



Historic District Commission

Meeting Minutes

April 30, 2026, 6:30 PM

RM 110 | Council Chamber

Chair Don Tise
Vice-Chair Brian Daniels
Glenn Connolly

Josh Gurlitz
Laura Moore

For interpretation
or translation
services, call
919-969-5105.

ဘာသာပြန်ဆိုခြင်းနှင့်
စကားပြန်ခြင်းအတွက်၊
(၉၁၉) ၉၆၉ ၅၁၀၅
ကိုဖုန်းခေါ်ပါ။

如需口头或书面翻
译服务，请拨打
919-969-5105。

လၢတၢ်ကတိကျိးထံ မ့တ
မ့ၢ် လၢတၢ်ကွဲးကျိးထံအ
တၢ်မၤစၢၤအဂီၢ် ကိးဘၣ်
၉၁၉-၉၆၉ ၅၁၀၅

Para servicios de
interpretación o
traducción, llame al
919 969-5105.

Opening

Roll Call

Charnika Harrell, Staff Liaison, Anna Scott Myers, Staff Liaison, Kevin Hornik,
Counsel to the Commission

Present

5 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn
Connolly, Josh Gurlitz, and Laura Moore

Secretary reads procedures into the record

Commission Chair reads public charge

Approval of Agenda

**Commissioner Gurlitz moved, Daniels seconded, to approve the
agenda. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.**

Announcements

Petitions

Old Business

[308 W. Cameron Avenue](#)

[26-0115]

**Vice Chair Daniels moved, seconded by Gurlitz, to reopen the
evidentiary hearing. The motions carried by a unanimous vote.**

**Ann Anderson, counsel for the applicant and property owner,
asked for commissioners to confirm whether they had any
communications outside of the meeting or conflicts of interest.
Chair Tise, Commissioner Daniels, Commissioner Gurlitz, and
Commissioner Moore confirmed they had none. Commissioner**

Connolly said that her son is on the same soccer team as the applicant's son. Anderson and LeAnn Nease Brown, counsel for Mr. Donald Stanford and Dr. Donna Bryant, did not object to Commissioner Connolly participating in the hearing. Jay Fulkerson, applicant and architect, explained his background in architecture. Fulkerson also presented a three-dimensional rendering of the revised new house. He explained that he brought the stature of the house down.

Fulkerson discussed the revisions to the new house. He said the original ridge line was 28.5 feet, and the new ridge line would be 24 feet and 9 inches. He explained that the new house was within range with the other houses on the street. He provided heights of other houses on the street. He said he did not think the height of the house was incongruous with the other houses on the street. Fulkerson also stated that the new house was larger than what was originally proposed. He said that there are larger houses on the street and provided sizes. He noted that the size of the new house was not unusual and that he thinks the size is not incongruous.

Fulkerson said that many of the houses on Mallette Street are deeper than they are wide. He said the new house has a similar form. He said the new house was moved north to give the existing house more space. He also said there are examples on Mallette Street where the houses are closer than his proposal.

Fulkerson presented a site plan. He explained that the parking area was modified so the spaces were in a straight line. He said he moved the cars as far from the existing house as they could be. He presented the original plan for the parking area and compared it with the revised parking area. He said there is a lot of front yard parking all over the historic district. He presented photos of front yard parking in the district and photos of houses that were close together. He also mentioned building a new retaining wall and stairs.

Fulkerson talked about a change to the Land Use Management Ordinance that allowed smaller lots. He also identified several lots on Mallette Street that he thought could be subdivided and a new house could be built.

Fulkerson shared the floor plan for the new house and discussed the changes. He said he did not think comments about rental

properties at the last meeting were relevant, but he thought the new house would be suitable for a family.

Fulkerson talked about subdividing the property and reducing the depth of the front porch.

Fulkerson presented an elevation of the new house that shows the original ridge line and the new ridge line. He discussed how the new retaining wall allowed them to lower the ridge line. He presented an elevation that compared the ridge line of the new house to the ridge line of the house at 129 Mallett Street.

Fulkerson said there were no changes to what was proposed for the existing house. He presented three dimensional renderings of views of the new house and original proposal from several locations on Mallett Street and Cameron Avenue.

Fulkerson addressed Commissioner's Gurlitz's question about shingles. He presented photos of roofs of houses on Mallett Street. He said that architectural grade shingles appeared to be the new standard, and that he did not think the new house was incongruous.

Counsel Anderson asked Fulkerson if he designed the house to be not incongruous with the character of the district based on his expert opinion. Fulkerson said he thought the original design and revised design were both not incongruous.

Counsel Nease Brown asked Fulkerson about the new retaining wall. Fulkerson clarified that the new wall would run east to west. Nease Brown asked about the purpose of the new retaining wall. Fulkerson said the wall eliminated grading immediately behind the existing house and allowed a transition in grade level for the new house.

