

Minutes

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Regular meeting

6:30 p.m. Jan. 10, 2024

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



Present: Chair Will Senner, Vice Chair Mathew Palmer, and members Elizabeth Dicker, G. Miller, Hannah Peele, Sara Riek and Bruce Spencer

Staff: Planner Joseph Hoffheimer and Town Attorney Bob Hornik

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

The mailed notices for Item 6C included the wrong address for the property in question. The property was correctly posted, and the rest of the information in the mailed notices is correct. The meeting agenda lists the correct address for the property, which is 406 W. Margaret Lane (PIN 9864756428). Staff sent corrections, and they have heard no opposition to the situation.

4. Minutes review and approval

Minutes from regular meeting on Dec. 7, 2023.

Motion: Member Bruce Spencer moved approval of the Dec. 7, 2023, minutes as submitted. Member Sara Riek seconded.

Vote: 7-0.

5. Written decisions review and approval

Written decisions from regular meeting on Dec. 7, 2023.

Motion: Member Elizabeth Dicker moved approval of the written decisions from the regular meeting on Dec. 7, 2023, as submitted. Spencer seconded.

Vote: 7-0.

6. New business

A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 202 W. King St.

Applicant is requesting to replace seven existing wood windows with Fibrex windows (PIN 9864965347).

Senner opened the public hearing and asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. Dicker disclosed that she lives across the street from the property but felt she could assess the application without bias.

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

Planner Joseph Hoffheimer was sworn in. Wendi Huffman was sworn in to speak on behalf of the applicant.

Hoffheimer presented the staff report and noted the inventory information, application materials, and applicable design standards would be entered into the record as evidence. He provided the staff comments: Replacement of historic wood windows with materials other than wood requires commission approval, and composite or engineered wood replacement windows are allowed on a case-by-case basis and must be smooth side out.

Hoffheimer also pointed out an existing decorative, character-defining feature below the upper portion of the window in one of the photos, which exists on both sides and the front of the house.

Huffman said that the new window is basically an insert window, and that no trim on the exterior will be touched. The window is a composite material that looks like wood, with mortise and tenon joints, and is made to last 50 years, without the upkeep of wood.

Huffman asserted that the windows are in poor condition. The wood is rotted and the glass has condensation. They are also not flush and are letting in drafts. She acknowledged that there was no formal assessment of the repairability of the current windows.

Huffman confirmed that the proposed windows will be the same size and arrangement of lites. The window will be simulated divided lite, with one pane and an interior and exterior divider to look like separate panes. She confirmed that no light will filter between the dividers.

Huffman confirmed that the proposed windows will be smooth side out.

Senner referenced Design Standard 6 for windows, which states that substitute materials are appropriate only if the window is unable to be replaced in kind. Huffman was not able to confirm whether the homeowner had pursued the option to replace them in kind.

Huffman said that the homeowner chose the proposed windows because of ease of maintenance, energy efficiency — the proposed windows are double-paned — and aesthetics because they look like wood.

The commissioners noted that they were concerned about the lack of a formal assessment or consideration for repairing the windows or replacing them in kind. They mentioned that historic single-pane windows are only allowed to be replaced with double-pane when energy efficiency cannot be attained any other way. The commissioners requested a restoration expert's opinion regarding the feasibility of restoration or in-kind replacement.

Senner offered to either table the application until a later meeting or to vote on the application. Huffman said that it was her understanding that the homeowners would prefer to table the application.

Senner closed the public hearing and called for deliberation.

Motion: Senner moved to table the application until the next meeting. Member G. Miller seconded.

Vote: 7-0.

B. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 309 Mitchell St.

Applicant is proposing to construct a six-foot aluminum fence in the backyard (PIN 9874177729).

Senner opened the public hearing and asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the property in preparation for reviewing this application. No other conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Bill Harris was sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Hoffheimer introduced the staff report. He said that the inventory information, application materials, and applicable design standards would be entered into the record as evidence. Hoffheimer presented the staff comments: Aluminum fences are allowed on a case-by-case basis and require commission approval. The design standards do not directly address gates, so staff recommend applying the standards for Fences and Walls. Further, the commission recently approved another visible aluminum fence at the northwest corner of Queen Street and Churton Street.

