

# Minutes

## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Regular meeting

6:30 p.m. Oct. 1, 2025

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



Present: Chair Will Senner and members G. Miller, Sara Riek, Bill Warren and Daniel Widis

Absent: Vice Chair Hannah Peele

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

There were no changes to the agenda.

### 4. Minutes review and approval

Minutes from regular meeting on Sept. 3, 2025.

Motion: Member G. Miller moved to approve the minutes from the regular meeting on Sept. 3, 2025, with corrections. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

Corrections:

- Pg. 2, paragraph 2, second sentence: Change to "It was clarified that town sewer is not required for this lot..."
- Pg. 4, first paragraph, last sentence: Change to "Senner mentioned that because those larger trees are preserved..."
- Pg. 8, paragraph 9, first sentence: Change to "Miller raised the question of whether the west-facing facade..."

### 5. Old business

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 311 W. Orange St.  
New construction house (PIN 9864883297).

Planner Joseph Hoffheimer said that the applicant has requested to continue the item to the November 5 regular meeting.

Motion: Senner moved to continue the 311 W. Orange St. application until the Nov. 5, 2025, regular meeting. Miller seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 208 S. Cameron St.  
West-facing addition in existing courtyard area (PIN 9874153612).

Senner reopened the public hearing.

Hoffheimer provided the staff comments:

- This application was continued from the September meeting. On Sept. 24, 2025, the applicant submitted a revised narrative, revised materials, revised elevations, and an alternative proposal for the revised brick color. All changes are indicated in the revised submittal documents.
- Staff still have general concerns about the plans to enclose the terrace and remain unaware of any similar commercial additions in the historic district.

Drew Wilgus introduced the changes to the application. He said most of the HVAC units, including the tallest ones, have been relocated to the north side of the building to be out of the way of public view. He added that this allows for more visibility of the dormers.

Wilgus said the changes in the application address the commissioners' concerns about the distinction between the old and new portions of the building. He said they planned to continue the existing foundation material into the addition, following their understanding of the design standards. He said that the awning has been changed to be shallower and with a more modern design.

Wilgus described the new parapet, which is now proposed to be about 18 inches tall, and the set-back gasket portions at the transition between the existing building and new addition end at roof level. He said the gaskets are meant to distinguish the center piece of the addition from the existing sides of the building.

Wilgus said the applicants were unable to find precedent for this exact scenario of the enclosure of a terrace on a commercial building.

He said the brick on the new addition is now proposed to be a buff color, and that the warmth of the color of the new brick and mortar are meant to complement the warmth of the existing brick.

Wilgus said the windows and lintels have a soldier course detailing to complement the existing detailing. He said the trim metal will be a bronze color to tie in with the existing patinaed copper.

Wilgus said the windows and doorways are now proposed to be aluminum storefront to distinguish the addition and reflect the current time of construction. He said the railings will be a picket style as shown before, painted bronze to match the trim metal.

Wilgus said the roofing is the same as in the previous version of the proposed design. He said the site plan and footprint have not changed.

Wilgus said the Board of Adjustment had approved a variance for the proposed ramp since the last meeting.

Wilgus showed the revised elevation showing the single remaining HVAC unit, which is placed so it does not obstruct the dormers in either elevation view or from the ground.

Wilgus said the continuation of the foundation brick helps to blend the new ramp into the facade, and that vegetative screening has been added in front of the ramp and in front of the relocated HVAC units at the northwest corner.

The commissioners expressed appreciation for the thoroughness and clarity of the submitted materials. Senner expressed appreciation for the thought and effort that went into developing the solution to move the HVAC units. Member Daniel Widis said he found the new design to incorporate an elegant solution to the differentiation between the new addition and the old building. He said he found the new brick color and the new window design to contribute to that differentiation. Senner agreed and added that the more modern canopy also helped to make the distinction. There was general agreement that either of the two proposed brick colors would be congruous with the district.

Miller said he found the removal of the gable to improve the congruity of the parapet. He said that he understands the recommendation to distinguish between old and new to be focused more on a historical context, and that the distinction is less important in this instance when both old and new are both modern.

Member Sara Riek referenced Additions to Commercial Buildings Design Standard 4, which recommends designing the addition to preserve the overall character of the building. She said she finds the new design to be more consistent with this design standard, and that moving the HVAC units to ground level allows the character of the building to be better preserved.

There was discussion of the approach of infilling the existing courtyard to build the addition. Senner said that it is understandable that there is not much precedent for this approach given that there are few commercial buildings in the historic district in the first place, and fewer with this type of shape with a courtyard. He said in his opinion thought and care has gone into designing this addition that is consistent with the design standards and congruous with the district. Senner said that in the absence of precedent, he feels comfortable relying on the commissioners' judgment of congruity. Member Bill Warren said that because the building is not historic, he sees the infilling of the courtyard to be less incongruous. Widis agreed, saying the purpose of the courtyard is up to the users of the building, and that it can be left up to them to decide whether infilling meets the needs of the building and its users. He said he would feel differently if this were a community amenity used by the public.

Miller said he finds the facade to be a character-defining view, and he believes enclosing the courtyard to have a major impact on the character of the building, against the recommendations of the design standards. He said he thinks the courtyard was integral to the original design of the building, and that the proposed design changes the feel of the building from a historical perspective.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: The applicant has submitted a revised design to address the commissioners' comments regarding more intentionality in differentiating the addition from the original building, eliminating elements that are artificial in nature, and taking steps to minimize the aesthetic impact to the west facade to the extent possible.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Riek moved to find as fact that the 208 S. Cameron 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 are

consistent with the Historic District Design Standards: Exterior Walls; Windows; Doors; Roofs; Accessibility and Life Safety; Additions to Commercial Buildings; Utilities; Walkways, Driveways, and Off-Street Parking; and Awnings and Canopies. Senner seconded.

Vote: 4-1. Nay: Miller.

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

Vote: 4-1. Nay: Miller.

Condition: The brick color will be one of the two presented in the proposal.

Miller noted that his opposition to approving the application is based on Additions to Commercial Buildings Design Standards 1 and 4.

## 6. New business

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 330 W. King St.  
Construct new detached garage (PIN 9864769302).

Senner opened the public hearing. He asked if 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. Nathan Pittenger was 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:

- Older iterations of the historic inventory note a shed constructed in the 1930s on the property, but the most recent one does not. The materials on the shed proposed for removal are more recent.
- At the time the packet was sent out, the garage door material, window glass application, paint colors, retaining wall material, and proposed light fixtures still needed to be confirmed. The applicant later sent an email with an update on many of those elements. Staff noted the polystyrene insulated door, which is not addressed in the design standards. He said the commercial grade retaining wall material will also need to be confirmed.

Pittenger introduced the proposed project by explaining that the materials of the siding will match the house. He said the windows will be aluminum-clad wood. He explained that two different garage doors were proposed, with the intent of getting feedback from the commissioners about which would be most congruous. He said the polystyrene door has a wood-like look with skylight windows. He said he could not find any similar examples of new detached garages around the historic district.

Pittenger presented the site plan, including some trees to be removed that are less than 24 inches in diameter. He said the retaining wall will be 6 to 7 feet high and will be built from 8-inch x 14-inch, 80-lb. stacked blocks. He confirmed the wall will have a cap. He confirmed the showing edge will be the rougher edge with a split-face look. Pittenger said the wall will be 3 to 4 feet from the building, per code. He confirmed that none of the wall will be visible from public view, but he said the neighboring house on the west side will be able to see the wall from the back yard. Pittenger clarified that there is grade at the site, which does not show up clearly in the photos. He said the land grades up 6 feet from the driveway to the existing concrete pad.

Pittenger confirmed that all trees being removed are under the 24-inch threshold.

Pittenger said he did not know the square footage of the main house. He said the garage will be 28 feet x 32 feet and will be 1600 square feet total. The commissioners observed that the existing house has a large footprint on a relatively large lot, so there was not concern that the new garage would overwhelm the existing house or the site. It was noted that the garage is appropriately sited to the rear of the lot. The commissioners generally agreed that the massing and siting were appropriate.

Pittenger said he spoke with two electricians who gave two separate options for the electric pole. He said the wire comes in from North Occoneechee Street, and that one option is to put the electric meter on the south side of the garage and run the wire underground to the panel in the house. He said the other option is to install a pole on the south side of the garage and run a wire underground to the house and another one underground back to the panel in the garage.

Pittenger confirmed there will be no other materials introduced to the site beyond the garage and the gravel walkway.

The commissioners reviewed the right and front elevations. Pittenger confirmed the siding will be horizontal.

Pittenger said the finish material on the Option 1 garage door would be aluminum with a wood look finish. The commissioners were not concerned with the compatibility of the garage door materials, as they are listed within the compatibility matrix.

Pittenger clarified that the elevations show 9-over-9 windows, but that the actual windows will not have muntins. He said the house has a variety of window styles, with some 3-over-1 and some 1-over-1. He said the proposed work reflects the 1-over-1 windows of the existing house.

