifth sentence change: "Kirshner plat" to "Kestner plat"
- Minutes page 3, second paragraph, sixth sentence change: "land, known as the Brown Chapel, to expand the Black Section" to "land to expand the Black Section"
- Minutes page 3, second paragraph, tenth sentence change: "combine them" to "combine them with the white section."
- Minutes page 4, under Motion and Vote: change: "Commission Member Ziegler made a motion, seconded by Chair Plaag, to recommend to the Town Council that pets should be prohibited in

the Boone Cemetery" to "Commission Member Ziegler made a motion, seconded by Chair Plaag, to recommend to the Town Council approval of the rules sign text including that pets should be prohibited in the Boone Cemetery."

- Minutes page 4, under Motion and Vote, add:

"Motion and Vote:

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Watkins, to submit to the Town Council for approval of the proposed rules sign text.

Commission Member Watkins asked if the rules and regulation sign would be considered separate from the interpretative panels. Chair Plaag replied there was a previous discussion by the HPC that the rules and regulation sign would not be an interpretative panel structure and that it would be simply a sign with the Town of Boone logo on it with a listing of the approved text information and positioned immediately outside the pedestrian gate into the cemetery. Chair Plaag added that this sign would be made in-house with an aluminum material similar to the other Town signage.

Commission Member Smyth wished to amend the motion to add that the proposed rules and regulations sign for the cemetery would match similar signs in the Town of Boone and be mounted outside the pedestrian entrance gate into the cemetery. Commission Member Watkins accepted this amendment to the motion.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay- None

The motion passed.

- Minutes page 6, before REVISED Panel #2: A Divided Cemetery add: "Discussion ensued on the draft text, sentence by sentence. The draft text is as follows:"

OTHER DISCUSSION

Ms. Mitchell clarified the Chair and Vice-Chair application procedure. She explained that once Staff received the completed applications for these positions, Staff would present those applications to the HPC at their next meeting. She continued that then the HPC would make a recommendation to the Town Council from those applications, and Staff would forward those recommendations to the Town Council for their consideration, most likely in February 2024. Ms. Mitchell pointed out that she had informed Vice-Chair Bond that she would be chairing the January HPC meetings.

Ms. Mitchell informed the HPC that she had scheduled and would conduct the new HPC member orientations. She also told the HPC that the quasi-judicial training had been scheduled and would be led by the Town Attorney, Ms. Allison Meade.

Commission Member Watkins suggested that the Planning and Inspections Department include a section for HPC educational materials for public use in their department library. Chair Plaag noted that a copy of the survey and landmark reports would be useful in that library.

Chair Plaag expressed his gratitude to Commission Member Watkins for his contributions over his multiple years of service to the HPC. He suggested that a resolution be made in honor of Commission Member Watkins. Commission Member Watkins thanked Chair Plaag for his appreciative words and expressed his gratitude to Chair Plaag for the many remarkable contributions he had made to the HPC, which have been the foundation on which the HPC has been based.

Chair Plaag expressed his gratitude to Commission Member Ziegler for her outstanding service to the board and for setting a high bar for future student members appointed to the HPC.

Council Liaison Roseman expressed her gratitude to all of the HPC members. Commission Member Watkins appreciated Council Liaison Roseman's dedication to the Town Council.

Ms. Mitchell, on behalf of the Staff, thanked the HPC and Council Liaison Roseman for their work and commitment to the HPC.

ADJOURNMENT

Commission Member Smyth made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Watkins, to adjourn the meeting at 5:56 p.m.

Vote: Aye – All

Nay – None

The motion passed.

Eric Plaag, Chair

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary