



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

December 13, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. P.J. Henningson
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Ms. Kim Parati
Mr. John Phares
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus, 2nd Vice Chair
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Jim Haden, Chair
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice Chair
Mr. Damon Rumsch

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, Clerk
Historic District Commission
Ms. Sonda Kennedy, Staff
Historic district Commission
Mr. Thomas Powers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney
Adkins Court Reporters

With a quorum present and in Chairman Haden’s absence, 2nd Vice Chair Ms. Titus called the regular December meeting of the Charlotte Historic District Commission to order at 1:01pm. She began the hearings portion of the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and others. She explained 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 the subject agenda item. Presentations by the applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Charlotte Historic District 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 the 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 if necessary. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application to 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 if 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 file an 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. Ms. Titus 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. Mr. Haden swore in all applicants and Staff, and she continued, for the duration of the meeting, to swear in people as they arrived.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED

HDC 2017-594, 1823 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-614, 617 W Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-650, 2227 Sarah Marks Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-655, 1009 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2017-660, 2124 Park Road	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2017-686, 1926/2010 The Plaza,	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-682, 800 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-600, 1719 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDC 2017-684, 300 E Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-719, 1508 S. Mint Street	Wilmore

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-594 1823 THOMAS AVENUE – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The application was continued from November for further design study regarding the following: Height, width, and scale, with the request that the dormers be pulled in and tie below the ridge and the second floor windows be smaller.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a corner lot at Thomas Avenue and Haywood Court. The street slopes downward from Thomas Avenue to Haywood Court. The existing structure is a c. 1922 one story Bungalow. Features include exposed rafters, eave brackets, cedar shake siding, and a low front dormer. Alley entrance from Haywood Court exists for the proposed garage access. A previous application for a two story garage was denied June 2017 but the revised plans address the concerns.

PROPOSED

The project is a detached garage in the right corner of rear yard. Access to the garage is from the alley. Garage height is approximately 20'-6". The building is set back from the principal structure and adjacent house. Design features include wood lap and cedar shake siding, exposed rafters, and eave brackets. Garage doors are carriage style. Because of the topography the actual building height is slightly more than the house, but the relative height of the garage is lower than the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings and determine if any exceptions are warranted.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Smaller size windows
- Note: Height approved due to topography.

Mr. Phares seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

-
- **MS. HARTENSTINE ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 1:21 PM AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
-

MS. HARTENSTINE DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-614 617 WEST PARK AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from November for the following:

- Revisit the front porch design for acceptable solutions to the four foot depth or
- Provide nearby examples of shallow front porches.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant lot with parcel dimensions of approximately 74' wide x 55' in depth (4070 square feet. Zoning minimum is 6,000 SF). The previous applicant received a variance for the front setback (10') and rear yard (10') because of the constrained parcel size and configuration. The adjacent parcel is similar in size and configuration. Alley access exists between the properties and is overgrown and encroached upon by the adjacent owner. Adjacent structures are 1 to 2 stories in height. The HDC approved similar plans for a prior applicant May 2017.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of a single family house. The front setback is 10' from ROW. Design features include brick foundation, wood lap and shake siding, and wood trim details. House height is approximately 23'-6". House footprint is 50'-6" x 28' (lot size is 74' x 55'). The applicant has presented examples of shallow porches in the Wilmore District and images of historic porch design. Revised porch depth is 5'-4".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction and if any exceptions are warranted.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with the Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Ms. Walker made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the application as submitted noting the applicants choice is exhibit labeled 'A'. Due to the small size of the lot (less than 1/10 of an acre) and supporting evidence provided, an exception is made to the required standard porch depth of eight feet.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH EXCEPTION WARRANTED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-650 2227 SARAH MARKS AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was continued from November for the following: Restudy of the massing in hopes of minimizing and simplifying the second story mass.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a corner lot at Sarah Marks Avenue and Edgewood Lane. The lot dimensions are 50' x 125'. The principal structure is a two story house and the garage is one story in the rear yard and accessed from the side street. The garage is non-conforming because it does not meet the required rear yard setback. Improvements can be made to non-conforming structures but any changes must be compliant with the Code of whenever the changes are made.

PROPOSAL

The project is an upper addition to the garage that would provide additional heated square footage living space without tearing down the garage. The addition would make the structure 18' in height, lower than adjacent single family houses. Existing siding would be replaced with new lapped wood siding and new upper siding is proposed to be cedar shake. The existing garage door would be replaced with a carriage style door. All other trim details will match the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings and if any exception is warranted.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Phares **MADE a MOTION to APPROVE** this application with the following modifications: Eave trim clarified, windows of addition identified and consistent with house addition.
Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 7/1 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: WALKER

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS FOR STAFF APPROVAL.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-655 1009 EAST BOULEVARD – ROOF AND FENESTRATION CHANGES

The application was continued in November for the following: final drawings with materials noted, entry canopies, fenestration changes, and landscaping.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The building is a c. 1968 one story commercial structure. The exterior is painted brick and has a mansard style parapet roof attached to the front. Roof top mechanical units are located toward the rear and not screened by the parapet. Approval for façade changes was issued May 23, 2006 (COA# 2006-31-D21).

PROPOSAL

Proposed is the removal of the mansard parapet, painting the brick that will become exposed once the mansard roof is removed, removal of the front awnings, and fenestration changes with new metal frame windows and doors. The front right picture window is replaced with two matching windows – but the space will be a brick pattern to read as now exists but with actual smaller windows. Some window openings on the side elevations are removed or changed in size. Windows that are removed will be bricked in but could be returned as windows in the future. The roof top mechanical units will not be visible from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for fenestration and roof form and if exceptions are warranted.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines and exceptions warranted. Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application making an exception based on the building being a c. 1968 infill commercial property, and painting previously unpainted masonry will unify the painted building, and bricked over window openings will still as former windows. Window height changes justified by removal of mansard roof. Recesses will indicate sites of former window openings.
Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED.

