

Minutes

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Regular meeting

6:30 p.m. Feb. 4, 2026

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



Present: Chair Will Senner, Vice Chair Hannah Peele and members G. Miller, Sara Riek and Daniel Widis

Staff: Planner Joseph Hoffheimer

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

Chair Will Senner called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. He called the roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

2. Commission's mission statement

Senner read the statement.

3. Agenda changes

Planner Joseph Hoffheimer clarified that the description under Item 5 on the agenda should say, "Approve written decisions from regular meeting...."

4. Minutes review and approval

Minutes from regular meeting on Dec. 3, 2025.

Motion: Member G. Miller moved to approve the minutes from the regular meeting on Dec. 3, 2025, as submitted. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

5. Written decisions

Written decisions from regular meeting on Dec. 3, 2025.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the written decisions from the regular meeting on Dec. 3, 2025, as submitted. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

6. Old business

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 420 Calvin St.
Request for after-the-fact approval for second-floor window replacement (PIN 9864753302).

Senner opened the public hearing.

Senner opened the public hearing. He 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. Christine Roth, the property owner, was sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Hoffheimer provided the staff comments:

- This application is being continued from the December regular Historic District Commission meeting.
- In October, 2025, vinyl windows were installed (without any permits) to replace historic steel windows which were likely original to the building and are somewhat unique, as they were part of a commercial building.
- The applicant has also proposed installing wood frame windows with wood interiors as an alternative to vinyl.

Roth apologized for not seeking approval in advance. She explained that the windows had been leaking and that Baker Roofing Company had installed the current windows. She requested guidance on how to remediate the situation. Hoffheimer said he could provide resources to help find appropriate replacements.

Senner emphasized that the ideal scenario would be an in-kind replacement with comparable steel windows that are as close a match to the original ones as possible. He said that if in-kind replacement is not feasible, it would be reasonable to look into replacement with another compatible material, using the photographs as a guide. It was noted that it is important that the windows on the second story match those on the first floor, including their framing and style.

There was discussion of procedure in this situation, including discussion of what constitutes feasibility. The commissioners agreed to defer to staff to make a judgment about what is reasonably feasible.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: The design standards provide guidance on the process for handling deteriorating existing windows with a clear preference on restoring existing windows. If that is not feasible, they recommend replacing in-kind. If replacing in-kind is not feasible, they recommend replacing with windows of an alternate, compatible material based on the design standards and the compatibility matrix.

Motion: Member Sara Riek moved to find as fact that the 420 Calvin St. application is in keeping 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, once modified, are consistent with the Historic District Design Standards: Windows. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

Motion: Riek moved to approve the application with conditions. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

Condition: Windows will be replaced in-kind, matching the previous original version. If in-kind replacement is not feasible, the reasons will be communicated to staff, and an alternate material meeting guidance in the design matrix will be chosen, with staff's discretion on returning to the commission for review.

7. New business

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 406 W. Margaret Lane
Add rear addition to garage (PIN 9864756428).

Senner opened the public hearing. He 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.

David Cates, draftsman for the proposed plans, was sworn in to speak on behalf of the application. James (Jim) Tomberg, a next-door neighbor, was sworn in to provide public comment.

Hoffheimer presented 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 design standards do not directly address additions to existing outbuildings.
- A rear addition to the existing house and minor changes to the existing garage were approved by the Historic District Commission in 2024.
- The garage was built 5 or 6 years ago, too recently to be included in the inventory.

The commissioners reviewed the site plan. It was noted that the addition is located to the rear of the existing garage and is sited to minimize visibility from the street. Cates added that the addition is being built on an already developed area, so there will be no change to the previous area or the driveway.

Dan Johnson, the property owner, was sworn in to speak on behalf of the application. Johnson said that landscaping would replace the existing asphalt in the back where the driveway wraps around the proposed garage.

It was noted that the materials match the existing, and that the massing of the addition differentiates it from the original garage, in accordance with the design standards. Cates confirmed that all materials match the existing and added that the door will be white.

The commissioners reviewed the east elevation.

The commissioners reviewed the north elevation.

Cates said the roof slope on the addition to the garage will be similar but might not be exactly the same, as it is a function of the width of the geometry of the structure.

The commissioners reviewed the west elevation.

The commissioners reviewed the south elevation. They noted that the addition is not visible from the street.

Cates confirmed that the existing light on the wall would be relocated to the new garage door.

Cates explained that the proposed windows will be aluminum-clad, simulated divided lites to replace the existing windows, which are grille-between-glass, but that the geometry of the windows will match the existing.

Hoffheimer said he could not find documentation of the construction of the garage as-is.

Cates said the new back door will be aluminum-clad wood with glazing to match the one that was approved two years ago.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: The garage addition is consistent with the design standards. It is a rear addition to the garage, sited and massed in a way that makes it a clear addition to the existing garage, minimizing its visibility from the street. All of the materials are consistent with the compatibility matrix and generally compatible with the existing garage.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Senner re-opened the public hearing.

Tomberg provided public comment. He said the garage is not visible from the street, but it is visible from his yard. He said the project fits with the renovation of the house over the past couple years without changing the character of it and will be an improvement to that area and is aligned with the design standards.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Miller moved to find as fact that the 406 W. Margaret Lane application is in keeping 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: Outbuildings and Garages. Riek seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the application as submitted. Riek seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 104 S. Hillsborough Ave.

Rear addition; renovation of the previous second and third rear additions by adding a northern shed dormer, a southern shed dormer, and a western gable dormer; new second-story wood porch; and rebuilding the existing rear shed into a new shed and screened porch room (PIN 9864763058)

Senner opened the public hearing. He asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. Vice Chair Hannah Peele disclosed that she worked on a project for the property which causes her to hold a fixed opinion on the application.

Motion: Senner moved to recuse Peele from the review based on her disclosed conflict. Miller seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the site in preparation for reviewing the application.

Hoffheimer presented 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 proposed aluminum siding removal, lighting, paint, and roof work can all be approved at the staff level as either minor works or ordinary maintenance.
- The chimney proposed for removal is similar to other chimneys that have recently been removed in the historic district.
- The design standards do not directly address additions to existing outbuildings.

Cates introduced the application by saying that the photos and elevations of the existing house show that the existing additions are awkward and sub-standard. However, he noted that the existing floor joists are pristine. He observed that the front door is not centered and suspected the house may have originally been a duplex. Cates said the building's massing is similar to 109 N. Wake St. and noted that the proposed shed dormers are similar to those at 211 N. Churton St., which has fairly high visibility from the street. He clarified that these dormers would be added onto the second and third additions, rather than directly onto the original structure.

Cates noted that the shed in the rear appears to have shifted or was built off the property line and would be relocated back onto the property.

There was discussion of the renovation of the shed. Cates said the shed will be renovated in place, with some existing walls being replaced. He said not much of the original shed will remain, though they will retain and reuse the footings and studs. Hoffheimer confirmed that the shed was built circa 1990, according to the inventory.

The commissioners reviewed the site plan.

Cates explained that only the south wall of the shed is encroaching on the property line and will be moved back or partially reused, while the west wall will remain since those setbacks have been met. Hoffheimer noted that a shed of that era could likely be demolished as a minor work.

There was discussion of the size of the shed, and it was observed that the shed is on the larger side relative to the primary structure. Cates noted that it is similar in size and proportion to other sheds in the district and is also half shed and half screened porch.

There was a discussion about the meaning of yellow areas on the site plan.

Miller said that the size of the shed did not appear to be problematic given its location. Cates added that the massing of it does not change much as viewed from the street. Senner noted that while siting a new shed of this size might be problematic, the existence of the current shed provides some flexibility. Cates noted that because the house sits on a hill, the structure is even less visible from the street.

The commissioners reviewed the front elevation and perspective.

The commissioners reviewed the left elevation.

Cates explained that the homeowner intends to remove the existing aluminum siding on the original house to return it to wood siding, while the addition will have Hardie board, smooth side out, which will help distinguish the addition from the original structure.. He noted that the shadow lines on wood siding

are deeper than those on Hardie board. He also said the windows on the new addition will have muntins, while the existing windows do not have them.

Cates explained that the vertical trim piece to the left of the third window from the right is an attempt to reintroduce the original corner of the house at that location. Senner said that would be logical if the original corner existed and were known. He asked Cates about the degree of confidence with which the original corner can be identified, beyond conjecture. Cates said he had a high degree of confidence based on structural evidence visible from the attic. He added that there has to be a transition from wood to Hardie board, and the vertical trim element helps make that transition.

Cates confirmed that the roof overhang will be the same on both sides and that the apparent difference on the elevation is a drafting error.

Cates confirmed that the existing wall at the joint will be rebuilt, and that everything to the left of the joint will be removed and rebuilt.