Chair Tise asked about the material for the new retaining wall. Fulkerson said the wall would have a red brick foundation.

Commissioner Gurlitz asked for the property's zoning district. Fulkerson confirmed it was zoned Residential-3 (R-3).

Vice Chair Daniels asked how much the height of the new house dropped in relation to the existing house and the house at 129 Mallett Street. Fulkerson confirmed four feet. He said it was accomplished by changing the roof pitch, dropping the floor,

and reducing the foundation height. He explained that the new retaining wall allowed them to reduce the foundation height. He also said the grade drops about 8.5 feet from the corner of Cameron Avenue and Mallette Street to where the new house would be.

Gurlitz asked if they planned to repair the existing perimeter wall. Fulkerson confirmed they intended to repair the wall to the extent needed.

Matt Slebos, owner of 402 W. Cameron Avenue, gave public comment. He said Cameron Avenue has a good balance of owner-occupied and student rental housing. He said the project would negatively impact the owners.

Counsel Anderson objected to the public comment based on relevance and the scope of the commission's purview.

Counsel Anderson gave a closing statement. Anderson reminded the commission of the applicant's burden and that if an applicant produces competent, material, and substantial evidence, then they are entitled to approval. She said in her opinion there was competing evidence presented. She explained that the commission must address whether the property is not incongruous with the character in general. She pointed out characteristics of the Cameron-McCauley Historic District from the Design Principles and Standards. She said that Fulkerson had thoroughly addressed the lack of incongruity and had shown that the new house fits in the range of possibilities that exist in the Cameron-McCauley Historic District.

Counsel Nease Brown gave a closing statement. Nease Brown mentioned that Mr. Stanford and Dr. Bryant provided evidence at the last meeting, and they did not see a reason to present again. She said the commission heard the opinion of an architect and that it was up to them to decide on congruity. She said they did not think the applicant met the burden of showing that the changes are congruous. She pointed to standards for new construction in the Design Principles and Standards. She said the height between 129 Mallette Street and the new house was better but still dramatic. She said the new house would be visually dominant given the topography. She said front yard parking was not congruous in the district. She also reiterated Chair Tise's comment about an awkward vertical orientation and how it related to horizontal and vertical expression in the design

standards. She said the cumulative effect of the design of parking, mass, scale, and proportion create an incongruity in the district. She suggested the commission deny the application.

Anderson noted that Mr. Stanford and Dr. Bryant's testimony at the last meeting was on the previous design, and that they had not provided any testimony that addressed the new design. She also clarified the difference between lay opinion and competent, material, and substantial evidence. She said that Mr. Stanford and Dr. Bryant's testimonies at the previous meeting were opinions and not competent, material, and substantial evidence.

Daniels asked Nease Brown to repeat the design standards she thought were relevant. Daniels also asked about a letter with public comment that was not shared with the commission.

Nease Brown explained that the letter was from a neighbor, and that she did not object to the commission seeing the letter but acknowledged it was hearsay because the person who wrote the letter was not at the meeting and could not be cross-examined. Anderson objected to the commission seeing the letter. Counsel Hornik advised the commission not to base any decision on the letter. Tise said he did not think the letter would address the presentation they were given. Gurlitz commented that letters do not constitute evidence.

Hornik explained the purpose of the design standards. He said the commission's decision is based on whether they find the evidence presented show that the changes are or are not incongruous with the character of the district.

Commissioner Moore said that her previous comments about the streetscape had been addressed. She said moving the parking allowed the front of the house to be clear which improved the streetscape.

Daniels said he had concerns about the vertical expression of the house and scale. Tise said he thought the retaining wall between the new house and existing house helped. Gurlitz said he wished the new house was not as vertical and agreed that the retaining wall helped organize the site. Commissioner Connolly said she did not think the new house would stand out given the heights of the other properties. Daniels said he did not think the commission could deny the application.

Vice Chair Daniels moved, seconded by Moore, that the application was not incongruous with the special character of the district, with the condition that the freestanding wall along the north property line is repaired. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Counsel Hornik asked Anderson to prepare the written decision.

Aye: 5 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn Connolly, Josh Gurlitz, and Laura Moore

Adjournment

Next Meeting - May 12, 2026

Order of Consideration of Agenda Items:

- 1. Staff Presentation*
- 2. Applicant's Presentation*
- 3. Public Comment*
- 4. Board Discussion*
- 5. Motion*
- 6. Restatement of Motion by Chair*
- 7. Vote*
- 8. Announcement of Vote by Chair*

Public Charge: The Advisory Body pledges its respect to the public. The Body asks the public to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Body and with fellow members of the public. Should any member of the Body or any member of the public fail to observe this charge at any time, the Chair will ask the offending person to leave the meeting until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair will recess the meeting until a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.

Unless otherwise noted, please contact the Planning Department at 919-968-2728; planning@townofchapelhill.org for more information on the above referenced applications.

See the Advisory Boards page <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/boards> for background information on this Board.