

**TOWN OF BOONE**  
**SPECIAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**AUGUST 30, 2022, 4:00 p.m.**  
**WebEx Video Conferencing**

---

**Historic Preservation Commission Members in Attendance:**

Chair Eric Plaag, Vice-Chair Bettie Bond, and Chuck Watkins

**Council Liaisons:** Virginia Roseman

**Town Staff in Attendance:**

Jane Shook-Director of Planning & Inspections, Jessica Mitchell-Long-Range/Special Projects Planner, Christy Turner-Senior Planner, and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

**Others in Attendance:** Jim Deal-Deal Moseley and Smith, John Winkler-Winkler Organization, and JC Feimster

---

**Call to Reconvene**

Chair Eric Plaag reconvened the Boone Historic Preservation Commission hearing from August 15, 2022, held via WebEx, and called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

**Case Z05737-052522 – Howard Street Ventures, LLC (Wilcox Warehouse) Certificate of Appropriateness**

John Winkler on behalf of Howard Street Ventures II, LLC (Wilcox Warehouse), has requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work (COA) to repair/replace and modify the exterior facade at 161 Howard Street (Watauga County PIN 2900-79-8147-000). The applicant proposes to replace damaged stucco with natural stucco as well as repair the awning and roof.

Chair Plaag swore in Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections, Ms. Christy Turner, Senior Planner, Ms. Jessica Mitchell, Long-Range/Special Projects Planner, and Mr. John Winkler, the applicant for Howard Street Ventures, LLC.

Chair Plaag asked the Historic Preservation Commission members if any commissioner had a fixed opinion about the case that is not susceptible to change; had 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; and had any commissioner engaged in any undisclosed ex-parte communication regarding the application? There were no answers in the affirmative.

Chair Plaag noted that he had recently received an email from Member Watkins containing a procedural question regarding this case; he said he did not respond to the email but forwarded it to Town staff for review. After reviewing the email, Town staff asked Member Watkins to hold his question regarding this case until this meeting.

Chair Plaag pointed out that Mr. John Winkler, the applicant for Howard Street Ventures, LLC (Wilcox Warehouse – COA) had submitted on August 26, 2022, new material found on page 67 of the meeting packet under Exhibit 12 and Exhibit 13. Chair Plaag noted that Exhibit 12 is a letter dated August 24, 2022, from Brent Davis Architecture, Inc., describing the exterior materials proposed to be installed or modified on the building's first and second stories. Chair Plaag confirmed with Town staff that the staff report for this case had not been modified since the last meeting. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Jim Deal, attorney for the applicant, if he objected to the material in the meeting packet, including the new proposed material, Exhibits 12 and 13. Chair Plaag noted that Exhibit 13 is a color rendering of the building. Mr. Deal had no objection to the new material in the meeting packet.

Chair Plaag said if there are no objections from Town staff, the applicant, or the HPC members, he would open the floor for Member Watkins to ask his questions regarding information that has been presented up to this point

for this case. Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins to hold any comments that he had regarding the new proposed material in Exhibits 12 and 13 that the applicant has not yet presented. Hearing no objection, Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins to make his comments.

Member Watkins commented on two digital images of the Wilcox Warehouse building that he had found in the Digital Watauga photography files. He said he was hoping to locate a better image of the building. He said the images were listed as PAL-BLA-04-032 dated 1950 and PAL-BLA-04-104 dated 1954, and they are the same photograph, but they are cited differently with different dates. He said the images show the building in brick, but unfortunately, the image is clipped off enough that it is noticeable something has happened with the first-floor, but you cannot tell if it was original. He said if we could see in the image the first-floor elevation entirely, we know that it does not exist anymore because of the walkway built there. He said it would be impossible to duplicate the original material.

Member Watkins talked about the second story; he said it is assumed the brick on it is original. He said, in his view, almost all of the brick on the second story is either partially or entirely spalled. He referred to the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. He read from the Standards for Restoration, Item 2:

Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken. He said that this information would seem to argue for the brick to remain in place and be visible. He said the problem is that the brick, for the most part, no longer has its original face. He felt that no amount of sealing would restore the look of the original surface.

Member Watkins continued to read from the Standards for Restoration, Item 6:

Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials.