Hoffheimer said that he does not have specific dates for the past additions, but that they are over 50 years old. Cates said the house directly to the north had an almost identical rear addition.

Cates said the head height is very low in the back of the house.

Cates explained that the house is small and the chimney must be removed to accommodate adding a bathroom in the older section. He clarified that the chimney is no longer functional and is fairly small and less architecturally significant than others in the district.

It was noted that the roofline of the addition is set below the peak of the existing structure to help identify it as subordinate to the original house.

Cates clarified that the darker lines on the drawings are software glitches and don't indicate anything.

Cates confirmed the Hardie board would be smooth side out.

The commissioners reviewed the rear elevation.

Senner noted that changes to additions are problematic when they modify elements that add historic character to the home, but that in this case, the additions are not changing character-defining elements of the home, even if they are historic because of the 50-year designation.

The commissioners discussed the proposed stone chimney. Member Daniel Widis expressed concern about stone as a choice of material for the chimney. Senner added that stone chimneys were typically built in this area during only a short period of time in the late 18th century. He said a stone chimney in this context may bring conjectural elements into the mix which may not be most appropriate.

Bridget Booher, the property owner, was sworn in. Booher proposed removing the stone chimney from the plans and instead having continuous siding with a fireplace vent out the back instead of a chimney. There was agreement to this amendment.

Cates said the material of the small, flat roof to the right of the chimney depends on the manufacturer's warranty and the final slope of the roof, which they won't know until it is constructed. He said that the

goal is to have it be standing seam, but if the slope is too low, it will have to be membrane. He stated that the final decision would be coordinated with staff. Cates said the interior ceiling height and the porch floor serve are the primary constraints for the roof slope.

The commissioners reviewed the right elevation.

Cates said the vertical separation shown in the renderings is a software glitch. He confirmed the design has an unbroken volume stretched out, with no indentation.

Cates confirmed that the windows being repurposed are the two on the left elevation, and everything else is new or existing and remaining in place.

The commissioners reviewed the shed elevations.

Cates said the panels on each corner, flanking the door, on the front elevation would be solid Hardie board between trim. He said the door is a screen door, and the rendering is showing the vertical siding behind it, through the screen.

Cates confirmed that the finish on all elements will match existing.

Cates confirmed that grading will be necessary to backfill against the brick foundation due to the existing slope.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: The proposed larger shed and substantial removal of the existing shed is massed in a way that, although is probably on the larger size relative to the size of the house and the size of the lot, is not incongruous with massing of other outbuildings in the district; is sited in the rear of the property that is consistent with the rest of the district; and is using materials that are compatible with the primary home and consistent with the compatibility matrix. The renovation to the existing home includes effective removal of the second and third renovations to the home. However, those additions are not providing character-defining elements to the original home, and as such, the proposed work is not inconsistent with the design standards. The work being proposed as an addition or reenvisioning of the previous additions, in and of its own right, is consistent with the design standards; it is being added to the rear of the home; it is subordinate to the primary structure and its massing; its materials are consistent with the compatibility matrix, with elements that visually differentiate it as an addition from the primary home, as is the intent of the design standards, with care taken to reuse and preserve existing windows wherever possible.

Tomberg provided public comment. He said he lives across the street from the house in question and is familiar with the design standards. He said he feels this project is exemplary in its adherence to the design standards. He addressed the commissioners' concern about how much of the rear of the structure is being removed, and whether portions of it could be reused. He said these types of additions built on the ground are structurally problematic and subject to termites and water damage. He said the materials are not typically sound enough to reuse them as part of new construction.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Miller moved to find as fact that the 104 S. Hillsborough Ave. application is in keeping 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: Additions to Residential Buildings; Outbuildings and Garages; Exterior Walls; Paint and Exterior Color; Roofs; and Exterior Lighting. Riek seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the application as submitted. Riek seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 108 N. Hillsborough Ave.

Remove shed from front porch and expose original front porch; replace existing front porch columns; change existing sliding door to single window; create sliding glass door and window combination on back ell (PIN 9864765460).

Senner opened the public hearing. He asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. Peele disclosed that she holds a fixed opinion that would prevent her from hearing the application in a non-biased manner. All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the site in preparation for reviewing the application.

Motion: Senner moved to recuse Peele from the review based on her disclosed conflict. Miller seconded

Vote: 4-0.

