



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
July 13, 2016

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair  
Mr. P.J. Henningson  
Ms. Jessica Hindman  
Mr. Nasif Majeed  
Ms. Mattie Marshall  
Mr. Dominic Ristaino, second Vice Chair  
Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair  
Ms. Claire Stephens
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Lilli Corbus  
Ms. Jana Hartenstine  
Mr. Rodric Lenhart  
Ms. Tamara Titus
- OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Staff  
Historic District Commission  
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff  
Historic District Commission  
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the  
Historic District Commission  
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney  
Court Reporters

---

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular July meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:04 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 submit 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 for each agenda item. 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 and 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 decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Haden 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. Haden said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will result in removal from the room.

Index of Addresses:     **NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2016-093, 529 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-103 420 W. 5 <sup>th</sup> Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2016-117 2219 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-130, 701 N. Graham Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2016-147 2200 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-123, 700 Templeton Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-123, 2215 Dilworth Road West	Dilworth
HDC 2016-151, 624 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-131, 1319 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-138, 1617 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-148, 1827 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-152, 1422 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-093, 529 E. KINGSTON AVENUE – ADDITION**

This application was continued in June for further design study regarding the:

- Massing of the rear addition and the context of the overall relationship of the project to its surroundings. Soften and break down the proposed roofline with the removal of the clerestory.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a c. 1920 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent residential structures are one, one and one half, and two story single family homes.

**Proposal**

Proposed is the addition of a screened porch enclosure to the deck on rear of the house. Siding and trim materials are wood to match existing. The roof is supported by new square columns. The new casement windows on the right side will match the existing windows at the front.

**Revised Proposal**

- The proposed clerestory windows have been removed from the roof of the proposed screened porch. All materials continue to match the existing.

**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 Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – massing, scale, size, materials, fenestration, footprint unchanged, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the rear addition as revised. All HDC concerns from the continuation were addressed. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                      AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION:** ADDITION APPROVED.

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-103, 420 W. 5<sup>TH</sup> STREET - ADDITION**

This application was continued in June for:

- More details on fenestration
- Details on the 3 large bi-fold doors on the front left elevation, the main entry door on the right side rear elevation, and material samples for the new materials.

**Existing Conditions**

Charlotte Fire Station Number 4 is a c. 1922 flat-roofed, three-bay, two-story brick building on West Fifth Street in Fourth Ward. It is adjacent to high rise and mid-rise multi-family buildings. The proposed addition has been approved by the Mecklenburg County Historic Landmarks Commission where a COA was issued May 20, 2016. A previous and somewhat similar proposal for an addition and renovation was approved in concept July 2013 by the HDC.

**Proposal –Addition**

The proposal is an adaptive re-use project with an addition to rear and right side. The fire station will become a restaurant. A rooftop terrace will also be added. The façade materials will be brick and metal. The exterior stairs will be enclosed with metal panels.

**Revised Proposal – July 13, 2016**

- The metal panels covering the exterior stairs have been removed.
- The roof of the rear addition has been modified.
- The material of the addition is brick.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Historic Districts staff believes the project meets the guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* Ms. Stephens made **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revisions to staff for probable approval. Revised drawings will show:

- Window and door details for staff review (mullion sizes, shapes, and depths to meet traditional forms).

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS

NAYS: RUMSCH

**DECISION:** ADDITION APPROVED. REVISED DRAWINGS WILL BE SUBMITTED TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL

- 
- **MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-117, 2219 THE PLAZA - ADDITION**

This application was continued in June for further design study regarding:

- Additional details of materials and massing of the addition
- Reducing the massing of the second floor by bringing the walls in
- Consider repeating the stucco and board and baton only in the gable
- Other traditional materials could be proposed in the gable at the back door to match the rest of the house.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a c. 1930 one and one half story Bungalow. Adjacent structures are one and one half story homes. The house is +/-14'-9" measured from the finished floor. Exterior material is painted brick.

**Proposal**

*Proposal – June 8, 2016*

The proposal is an upper level addition. New siding material is wood with roof trim details to match existing. New windows will match existing windows in design and material. The rear porch will be removed. The building footprint does not change.

*Revised Proposal*

- The roof has been changed to a gable at the rear of the addition.
- The side gable on the right side elevation has been moved toward the front.
- The rear porch roof has been reduced.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the design guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Majeed made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as drawn. *Ms. Stephens seconded.*

**VOTE: 5/2**                      **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, MAJEED, MARSHALL, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** HINDMAN, RUMSCH

**DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED**

- 
- **MR. RUMSCH DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-037, 2200 PARK ROAD – ADDITION**

- The application was denied June 8, 2016 for its failure to meet the HDC guidelines for size, context and fenestration. By the applicant's own admission there were no historic structures found in Charlotte's Local Historic Districts that have the same proposed garage door arrangement that could be presented as example, but they had to provide examples from other cities. Under Size, the proposed enclosure of the existing deck is 2000 square feet. The footprint of the original structure is 3,900 square feet so this is a significant enclosure that will be highly visible. The plans also fail to meet Policy & Design Guidelines for Fenestration as there are no windows on the existing structure like the ones that are proposed on the left side elevation. That is not drawn from anything on the original structure, the garage doors are not drawn from anything on the structure and there is no context for this within the historic districts. The Commission will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned before allowing the application to be heard.