He said if taking that information literally, it would seem to argue for the need to remove the brick and replace it with a matching new brick. He noted that would be very difficult to do, especially since whatever brick remained on the first-floor had disappeared because of the presence of the walkway. He said he felt it difficult to imagine asking the applicant to replace the entire existing brick façade, or to try and seal the existing façade to make it look as it did when the building was first constructed.

Member Watkins talked about the proposed façade materials discussed at the previous meeting for this current COA case, which included the wood cladding to be used on the first-floor façade and the suspended flat awning type found on certain buildings on King Street. He said all of the proposals for the façade are essentially merging a deteriorated second-floor brick façade with some conjectural first-floor components, and these proposed remedies did not seem helpful. He read the Standards for Restoration, Item 7:

Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

He said, in his view, the various proposals that have been suggested violate this section of the Standards for Restoration in one form or another. He referenced the following addresses of the surrounding buildings on Howard Street at 182, 191, 205, 216, and 222; he noted that these property owners had used stucco to update the appearance of the concrete block. He said the only real full understanding we have of the façade on the applicant's building is a stuccoed façade with the matching awning. He said although we may not like the stucco on the building, he is inclined to see its merit.

Chair Plaag responded that when there is a question on best practice, the HPC is guided first by the Standards for the Historic District (Town of Boone Unified Development Ordinance Appendix D), which takes precedence over the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and any underlying guidelines from the National Park

Service (NPS). He noted that the HPC is first guided, broadly, by the Secretary of the Interior Standards, second are the historic district standards, subject to change at any time through the usual UDO text amendment processes. He said when there is a question about what is the best practice, the HPC should look at the Secretary of the Interior Standards and enforce those 10 Standards and interpret those standards to find the best solution.

Chair Plaag further stated that there are times when all the things required in the Secretary of Interior Standards cannot be completed. He said, in this case, the appearance of the Wilcox Warehouse building has not been preserved over time. He explained, on occasion, standards conflict with one another; he continued that it is the responsibility of the Commission members to interpret all of the standards to find a solution that complies with the standards as closely as possible.

Chair Plaag referred to UDO Appendix D, Downtown Boone Design Guidelines and Handbook, Section 1.4 for commercial properties in the historic district. He pointed out that this section makes it clear what needs to be done to retain the commercial character with a contemporary design compatible with the surviving and surrounding buildings. He emphasized that the first-floor level of the building doesn't exist anymore, and there is not enough original material there to bring it back to its original state or to what it looked like in its period of significance. He said all the HPC could do was agree on a contemporary design for a storefront that would be new construction and is compatible with surrounding buildings.

Chair Plaag referred to UDO Appendix D, Section 1.2 for commercial properties in the historic district, and referenced that the second-floor façade and the other elevations of the building, when their components are uncovered or when they survive, should be preserved, regardless of what else might have happened on the building, including on the first-floor façade. He said this was why he recommended that the stucco be removed.

Chair Plaag referred to Appendix D, Section 1.6 for commercial properties in the historic district, and pointed out that this section states that non-historic coverings of upper facades should be removed. He said stucco is a non-historic covering of this building, and it was not there during the period of significance. He said the stucco was installed on the building in the 1990s. He said that throughout the district, stucco was not a commonly used material during the period of significance until the very late part of that period.

Chair Plaag explained that Mr. Winkler had previously asked the HPC for guidance on replacing the windows on the second-floor elevation, and the HPC had advised Mr. Winkler to use wood material for framing and try to keep with the muntin window pattern seen in the 1953 image of the building.

Chair Plaag explained that the applicant had not conferred with a restoration specialist who is familiar with working with historic brick to get their feedback on the condition of the brick. He said no one had been up on a ladder to assess the condition of the brick, except possibly Mr. Laurence Lindsey, from L Squared Engineering. Chair Plaag said the HPC had to work with the facts they had before them on this case. Chair Plaag said he was open to the applicant finding an appropriately credentialed preservation specialist to examine the brick, to see if the brick needs to come off and be replaced with a similar brick to comply with the historic district standards and the NPS guidelines. Chair Plaag said he could tell the applicant does not want to do that because that is more expensive than what has been proposed. He said if removing the stucco and sealing the brick does not work and there are water issues, then there needs to be a discussion on how to resolve those issues. He reiterated that covering the building with stucco, a non-historic material, in the historic district simply because it had stucco on it during the non-historic period of the historic district is not a solution under the historic district or NPS standards.

