

# Minutes

## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### Regular meeting

6:30 p.m. Feb. 5, 2025

Board Meeting Room of Town Hall Annex, 105 E. Corbin St.



Present: Vice Chair Hannah Peele and members G. Miller, Daniel Widis, and Bruce Spencer

Absent: Chair Will Senner and members Sara Riek and Mathew Palmer

Staff: Planner Joseph Hoffheimer and Town Attorney Bob Hornik

#### 1. Call to order, roll call, and confirmation of quorum

Vice Chair Hannah Peele called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. She called the roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

#### 2. Commission's mission statement

Peele read the statement.

#### 3. Agenda changes

There were no agenda changes.

#### 4. Minutes review and approval

Minutes from regular meeting on Jan. 15, 2025.

Motion: Member G. Miller moved to approve the minutes from the regular meeting on Jan. 15, 2025.  
Member Daniel Widis seconded.

Vote: 3-0. Abstention: Member Bruce Spencer.

#### 5. Written decision review and approval

Written decision from regular meeting on Jan. 15, 2025.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the written decision from the regular meeting on Jan. 15, 2025. Widis seconded.

Vote: 3-0. Abstention: Spencer.

#### 6. Old business

A. Demolition by Neglect Complaint: 217 S. Occoneechee St.

Approve order to direct the Planning Director to conduct an administrative hearing to determine whether the subject property is undergoing demolition by neglect. (9864850633)

Motion: Miller moved to approve the written order, pursuant to section 8.8.3.7 of the Unified Development Ordinance, to direct the planning director to conduct an administrative hearing to determine whether the property is undergoing demolition by neglect. Widis seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

## 7. New business

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 120 N. Wake Street  
Remove and enclose three windows on the south side of the house (9864967592)

Peele opened the public hearing and asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. None were disclosed. All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the site in preparation for reviewing the application.

Hoffheimer was sworn in. Lisa Inman, the applicant and property owner, and Craig Fox, the contractor for the project, were sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Hoffheimer introduced the application by presenting the staff report. He noted that the inventory information, application materials, and applicable design standards would be entered into the record as evidence. He provided the staff comments:

- The minor works standards do not allow staff to approve removal of windows, but the Windows standards are tailored toward historic and/or character-defining windows.
- The applicant plans to retain the existing window furthest to the right on the south elevation. If that is not possible, an exact match will be used.

Inman presented the application and clarified which windows will be removed. Only the back window will remain. She confirmed that the section of windows in question is not visible from the street and will be filled with the same siding that exists on the rest of the house. Because the house is relatively new, it is easy to find the same siding.

Vice Chair Peele noted that the proposed work is not on a character defining façade and asked if there were any questions. Spencer said the proposed work seemed reasonable, and the applicant confirmed that the house was only built in 2000.

Motion: Miller moved to find as fact that the 120 N. Wake Street application is not incongruous with the overall character of the Historic District and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the commission's discussion of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 3.12.3 of the Unified Development Ordinance because the plans are consistent with the Historic District Design Standards: Windows and Exterior Walls. Widis seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

Peele summarized the commissioners' discussion: the windows are not character defining, the house is relatively new construction, and the new siding will match what exists on the rest of the house.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the application. Spencer seconded.

Vote: 4-0

Conditions: None.

Hoffheimer said that the applicant may need to replace the rear window like for like, which would require separate minor works approval because the proposal to remove the windows was approved without conditions. A condition would allow for the potential replacement to be approved by the commission.

Motion: Spencer moved to amend the motion with conditions. Miller seconded.

Vote: 4-0

Conditions: If the window needs to be replaced because it cannot be reused, that it be replaced with a like window.

Hoffheimer confirmed that the final approval documents will be mailed in approximately one month.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 106 E. Union Street

Replace shed doors with carriage type doors, replace 5V siding with German lap siding, and replace gravel with brick pavers (9874086022).

Peele opened the public hearing and asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. None were disclosed. All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the site in preparation for reviewing the application.

Hoffheimer was sworn in. David Cates, the presenter for the project, and Stephen Demorest, the applicant and property owner, were sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Hoffheimer introduced the application by presenting the staff report. He noted that the inventory information, application materials, and applicable design standards would be entered into the record as evidence. He provided the staff comments:

- Staff could not find any documentation of the age of the vertical metal sheathing, wood trim, or paired doors, although the current doors are not historic.
- The minor works standards do not allow for staff-level approval of the sheathing, trim, or door replacements.
- The minor works standards allow for staff approval of the driveway replacement, and staff recommend that the commission approves the brick pavers as submitted.

Cates presented the application. He clarified that what may be characterized as a garage door in some of the elevations is more of a carriage door. He added that the section of the building in question is really a shed, and nobody knows the age of it.

The commissioners reviewed the proposed siding. Cates confirmed that the proposed siding will be wood German lap siding to match the existing building. Peele inquired about the condition of the current 5V metal siding, and Cates said it is not in the best shape. Demorest confirmed that the mural on the metal siding is recent and not historic. Widis asked about the mechanics of the siding replacement, and Cates confirmed that other than the change from metal, the volume and outside form will remain the same. The roof is not changing, and the roof material will also remain the same.

The commissioners discussed the age of the structure. Demorest confirmed it was there in 1996, and Widis added that judging from photos and the difference in material, it is clearly an addition. Widis added that the quality of the building attached to the section in question has a higher level of craftsmanship.

Peele asked what would need to be retained for the building to remain in keeping with the character of the historic district. Spencer responded that the metal siding is not historically significant and that replacing it with German style siding is an improvement and not in conflict with the district. He added that the current door appears to have some existing problems underneath it and that it is not significant door.

Peele asked if there were any other comments and said that the commission needed to justify the replacement of the doors. Widis replied that, without knowing the age of the structure, changes to the door would not violate any character questions or cause damage. Hoffheimer added that the doors are

not historic, and he had seen images of the building without the doors. Peele inquired about the door material, and Cates confirmed that the current wood doors will be replaced with wood.

Peele closed the public hearing.

Peele and Spencer discussed how to summarize the facts and evidence needed for the final decision. Peele summarized the commissioners' discussion: the proposed modifications are not incongruous with character of the district, the materials are approved in the compatibility matrix, and the doors are being replaced with a like-for-like material.

Peele brought up the walkway, and Hoffheimer noted that the walk is allowed as a minor work, but approval by the HDC allows for all the proposed work to be approved at the same time.

Hoffheimer added that the proposal in the application to replace wood trim with Hardie trim also requires HDC approval but noted that the compatibility matrix allows it. Peele confirmed that the compatibility matrix allows the proposed trim.

Motion: Miller moved to find as fact that the 106 E. Union Street application is not incongruous with the overall character of the Historic District and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the commission's discussion of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 3.12.3 of the Unified Development Ordinance because the plans are consistent with the Historic District Design Standards: Wood; Doors; Outbuildings and Garages; and Walkways, Driveways, and Off-Street Parking. Spencer seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the application. Spencer seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

Conditions: None.

## 8. General updates

Hoffheimer provided an update about tentative Certified Local Government (CLG) trainings. He also updated the commission about the town's upcoming Unified Development Ordinance rewrite as well as two upcoming rezoning requests in the historic district.

## 9. Adjournment

Peele adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Hoffheimer  
Planner  
Staff support to the Historic District Commission

Approved: March 5, 2025