

**Historic Preservation Commission**  
**Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 5:30 pm**

A regular meeting of the City of Hickory's Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) was held on Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 5:30 pm, in Council Chambers of the Julian G. Whitener Municipal Bldg.

**Members Present:** Katherine Mull, Dale Rockensuess, Sam Hunt, Kim Menzies, Dan Rink, Dan O'Malley, Simon Lucas, Mary Moorer, and Ernie Sills

**Members Excused:** none

**Members Absent:** Emily Greene

**Others Present:** Senior City Planner Ross Zelenske, Deputy City Attorney Arnita Dula, and Minutes Clerk Anne Starnes

**Call to Order:** Katherine Mull, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

**Roll Call:** Ross Zelenske called the roll and stated a quorum was present.

**Approval of October 22, 2019 Minutes:** Minutes of the previous meeting held in October 2019 were distributed to members in advance. No additions, deletions or corrections were stated. Ernie Sills moved, seconded by Mary Moorer, to approve the October 22, 2019 minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**Items of Correspondence:**

**CLG Annual Report** – The Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report was submitted in December, but Mr. Zelenske had not yet received comments back from the state. It was submitted on time, and hopefully they will make positive comments on the Commission's work last year.

**PNC Conference** – In November, Mr. Zelenske and Mr. Rink attended the Preservation North Carolina Annual Conference in Raleigh. Mr. Zelenske will advise members of any upcoming training opportunities, but said Mr. Rink's conference attendance should count as one of the Commission's two CLG training credits needed, so only one more member needs to attend a training this year. The state recently had some staff turnover, and Mr. Zelenske was unsure where future trainings now stand. Before moving to Atlanta, Amber Stimpson had coordinated all of the local government trainings for the State Historic Preservation Office.

**COA Report** – The 2019 COA Report was included in members' agenda packets. Mr. Zelenske said the Commission was not extremely busy during calendar year 2019, with three major COAs and 3-4 minor ones.

**Oakwood Signage** – This year's work plan includes the bronze plaque program, street sign toppers, and pole signage for the recent Oakwood Historic District Expansion. Mr. Zelenske is working with the City's Street Department on the signage. The sign toppers have been ordered, and will be installed after they are made. They should go up soon, in both the current Oakwood National Register Historic District and the expanded area. He is also working on approval of the pole signage. The plaque program is going well, with approximately 40 plaques ordered this year. They budgeted for 80 plaques, with payments set up on a 50-50 ratio of the homeowner and City paying for each plaque. He expects to send out another mailer soon.

**Bond Commission Update:** Mr. Sills reported the Riverwalk bids came in considerably over budget, so the project is now being redesigned. There are difficulties involved in grading such a steep slope, and they had to go back to the drawing board. Mr. Sills said it would now be more of an elevated walkway. Mr. Zelenske said a third tenant in the Trivium Corporate Center was recently announced, Cataler North America Corp., and

interest in the business park is still strong. The City Walk is under construction, with most of the current work being at the western end, and moving east. He shared copies of the “Crafting Hickory” publication with members, which was distributed as a *Hickory Daily Record* insert on Sunday, January 19, 2020. Mr. Sills noted the Book Walk project is moving along. It will pass by a new public art installation at the entrance to Sam Davis Field, in recognition of the 1964 Ridgeview High School football team, “The Untouchables.” The Ridgeview High team earned the nickname by not being scored on during their entire season, and Mr. Davis was their coach.

**Approval of FY 2020-21 Work Plan:** A copy of the draft work plan proposed for next year was included in the agenda packet. Mr. Zelenske said the Commission had requested a substantial budget last year, but quite a bit of the budget was funding for the new historic district signage. He said the initial plan was to have two phases for the signage, but it all came in under budget and he was able to pay for it from the current budget. Phase 2 will not be included in the next work plan. He must submit the work plan to the budget office next week, so members need to make any changes and approve it today.

Mr. Zelenske said he has proposed a similar work plan to the current year, but with a lower budget of \$7,800. He reviewed details of the budget and work plan, and recorded any changes. The bronze plaque program funding will be \$2,000, allowing the City to fund up to another 40 plaques. He was uncertain what type of new project the members might want to take on next year, and has included \$3,000 in the budget. They have created one historic walking tour, and maybe a second one could be discussed.

Mr. Zelenske and his predecessor, Dave Leonetti, discussed doing some “strategic survey work” along the City Walk and railroad corridor to take a closer look at those buildings. They would need to hire an architectural historian to consider what could be tied in with the bond projects, and help spur private redevelopment through National Register designation, which would then be eligible for tax credits. He suggested the cost of hiring an architectural historian would be approximately \$3-4,000. An alternative would be the two other districts, Hillcrest and Timberland Terrace/Fox Circle. Mr. Zelenske was thinking of moving on that project sooner, rather than later, since there is currently money in the budget for it. He put \$3,000 in the proposed draft, but could increase it to \$4-5,000.

Mr. Rockensuess said he remembered the budget being more around \$10,000 for the past several years, and Mr. Zelenske said it had fluctuated, from \$11,000 down to \$8,000, and up to \$14-15,000 for the current year, but he expects to come in under budget this year. He noted it is important for the Commission to spend the budget they receive. Mr. Rockensuess suggested that having a budget of \$10-11,000 would be better, because members would have some flexibility with their budget. In some past years where \$11,000 was budgeted, Mr. Zelenske said only \$6-7,000 was spent, and again, the budget provided by City Council needs to be spent by the Commission. Mr. Rockensuess suggested a total budget of \$9-10,000 for next year, so that members could help Patrick Daily or another group with a project, if they should ask for help.

Ernie Sills moved, seconded by Dale Rockensuess, to approve the proposed FY 2020-21 budget and work plan, but increasing the budget from \$7,800 to \$9,000. The motion carried unanimously.

**Quasi-Judicial Training:** Mr. Zelenske said Deputy City Attorney Arnita Dula was present for the training session for Historic Preservation Commission members. He referred to PowerPoint slides during his presentation, and reviewed slide #2 (Types of Hearings).

- Legislative
  - Making a decision based on public policy
  - Recommendations to City Council
- Quasi-Judicial
  - Making a determination based on existing legal standards and evidence presented
  - Functions like a court case
  - Decisions on Certificates of Appropriateness

Mr. Zelenske said legislative hearings are more policy related. He said recommendations to City Council would specifically include those related to the National Register, noting the Commission has no policy-making authority. Ms. Mull asked if these are open to public comment, and Mr. Zelenske said yes, if it is a public hearing, but typically, there is not a lot of public input. When the Design Review Guidelines were amended, a public hearing was held but no one except for members and staff attended. Quasi-judicial ones make up the majority of the Commission's hearings, and COAs are the main type of these hearings. He said "quasi" means "like court."

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #3 (Differences between Hearings).

	<b>Legislative</b>	<b>Quasi-Judicial</b>
<b>Type of hearing</b>	Legislative (policymaking)	Evidentiary
<b>Evidence</b>	None	Witness testimony
<b>Findings</b>	Generally none	Written findings of fact; must address contested facts
<b>Standards</b>	Establishes standards	Can only apply standards already in Place (Guidelines)
<b>Conditions</b>	Generally not permitted	Allowed if based on standard in the Ordinance
<b>Conflicts of Interest</b>	Requires direct, substantial, identifiable financial interest	Any financial interest, bias, or undisclosed ex parte communication

He said the members are essentially replacing a judge during quasi-judicial hearings, and must weigh the witness testimony and evidence in making their decisions.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #4 (Ethical Concerns).

- Quasi judicial proceedings require ethical behavior to ensure fairness
  - No ex-parte communication/behavior
  - No conflicts of interest
  - No Commissioner bias
- Legislative proceedings have a less intense ethical standard, but conflicts of interest should be avoided in general

Mr. Zelenske said ethical behavior is required, with no ex-parte communications taking place outside of the hearing. Conflicts of interest, such as financial ties, must be shared with the Commission, and having an opinion of the applicant, or the particular property, could be construed as a Commission member having bias. He said there are less concerns regarding legislative proceedings, but if a member thinks there is an issue, they should disclose it and consider recusing themselves.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slides #5–6 (Ex Parte Behavior).