Member Watkins disagreed with Chair Plaag and said there were two choices: to restore the façade that existed for many years that matched surrounding buildings, or invent a new appearance for the building. Member Watkins said he did not like either one of these choices. He said that in fairness to the applicant, he thought restoring the façade that we know existed was the better of the two choices. Chair Plaag said it is clear in the historic district standards that non-historic materials are not supposed to be used for rehabilitation or new construction in the

historic district. Member Watkins said neither is a new appearance to be invented for the building. Chair Plaag said we are not proposing to invent a new appearance, but asking that the known elements that survive be restored to the extent possible, as outlined in Appendix D, Section 1.4. Member Watkins said he would argue that the brick cannot be repaired. He said the second-story level of the building is not going to look like it would have in its original state, regardless of what happens to the first-floor level. Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins to point out the evidence either in the meeting packet, or that was presented by witnesses that confirms what he said regarding the building. Member Watkins said in his view, he thought that about 98 percent of the original surface of the brick had deteriorated, and sealing it would be unusual.

Chair Plaag told Member Watkins that if he felt strongly that the brick on the second-floor level could not be repaired, then Member Watkins had the right to propose a finding of fact based on the evidence presented in this case by witnesses or from the meeting packet. Chair Plaag reminded the HPC that they are supposed to consider only competent material and substantial evidence when making findings of fact.

Member Watkins made a motion that a visual inspection from the street level of the second-floor brick on the building reveals that the brick is almost entirely defaced by spalling.

Discussion ensued on the content of the motion. Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins who was making the visual inspection; Member Watkins replied himself or anyone. Chair Plaag told Member Watkins that he did not believe that he was able to testify to the visual inspection in the case. Member Watkins said he felt competent to stand on the ground and look at the brick.

Chair Plaag said he recalled Mr. Lindsey testifying that it was his initial recommendation to remove the stucco and seal the brick. He continued that Mr. Lindsey only changed his mind when he learned about the Howard Street project. Mr. Lindsey said nothing about the brick's structural or viability, but that aesthetically, he thought that re-stuccoing it would be more in line with the proposed Howard Street project. Mr. Deal recollected that Mr. Lindsey said more than Chair Plaag recalled.

Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins if he had anything to add to his original motion, or if he could restate his motion. Member Watkins restated his motion that viewed from the street, the second-floor brick on the building appears to be almost entirely spalled, and sealing the brick would not result in an appearance that would convey the impression of a historic building. Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins if there was any specific evidence he wanted to refer to other than personal observation. Member Watkins explained that he was offering his information as a member of the HPC and was not testifying on behalf of anyone or advocating for any particular outcome. He said he was stating that the material that survives on the building is not in its original form for the most part.

Vice-Chair Bond asked if there was a way that the applicant could try to seal the brick, and if it did not work, the applicant could use the stucco. Member Watkins pointed out that he was not arguing that the brick cannot be sealed, as it is his opinion that it can be sealed. He explained that a sealed and spalled brick would not look like the brick on the building when it was originally constructed and would not look like an aged surface. He said it would look like a sealed and spalled brick.

Chair Plaag called a vote of Member Watkin's motion on the finding of fact.

**Vote:**

Aye – (Watkins)

Nay – (Plaag)

Abstain – (Bond)

**The motion failed.**

Mr. Deal called Mr. Winkler to testify about Exhibits 12 and 13 included in the meeting packet that was submitted in response to the discussion held at the last HPC meeting. Mr. Deal asked Mr. Winkler if he had asked Mr. Brent Davis from Brent Davis Architecture to prepare Exhibits 12 and 13 for submission for the HPC's consideration; Mr. Winkler said yes. Mr. Deal said that Mr. Winkler did not have comments regarding the exhibits, and Mr. Winkler felt the exhibits were self-explanatory. Chair Plaag asked if there were any objections from Mr. Winkler or the Town staff to accepting the said exhibits into the record. Chair Plaag accepted the said exhibits into the record hearing no objections.

Chair Plaag asked about the board and batten material being proposed on the first-floor level and wanted to know if this material was acceptable in the fire district. Ms. Christy Turner, Senior Planner, responded that a Town building inspector stated the proposed material is acceptable in the fire district.