Harris introduced the application by saying that he and his wife have lived in the house for eight years and had never intended to put up a fence. However, the deer have been eating their garden and they would like to manage the deer's access to the yard.

Harris confirmed that the neighbor's fence is about six feet high as well. It may be slightly shorter than the proposed fence, but not by much. He also confirmed that he planned to tie into the neighbor's wood fence at the neighbor's request to avoid creating a two-foot gap between the fences. He noted that Charles Burton, the neighbor, had signed off on the application.

The commissioners asked about the chosen material for the proposed fence and asked if any consideration was given to alternate materials such as wrought iron or painted steel, which are allowed in the design standards. Harris said that he had considered cast iron and steel, but that he has experience with aluminum and chose it for its tensile strength and lower maintenance, since it will not rust.

There was discussion of the large gate at the end of the driveway. Harris said that he parks his cars in the driveway, so there will typically be two cars blocking the view of the gate from the street. The commissioners noted that the gate is at the very end of the driveway, almost tucked around the side porch, and that there is some benefit to reduced visibility as to how it is sited.

The commissioners asked whether any alternatives to the gate were considered, such as a removable panel the same profile as the fence. Harris said there were not, and that the fencing company suggested a swing gate to provide access to the back yard.

Many of the commissioners agreed that the proposed gate is not incongruous with the Historic District.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: There were no concerns that the fence would be incongruous with the district based on the design, profile, similar metal fences in the district, siting relative to the house, and how the location of the gate features are sited relative to the rest of the house and the property.

Senner closed the public hearing and called for any additional deliberation.

Motion: Riek moved to find as fact that the 309 Mitchell St. 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: Fences and Walls. Dicker seconded.

Vote: 7-0.

Motion: Miller moved to approve the application as submitted. Vice Chair Mathew Palmer seconded.

Vote: 7-0.

C. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 406 W. Margaret Lane

Applicant is proposing a new rear screened porch, a new second floor rear shed dormer, replacement of the existing rear west patio door with a full glass door, and relocation of a small garage door from the east to the south elevation (PIN 9864756428).

Senner opened the public hearing. He asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the property in preparation for reviewing the application. No additional conflicts of interest were disclosed.

David Cates was sworn in to speak on behalf of the application.

Hoffheimer introduced the staff report and noted the inventory information, application materials, and applicable design standards would be entered into the record as evidence. He mentioned that the existing garage is not in the 2013 update, but in the inventory it is described as "a late 1940s front-gable, frame garage." He provided the staff comments: The design standards require that new additions have a height lower than the original house, but the applicant has provided examples of nearby shed dormer additions that start at the original ridgeline. The commission may also want to ask for clarification of plans for any doors or windows that might be visible through the screens on the rear screened porch addition.

Hoffheimer mentioned that staff was asked for clarification about past approvals for rear dormer additions that start at the ridge line. The two examples that the applicant showed within the vicinity of 406 W. Margaret Lane are located at 216 S. Occoneechee St. and 409 W. King St. 216 S. Occoneechee St. was approved under the current standards in 2022. There was no record of the discussion of that application in the minutes. Those plans were submitted in Microsoft Excel, so there may have been a margin of error at play. 409 W. King St. was approved in 2013 under different standards.

Cates mentioned that he had submitted 404 Calvin St. as another example of a shed dormer addition. Hoffheimer clarified that the photo submitted for 404 Calvin St. was, in fact, 216 S. Occoneechee, but both had similar designs and were done by the same contractor.

Cates introduced the application by providing clarification for the motivation for the rear shed dormer. The homeowners wanted to provide access to the second floor of the house which is currently accessible only by ship's ladder. Initially they wanted a more obvious dormer, but they landed on the proposed design, which is less obvious and tucked in the back of the house.

It was noted that there is an error in the inventory, which states that the structure has vinyl siding. It in fact has German wood siding.

Cates confirmed that there will be no hardscape modifications.

Senner referenced Item 3 in the design standards for Additions to Residential Buildings, which calls for minimizing the site's proportion of constructed to unbuilt area. He mentioned that the lot is already quite small, and the addition of a screened porch adds a fair amount of constructed area. He asked if Cates could reference other densely filled sites in the district.