- Who can a Commissioner speak with about a COA prior to the hearing?
  - Another Commissioner?
  - Applicant?
  - Adjacent Property Owner?
  - City staff?

Prior to a hearing, Mr. Zelenske said it is only appropriate to discuss a COA with staff.

- When does the clock start?
  - When an application is received

Mr. Zelenske said a Commission member who is a historic property owner might talk with a neighbor who shares that they are considering building an addition to the back of their home. He recommends telling the neighbor to call the City to discuss the project; technically, they have not applied for a COA yet, so it is not official, but Ms. Dula said that, depending on the level of their discussion, possibly the HPC member has already formed an opinion and should consider recusing themselves from the hearing. Mr. Zelenske said it is his job to help guide the applicant through the process.

- Can the Commissioner visit the subject property prior to the hearing?
  - Yes, but they must disclose this during the beginning of the hearing and state any findings
  - Commissioners may not trespass on private property

In discussing the importance not to trespass on private property, Mr. Zelenske noted the issue of insurance coverage. In the event a HPC member is injured while on the property, the City's insurance would not cover them.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #7 (Conflicts of Interest and Bias).

- Can a Commissioner hear a case regarding a family member?
  - No family members
- How about an adjacent neighbor? Fellow church parishioner? Business partner?
  - No business partners
  - Neighbors and friends are a maybe

Mr. Zelenske said that talking with neighbors, friends, or fellow church members should be disclosed to the Commission, and the HPC member would likely need to recuse their self.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slides #8-9 (Collecting Evidence).

- Competent material, and substantial evidence is required.
- Burden
  - Does the applicant carry the burden for approval, or does the City/opposing party have to prove otherwise?
  - The person requesting the COA has the burden of proof to provide sufficient evidence for their approval
- Hearsay
  - A statement about facts made by someone who is not present
  - Can the Commission consider a petition with 20 signatures from neighboring owners opposing a COA?
  - Generally not permitted; Commission must determine what weight, if any, to give hearsay during findings of fact

Mr. Zelenske said petitions are more typically used in legislative hearings. Occasionally e-mails could be received from people asking him to share them with members, or members could receive the e-mails themselves. Someone might send him an e-mail, asking that he present their information at the hearing because they are unable to attend. Ms. Dula said this should not even be entertained in a quasi-judicial hearing; the person needs to be sworn in and present the information as testimony, and an e-mail cannot be sworn in. Mr. Zelenske said this is a difficult situation, because he does not want to silence people and say their information

cannot be considered, especially when they are out of state property owners. However, as Ms. Dula said, the correct and legal answer is no. Ms. Mull asked if this would change if the e-mail were circulated prior to the hearing. Again, Ms. Dula said that since it is quasi-judicial, witnesses present testimony after being sworn in, so they must be present at the hearing to participate. She said this goes back to ex parte communication, and the members do not need to consider things that are outside. If the matter went further, say that someone appealed the decision, she said the record would be considered, what was actually presented as sworn testimony and the exhibits that were submitted into evidence; they cannot consider an e-mail from a person who was not here, was not sworn in, and the applicant had no opportunity to cross examine that person. Questions cannot be asked to an e-mail, and that is why it is very important for an actual person to attend the hearing, or a capable legal representative should attend in their place. Otherwise, Ms. Dula said it would put the applicant at a disadvantage. Mr. Rockensuess suggested Mr. Zelenske should now advise anyone questioning this that the Commission will not entertain e-mails.

- Opinion
  - A view formed about something, not necessarily based on fact
  - Only expert witness testimony is permissible
- Exhibits
  - Witnesses may present documents, photos, etc. for consideration by the Commission
  - Must be entered into the record
- Continuances
  - If more time or evidence is needed, it is permissible to table the hearing to a future date, up to 90 days per City ordinance
  - Can an applicant request more time if they realize the case is not going in their favor? Can an opponent?

Mr. Zelenske said a decision does need to be made; if no decision is made, then it is presumed to be approved. Regarding requesting more time, Ms. Dula said they could ask, but the Commission does not have to grant it. It is within members' purview, or authority, to make a determination of whether the hearing should be continued. If it is just because someone needs more time to get their act together, that is not necessarily a good reason to continue a hearing.