Pittenger said there will be one light on each side of the garage door, and he will need to confirm how many lights will go above the car entry doors on the garage, which he said he will communicate with staff about.

The commissioners reviewed the left and rear elevations. Pittenger reconfirmed the siding will be horizontal and the windows will be 1-over-1.

There was discussion of the options of a parged versus a brick foundation. The proposed work includes a parged foundation, but the existing house has a brick foundation. The commissioners were not concerned with the congruity of a parged foundation, since the garage will be tucked back in the rear of the site with minimal visibility. They said it would also differentiate the new addition from the existing historic structure.

On the typical wall section, Pittenger confirmed that the soffit will be aluminum, but that the plans show a call-out to a vinyl soffit. He clarified that that was a typical detail that did not get updated, in error.

There was discussion of the age of the existing shed. Senner said that although the age of the shed is unknown, all evidence points to the shed being built significantly more recently than the house. Pittenger confirmed that he believes the shed to be newer based on the materials used on the exterior and the

roof. He confirmed that the structure inside also appears to be newer, and there is no indication that the shed was renovated from a historic structure.

There was discussion of the congruity of the overall plans, especially given the siting of the garage so far back on the site and its minimal public visibility.

Pittenger confirmed there will be no changes to the driveway, but there will be a concrete apron in front of the garage.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: The commissioners did not find any elements of the proposal that were incongruous with the historic district. The garage was massed and sited appropriately for the house and the lot, consistent with the design standards and other garages in the district at the rear of the property. The materials were all consistent with the compatibility matrix and compatible with both the historic district and the main house. The applicant provided clarification that the windows would be 1-over-1 instead of 9-over-9 as shown. The commissioners found that either of the two garage options would be consistent with the design standards and the compatibility matrix, the first option being wood-look aluminum.

Senner re-opened the public hearing.

Pittenger agreed to send a lighting cut sheet to staff.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Miller moved to find as fact that the 330 W. King 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 are consistent with the Historic District Design Standards: New Construction of Outbuildings and Garages; and Fences and Walls. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

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

Vote: 5-0.

Conditions:

- Windows will be 1-over-1.
- A cut sheet of the lights will be sent to staff for approval.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 332 W. Tryon St.

Add two shed dormers to the rear roof and construct a small pool in the back yard (PIN 9864883297).

Senner opened the public hearing. He asked if 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.

Anton Wilson and David Cates were sworn in to speak on behalf of the application. Cam Cover, a neighbor across the street, was not sworn in, but she said that she and other neighbors had no concerns about 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. There were no staff comments on the application. Hoffheimer reminded the commissioners that the landscaping and fencing could be approved as a minor work and that staff had no objections to those parts.

Cates began by submitting two emails from other neighbors in support of the proposal.

The commissioners reviewed the site plan. Senner noted that it is not shown on the site plan, but there is a fair bit of existing vegetation that is located east of the existing driveway pull-in that provides screening toward the area of the proposed pool. Cates added that there is a lot of vegetation around the perimeter of the yard.

Cates clarified that the “steps as necessary” comment refers to an extension of the existing brick steps. He said one or two additional brick steps may need to be built.

Cates addressed the note on the site plan “Exist. metal fence to be adjusted as necessary.” He said the existing fence is too close to where the pool is proposed to be sited, so the fence will likely need to be moved east a few feet. He confirmed the fencing material would remain the same. Cates clarified that the northern part of the fence intersects with another gated fence on the west side, and that the enclosure will meet pool fencing requirements, as it is 48 inches high.

The commissioners reviewed the rear elevation. It was observed that these elevations are in the rear of the property, and that the applicant had raised the point that there are many instances of rear dormer additions in the historic district. It was noted that this is a corner lot, but acknowledged that rear dormers are congruous with the district.

Cates said the design took the existing dormer and duplicated it, which was intended to add some symmetry to the imbalanced existing design. It was noted by commissioners that the single dormer is not a historic element, so modification is more appropriate than if it were historic.

It was acknowledged that the proposed design follows many of the design standards: the addition is on non-character-defining elevations; the scale is proportional and does not overpower the primary building; the addition preserves the overall character; it is subordinate to the roofline; the windows are compatible with the existing structure; and the materials are compatible.

The commissioners reviewed the west elevation. Cates addressed the reason behind changing the siding on the existing dormer. He said the most recent rear addition was built with board and batten, and the homeowners wanted to relate that dormer to the vintage of the new addition and distinguish it from the rest of the existing house. He explained that all three sides of the existing dormer will be re clad to match the new dormers.

The commissioners reviewed the east elevation.