Cates mentioned 176 W. King St., 189 W. King St., 203 W. Margaret Lane and 114 N. Wake St. as examples of houses that occupy a large portion of the lot. He also mentioned that the house is fully within its setbacks.

There was discussion of visibility of the addition, which is behind the house and away from street view.

Cates confirmed that what looks like a step on the front elevation in the model is a mistake within the model, and he reiterated that there will be no change to the hardscape.

Miller inquired about the relationship between the door and window on the accessory building, noting that they seem inconsistent with the primary residence.

Cates replied that the two doors are in different planes, and that the accessory building is hardly visible from the street because of an elevation difference. He explained that the door is a relocation of the door on the side of the garage because they are trying to eliminate an existing concrete step in the middle of a narrow walkway. He said that this is the only appropriate place to put the door.

Miller said that the placement of the door seemed fine, but that the window should be moved to the left for the proportions to work better.

James Tomberg, a neighbor, was sworn in. He said that his backyard and the applicant's backyard are at corners. He estimated that the garage was built within approximately the past four years.

Declan Camby, a neighbor at 407 W. King St., was sworn in. Camby agreed that the garage was built recently, within the past 10 years. He affirmed that it is not from the 1940s.

The commission reviewed the west elevation. Senner acknowledged the design standard of having a roofline begin below the roofline of the existing structure. He noted that the commission is typically strict about this rule when the ridge is perpendicular to the structure, but that in this case the roofline is clearly subordinate to the structure. The commission members agreed that this design keeps the addition subordinate to the primary structure. They also noted that it is narrower than the main house.

There were questions about the doors on the west elevation fitting between the windows, as the model showed overlaps. Cates confirmed that they will fit properly and still include as much trim as possible. He confirmed that the doors will be evenly spaced between the windows, and that the design is proposed to be more symmetric than it currently is. The commissioners noted that the rear of the west elevation will not be visible from the street since it is tucked behind the structure.

Cates added that there are two single doors on each side of the fireplace that will access the screened porch. They will match the doors on the proposed west elevation, but they are not visible on the rear elevation because the doors are open in the model. However, they are visibly open on the west elevation of the model. He also confirmed that there will be no exterior doors to the screened porch.

The screened porch will be symmetrical, reduced height, wood, screen, and a matching roof material with MiraTEC trim. Cates said that the screened porch will be sitting on posts with air beneath it, and that it will be about 16 inches off the ground.

Cates confirmed that they will reuse the garage door that is being relocated, and that the place where the door is removed will be covered to match the existing siding. He reiterated that there is a step right in front of the door in the very narrow walkway, so the homeowners are trying to mitigate a safety risk.

There was further discussion of the spacing between the window and the door on the garage. Cates said that there is space to center the door between the edge of the window casing and the corner board of the garage to help balance out the proportions.

Senner summarized the commissioners' discussion: He said he had not heard any concerns that the majority of the commission would find incongruous with the district. The dormer has been located in a thoughtful way to maintain the addition's subordinate nature to the primary structure and the screened porch is appropriately located at the rear of the house and inset from the primary structure. All the materials meet the compatibility matrix.

Senner closed the public hearing.

Motion: Dicker moved to find as fact that the 406 W. Margaret Lane 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: Doors; Additions to Residential Buildings; Porches, Entrances, and Balconies; Windows; and Exterior Lighting. Palmer seconded.

Vote: 6-1. Nay: Miller.

Motion: Riek moved to approve the application as submitted. Miller proposed a condition. Riek accepted the condition and moved to approve the application with conditions. Dicker seconded.

Vote: 6-1. Nay: Miller.

Conditions: The door on the south elevation of the garage shall be centered between the window and the right side of the façade.

Miller noted that he does not believe the application meets the standards for Additions to Residential Houses.

D. Certificate of Appropriateness Application: 114 W. Queen St.

Applicant is proposing to add porches to the main house, add an accessory dwelling unit to the brick kitchen structure in the backyard, and construct two sheds in the northeast corner of the property (PIN 9874071780).