Mr. Rockensuess asked if an applicant could attend the hearing, realize it was not going in their favor, and then withdraw their application without the Commission having ruled on it. Mr. Zelenske was inclined to say their application would then be disapproved. Mr. Rockensuess asked if they could then resubmit a new application, and Mr. Zelenske said the new application would need to be substantially different.

Mr. Rockensuess asked if staff is allowed to give applicants their opinion on the likelihood their application will be approved. Mr. Zelenske said yes, and that is what he tries to do. He does not want them coming to a hearing and be in the dark, so he tries to prepare them ahead of time. Ms. Menzies said they had applied for a COA in the past, and Mr. Zelenske was very good at explaining the details and guiding them. They had no knowledge of the application process or how to guide their contractor to do what was needed, and he had helped guide them. He also followed up with them prior to and following the hearing.

Ms. Mull asked if the applicant knows what the staff recommendation will be, prior to the hearing. Mr. Zelenske said they receive the staff report at the same time the Commission members do, so in a sense, yes and no. He does not make his decision when he initially talks to an applicant, he has to gather information and do his own research. During the lead up time, he considers and re-considers his opinion, and it can be a difficult process.

Mr. Zelenske said the applicants have plenty of time to come to the hearing well prepared, but the opponent does not really receive very much advance time. It can be difficult for them to retain an attorney with only one or two weeks' notice and then they must attend the hearing and provide expert testimony. He suggested having

a little sympathy for the opponent, but Ms. Dula said no, that you do not want people to use it as a tool to delay. The applicant is already ready to go, they have invested in their application and may even have a timeframe, but now you have someone who is trying to gather 20 neighbors to come and speak to members. Many times, what they have to say is just opinion, and it is possible no actual evidence will even be presented. She understands what Mr. Zelenske is saying about people not having enough time to prepare, but that is not a creation of the City, or of this body, it is how the procedures are laid out. Commission members are following the procedures, and if something is handled in a way that disadvantages the applicant, that is just wrong. Allowing an opponent's neighbor to come in and derail the case gives credence to it, and it is just wrong. Ms. Dula said she was just being pragmatic, and legal.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #10 (Making a Decision).

- Quorum and Voting
  - Majority of the board must be present at the hearing (5 out of 9)
  - Simple majority vote needed for approval
  - What about conflicts of interest or if someone is absent?

Mr. Zelenske said there are times when someone has a conflict of interest and cannot participate in the hearing. If not enough members show up to participate in a hearing it has to be delayed, and this has happened before. Letting him know well in advance that you will not be available is helpful. It is set up in the rules of procedure that, if for some reason it was necessary to go below the quorum, then the Commission could still hear the case; this is not an ideal situation, and typically at least 5 out of 9 members are needed.

Mr. Rockensuess said if only five members attend a hearing and approve an application on a vote of 3-2, then would there be a rule that stipulates a majority is at least five votes. He said if only three people vote in favor, then that is not a majority of the Commission being in support of the applicant. Mr. Zelenske said the way he has it set up, is that it is a majority of those who are present and listening to the case. There could be an unknown scenario where only five members were present, but one had a conflict and had to be recused, so four people heard the case. He said there would almost need to be a rule made out of necessity, because a decision must be made. Right now it is written where a simple majority is needed, but at least five members must be present to open a hearing. Ms. Dula said there is currently no legal requirement in this instance, to say that more than five members, or a super majority, is required. There are some matters the Planning Commission considers that require having almost a super majority present. With certain matters considered by City Council, due to procedural requirements, they may be required to have a super majority. This Commission is required to have a quorum present, and a simple majority of only three people voting in favor is perfectly legal. Mr. Zelenske said vacancies could also become an issue, but have not been for this Commission.

Mr. Lucas asked if an applicant could come to their hearing and, after seeing only five members present, could they then ask for a delay because they do not feel they are getting a fair ruling. Ms. Dula said they could request a delay, but members do not have to agree to it. The applicant would be present and ready to go, so why delay the proceeding? She asked what the rationale would be behind their request.

- Precedents
  - Prior decisions are not legally binding, but the board should be aware of similar cases and target consistency.

Mr. Zelenske said that every case is unique; just because members approve a building addition to one house, does not mean they must approve a building addition for a similar house.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #11 (Findings of Fact).