Chair Plaag noted that he wanted to review the muntin windows as shown in the 1950 image. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Deal if Mr. Winkler objected to him reviewing the windows; Mr. Deal said Mr. Winkler did not object. Chair Plaag pointed out in the 1950 image in the meeting packet, it appeared that on the second-floor, the window design was a six-over-six as opposed to the present two over two design. He said Exhibit 13 shows the window design as a two over two. Chair Plaag suggested that if Mr. Winkler is replacing the windows, the windows should be changed to a six-over-six double-hung sash window instead of the two over two design. Chair Plaag asked Mr. Deal and Mr. Winkler if they had an objection to this proposed change. Mr. Deal asked Mr. Winkler about the window openings, and if the request to change the windows to six-over-six would work because there is no proposed change for the window openings. Mr. Winkler said he was finding it difficult to get some building materials at this time, but he would do the best he could to get the suggested windows. Chair Plaag pointed out that he only mentioned the proposed window change because Mr. Winkler previously said that because of the removal of the stucco around the window framing, there are now some gaps, and he thought he would probably have to replace the windows. Chair Plaag pointed out that Mr. Winkler is not obligated to replace the windows, it's encouraged, but the HPC cannot make Mr. Winkler replace the existing windows as part of this COA review. Chair Plaag said if Mr. Winkler intends to use the current windows that he has, he thought the most difficult challenge would be to try to repair the wood framing, not vinyl, around the windows to make them look like they belong would be not ideal, but acceptable under the standards. Mr. Winkler said he would need to replace the gaps around the rotten window sills where needed.

Chair Plaag asked if the proposed design that was submitted is approved, how long would Mr. Winkler have to wait to come back to ask about the windows for the building, if necessary. Ms. Turner said the COA is good for one year. Ms. Shook asked to clarify Chair Plaag's question, in which he reiterated if the HPC approved the building design, if Mr. Winkler would have a year if replacing the windows to be six-over-six. Ms. Shook and Ms. Turner replied yes. Chair Plaag noted that the one year would give Mr. Winkler some time to assess the best options for the windows and to order them.

Chair Plaag asked if there were questions regarding the proposed design of the building. Mr. Winkler asked how he was to move forward with the exterior repair of the building. Chair Plaag said the possible approval of the proposed design in the meeting packet would include removing the remaining stucco from the south and east elevation second-floor. He strongly encouraged Mr. Winkler to contact Ms. Jennifer Cathey, a restoration specialist from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), to locate an expert to assess and ensure the brick is viable before the brick is sealed. He said that Ms. Cathey could recommend a list of people who have done successful renovations and follow the NPS guidelines. Chair Plaag noted that if there is no way to save the brick, we will need to discuss the best course of action relating to the second-floor elements. He said that there is a disagreement among some of the HPC members on what the solution is for it. He suggested placing a condition, if it is acceptable to Mr. Winkler, that if he gets into doing the work proposed by the HPC, and the work cannot be completed based upon an analysis by a restoration specialist who has experience working with historic brick, and it requires that the applicant come back to the HPC to discuss the next best solution, it would not be recorded as a new case but a reopening of this case with no additional fee. Ms. Shook said there are costs associated with

meeting notices. She said she would check with the Town Attorney on the legal requirements. He suggested the HPC could possibly say that within the one year of the COA approval, if that discovery is made, the applicant has the option to come back under the original application for reconsideration, but if it is beyond that date, it would require a new application.

Mr. Winkler asked if he was required to put the awning up before his tenant could occupy the building. Mr. Deal asked the HPC if it would be acceptable for Mr. Winkler to wait to put the awning up until after he had confirmed whether or not the brick could be restored and properly sealed. Chair Plaag said the awning being installed is not an occupancy requirement. He asked Ms. Shook if there was any reason the awning could not be put up while the COA was pending. Ms. Shook said a separate building permit would need to be applied for, paid for, and issued before the awning could be installed. Mr. Deal said he thought a building permit had already been issued for the awning.

Member Watkins pointed out that he could not support the proposal to approve this case. He said there is an established period of significance for the historic district, and the HPC has tried to preserve what is related to that period which is good. He said that when we start adding conjectural elements to unknown facades, we back-date elements to conform to that period, he did not think that was practicing good historic preservation. He said given that there is a known appearance to a building, the applicant applied initially to restore the building to that known appearance. He further stated given there is no understanding of its earlier historic appearance, he thought it was inappropriate to begin adding conjectural elements like awnings that appear on buildings on King Street. Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins to point to a standard that supports his perspective. Member Watkins said he could not point to a standard, but he thought there were various theories of historic preservation that support it. He concluded with he did not believe it was appropriate to pick and choose elements to try to get the appearance of a building to conform to an arbitrary period in time.