Senner opened the public hearing. He asked whether there were any conflicts of interest or bias among the commissioners. All commissioners disclosed that they had visited the property in preparation for reviewing the application. No additional conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Stanford Morris, the applicant, was sworn in.

Hoffheimer introduced the staff report and noted the inventory information, application materials, and applicable design standards would be entered into the record as evidence. He added that the applicant has additional information about the history of the property. He provided the staff comments:

- Staff are not aware of any similar porches in the historic district that have a wall matching the existing structure on one side and screens on the other two. Due to the appearance of the porches, the *Additions* standards may also apply.
- If the porch walls are approved, staff do not necessarily see a conflict with adding new false shutters, since the section would be entirely new and match the existing structure.
- The commission has recently approved new roof overhangs over existing stoops, but the proposed front porch is larger than those.
- The rear elevation for the main house includes a shed dormer addition that is not shown in the existing photo, and the dormer roof does not appear to be inset from the ridgeline of the existing structure.
- The materials for the pathways, paint, and exterior lighting will need to be clarified.
- Staff are not aware of any similarly sited sheds in the historic district and recommend paying particular attention to *New Construction of Outbuildings and Garages* Standards 1 – 4.

Hoffheimer noted that since the agenda went out the applicant had provided documentation of some changes to the proposal, which are included on p. 14-19 of the printed addendum provided for the commissioners. He added that the board would need to determine whether this is a major change, in which case it would need to be separately noticed to neighboring property owners. The change includes a change in dimensions but a reduction in size from what was originally submitted.

Morris said that he appreciated the work of the commission and staff and that he was ready to answer questions and hear the commission's feedback on this project.

There were questions about whether the roof of the house is being raised. Morris responded that the only change to the roofline is the addition of the dormer on the rear.

Morris confirmed that the entire existing shingle roof will be replaced with standing seam metal to match the current color. Hoffheimer said that as long as the color is similar to the existing shingles, this can be approved as a minor work.

Morris confirmed that the existing path in front of the house is concrete and that he planned to replace it with mulch, Chapel Hill gravel. The commissioners responded that Chapel Hill gravel would be an appropriate material.

Morris added that he plans to recreate a pathway that existed between the house and the Burwell School. There is already an existing gate in the fence to allow pass-through between the properties. The steps on the left side of the front elevation will be added, and the path and steps would mirror 116 Queen St., which is made of packed earth with stones. Morris noted his intent to complement neighboring properties.

Morris said the addition would have a band of brick foundation to match the existing foundation.

Morris said he plans to relocate a window from the back of the house to the front and to replace the window with a door in the rear.

There was a discussion of mixing solid wall materials with a screened porch. Morris said that the front side of the porch would be a continuation of the existing Hardie plank to give the porch privacy from the street since it will be off a bedroom. The other two sides of the porch will be screened. He also mentioned considering a knee-wall of siding on the screen sides with a screen on top.

The commissioners recognized the need to evaluate the change in material from the front elevation to the side elevation and said that they would like to see examples of this being done in the district. Hoffheimer noted that staff are not aware of any records in Hillsborough or in other historic districts of a front wall with two screened walls. He said that some districts may have standards that state that the outside of a structure should be honest to its use, but he could not find that language within the Hillsborough Historic District Design Standards.

Morris noted his intent to make the addition tie in seamlessly with the rest of the structure. The commissioners clarified that additions to residential buildings are supposed to be clearly distinct from the original structure.

There was discussion of contributing versus non-contributing structures, and Hoffheimer clarified that windows in this house can be treated differently than historic wood windows.

There were questions about the siting of the porch to keep it less visible from the street. Morris said the placement of the porch is due to the slope of the land and drainage of water. The commissioners asked whether Morris had considered other strategies to mitigate running water. Morris said he had looked into French drains and sump pumps but also appreciated the functionality of a side porch. The commission reconfirmed that the Historic District Commission does not consider drainage as a factor in their assessment of applications.

Privacy alternatives for a three-sided screened porch were suggested, including interior privacy screens landscaping for privacy, which would potentially be more congruous than a false wall.