- Translating the presented evidence (photos, testimony, etc.) into a written statement
- Making a decision on any disputed facts
- Conclusion of law (approving/denying) must be based on the findings of fact

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #12 (NCGS 160A-400.9).

- The Commission shall take no action except to prevent that which would be incongruous with the special character of the landmark/district.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #13 (Eight Statutory Factors).

1. Height
2. Setback and placement
3. Materials
4. Architectural details
5. Roof
6. Fenestration
7. General form
8. Appurtenant features

He distributed the detailed list of the statutory factors to members earlier, and this is part of what members will base their decision on.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #14 (Design Review Guidelines).

- Document designed to define what is congruent.
- Covers specific situations/requests to be used as a flexible standard for decision-making
  - “Modern exterior light fixtures such as flood lights should be placed in inconspicuous locations where they cannot easily be seen from the street.”

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #15 (Sample Congruent Findings of Fact).

- “I move that the Commission find as fact that the proposed project to 123 Main Street is congruent with the character of the district because all eight criteria are generally in harmony with special character of the neighboring properties and the district as a whole for the following reasons {...}”

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #16 (COA Findings of Fact).

- ... is congruent with the character of the district, based on the fact that all 8 criteria are generally in harmony with the special character... for the following reasons:
- the height of the addition will bring it more in balance with the surrounding buildings (HEIGHT)
- the setbacks are minimal and do not affect the existing area (SETBACKS)
- the addition will expand the building footprint but the placement is consistent with the remaining structure (SETBACKS)
- the proposed materials are consistent with the existing materials, architectural details are similar to the existing building (MATERIALS)
- the flat roof is appropriate with the architectural style (ROOF)
- Three parking stalls will be lost but the overall parking need is met, (APPURTENANT FEATURES)
- the windows and doors will remain the same (FENESTRATION)
- and the general form is consistent with the surrounding area (GENERAL FORM)

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #17 (Sample Decision to Approve/Deny).

- “I move that the Commission, based on the previously adopted findings of fact, approve Certificate of Appropriateness 20-01 {as proposed / subject to the following conditions}.”
- Can you approve a COA if it goes against the established Design Review Guidelines? Or, against the Eight Statutory Criteria?

Mr. Rink said he thinks that members should not approve the COA under the circumstances stated in the slide, but he thinks they can. Mr. Zelenske said not to go against any Design Review Guidelines, especially the Eight Statutory Criteria. If you do go against one of the Design Review Guidelines, it needs to be stated very clearly

in your motion exactly why it would actually be appropriate in this particular instance. Even if it meets seven out of the eight criteria, he would not recommend members approve something not including all of the criteria. Say that it does not meet the one issue with the roof, or something, then it does not meet the criteria and should probably not be approved. Again, that would open up all sorts of problems if someone were to appeal the decision; he advised being very careful that you are extremely clear in saying why, and make it defensible.

Regarding the sample statutory factors and congruence, Mr. Rink asked if one of the criteria was not met, then would the motion need to say that the proposed project is not congruent with the character of the district? Is that the only difference? Mr. Zelenske said that saying it is not congruent would essentially lean toward it being disapproved. If going with that route, the following motion would need to recommend disapproval. Mr. Rink asked if the other seven criteria, that are congruent, should be listed in the motion, along with the one that is not congruent, or do all eight criteria still need to be addressed. Ms. Dula said he seemed to be going with a two-step process, based on the evidence heard during the hearing, which facts have been established, and which do or do not support the criteria. It might be necessary to make a determination on which factor carries more weight.

Mr. Hunt asked what the recourse would be for an applicant if one of the eight factors is disapproved. Mr. Zelenske said they would need to amend their application to where it can be approved, and bring it back to the Commission; it is kind of challenging. There is not an established delay, as with a zoning, which requires a 1-year delay. They would just need to come up with a different way to meet that one issue through a different application.