Chair Plaag said that the HPC has agreed that the historic exterior elements of the first-floor no longer survive. He said the HPC is aware that there were one or maybe two openings, and there may have been an extension of the original brick along the far outside edges of the first-floor elevation. He said the HPC does not know much about the building beyond these things. He said the standard to apply to this is when the storefront cannot be saved, retaining the commercial character with a contemporary design compatible with surviving and surrounding buildings. He said the proposed cable-hung awning, board and batten wood elements, and the windows already on the building are all elements of a contemporary design compatible with the historic district. He stated these elements are not conjectural elements to make it look like it was there when the building was built. He said this is not what the applicant had proposed to do with the first-floor level. He explained that the applicant was trying to meet the standard by proposing a storefront that retains the commercial character of the building, using a contemporary design that is compatible with surviving and surrounding buildings with what is required of the historic district. He said the first-floor level is being treated as if it were new construction, and awnings are permitted on new construction. He reiterated the HPC is taking conflicting standards to come to an agreement. He thought the proposed design the applicant presented had a contemporary look, and it doesn't look like something from the period of significance, yet it is compatible with the materials that would have appeared during the period of significance. He said that he disagreed with Member Watkins on the points he stated earlier for these reasons.

Member Watkins said that the discussion was suggesting taking historical elements, combining them, and applying them to a building on which they never existed in the past. He said the building would look like a historic building, but it would not be a historic building. He said the building with stucco on it conforms with any number of buildings that surround it that are also stucco. Chair Plaag asked Member Watkins if he could point to the standards in the historic district that affirm his argument. Member Watkins said he would apply the NPS and the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation to his argument. Member Watkins read from the Standards for Restoration, Item 7:

Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

He said that because of this standard, the awning and board and batten material should not be used in the proposed building design.

Vice-Chair Bond said she did not see the point of the argument regarding the proposed building design. She said that all of Howard Street should look compatible and have the same feel and ambiance of the 1950s and 1960s that is being proposed and is historically appropriate in the Howard Street Project. She expressed that a whole new street, with the previous COA case of the Café Portofino project and the current project, being proposed would work together with King Street, Rivers Street, and Howard Street to make for the time period that was significantly important for the creation of Downtown Boone. She suggested that the HPC focus be on tweaking the windows, and figuring out the best solution for the brick issue.

Discussion ensued on the proposed conditions for this case. Chair Plaag explained that connecting the cables to the awning would be through the mortar, and an awning installer would know how to do this process correctly.

Chair Plaag discussed conjectural features as the medallions on the second-floor. Chair Plaag explained that the HPC is treating the second-floor as a surviving historical element, and the medallions are not a historic element. It was referenced to the packet page 69 of the August 30, 2022, meeting packet, where a design was provided with the mentioned medallions. Chair Plaag, Vice-Chair Bond, and Member Watkins agreed that one condition would be that the medallions on the second-floor level should be eliminated. The applicant accepted that condition.

Chair Plaag asked the applicant if they agreed to the condition of the awning attached through the mortar. Mr. Deal stated that he was not sure how large the attachment was to fit in the mortar area. Chair Plaag explained that a plate with a hook is what the cable is secured with, and then a bolt goes through the mortar. Chair Plaag and Mr. Deal discussed that the bolt goes through the mortar, and the plate can cover the brick. Mr. Winkler and Mr. Deal showed concern for the condition of the mortar because he did not know the condition of the mortar to hold the cable-hung awning. Chair Plaag pointed out that the historic standards state that if the brick has to be repointed, the new mortar has to be of a similar mix and color. Ms. Shook confirmed that the applicant has current permits in the Planning and Inspections office, not for the restaurant but for the façade renovations. She continued that the order in which those are completed has no bearing on occupancy requirements for the restaurant. She stated the work could be completed in the order needed. Chair Plaag confirmed with the applicant that the ramps and walkways would not be modified; Mr. Deal confirmed that statement was correct.

Chair Plaag restated that the conditions include the removal of the medallions, and the cables for the cable-hung awning will be installed with the plate covering the brick and the bolt going through the mortar, additionally if the mortar is to be repointed to follow the standards for the historic district.