The commissioners agreed that there were a significant number of tweaks that would justify cleaning up the documentation and tabling the proposal for a future meeting. They mentioned that they would like to see more documentation and details about the proposal because they were having a hard time picturing what the house will look like after these changes. They also noted that it would be helpful to see examples of similar designs in the Historic District. The commission agreed to proceed with providing feedback on the proposal so Morris could make changes to improve the application.

There were questions about the addition of a front porch and how the planned porch would speak to the existing structure and tie into the existing roofline. Morris confirmed that there will be a ceiling under the porch, made of beadboard painted light blue. He confirmed that the material for the porch will be plain gray, poured concrete.

After discussing the porch, the commissioners agreed that the style of the house is somewhat unique in the district, so they would be willing to look at examples of other Dutch Colonial houses with a similar front porch, even if they are not within the district.

The commissioners noted that the front elevation is a character-defining elevation, and that there are many standards that call for hesitancy in making changes to character-defining elevations.

There were questions about the well in the front elevation. Morris said that the bottom part of the well exists, and that the top part would be added.

The commissioners requested that in a future submission Morris provide clear indication of what already exists and what changes will be made so they can easily compare the existing structure to the proposed project and will not miss any details. They also requested that Morris indicate what materials would be used. They recommended that Morris consult the example proposal posted on the website as an example for distinguishing between existing and new features.

Morris said that the dormer would be built to add light into a current storage area, and that the windows would be wood and would be reclaimed from a place like the Habitat Re-Store. Senner reminded Morris to work with staff if there is any variability in the proposed window material.

There was discussion of the rear porch. Morris clarified that there will be a flat roof with a railing to provide egress from the second floor onto the porch. The existing dormer will become a door onto the porch. The railing material would be wood pickets painted to match the existing sage green trim. There would be no stairs from the balcony. He said the inclusion of the porch is to move water out away from the back door and foundation. The commissioners recalled a porch with a balcony in the rear of a house that came before the commission a few years ago on East Queen Street.

The commissioners asked whether Morris had considered skylights in the storage room instead of a full dormer. Morris said he decided against skylights because he wants to avoid leaks.

Morris confirmed that the porch on the western elevation will have a screen door at the rear to give access to the porch. The slope of the terrain allows the floor of the porch to be flush with the ground at that point.

On the east side elevation, Morris noted that the new window on the second floor next to the chimney will be the window that came out of the rear dormer. There was discussion that the placement of the window looks off-balance.

Morris confirmed that the roof added to the stoop on the east elevation will be a simple straight, angled post, even though the drawing makes the post look more ornate from the east elevation compared to the rear elevation.

There was discussion of the lites of the windows in the side of the back porch. Morris said that he does not know the details of the windows yet because he plans to find them at the Habitat Re-Use store. It was suggested that the porch could become a three-sided screened porch and then windows would not be necessary.

The commissioners expressed concern that putting porches on this house might cause it to lose some of its historic character. Morris said he would bring example photos to address that concern. The commissioners suggested that the design standards make it easier to determine rear porches to be not incongruous, compared with front or side porches.

Senner added that to the extent possible, it would be helpful if examples shared with the commission are from historic districts. He clarified that just because examples exist does not mean the element will fit with the design standards and the character of the house.

There was discussion of the proposed new path and the attempt to replicate a historic feature. The commissioners agreed that if the proposed path falls within the design standards, it can be approved. However, if it falls outside the design standards, documentation would be needed to justify it on the grounds of being a historic element.

There was discussion about the proposed shutters. Commissioners determined that since the building has existing shutters that are non-functioning, it would not be incongruous to add the shutters.

There was discussion of having a large front porch over a Dutch Colonial style house. Hoffheimer mentioned that there was one front porch approved in the last five years at 332 W. Tryon St. He said there are many examples of front porches in the district that the commission might not approve if it were brought before them today.

Miller confirmed that the green lines on the site plan are existing wood fences, and that there will be no new walks in the rear.

The commissioners moved to discussion of the Strudwick Kitchen.

Morris said that the previous owners of the house had an apartment attached to the kitchen that they rented to university students.

The commissioners discussed the massing of the addition and whether it would be clearly subordinate to the kitchen as the primary structure. Morris said that the original structure is 20 feet x 16 feet, and the proposed structure is 26 feet x 26 feet. He mentioned that he had worked with David Cates to design the accessory dwelling unit, and that it had been designed so the original structure clearly stands out. The commissioners agreed that they would prefer there be a separation or a breezeway between the addition and the kitchen so the original structure can be clearly seen. Morris confirmed that it would be possible to separate the two.