Mr. Rockensuess mentioned the First Presbyterian Church application a couple years ago, where members voted on two different motions; one motion approved most of the changes requested, but the second motion disapproved a portion of their requested changes. Mr. Zelenske said it was a good compromise, that if members were able to approve certain components of the application, then it could be broken into two separate decisions. Mr. Rockensuess noted the church had not come back to dispute it. Mr. Zelenske said members are able to do that if it is something that can be broken up, and that way at least a portion of it can be approved. Mr. Rockensuess said this is where members' discussion comes into play as they reach their final decision.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #18 (Procedural Change?).

- Would the Commission prefer to have staff draft basic findings of fact that would accompany the staff report?
  - Commission would still need to review and add additional findings of fact.

Mr. Zelenske said some other jurisdictions, in particular Raleigh, actually include a basic draft of findings of fact in their staff report. He and Ms. Dula have discussed the possibility of providing a draft to members. He would always encourage members to add on to what he provided, as his draft would be basic. Mr. Rockensuess commented that, if this were done, then all the members would be needed for is to say yes or no; while it might sound easier, the motion he writes and presents is based on Mr. Zelenske's staff report and members' discussion. He said if it is prepared and written for them in advance, it almost takes away the need for their discussion. Mr. Hunt said it could provide a learning opportunity, so that other members could learn how to make the motion in Mr. Rockensuess' absence. Other members rarely make the motion. Mr. Rockensuess said he begins writing the minute Mr. Zelenske begins presenting the staff report. He said it might be beneficial to other members to have, but maybe it should only be distributed to them after the staff report is presented. He said members still need to think and work during the presentation; he is concerned that members would not pay attention, form their own opinions, and hold a discussion. He said there are two sides to it. Ms. Dula said Mr. Rockensuess has a point, that it could make you lazy, because you are assuming that you will not have any opposition. You have to listen, and if someone comes in opposition and speaks against it, then you have to make a decision and weigh the evidence that person has presented, too, and you cannot just rely on the draft. Another possibility is the applicant may bring in additional facts, and you must listen and be attentive to that.

Mr. Rockensuess asked if Mr. Zelenske always provides the sample page included today, with the eight statutory factors discussed in detail, and blank areas for members to write their notes. Mr. Zelenske said he often does, but not always. Mr. Rockensuess said if this page, plus the sample motions, were always included in the agenda packet before a hearing, then that would be very beneficial to them. Ms. Mull agreed, and Mr. Zelenske clarified that they mean beforehand, in the packet that is mailed to members, and not handed out to them during the meeting. They said yes, beforehand, in case they want to make notes prior to the hearing. Mr. Zelenske said he would do this in the future, that he wants members to be prepared and comfortable in making their decisions; if they are not, then that is not acceptable to him. Mr. Rockensuess said the Commission members have open conversations when it comes to decision making, and it is a very detailed process. The City has to have the technical aspects on record, so if someone wants to contest it, it is all right there in detail. He said the City has to have that, and the Commission also needs to have it.

Mr. Zelenske reviewed slide #19 (Referenced Materials).

- Portions of this presentation use material from a handout from the January 4, 2017 Quasi Judicial Decisions Workshop by Dave Owens, UNC-CH SOG.

There was no further discussion or questions for staff.

**Other Business:** Ms. Mull asked if there was any other business for the Commission.

Ms. Moorer asked if there was a Mosteller Mansion update. Mr. Zelenske said they have submitted construction plans, and the civil side of the plans was approved by the City of Hickory. The architectural plans were reviewed and disapproved on some issues, but he anticipates that those will be remedied. He does not know the timeline, but has heard that demolition could occur during February; he has not had any specific updates on that. At this point, the City is reviewing the plans and proceeding is up to the developer. Mr. Zelenske understands that negotiations regarding the property changing hands are still on going.

Mr. Lucas asked what the 2020 meeting dates would be. Mr. Zelenske said Commission meetings would be held monthly on the fourth Tuesday at 5:30 pm during the year, and members would be advised in advance if a meeting is cancelled. The Commission is supposed to meet at least once every three months.

**Next Meeting:** The next regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 25, at 5:30 pm. A COA for a mural on the side of the Hickory Community Theatre building will be on the agenda.

**Adjourn:** Ernie Sills moved, seconded by Sam Hunt, to adjourn. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 pm.



Anne Starnes, Minutes Clerk  
City of Hickory



Katherine Mull, Chair  
Historic Preservation Commission