



**CHARLOTTE**  
 HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
 December 14, 2016

MINUTES

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. James Haden, Chair  
 Ms. Jana Hartenstine  
 Mr. P. J. Henningson  
 Ms. Jessica Hindman  
 Mr. Rodric Lenhart  
 Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair  
 Ms. Claire Stephens  
 Ms. Tamara Titus

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Mattie Marshall  
 Mr. Dominick Ristaino, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair  
 Ms. Deb Ryan  
 One Vacancy

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. John Howard, Administrator of the Historic District Commission  
 Ms. Kristi Harpst, Staff  
 Historic District Commission  
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff  
 Historic District Commission  
 Ms. Linda Keich, Staff  
 Historic District Commission  
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney  
 Adkins Court Reporters

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular December meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:05 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 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 either 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. A 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 be removal from the room.

Index of Addresses:

**Continued**

1608 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
300 West Park Avenue	Wilmore

**New Applications**

1816 Wickford Place (4 parcels)	Wilmore
421 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
700 Templeton Avenue	Dilworth
1741 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
1619 Lyndhurst Avenue	Dilworth
620 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
1422 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
522 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
632 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
1610 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
1619 Euclid Avenue	Dilworth

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-179, 1608 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The application was continued from November for the following items: 1) Show accurate grade on all elevations with existing and proposed grade outlined and contour reference heights on all corners, 2) Accurate side elevations that reflect impact of change in grade to foundation, 3) Front and rear elevations from property line to property line, 4) Revised bracket detail and arrangement in side gables.

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on Merriman Avenue. The parcel tapers in width from the front to back. Adjacent houses are one to two stories of varying architectural designs. Setbacks are approximately 20 to 27 feet from right of way. Building heights vary between 14.5 and 29.6 feet.

***PROPOSAL – SEPTEMBER***

The proposal is a new single family home. Design features include a full width front porch, a front facing gable dormer, rear shed dormer and wood trim materials. Front porch depth is 8 feet. Proposed height is approximately 25 feet.

***PROPOSAL – OCTOBER***

1. The site plan includes grading information
2. Front dormer has been moved
3. Revised height is 24’-6”

4. Driveway design has been modified
5. Porch columns consistent on all elevations

**PROPOSAL – NOVEMBER**

1. Grading plan has been revised to reflect a flat, consistent foundation without a slope
2. Foundation and wall section has been revised
3. Brick foundation is proposed
4. Tree protection plan included
5. Eave dimensions added
6. Material notes updated
7. Handrail detail included

**PROPOSAL – DECEMBER**

1. Grading plan has been revised to reflect the proposed grade
2. Bracket detail and arrangement has been revised

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction**, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Column, and bracket details
- Window sill and casing details

**Ms. Hartenstine seconded**

**VOTE:** 8/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** Application approved with revised drawings to staff for probable approval.

---

Mr. Henningson declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

---

**Application: HDC 2016-278, 300 WEST PARK AVENUE – GARAGE**

The application was continued from November for the following items: 1) Scale down the massing on alley side by redesigning the third garage door to look more like a pedestrian door and lower its ridgeline, 2) Recommend wood doors because of its high visibility from the street, 3) Include a perspective view from the street toward the alley.

**EXISTING CONTEXT**

The site is a corner lot at 300 West Park Avenue and Southwood Avenue. Site dimensions are 50’ x 195’ with an alley. There are several trees on the right side and within the city’s right of way. Plans for a new single family house were approved October 16, 2016.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is a one story detached garage with access from the alley. The side setback is 15 feet from right of way, 20 feet from the alley, and 50 feet from the house. Garage height is approximately 17 feet. Siding is wood lap with other details to match the house. Additional landscaping is proposed on the side facing the street.

**PROPOSAL – DECEMBER**

1. A secondary garage door is proposed on the right side
2. Perspective drawings from the street have been included
3. Proposed door material is ‘composite’

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings.

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

**MOTION:** Based on insufficient information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for further design study regarding the reduction of the massing.  
**Ms. Titus seconded**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Due to non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Garage*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application citing

- Massing, relationship of the building’s various parts to each other

**Mr. Rumsch seconded**

**VOTE:** 7/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** Application for garage denied

**Application: HDC 2016-177, 178, 276 & 277, 1816 WICKFORD PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a c. 1938 one story single family house. The parcel is zoned R-43 Multi-Family and is approximately .34 acres. Adjacent properties are multi-family (not in the district) and single family residences, primarily 1 and 1.5 stories in height. The HDC placed a 365-day Stay of Demolition on the property January 13, 2016. There are mature trees on the site; those to be saved or removed are identified on the plans.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is the construction four single family structures on the site which is currently going through the rezoning process. There are two models being proposed and will be identified as Lot/Plan 1, 2, 3 and 4. The setback of the proposed house for Lot 1 is the same as the existing structure which will set the location for Lots 1-4. All homes are 1.5 stories (approx. 25’ to 28’ in height), and feature front porches 8’ in depth, wood siding, wood windows, brick foundations, and wood corner boards. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the porch columns and soffits. Plans 1 and 3 feature a front shed dormer and cross gable. Plans 2 and 4 feature a front gable with shed dormers to either side.

The underlying zoning will require an 8’ planting strip and 6’ sidewalk. New landscaping and tree save opportunities are shown on the site plan. Included in the plan is a new private alley at the rear for the four houses.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:** Adjacent Property Owner Linda McGee spoke in favor of this application. She stated that the 365 day stay of demolition did not accomplish anything and she is thrilled to have homes that are consistent with the neighborhood.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for:

- Size, the relationship of the footprint of this house in relationship to the lot as evidence in slides 57 and 60. The applicant has not provided the numeric evidence to show that this relationship exists within the neighborhood.
- Scale, the key element of this house to the historic buildings around it, Height
- Massing, these houses have conflicting styles and proportional elements. i.e. window sizes and floor heights

**Ms. Stephens seconded**

**VOTE:** 6/2      **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** HADEN, HENNINGSON

**DECISION:** Application for New Construction of four homes denied

Mr. Lenhart is the applicant for the next application and removed himself from the Commission.

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-293, 421 GRANDIN ROAD – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing site is a vacant lot approximately 5-6 feet above the sidewalk. There are mature trees on and around the site. Adjacent structures are one and two story structures including a quadraplex on the immediate right side. Setbacks on the block vary.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is a new two story single family house. The proposed height is approximately 27'-5" from grade (approx. 25'- 3' from FF). House footprint dimensions are 38' x 76'. The proposed 36' setback matches the previous structure. Proposed materials are Hardie - Artisan Series -siding, wood trim and brick foundation. Windows are aluminum clad wood. The tree removal and replacement is listed on the site plan.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded**

**VOTE:** 7/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-274, 700 TEMPLETON AVENUE – ADDITION**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The existing structure is a c. 1936 one story brick house. Adjacent properties are 1 and 2 story single family houses. A multi-family development is located behind the house. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the property July 13, 2016.

***PROPOSAL***

The proposed project is a large addition to the single family house. The detached garage will be accessed from the side street. The proposed height is approximately 24'-6". Materials are brick with wood trim. A rear section has lapped wood siding. Other features include wood clad windows and a front porch with a depth of eight feet. The detached garage is 20' in height with materials and architectural details to match the house and wood garage doors. Rear yard pervious area is approximately 58%.

***APPLICANT COMMENTS***

Architect Allen Brooks handed out revised plans and asked these be ones for consideration.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

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

**FOR/AGAINST:** No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- Substitute elevation is the one being considered
- Full computer drawings with necessary details, materials, and dimensions
- Landscaping and HVAC indicated on site plan
- Fence details
- Setback drawing showing two homes to left
- Drop the proposed house into the exhibit.

**Ms. Stephens seconded**

**VOTE:** 8/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION CONTINUED

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-284, 1741 WILMORE DRIVE – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a c. 1934 one story Bungalow. Existing materials are vinyl over wood siding and brick.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is a rear addition, fenestration changes and siding repair/replacement. On the front elevation a new primary entry door replaces two existing, new windows are 3 over 1 wood STDL, new dormer windows and new wood handrail. New windows are proposed on the left, rear and right elevations. The vinyl siding will be removed and the underlying wood siding will be repaired and replaced where necessary.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions and fenestration. The guideline for setback does not apply.

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- New elevations showing proposed only
- Maintain the full height of the windows on the left elevation
- All details – including trim, skirt board, corner board, rail, sill
- Match the proposed window pattern on the two casement windows of the right elevation.

**Ms. Hindman seconded**

**VOTE:** 8/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-288, 1619 LYNDHURST – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a c. 1905 one story “Triple A” cottage. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey of Historic Places. Exterior siding is wood and stucco. The front porch is currently enclosed. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2 stories in height.

**PROPOSAL**

The project includes re-establishing the open front porch and construction of a second floor addition within the existing building footprint. The front porch design features new wood columns and hand rails. Roof slope will be continued to a new ridge height. Two small dormers would be added to the front. New windows and trim would match existing. New materials include lapped wood and shake siding. Existing windows to be replaced are noted on the left, rear and right elevations. The chimney will be raised.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS**

Architect Paul Pautzsch said there are other two story houses on the street. The goal is to create a one and one half story house of the smallest house on the street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to DENY** this application:

- Fails to meet guidelines for massing - overwhelms house going from 22’6: to 30’4”
- Raising ridge 8 feet destroys the massing and look of original structure
- Goes from a true one story to a full two story – especially on the sides
- Does not meet guidelines for additions and does not respect the original character and massing of the house

**VOTE: 8/0 AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-298, 620 WOODRUFF PLACE – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a c. 1942 one story, side gabled duplex. Exterior features include a clay tiled front and side porch, 6/6 wood windows and brick exterior. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2 story single and multi-family dwellings.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is a conversion of the duplex to a single family dwelling with a second story addition within the existing footprint. The rear addition is a covered porch. New materials include brick to match existing and wood trim. Other design features include tapered columns on brick piers, metal porch roof and wood eave brackets.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply because it is not being changed.

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to DENY** this application due to:

- Failing to meet guidelines for massing by raising the roof 14 feet and making a one story house into a 2 ½ story house
- Proposed overwhelms the original structure
- Virtual demolition of existing



- Does not meet guidelines for additions because it does not respect the original character of the property
- It is not sensitive to the character and massing of the original house and would also alter the existing architectural style

***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

**VOTE: 8/0**    **AYES:**    HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:**    NONE

**DECISION:**    APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-299, 1422 THE PLAZA**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The existing structure is a c. 1941 single family house. Adjacent structures are also single family homes on deep lots. The setback of the house is approximately 48 feet from right of way. The site is approximately 4-5 feet above the sidewalk. Approval for a second floor addition was issued March 14, 2014 (2013-048).

***PROPOSAL***

The project is a right side screen porch addition at the rear of the house and not highly visible from the street. The addition extends 3' beyond the thermal wall of the side of the house.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

**FOR/AGAINST:**    No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

**MOTION:**    Based on the need for additional information Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- Accurate drawings with detail
- Engineer's report (regarding foundation)
- Tree protection plan from an Arborist
- Revised plan from stucco foundation to brick.
- Stucco eliminated.

***Mr. Henningson seconded.***

**VOTE: 8/0**    **AYES:**    HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**    APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-301, 522 W KINGSTON AVENUE - ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a one story brick American small house constructed in 1951. The house has a small porch with a gabled roof and squared columns. Adjacent structures are similar in scale and style with porch additions. Setbacks vary slightly along the street.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is a new full size front porch. New pier/column element will support expanded gable roof, new brick foundation and piers, wood handrails, and a new brick foundation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:** No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

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

- No column beam detail
- Beam only - with detail to match existing
- Tree protection plan.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

**VOTE: 8/0 AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-297, 1610 DILWORTH ROAD – NEW WINDOW**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is ac. 1933 two story brick home with stucco accents. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is the installation of a fixed window in the front gable within the half timbering trim.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission shall determine if the window design meets the applicable *Policy & Design Guidelines*.

**FOR/AGAINST:** No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as shown in the revised handout drawing.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

**VOTE: 6/2 AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW WINDOW APPROVED - REVISED HANDOUT DRAWING

---

- **Ms. Hindman was not in the room for the next application.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-282, 1619 EUCLID AVENUE – ROLLED CURB**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The site is a single family residence. The front yard is approximately 2-3 feet above grade with an original rolled concrete curb retaining wall. Work was begun to reface the rolled curb/retaining wall and raise the height. The sidewalk and steps have been resurfaced in stone. When it was brought to the attention of the owners that work of this nature needed prior approval, the work immediately stopped and an application was filed.

***PROPOSAL***

The applicant is requesting removal of the rolled curb and a new of a stacked stone wall not to exceed 3 feet in height. The additional retaining wall height will be backfilled to create a flat front yard. All other site improvements may be reviewed administratively.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

The Commission shall determine if the rolled curb wall should be retained and repaired.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Rick Harris adjacent property owner spoke in opposition.
- Stan Smith adjacent property owner spoke in opposition.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to DENY** this application.

- Concrete curb to be restored
- Steps and sidewalk to be restored
- The new materials are not historic in their application
- ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** specify repair vs. replacement
- Architectural elements are not interchangeable from house to house.  
***Ms. Titus seconded.***

**VOTE: 7/0 AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS,

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION DENIED.

---

- **Mr. Lenhart declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the commission for the next application.**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-291, 632 GRANDIN ROAD**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing home is c. 1929 two story. The house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register Survey. The applicant began painting the brick foundation and chimney. He was notified that painting previously unpainted masonry was work that needed prior before beginning. The work stopped immediately and the owner filed an application.

**PROPOSAL**

The applicant submitted an application in March 2016 with photographs to request an exception for painting the brick chimney. The HDC approved the painted foundation upon proof of visual disparities in the masonry work. The HDC denied the application to paint the remainder of the chimney and further advised the homeowner to explore alternate solutions and come back in six months.

Because the brick is textured and multi-colored, paint removal would not be appropriate and the applicant is requesting to finish painting the chimney. The steps and brick rowlock on the porch will not be painted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted to paint the remainder of the chimney.

**FOR/AGAINST:** No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Mr. Rumsch made **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application until the Commission has a policy discussion.

*Ms. Titus seconded*

**VOTE: 7/0 AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH  
STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK CONTINUED.

---

Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to approve the October minutes with corrections. Ms. Stephens seconded and the vote was unanimous.

With a meeting length of 4 hours and 31 minutes, the meeting adjourned at 5:37 pm.

---

Linda Keich, Staff  
Historic District Commission