Joyanna Livingston and Brad Lessler, the property owners, were sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Hoffheimer presented 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 have not found any documentation of the building prior to the more recent alterations.
- The existing front porch supports are described in the inventory as “turned posts with decorative sawn brackets” and appear to be historic, so their proposed replacement may require further justification.
- Staff are unaware of the age of the wood window to the left of the front entrance.

Livingston clarified that the window to the left of the front entrance is not actually wood. She offered to provide photos as evidence.

The commissioners discussed removing the shed addition from the front porch.

It was agreed that the shed addition was not original to the house and that the original porch would have extended along the entire width. It was agreed that this is not a conjectural modification. Livingston added that from the inside of the shed the exterior wood siding and concrete slab floor from the original front porch still remain. She said it is obvious that it was originally a full porch.

There was discussion of the existing columns. It was agreed that they are a character-defining element of the front elevation. Livingston said that she had trouble finding columns the same width as the existing ones, as the originals are three inches wide and options that are currently available start at four inches. The commissioners said that obtaining custom matching columns would be the ideal solution. Lessler

noted that the columns appear to be small from a structural standpoint. Senner suggested that a letter from a structural engineer stating that the columns are not adequate under current building codes would be reasonable justification for not replacing the columns in-kind.

The commissioners emphasized that the most appropriate solution would be to replicate the existing columns, but that the style and design of the columns and the reclamation of the porch are greater influences to the house's character than whether the columns are three or four inches wide. There was discussion of custom millwork as an approach to obtaining columns with matching detailing.

The commissioners discussed the reclaiming of the original southern window, which would involve removing an existing sliding door and installing a new window. Livingston said the new windows would be fiberglass and said the intent was for all windows facing the street to match. She said the front left window is a non-functional aluminum window that is not original to the house. She added that very few windows in the house are functional. She proposed replacing all three front windows with four-pane, double-hung fiberglass windows. Lessler added that the windows on the rest of the house are currently vinyl replacement windows.

Lessler confirmed they planned to replace the existing vinyl-over-wood siding with matching cedar.

The commission discussed adding a sliding door to the rear of the house. It was noted that this side of the house is protected from the view from the street. Lessler confirmed that the windows and door will all be fiberglass, including the window to the right of the new sliding door.

There was further discussion of the columns on the front porch. The commissioners expressed that the design standards would prefer matching the two existing columns rather than replacing all four or having mismatched sizes. During discussion, the applicants stated that the existing columns are deteriorating at their base. Senner referenced Porches Standard 5, which recommends replacing deteriorating or damaged elements in-kind, with a preference for preserving original materials. Lessler proposed replacing the bottom few inches of the posts with matching material.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: Reclaiming the existing front porch intends to bring the porch back to its original design intent. Although there is a lack of photographic evidence, the design intent is evident based on the design of the home, investigation of the interior, and other comparable homes in the district. This project would be returning the front porch to its original state, which is not incompatible with the design standards or the district. The replacement of the windows, given that they are not the original windows, is not inconsistent with the design standards. The proposed materials are listed in the compatibility matrix. The modifications on the side and rear of the home are not inconsistent with the design standards. They are not on the character-defining elevations, and the materials are consistent with the design standards. The one item of question was around the two existing and potential two new columns for the porch. The consensus was that the preferred approach would be to introduce two new columns to match the original columns and, if possible, to repair the existing columns in place. If there are problems repairing the existing columns or procuring new matching columns to fill in where the shed was removed, the applicants will contact staff to discuss how to move forward.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Miller moved to find as fact that the 108 N. Hillsborough Ave. application is in keeping 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; Doors; Porches, Entrances, and Balconies; Exterior Walls. Riek seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the application with conditions. Riek seconded.

Vote: 4-0.

Conditions:

- All new windows and the sliding door will be fiberglass.
- Applicant will investigate procuring matching columns for the front porch. If unable to get custom or off-the-shelf matching columns, applicant will contact staff with evidence and provide alternative solutions.

8. Elect vice chair

Senner opened the floor to nominations.

Motion: Miller nominated Peele for vice chair. Riek seconded.

There was discussion of Peele's nomination and procedures for absences of chair and vice chair.

Vote: 5-0. Abstention: Peele.

9. General updates

There was discussion of amending the definition of quorum in the Unified Development Ordinance to account for vacancies and recusals.

10. Adjournment

Senner adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m. without a vote.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Hoffheimer
Planner
Staff support to the Historic District Commission

Approved: March 4, 2026