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In Chairman Egan’s absence Vice Chairman Ristaino called to order the Regular July meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:07 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must complete a blue form and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of the proposed project to the Commission. The Commission will first determine if there is sufficient information to proceed. If continuing, Commissioners and the applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium. Presentations by the applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the Policy & Design Guidelines. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. The majority vote
of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is a quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received. While the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the Approval or Denial to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Ristaino asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Mr. Ristaino said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. He will ask once that an audience member be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

A MOTION was made by Dr. Corbus and seconded by Ms. Marshall and voted unanimously to alter the order of the meeting to move forward the time that FOR/AGAINST audience members speak.

New Member, Claire Stephens, was introduced as the new occupant of the Hermitage Court seat.

Ms. Titus reminded that the annual Preservation North Carolina Conference is being held in Salisbury this year, September 16-18 and it is the 40th Anniversary.

Ms. Titus asked that a landscape plan be required for all applicable applications and that it be required that HVAC location be indicated on plans.

Index of Addresses:

**CONTINUED APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2015-097, 2006 Dilworth Road East Dilworth
HDC 2015-106, 318 E. Kingston Avenue Dilworth
HDC 2015-107, 1726 S. Mint Street Wilmore

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2015-113, 1748 Merriman Avenue Wilmore
HDC 2015-114, 1912 S. Mint Street Wilmore
HDC 2015-129, 1724 S. Mint Street Wilmore
HDC 2015-129, 317 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
HDC 2015-130, 304 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
HDC 2015-132, 800 E. Tremont Avenue Dilworth
HDC 2015-134, 600 East Boulevard Dilworth
HDC 2015-137, 1507 Southwood Avenue Wilmore
HDC 2015-138, 1819 Lyndhurst Avenue Dilworth
HDC 2015-139, 441 West Boulevard Wilmore
HDC 2015-140, 1552 Merriman Avenue Wilmore

**APPLICATION: HDC 2014-097, 2006 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – LANDSCAPE FEATURES**

The project was continued from June for accurately dimensioned drawings and further design study regarding the height of the proposed wall and piers.

*Existing Conditions*

The existing site has a two story Colonial Revival home slightly elevated above the sidewalk and set back approximately 50 feet from the sidewalk. The existing walkway does not connect to the sidewalk.
Proposal
Revised plans show the retaining wall, water drinking fountain at the front sidewalk, decorative lighting atop the new piers, driveway expansion, a new walkway extending from the sidewalk to the house, new steps in the front retaining wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Commission will determine if the proposal is complimentary to the context of the streetscape.

FOR/AGAINST:
- Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in favor of the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines – Landscaping, Mr. Sullivan made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Dr. Corbus seconded.

VOTE: 11/0  AYES:  BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSH, STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS  
NAYS:  NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPE FEATURES APPROVED.


The application was continued from June for more information on the existing and original design of the front porch.

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a 2.5 story c. 1910 Four Square. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

Proposal
The proposal is to remove the stone from the archway and the columns and the foundation on the front porch of the house. Wooden columns on existing stone piers would replace the most of the stone work on the front porch. The new wood columns will be 10” round Tuscan style.

Revised Proposal – July 8, 2015
The revised proposal includes an analysis from a Registered Engineer that says the stone work is a later addition. The applicant has also submitted additional photographs of surrounding homes for context of what is appropriate front porch design and detailing. Proposed is the addition of paired columns on stone (existing) piers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal to remove the stonework meets the Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions, or if an exception is warranted.

FOR/AGAINST:
- Adjacent Property Owner Kemper Boyd spoke in support of removing the added stonework.
- Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition to removing the stonework.
MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions*, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE the removal and replacement of front porch elements as submitted. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 11/0

AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSH, STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: REMOVAL OF ADDED STONEWORK AT FRONT PORCH AND REPLACEMENT IS APPROVED.

Application: HDC 2015-107– 1726 S. Mint Street – Dormer Addition

This application was recently continued for revised plans which will show: 1) Removal of the transom window in the proposed dormer, 2) Additional column/beam and window details, 3) Remove rear shed dormer, 4) Move front dormer wall back, 5) Pull shed dormer windows in from sides.

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is c. 1940 a one story cottage style house at the corner of South Mint Street and West Boulevard in the Wilmore neighborhood. Adjacent structures include a quadruplex and one story houses.

Proposal
Proposed is the addition of a shed dormer on the left side, new porch columns and handrails. The dormer will have wood windows and lap siding.

Revised Proposal – July 8, 2015
The revised proposal includes the removal from the plans of the transom window, porch rail and column detail, window section, and the dormer set back from thermal wall.

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* for Additions.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions, pg. 36* – Mr. Bender made a MOTION to APPROVE this application with revised drawings to go to Staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show 1) Windows to have a two inch thick historical sill package, 2) All traditional materials, 3) Trim will be 4 inches wide, 4) Corner board and trim to extend past siding, 5) Back rail to match the front rails, 6) Soffit/fascia treatment to match existing. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

VOTE: 11/0

AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF.
APPLICATION: HDC 2015-113, 1748 MERRIMAN AVENUE – ADDITION

This application was Denied in May due to the inappropriate massing of the front dormer. The Commission will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned to allow the application to be heard.

The Commission voted unanimously that this application has a substantial change and they will hear the presentation.

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a c. 1940 one story cottage style home with wood siding and trim, and 6 over 1 window light pattern. Adjacent homes are primarily one story.

Proposal – May 13, 2015
The proposal is a second story addition within the existing building footprint and extension of two chimneys. Project details include a new front gabled dormer, wood lap siding, windows and trim details to match existing, roof trim and materials to match existing, and a new covered balcony on the front. Total height is approximately 23’-4”.

Revised Proposal – July 8, 2015
Revised plans include the following:
• The new front dormer has been scaled down
• Balcony has been removed from the front
• Left and right side elevations have been modified with side gables and organized window placement
• The roof massing of the rear addition is now a traditional rear facing gable (rather than a saltbox form)
• Materials and details will match the existing structure. The height remains +/-23’-4”.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for revised plans which show 1) Accurate plans with dimensions and materials, 2) Porch plan redesign – raise it or change it, 3) Porch section, 4) Column details, 5) Boxing detail, 6) Fiber cement note removed, 7) Redesign side elevation roof line, 8) Brick to match house on chimney, 9) Make clear the correct termination of the side gable, 10) Include the house in the building height survey exhibit, 11) Details and materials noted as matching, 12) All natural materials, 13) Add porch beam. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.
APPLICATION:  HDC 2015-114, 1912 S. MINT STREET – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on South Mint Street, a large canopy tree exists in the front yard. The parcel tapers in width from the front to the back. The distance between the sidewalk and existing grade is approximately 8 feet. The topography of the street and adjacent parcels vary. Heights of the adjacent houses are 1, 1.5 and 2 stories of varying architectural designs. Setbacks vary between 25’ and 35’ from back of sidewalk.

Proposal
The proposal is a two story single family home. Design features include a full width front porch, front facing gable dormer, rear shed dormer, and wood STDL windows. Proposed height is +/-30’. The tree in the front yard will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance of Policy & Design Guidelines - New Construction—Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DENY this application for 1) Size – The house footprint is too large for the site, 2) Scale – The height of the home is substantially taller than most of the homes on the block, 3) Massing – the massing of the side wall and rear dormer are out of proportion with the overall design of the house, 4) Fenestration – the placement of the windows on the side elevations are not organized. The house does not meet the guidelines.

VOTE: 11/0
AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, STEPHENS, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.

———

APPLICATION:  HDC 2015-135 – 1724 S. MINT STREET - ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a c. 1936 one story cottage style home near the corner of South Mint Street and West Boulevard. Adjacent structures include a quadruplex and one story houses.

Proposal
The proposal is the addition of a front gable and shed roof over the front porch supported by columns atop stone piers. New materials will match existing. The plan is to convert the duplex back to a single family use.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions.
MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE for: Accurate drawings and photos of all 4 elevations. Note the chimney demolition and handrail demolition constitute a zoning violation based on the fact the work was started before HDC review and approval. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.


Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a c. 1925, one story bungalow originally designed as a single family home that was converted to a duplex. Features include a front gabled roof and hip roofed front porch. A small porch/entry is located on the left side.

Proposal
The proposal is a renovation project and a conversion back to a single family home. The rear addition will not be visible from the street as it ties into the existing ridgeline but will be removed and replaced. A window on the left side is proposed to be removed. A detached garage will be removed with materials repurposed for the renovation where appropriate. The front door to the left will be removed and the remaining door will be centered. Materials from a dilapidated rear shed will be salvaged for the renovation. A carriage track drive will be added. HVAC is located in the rear.

The left side addition is an extension and enclosure of the existing porch, and removal of the secondary chimney. New materials and details will match existing traditional materials. New windows will be wood STDL.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings to staff. The revised drawings will show 1) Left side fenestration organized, 2) HVAC located in the rear of house, 3) All natural materials, 4) Tongue and Groove porch flooring oriented perpendicular to front thermal wall. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS FOR STAFF APPROVAL.
APPLICATION: HDC 2015-130, 304 S. SUMMIT AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The existing c. 1925 home is a one story Bungalow with a front facing gable over a full front porch. The house is at the corner of West 4th Street and South Summit Avenue.

Proposal
The proposal is a rear shed dormer addition and the addition of paired, wood STDL windows in the existing right side gable to match the left side. Materials and details of the shed dormer will match the existing house. The dormer width is approximately 18’. A chimney will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance of Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

VOTE: 11/0  AYES:  BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS:  NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-132, 800 EAST TREMONT AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The existing structure, c. 1920, is a one story bungalow located at the corner of East Tremont and Lennox Avenue. The house features a gabled porch, high hip roof and right side dormer with a side entrance.

Proposal
The proposal is the addition of an overhang for the side entrance with a new stoop. The foundation will be brick. HVAC will be relocated to the rear. Stoop will have a metal hand rail. Wood brackets will match existing. The ceiling will be painted bead board. The window and door will remain unchanged.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions, Mr. Haden made a MOTION to APPROVE this application as submitted. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 11/0  AYES:  BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS:  NONE
DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

Ms. Titus declared a Conflict of Interest as an Adjacent Property Owner and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-134, 600 EAST BOULEVARD - ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The location is the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral Complex. The c. 1951 cathedral is a Gothic/Byzantine design with basilica, projecting gabled sections and flanking towers. The c. 1967 Hellenic Center is a brick two story arcaded structure. On the left side is a playground enclosed with a metal picket fence. Site features include a plain concrete plaza with landscaping.

Proposal
The proposal is a renovation, addition, and new site features. The project is being driven by the need for an elevator. This will be accomplished by the addition of a tower to the right of the entrance and to balance it out, an additional and matching tower to the left. On the right side the existing wheelchair ramp will be redesigned to meet code and will be covered with a canopy. The courtyard between the church and the Hellenic Center will be improved with new concrete pavement, planters, decorative lighting, benches, and three flag poles. A new covered walkway will connect the Cathedral, Hellenic Center, and parking lot. Materials (including brick, precast concrete, copper roofs, other masonry) and architectural details will match and complement the existing structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:
- Tamara Titus adjacent property owner spoke in opposition to the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance of Policy & Design Guidelines -- Additions, Mr. Sullivan made a MOTION to APPROVE this application as submitted. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 6/4
AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN
NAYS: DUFFY, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

Ms. Marshall left the meeting at 5:22 and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-137, 1507 SOUTHWOOD AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was denied in June for scale, fenestration and context. The HDC will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned before allowing the application to be heard.
The Commission voted unanimously that this application represents a substantial change to the recently Denied application.

**Details of Proposed Request**

*Existing Conditions*

The existing structure is a c. 1936 one story ranch style home. The surrounding context is a variety of one and two story homes. Across the street is a commercial structure. The 365-Day Stay of Demolition was approved by the HDC on March 11, 2015.

*Proposal – June 10, 2015*

Proposed is a new 1.5 story single family house and a detached garage. Features of the house include a full brick façade, front and rear shed dormers, wood trim and wood windows. The front setback will match the existing house. The height from finished floor to the ridge is approximately 27'-11”.

*Revised Proposal – July 8, 2015*

Plan revisions include the following:

- Reduction in height from 27'-11” to +/-23’.
- Second floor balcony removed
- Front dormer reduced
- Redesign of front full brick columns to brick piers with wood columns
- Revised fenestration proportion and rhythm on side elevations (affected by height reduction).
- Replacement of metal hand rails with wood
- Reduction in size of the rear dormer – shed dormers front and rear.

The Commission voted unanimously that the revisions represent a substantial change and will be reviewed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak FOR/AGAINST this application

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE this application with revised drawings to staff. The revised drawings will show 1) windows will be 3/1, 2) change out the French doors, 3) show HVAC units in the rear yard. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE:** 10/0  

**AYES:** BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Mr. Bender made a MOTION to lift the stay of demolition and the applicant can proceed with removing the structure. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE:** 10/0  

**AYES:** BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE
DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED ONCE STAFF SIGNS OFF ON FINAL PLANS. DEMOLITION MAY PROCEED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-138, 1819 LYNDHURST AVENUE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a 1½ story Victorian style structure used as office space. The short block face has three structures facing Lyndhurst Avenue. Design features include a high hipped roof, side gables, and wraparound porch. Adjacent structures are a variety of one and two story designs.

Proposal
The proposal is a second story addition to the front and new second story addition to the rear. The front porch and first level front of the house will remain from the front. Design features include wood siding, reuse of existing windows and new windows to match existing. Total height will be +/-36’. Mature trees close to the structure will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR/AGAINST this application

MOTION: Based on non-compliance of Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to DENY this application due to: 1) Massing – the plan drops a full second story on a 1 story house, 2) Fenestration – windows not drawn from existing, historical pattern, 3) The additions do not respect the original character and massing of the structure. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-139, 441 WEST BOULEVARD – ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a C 1948, one story, cottage style home. The gabled front porch is offset to the left.

Proposal
The proposal is the addition of a dormer to the right side of the front elevation and centered above the first level window group. Details include wood siding and trim to match existing and a wood window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:
No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak FOR/AGAINST this application.

**MOTION**: Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to APPROVE this application as submitted with a 2” sill on dormer window. Ms. Stephens seconded.

**VOTE**: 10/0  
**AYES**: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS  
**NAYS**: NONE

**DECISION**: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-140, 1552 MERRIMAN AVENUE – PORCH ADDITION**

**Existing Conditions**  
The existing structure is a c. 1962 one story brick home. It features a low hipped roof with wide eaves. Adjacent homes are one and two story with front porches.

**Proposal**  
Proposed is the addition of a front porch. The depth is to be eight feet. The gabled roof will be supported by appropriately sized and detailed columns. Wood siding will be added to the new gable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Rhythm, Setback, Materials and Context.

**FOR/AGAINST**:  
- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application

**MOTION**: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE the Application with boxing details to be made clear, column trim to be spelled out. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

**VOTE**: 9/1  
**AYES**: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, SULLIVAN, TITUS  
**NAYS**: RUMSCH

**DECISION**: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

---

A motion was made to approve the June 2015 minutes with revisions from Ms. Titus.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm with a meeting length of 5 hours and 30 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.