**Existing Conditions**

The two story brick commercial building was constructed in 1928 and listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register. The site is located at the corner of Ideal Way and Park Road and is known as the Old Martin Hardware Building. The rear deck expansion and other façade changes, including roll up garage doors on the front façade, were approved by the HDC on May 13, 2015.

**Revised Proposal**

The proposal is the addition of a deck enclosure of windows and doors on the rear of the building. The following items have changed from June:

- The height is below the existing roofline
- The depth of the addition has been reduced
- Overhead door sizes have been changed to a smaller dimension

- Exterior siding has been changed to hard coat stucco

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

MOTION: A MOTION was made, seconded and the vote was unanimous to recognize Substantial Change.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Adjacent property owner Ms. Paula Pridgen gave a PowerPoint presentation in opposition of this addition and improvements.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application because it meets all Guidelines for Additions:

- Size – it softens the footprint
- Scale/Rhythm– it is stepping down to the deck
- Massing – does relate positively to the various parts of the building to each other
- Fenestration – it compliments the front and is unique unto itself
- Setback – is being respected because the footprint is not changing
- Materials – stucco is appropriate, it is a complimentary material to the brick
- Context – it is in adjacent to a shopping center on one side and to residential on the other side

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment to require vegetation on the left, rear, and right side of the addition.

- Materials include hard-coat stucco facade, aluminum frame windows and doors.
- Orientation and proportion in the divided lights of the windows on the Ideal Way side to be reviewed by staff with the new rear doors in mind. Mr. Henningson seconded.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED. STAFF WILL REVIEW REVISED PLANS.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-130, 701 N. GRAHAM STREET – FIRE RECONSTRUCTION**

The application was continued in June for:

- Window details
- Materials and design of the canopy columns
- Information about the siding dimensions and the brick that is going to be used under the canopy
- Head and jam detail on how the artisan siding will fit with the windows
- Detailed column drawing at the canopy.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a c. 1987 one story commercial building at the corner of North Graham Street and West 10<sup>th</sup> Street. It is a Circle K. A recent electrical fire that started inside the building has caused extensive damage to the exterior wood siding. Adjacent structures are industrial, commercial, and residential. There are no damages to the site or canopy.

**Proposal**

The proposal is a renovation which includes replacement of the wood siding with cementitious siding (Hardie Artisan) and new signage.

**Revised Proposal – July 13, 2016**

- Window details have been included
- The siding on the parapet has been enlarged (8” to 10”)
- The canopy columns are clad in brick and Hardie siding has been added.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The HDC will determine if an exception for non-traditional siding material should be approved.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted because all the issues have been addressed.

- The base of the columns is to be three feet, four inches as shown.
- Staff will approve the jam detail, a wooden or Hardie material of one inch thick for the siding to butt the window frame it sits in.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION APPROVED**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-2016-123, 700 TEMPLETON AVENUE – DEMOLITION**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a C. 1936 one story brick house. Adjacent properties are one and two story single family houses. A multi-family development is located behind the house. There are pictures of bad past repair, shifting, and repairs that need to be done if the house stands. There is also an engineer’s report indicating that the house needs to be taken down.

**Proposal**

The proposal is full demolition of the subject property.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this house is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to recognize this house as a contributing structure. Ms. Marshall seconded.

**VOTE: 7/1**                    **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH  
STEPHENS

**NAYS:** MAJEED

**MOTION:** Based on *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to impose a **365 day stay of demolition with a 90 day delay before reviewing plans for new construction**. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**                    **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION WITH A 90 DAY DELAY BEFORE NEW PLANS ARE REVIEWED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-145 – 2215 DILWORTH ROAD WEST – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

**Existing Context**

This is a c. 1929 single family Colonial Revival home. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The parcel is irregularly shaped and makes access to the rear impossible or at least very difficult. Adjacent structures are single family houses. Garages are all around.

**Proposal**

The proposal is a new detached garage to be located in the left side yard. It is to be the shelter and work space of a vintage Mercedes that the family has inherited. Garage height is approximately 13'-5". Primary siding is cedar shingles with trim details to match the house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if an exception should be warranted due to the unusual shape of the lot for locating the accessory building in the side yard and if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Mr. Haden's invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on no exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application because developed parking is not allowed in the front yard and Ms. Marshall made a friendly amendment that was accepted to state that new garages cannot be located in front or side yards. Mr. Henningson seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**                    **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE DENIED**



---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-151, 624 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE – FRONT ADDITION**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing c. 1915 structure is a one story single family Bungalow. There are two flat roof additions- one to the left and one to the right side. This address is directly behind Dilworth Methodist Church on East Boulevard and adjacent to a parking lot where a house once was on the corner.

**Proposal**

The proposal is the modification of the primary roofline and new gable roofs on the left and right side additions. A second gable is introduced over the front porch. This is to simplify and unify the roof. An existing but added octagonal window on the front façade will be removed.

**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 Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST the application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for approval which will show:

- Corner board to engage the column
- Pier to match the existing
- Confirmation that the roof 2 ½ \12 pitch gables, match existing materials, extend lap siding.

**VOTE: 8/0 AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS,

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS TO STAFF.**

- 
- **MS. MATTIE MARSHALL WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-131, 1319 THOMAS AVENUE**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing house was constructed in 1920. The site is on the edge of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District and located adjacent to a commercial parking lot on one side. An alley exists for access to multiple properties. A two story accessory dwelling was approved October 8, 2014. A large garage will not be impacted.

**Proposal**

The proposal is a one story accessory building in the rear yard. The overall size of the accessory building has been reduced in height and square footage. Exterior siding is wood lap. The structure will have a screened porch on the left side.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will determine if an exception should be granted for locating the accessory building in the side yard and if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with the *Policy & Design Guidelines* Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff.

- Staff will review the complete construction drawings including the column, beam and eave detail, and roofing materials to make sure they meet our guidelines.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH  
STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-138, 1617 THOMAS AVENUE – FRONT YARD PARKING PAD**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing house was constructed in 1925. A shared concrete driveway is located on the left side of the property.

**Proposal**

The property owner constructed a concrete parking pad in the front yard. The owner is requesting an exception to allow the parking pad to remain.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will determine if an exception is warranted to allow the parking pad in the front yard.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for developed parking in the front setback. **Mr. Majeed seconded.**

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT YARD PARKING PAD DENIED**

---

- **MS. HINDMAN WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-148, 1827 THOMAS AVENUE – SIDE/REAR ADDITION**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow constructed in 1929. Adjacent structures are also one story in height. Exterior material is horizontal wood lap in the front gable and vertical wood siding on the remaining elevations.

**Proposal**

The proposal is an addition to the right side and rear. The right side is expanded approximately 8 feet. New materials, windows and roof trim will match existing.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the design guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with conditions. Mr. Ristaino made a friendly amendment that pulled the conditions together and was accepted – Staff will approve the final details of the rear deck, columns, brackets, ceiling, window trim detail, divided lites on the windows and any other historical details to insure that everything will match existing. **Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-152, 1422 THE PLAZA – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE/ADDITION**

The application was denied June 8, 2016 due to its failure to meet the guidelines for size because the proposed garage is wider than the house, for Scale because the proposed garage is taller than the rear elevation of the main house, for Context because it appears to be the largest garage in Plaza Midwood in the historic area at this time and because it does not read as a secondary structure to the main house. The screened porch addition was denied because it fails to meet HDC guidelines for Massing and Rhythm. By punching out 3 feet on the side it becomes a featured element on the right side elevation and guidelines would call for it to be less substantial.

The Commission will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned and/or if there is a change of circumstance before allowing the application to be heard.

**Proposal**

The existing structure is a single family house constructed in 1941. Adjacent structures are also single family with lots that are 192.5' in depth. There are two accessory buildings in the rear yard that will be removed. A COA for a second floor addition was issued March 14, 2014 (2013-048). A three car garage with an upstairs is proposed.

**Revised Proposal**

The project proposal is for a detached three car garage in the rear yard and a side addition to the house toward the rear and not highly visible from the street. The following items have changed from June:

**A: Detached garage**

1. The garage height is has been reduced from 25'-10" to 22'-9"
2. The roof over the front entrance has been removed
3. The front dormer has been modified
4. The massing of the roof has been reduced (see south elevations)
5. Paired windows in the side elevations are single double hung
6. The rear gabled dormer has been changed to a shed dormer

**B: Side addition**

1. The design has not changed. The applicant has submitted past HDC approvals of side additions

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages and additions.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with the **Rules and Procedures** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to DECLINE** hearing this application because the revised plans do not represent a substantial change in plans or circumstance from that recently DENIED. **Mr. Henningson seconded.**

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: COMMISSION DECLINED TO HEAR THIS APPLICATION AS SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE WAS NOT REPRESENTED.**

---

**Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to APPROVE the May minutes. Mr. Ristaino seconded. The vote was unanimous to approve the May minutes. 8/0**

The Commission came out of closed session at 7:35 pm. A MOTION was made and unanimously approved to adjourn at 7:36pm with a meeting length of 6 hours and 32 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.