Cates said the standing seam roof over the small portion of roof in the rear is a common architectural style, which helps to provide some contrast. He said the existing roof over the most recent kitchen addition was standing seam, so the homeowners wanted to connect those elements stylistically.

Cates said there will be minimal grade change over the course of the retaining wall. Cates confirmed the grade falls off to the east, and the commissioners acknowledged that the visibility of the wall will be minimal.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: There were no elements of the application that the commissioners found concerning. The commissioners appreciate that the dormers have been added to the rear of the property in a way that is not overpowering of the primary structure, with materials that are compatible with the compatibility matrix and consistent with the design guidelines of the historic district. While the existing dormer is being modified and reclad, it is not a historic element. The proposed pool is in the rear of the property and sited in a way that is consistent with the design standards and compatible with the historic district. The adjustment of the existing fence is consistent with the design standards.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Riek moved to find as fact that the 332 W. Tryon 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 are consistent with the Historic District Design Standards: Additions to Residential Buildings; Site Features and Plantings; Walkways, Driveways, and Off-Street Parking; and Fences and Walls. Senner seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

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

Vote: 5-0.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 319 W. Margaret Lane  
Add ground-floor suite and deck and revise roof deck (PIN 9864852733).

The public hearing was not formally opened.

Fred Stewart was sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Senner 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 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 applicant has confirmed that the new siding and trim will be wood, matching the existing in size and color, and the roofing will be fiberglass, asphalt shingle in medium gray color.
- The windows will be aluminum-clad wood in white to match existing as closely as possible.
- Trellises are not directly mentioned in the standards but are allowed as minor works.



Stewart said the two main objectives of the project were to add a ground-floor suite for aging in place and to take better advantage of the view and connection to the back yard. He said that in the process the homeowners hope to better integrate the look of the back roof deck into the design of the rest of the house.

Stewart said the foundation of the existing house is painted concrete block, so the proposed plan matches those foundation materials. He presented the site plan and new footprint.

Stewart addressed the existing window on the east side of the house that is proposed to be infilled.

Stewart addressed the differentiation between the existing house and the addition. He said the gable on the east side, from an addition in the 1980s, is flatter than the rest of the gables, so rather than adding a third design ethos by adding something even more modern looking, he chose to duplicate the flatter gable, which he said will be read as different from the rest of the Queen Anne Victorian style of the rest of the existing house. He said the addition will be visible from the street. Stewart showed where the previous addition was located on the floor plan, which he believes to be the entire southern portion of the house. He confirmed that the roofline is the main feature that will distinguish the addition from the rest of the house. It was observed by commissioners that the positioning of the addition helps to distinguish it, since it is set off to the side of the original house. There was general agreement that the addition does not look like it was built as part of the original house.

The commissioners reviewed the front elevation.

Stewart confirmed that the roof deck will remain, but that the overhang is being removed, so the deck will be narrowed slightly.

It was observed that the addition is substantially set back from the front facade of the house and is clearly subordinate to the existing structure in massing, scale, and location. There was not concern that the addition detracts from the character defining elements of the front facade.

Stewart confirmed the post that is visible from the front of the house will be painted wood and will be the same materials and dimensions as the existing porch posts. He clarified they will be square like the porch posts, but not round like the front portico posts.

The commissioners reviewed the east elevation.

The commissioners reviewed the south elevation. Stewart said the white sliding doors will be aluminum-clad.

The commissioners reviewed the west elevation.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: There was no concern among the commissioners about elements that might be incongruous with the historic district or inconsistent with the design standards. The proposed addition is set back from the front facade, distinguished from the primary massing of the original home in a way that does not detract from the character of the front facade. It is distinguished from the primary structure through its roofline, as read from the front of the house. The materials being used are all consistent with the compatibility matrix and congruent with the original home and other homes in the district.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Widis moved to find as fact that the 319 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: Additions to Residential Buildings; Decks; Doors; and Windows. Riek seconded.

Vote: 5-0.

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

Vote: 5-0.

#### **7. Elect officers**

There was discussion of the process for election of officers for next year.

Hoffheimer assumed the chair. He opened the floor for nominations by board members for the chair.

Nomination: Miller nominated Senner for role of chair. Warren seconded. Senner accepted the nomination.

Vote: 5-0. Abstained: Senner.

The commissioners postponed the election of vice chair until the next meeting.

#### **8. General updates**

Hoffheimer provided updates about required Certified Local Government reporting.

There was discussion of the town's parking study.

#### **8. Adjournment**

Senner adjourned the meeting at 7:53 p.m. without a vote.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Hoffheimer  
Planner  
Staff support to the Historic District Commission

Approved: December 3, 2025