Chair Plaag discussed that removing the stucco will be for the visible portions of the second-floor south and east elevations. Mr. Deal clarified the recommendations for removing the stucco on the east side elevation. He continued that the recommendation is to remove stucco on the east and Howard Street facing sides, and it is believed that brick is under the stucco. Mr. Winkler stated he was not interested in removing the stucco currently there as it is not an issue. Chair Plaag explained that based on the photographs presented, it suggests that the stucco on the east side was presumably done at the same time as the stucco on the south side. Mr. Winkler said he would not know what to do until he could examine the brick. Chair Plaag suggested a condition for this specific topic that in addition to proposed work for the south elevation, the stucco visible on the second-floor of the east elevation is to be evaluated, and if it is in the same condition as the south elevation has suffered from, that stucco is to be removed, and the brick is to be repaired, and sealed in the same manner as

the south elevation. Mr. Winkler agreed to this condition. Chair Plaag expressed that this work would benefit the applicant in protecting the building in the long term.

Chair Plaag continued to explain another condition, which includes if the applicant consults an experienced historic preservation specialist who has done work for historic brick and damaged historic brick, who evaluates the second-floor south and east elevations, and it is found that those elevations cannot be repaired or preserved, the applicant is permitted to come back to the HPC within one year without filing a new COA application to discuss alternative remedies. Chair Plaag explained that this condition might need assistance from the Town Attorney. Mr. Deal expressed that this condition could be subject to the approval of the Town Attorney. Ms. Shook clarified that this discussion was sufficient.

Chair Plaag continued with the final condition based on the previous discussion during this meeting regarding windows. He stated that if the second-floor windows are replaced, they are to be a wood, six-over-six, double-hung sash window. He further noted that the condition also includes if the windows are or not replaced, then the trim should be replaced with wood elements and not with vinyl. Chair Plaag explained that wood was used during the period of significance. The applicant agreed to this condition.

Chair Plaag expressed that Ms. Turner is to provide the applicant with the contact information of Jennifer Cathey.

Chair Plaag mentioned the standard set of conditions for COA cases and asked the applicant if there was any objection to those standard conditions that apply; the applicant replied that there were no objections 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 (May 25, 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 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.

The Commission may issue approval subject to reasonable conditions necessary to carry out the purposes served by the historic district (see G.S. 160D-940, 160D-947(a)):

The HPC recommended the following conditions for approval:

- The cable for the cable-hung awning will be installed with the plate covering the brick and the bolt going through the mortar. If the mortar is to be repointed, the applicant must follow the standards for the historic district of the new mortar being of a similar mix and color.
- The medallions on the second floor, shown in the applicant's proposed design, shall not be included in the façade of the building.
- The existing stucco will be removed on the visible portions of the second-floor south and elevation. In addition to the proposed work for the south elevation, the applicant will have the stucco of the visible portion of the second-floor east elevation evaluated, and if it is in the same condition as the south

elevation has suffered from, the applicant will remove that stucco, and repair and seal the brick in the same manner as the south elevation.

- If the applicant consults an experienced historic preservation specialist who has done work for historic brick and damaged historic brick, who evaluates the second-floor south and east elevations, and it is found that those elevations cannot be repaired or preserved, the applicant is permitted to come back to the HPC within one year without filing a new COA application to discuss alternative remedies. This condition is subject to the approval of the Town Attorney.
- If the applicant replaces the windows on the second-floor level, they are to be a wood, six-over-six, double-hung sash window. If they are not replaced, then the trim should be replaced with wood elements and not with vinyl.

Chair Plaag made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Bond, to recommend approval of the design described on meeting packet for August 30, 2022, packet pages 67 through 69, with the additional conditions discussed and agreed upon and listed above, including the three standard conditions.

**Vote:**

Aye – (Bond, Plaag)

Nay – (Watkins)

**The motion passed.**

Chair Plaag closed this case.

**Other Discussion**

Chair Plaag announced that the next HPC advisory meeting is on September 6, 2022, at 3 p.m. He noted that September 13, 2022, quasi-judicial meeting had been canceled because no cases had been submitted for review.

**Adjournment**

Vice-Chair Bond made a motion, seconded by Member Watkins, to adjourn the meeting at 5:39 p.m.

**Vote:**

Aye – All

Nay – None

**The motion passed.**

---

Eric Plaag, Chair

---

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary