



# CHARLOTTE™

## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES 14 June 2017

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. James Haden, Chair  
 Ms. Jana Hartenstein  
 Mr. Paul Henningson  
 Ms. Jessica Hindman  
 Ms. Mattie Marshall  
 Mr. Dominick Ristaino, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair  
 Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair  
 Ms. Claire Stephens  
 Ms. Tamara Titus  
 Ms. Jill Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** T wo Vacancies

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. John Howard, Administrator  
 Historic District Commission  
 Ms. Kristina Harpst, Staff  
 Historic District Commission  
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff  
 Historic District Commission  
 Ms. Linda Keich, Staff  
 Historic District Commission  
 Mr. Jason Kay, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
 Ms. Karen Weatherly, Senior Assistant City Attorney

Mr. Haden reported that the Nominating Committee met and recommend: Mr. Haden to remain as Chair, Ms. Hindman be the 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair, and Ms. Titus be the 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair. A **MOTION** was made to accept the recommendation and the vote was unanimous.

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular June meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 1:06 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 to speak 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 proceeding, 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 **Historic District 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 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. Mr. Haden swore in all applicants and Staff, and he continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	1726 South Mint Street	Wilmore
	331 East Boulevard	Dilworth
	600 West Boulevard	Wilmore
	1516 Wickford Place	Wilmore
	1714 South Mint Street	Wilmore
	1211 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	420 South Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
	300 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	716 West Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
	1919 Springdale Avenue	Dilworth
	528 East Boulevard	Dilworth
	1508 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
	1823 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	324 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
	229 North Church Street	Fourth Ward
	2021 Dilworth Road West	Dilworth

**Application:** 1726 South Mint Street HDC 2017-261 – Window Removal and Tree Removal. A half-circle window was removed from the front of the house without approval during the recent renovation. A large tree in the front yard was also removed.

These issues are before the HDC in response to an Enforcement procedure initiated.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS**      Owner Kim Flood explained that the contractor was to get all permits and she did not realize work was being done without HDC approval. She said the tree was a nuisance tree: it was a pecan and uninvited people were frequently in the yard picking up the nuts. It also had large limbs falling. The window was in a closet and not convenient for her, so she had it removed and filled in with brick reclaimed from other parts of the house.

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

**MOTION:**                      Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION that the removed tree will be replaced with a new large maturing canopy tree in the front. Removing the window is DENIED and the window must be replaced, matching what was removed.  
*Ms. Stephens seconded.*

**VOTE:** 10/0              **AYES:**              HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:**                      NONE

**DECISION: TREE WILL BE REPLACED. WINDOW WILL BE REINSTALLED.**

---

Ms. Walker declared a conflict of interest, due to being on the Dilworth Land Use Committee of the neighborhood organization, and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

---

**APPLICATION: 331 EAST BOULEVARD HDC 2017-296 – DEMOLITION**

This c. 1925 two story, brick quad is at the corner of East Boulevard and Euclid Avenue. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The owners owned the adjacent house (Magic Maze), which has been demolished. There are no plans, at this time, for any new construction. Mention was made of structural issues but no engineer’s report was included.

**FOR/AGAINST**              Ms. Diane St. John spoke in opposition to the demolition.  
   Ms. Ellen Citarella spoke in opposition to the demolition.

**MOTION:**                      Due to the need for additional information, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** the application for more information regarding condition.

***Ms. Titus seconded.***

**VOTE:** 9/0                   **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL,  
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**    **DEMOLITION DECISION CONTINUED IN THE ABSENCE OF AN APPLICANT AND  
THE NEED FOR INFORMATION AND REPORTS REGARDING CONDITION.**

---

**APPLICATION: 600 BLOCK OF WEST BOULEVARD HDC 2017-296 DEMOLITION**

Proposed is a request for the demolition of several multifamily buildings on both sides of West Boulevard. Some of the apartments are already empty and boarded up, and some still have tenants. There are 35 units all together. The buildings were built in the mid-1950s.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:**    Owner James Scruggs said he has owned all but two of the buildings, in addition to a large vacant lot behind the units on the odd side of the street, for 10-12 years. The future plan is for townhomes over the entire acreage. He said the City is pushing him to demolish the buildings due to structural issues and crime issues. He has documents relative to the building issues and the crime issues but did not include them.

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

**MOTION:**                Due to the need for more information to support consideration for immediate demolition, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION that the HDC needs to see the specifics from the City (including applicable Code) and structural documentation.

***Ms. Marshall seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0               **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL,  
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**Note:**                    There was a mistake made in the notification process and it will be corrected to include the correct scope in the re-notification.

**DECISION:**    **INFORMATION SUPPORTING DEMOLITION MUST BE SUBMITTED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 1816 WICKFORD PLACE HDC 2016-324 - NEW CONSTRUCTION**

Revised drawings for the corner lot show porch foundation detail relative to a large tree. A floating foundation will protect the tree at the front corner. Specifications have been reconciled and corrected. The window detail has been added.

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for a Certified Arborist’s letter on tree protection relative to the revised plans – address dirt pile up and the footings/foundation - Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION for staff to review the additional information for probable approval.  
*Mr. Henningson seconded.*

**VOTE:** 10/0           **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**   **STAFF WILL REVIEW, FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL, ARBORIST’S LETTER RELATIVE TO TREE PROTECTION AND REVISED PLANS.**

---

**APPLICATION: 1714 SOUTH MINT STREET HDC 2017-306 – PAINTING BRICK**

This is a c. 1940 two story quad of yellow brick. There have been several additions over time which do not match each other or the original building. There are areas of bad repair. Even the bricks do not match in size and texture. The request is to paint all the brick to unify the disparate parts.

**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. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application. Revised submittal will include an exhibit showing that the original yellow brick will remain, other areas will be considered for painting with mitigating landscaping, all four elevations will be shown with explanatory labels. Ms. Titus seconded.

**VOTE:** 10/0           **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**   **REQUEST TO PAINT BRICK CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 1211 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE HDC 2017-132 – PAINTED BRICK**

This c. 1950 one story brick house was recently painted by a former owner. The new owners would like to keep the paint. At a site visit, staff made the recommendation that all problem areas (though now painted over) be marked for a visual to the HDC. Many areas were marked with blue painters' tape that show walls bowing, cracks, patches, broken bricks, crooked bricks, different sized bricks, degradation of mortar, etc.

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

Before reapplying the owners will work with staff to:

Do a test area on the back of the house on the original brick in an unobtrusive location to explore the feasibility of removing the paint.

Explore the possibility of a faux finish paint job to replicate the look of the original brick. Ms. Marshall seconded.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** the application.

**VOTE:** 9/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** WALKER

**DECISION:** **PAINTED BRICK CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 420 SOUTH SUMMIT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

A two story house was recently approved for this vacant lot. Now proposed is a one and one half story house. It is to be clad in wood siding and have a brick foundation.

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information and resolution through further design study, Ms. Stephens made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application. Revised submittal will include resolved:

- Scale of upper windows
- Column detail
- Gas fireplace bump out to become a masonry chimney or read as a bay

- Appropriately sized window trim and drip cap
- Wider window trim
- Gang the upper windows to eliminate siding between and add a mullion
- Correct upper window scale
- Pull in side shed dormer
- Reconcile rake and eave boxing depth
- Locate HVAC and drive on site plan
- Resolve roofing material.

***Ms. Hartenstine seconded.***

**VOTE:** 9/1     **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** RUMSCH

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 300 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE HDC 2017-351 – DEMOLITION**

This c. 1930 one story house is located at the corner of East Worthington Avenue and Cleveland Avenue. Due to changes over time, it is listed as Non- Contributing in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Demolition has been requested in the past but new owners are now requesting.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:** Architect Allen Brooks is looking at this project as an opportunity to reinforce residential on this edge of the Local Historic District. A plan is being developed.

New Owner Lucy Raynor said they have converted and transformed the house diagonally across back to residential and she would like to do the same with this house. This house has been residential for years. – in going from office to residential. She and her husband want to create a residential corner with a new duplex or triplex.

**FOR/AGAINST:** Neighbor Rick Cohan shared concern that a DEMOLITION would be approved without approved new construction plans. He pointed out that everything around is zoned non-residential.

**MOTION:** Based on Historic District Guidelines – DEMOLITION, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to recognize the house as a Contributing structure to the Dilworth Local Historic District.

***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0                    **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Based on the house being determined to be a Contributing structure to the Dilworth Local Historic District, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to impose the maximum 365 Day Stay of Demolition.

***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0                    **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**APPLICATION: 716 WEST KINGSTON AVENUE HDC 2017-334 – REAR ADDITION.**

Proposed is a two story rear addition. A rear facing gable will be clipped as well as the roof that can be seen from the street over the existing ridge.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:** Architect Jennifer Benson pointed out that there will be no footprint change. The tip of the new roof will be visible from the front. All materials will match. The proposed addition is atop a previous rear addition.

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

**MOTION:** Based on no exception warranted to Historic District Guidelines – New Construction – Scale, Size, Height (proposed regarding surrounding historic), Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DENY this application for a rear addition.

***Ms. Titus seconded.***

**VOTE:** 7/3                    **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, STEPHENS

**DECISION: TWO STORY REAR ADDITION DENIED.**

Ms. Hindman declared a conflict of interest as an Adjacent Property Owner and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

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



**APPLICATION: 1919 SPRINGDALE AVENUE HDC 2017-328 – REAR ADDITION**

This c. 1900 one story, wood sided house is listed as a Contributing structure on the Dilworth National Register Survey. There are four very similar houses on deep lots facing each other on this street.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:** Architect Allen Brooks acknowledged that this is one of a group of Victorian Cottages. It was completely gutted in 2010 but maintained the original form. Twin gables with a hog trough is the form of the rear roof. The proposed scheme is to take advantage of the existing rear height with a gambrel roof form engaging the twin gables and eliminating the hog trough. The adjacent house is much higher. There is no intent to alter the front.

Owner Jody Lawson said they want to stay but just need another bedroom. The new roof form is trying to fix an existing water problem. They do not want the addition visible from the street.

**MOTION:** Based on Historic District Guidelines – Additions, Ms. Walker made a MOTION to recognize that the proposed complies with applicable criteria.  
*Ms. Marshall seconded.*

**VOTE:** 8/0                   **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Based on the need for further design study, Ms. Hartenstine made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application for the rear addition. Issues to be resolved include:

- Massing of addition vs. the Victorian Cottage style
- Window proportion regarding Victorian Cottage style
- Architectural style of addition
- Roof form to complement existing
- Landscape plan.

*Ms. Stephens seconded.*

**VOTE:** 8/0                   **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 528 EAST BOULEVARD HDC 2017-362 – ACCESS RAMP**

This c. 1966 two story brick building has been in office use for a number of years at the corner of East Boulevard and Winthrop Avenue. It is an example of the Mid Century Modern style. The proposal is to install an access ramp on the front. It will be parallel to the building and against the front wall. The doors on the side and rear open into stairwells which would not work for the required access to be added there. It is to be a Buddhist meditation center.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:** Buddhist Monk Allen McGillivray said that the building is originally the monastery for the Greek Church. This new purchase will suit their needs very well. Code requires access to the main level. A low, punched brick wall to match the building will be in front of the ramp.

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

**MOTION:** Based on this proposal meeting all applicable criteria for Historic District Guidelines, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to PROCEED with the review.  
*Ms. Hindman seconded.*

**VOTE: 10/0** **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with Historic District Guidelines, Ms. Hartenstine made a MOTION to APPROVE the front ramp with staff to review revised plans which show the cap detail on the new brick screening wall.  
*Ms. Stephens seconded.*

**VOTE: 10/0** **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: RAMP APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.**

---

Ms. Walker declared a conflict of interest and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

---

**APPLICATION: 1508 DILWORTH ROAD HDC 2017-364 – GARAGE, SIDE PORCH, TREE REMOVAL**

This c. 1927 large, two story brick house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. A new two story garage is proposed for the right of the house in the rear yard. The garage will be clad in wood siding. A large tree will have to be removed. A chimney will be added for an outdoor fireplace to the wraparound terrace.

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

**MOTION:** Based on proposal meeting all applicable criteria for Historic District Guidelines, Ms. Marshall made a MOTION to PROCEED with the review.  
***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

**VOTE:** 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Based on the need for more information regarding the trees, and tree protection, and site plan information, Ms. Marshall made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application.  
***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

**VOTE:** 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED.**

---

Ms. Hartenstine declared a conflict of interest and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

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

---

**APPLICATION: 1823 THOMAS AVENUE HDC 2017-308 – NEW GARAGE**

This address is at the corner of Thomas Avenue and Haywood Court. It is a one story house. Proposed is to add a one and one half story, two car garage to the back yard with entry from Heywood Court or the alley. Materials will match the house.

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

**MOTION:** Based on no exception warranted to Historic District Guidelines - Garages, Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to DENY the garage on the specifics of Size, Height, Width, and Context. Ms. Titus seconded.

**VOTE:** 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: ONE AND ONE HALF STORY GARAGE DENIED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 324 GRANDIN ROAD HDC 2017-337 – NEW GARAGE**

This address is at the corner of Grandin Road and West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The application was recently continued for further design study regarding the requirement that a garage be secondary to the house. Revised plans show changes.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:** The owner pointed out that the new plans show the garage being lowered by three feet, it has been narrowed along the street elevation, the roof has been simplified, details have been taken from the house.

**FOR/AGAINST** Neighborhood Resident Vivian Coleman spoke in full support. She pointed out that the first plan was also appropriate.

**MOTION:** Based on this revised proposal meeting all applicable criteria for Historic District Guidelines, Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to PROCEED with the review.  
***Ms. Hindman seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application. Revised plans will show:

- window detail to match house
- head height windows
- roof pitch
- retaining wall or treatment beside garage doors
- materials noted
- clarify footprint dimensions
- corrected south elevation

***Ms. Marshall seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0    **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: GARAGE CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 229 NORTH CHURCH STREET HDC 2017-184 – FAÇADE RENOVATIONS**

This address is the old Medical College Building in the Fourth Ward. It is a Historic Landmark. The proposal is to remove downspouts on the building and repair where they are removed. They have been in place for decades but are neither functional nor historic. The downspouts are creating ongoing problems with critters and water getting in behind them.

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

**MOTION:**        Based on compliance with all applicable Historic District Guidelines, Ms. Hartenstine made a MOTION to APPROVE the removal of the gutters and repair where necessary.  
***Ms. Walker seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0    **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: GUTTERS WILL BE REMOVED AND WALL REPAIRED.**

---

**APPLICATION: 2021 DILWORTH ROAD WEST HDC 2017-365 – VINYL FENCE**

**A white vinyl fence is proposed for the back yard of this address.**

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:**    The owners explained that they want vinyl because it is an “eco-

friendly” superior product. They said it meets all HDC Guidelines. They are willing to put this proposed fence inside the existing fence.

**FOR/AGAINST:** Adjacent Property Owner Rich McDermott spoke in opposition to the fence.

**MOTION:** Based on no exception warranted to Historic District Guidelines - Fences, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DENY the installation of vinyl fencing.  
***Ms. Titus seconded.***

**VOTE:** 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: VINYL FENCING DENIED.**

---

**A MOTION** was made, seconded, and the vote carried to APPROVE the March MINUTES.  
**A MOTION** was made, seconded, and the vote carried to APPROVE the April MINUTES with noted changes/corrections.  
**A MOTION** was made, seconded, and the vote carried to APPROVE the May MINUTES.

---

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 pm with a meeting length of six hours and 16 minutes.

---

Respectfully Submitted, Wanda Birmingham