Morris said that the patios on the sides of the kitchen were included to stabilize foundation of the brick walls of the kitchen. They will be concrete slabs with brick borders. Morris mentioned he had discussed the project with Wayne Johnson, an expert in historic brick structures, who said the alternative to concrete slabs is to pull out and repoint each brick, which because of the compression of the brick and the mortar required, is cost prohibitive. The commissioners requested a short letter or statement from Johnson or another expert stating their opinion about shoring up the foundation.

Morris said the slab of the patio extends past the side of the house to be in line with the chimney and a fence which will tie into the corner of the kitchen and the house. Some of the fencing already exists, but the portion that ties into the kitchen will be new.

The commissioners asked about the square footage of the house compared with the accessory dwelling unit. Morris said that the kitchen and its addition will be 996 square feet, and the house is 1,865 square feet.

There was discussion of the material of the patios. Hoffheimer said the rear patio could be approved as a minor work if it is fully removable. Morris suggested he could use brick pavers on top of the concrete. Some commissioners expressed that they felt the design would be less incongruous if it had brick pavers on top.

There was discussion of the concrete steps for accessing the crawl space. The commissioners agreed that the steps were sited in a good spot in the rear of the structure.

There was discussion of the spacing of the windows on the west side. The commissioners commented that the windows seem very close to the sides of the addition. Morris suggested making the addition smaller so the windows could have some more room.

There was discussion of the transom windows in the middle of the south elevation. Morris explained that they were designed to provide light while giving privacy to the apartment from the main house, as they would be located 7 feet up on the wall. The commissioners noted their concern that this seems like a mix of styles on this character-defining elevation of the structure. There was discussion of the internal consistency of the design and the orientation of the design elements.

The commission moved on to discussion of the sheds. They agreed that the modifications in the newly submitted design would not be significant enough of a change to warrant submitting new notice to neighboring property owners. Town Attorney Bob Hornik added that the sheds are such subordinate structures that they would not warrant new notice.

The commissioners discussed the siting of the sheds. Morris said the revised siting of the sheds was intended to retain the view for the neighbors at 304 N. Churton St. He said the sheds will sit 20 feet from the property line, and that the neighbors have a shed about the same size that is seven feet from the property line, with the house sitting another 10-12 feet from there.

There was discussion of whether there might be confusion about whether these structures belong to a neighboring house. Morris said he has talked with the neighbors about this plan, and it was noted that all required public notice was made. It was also noted that the fence makes it clear which property the outbuildings are on.

Hoffheimer noted a staff concern that the sheds were intended to blend in with the Burwell School, and that the Burwell School uses the applicant's property for events. He expressed concern that these structures might be misconstrued as part of the historic Burwell property. The commissioners agreed that the proposed red roofs of the sheds would be more compatible with the Burwell School than with the applicant's house. They suggested changing the proposed roof color to match the house to alleviate potential confusion.

Motion: Miller moved to table the application until the next meeting. Senner seconded.
Vote: 7-0.

7. Alliance for Historic Hillsborough board seat

Hoffheimer announced that there is a seat on the Alliance for Historic Hillsborough board reserved for a Historic District Commission member, which has not been filled for a while. Riek expressed interest in the position.

8. General updates

Modifications to the design standards will be discussed at a future meeting. The discussion was postponed due to the number of applications on the agenda this month.

Hoffheimer gave an update about the side entrance at 100 S. Churton St. He said the owners are not going to move forward with the approved design right now and are proposing to use a different wooden door instead of the double doors that are currently there.

It was noted that there is a new fence at the house at Margaret Lane and South Occoneechee Street. The fence received minor works approval from staff.

Dicker noted that she will be absent next meeting.

9. Adjournment

Senner adjourned the meeting at 9:32 p.m. without a vote.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph Hoffheimer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Joseph" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Hoffheimer".

Joseph Hoffheimer
Planner
Staff support to the Historic District Commission

Approved: Month X, 202X