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-660 2124 PARK ROAD – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

The application was continued for more information on window replacement.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1920 one and one half story brick bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. A Stop Work order was issued due to window removal.

PROPOSED

Windows on the right and left side have been removed and openings changed. New windows are proposed to match existing in muntin pattern and dimensions. A full size window sample will be available at the hearing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement windows and trim meet the guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines –Window Replacement*, Ms. Parati made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the right elevation with the top and bottom sashes must match the light and meeting rail dimensions of the existing windows. She moved to deny the left elevation, based on our *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines* 4.13 and 4.14. The windows and pattern should match the previous windows with exact dimensions.
Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 6/1 AYES: HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, PARATI, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: MARSHALL

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT RIGHT ELEVATION APPROVED AND LEFT ELEVATION DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017 -686 1926/2010 THE PLAZA - DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure at 1926 The Plaza is a c. 1935 one story single family home. Exterior features include two small hipped dormers and a small covered porch on the front. The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham Estate, designated a Local Historic Landmark. The four acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping and unique site features.

PROPOSED

The proposal is demolition of all structures on both properties. The Historic Landmarks Commission has placed a 365-Day Stay of Demolition on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission will make a decision as to whether or not the buildings are determined to be contributing to the Wilmore 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 not contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on ***Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Demolitions***, Mr. Henningson made a motion to recognize that the structure has special significance and value to the character of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District.

Ms. Marshall seconded

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

MOTION: Mr. Henningson mad a motion to put a 365 day stay of demolition on 1926 The Plaza.
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

Mr. Henningson made a motion to recognize 2010 The Plaza has special significance and value to the character of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District.

Ms. Marshall seconded

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

Mr. Henningson made a motion to put a 365 day stay of demolition on 2010 The Plaza.

Ms. Marshall seconded

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

Mr. Henningson made a motion that the shed on 2010 the Plaza has no significance to the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District therefore immediate demolition on the structure may proceed.

Ms. Parati seconded

VOTE: 5/3 **AYES:** HENNINGSON, PARATI, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, PHARES, MARSHALL

Mr. Henningson made a motion that the garage on 2010 the Plaza has no significance to the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District therefore, immediate demolition of the structure may proceed.

Ms. Stephens seconded

VOTE: 5/3 **AYES:** HENNINGSON, PARATI, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, PHARES, MARSHALL

MOTION: Mr. Henningson made a motion that the orangery (greenhouse) on 2010 the Plaza has no significance to the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District therefore immediate demolition on the structure may proceed.

Ms. Parati seconded

VOTE: 5/3 **AYES:** HENNINGSON, PARATI, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, PHARES, MARSHALL

DECISION: IMMEDIATE DEMOLITION MAY TAKE PLACE ON THE SHED, GARAGE, AND ORANGERIE (GREENHOUSE). 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION ON THE MAIN HOUSE, 2010 THE PLAZA – VANLANDINGHAM ESTATE, AND 1926 THE PLAZA.

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: HDC 2017- 682 800 WOODRUFF PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant parcel on Woodruff Place at the corner of Hurston Place. It is at the very edge of the Wesley Heights Local Historic District. It is in an area with one and one half story homes, and two story homes. There is infill new construction behind this address (not in the Wesley Heights Local Historic District), and across the street (in the Wesley Heights Local Historic District). The landscape slopes downward toward Freedom Drive. The site is approximately three feet above the sidewalk and the lot size is actually larger than most at 82.5' x 150'. Existing house setbacks along the street vary between 34 and 41' on the block face. The previous structure on this site was a single family, one and one half story house that was demolished without Historic District Commission approval by a prior owner. There are mature trees of various conditions on the edges of the property. The previous application was denied September 13, 2017.

PROPOSED

Proposed is a two story single family house. The proposed front setback is approximately 34 feet from the right of way to the front thermal wall. The house height is approximately 26' from the first floor. Primary exterior material is brick. Architectural details are inspired from homes in the neighborhood and of the home that was demolished. Windows are wood Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). The detached garage, with alley entry, materials and design reflect elements of the house, the height is

approximately 23'-6". Other details include wood roof trim, copper gutters or similar, wrought iron hand rail, and wood porch columns. The house has a primary orientation toward Woodruff Place but also addresses Hurston Place in a secondary fashion. One mature tree would be removed and a new tree will be planted in the front yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Fred Martin spoke in support of the application

Neighborhood Resident Stephen Shifton spoke in support of the application.

Neighborhood Resident Michael Sullivan spoke in support of the application.

Neighborhood Resident Michael Mathis spoke in support of the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** with the expectation that revised plans will be submitted which show:

- Dormers that are more in keeping with the vocabulary of the historic neighborhood
- The Woodruff Place elevation as successful as the Hurston Place elevation
- 3D image exhibit suggested
- Landscaping plan
- Two doors on the garage instead of one large door
- Samples of non-traditional materials and product information.
- We are good with the height and width given the size of the lot
- Details on the windows, the window sills and the gutters.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 600 1719 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – ADDITION, FENESTRATION CHANGES, GARAGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1950 one and one half story brick house. Design features include an asymmetrical sloping front facing gable roof and two wide picture windows.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is a front porch addition with 10" square columns and metal roof, a second floor addition that raises the ridge of the existing cross gable roof, a new rear dormer will tie below new ridge height, small right side addition, roof element added to left side dining room windows, rear first floor addition and rear porch. Existing front porch stoop and trim around the door is not original and is to be removed for the new porch addition. The windows in upper side gable ends will be centered once the roof ridge is raised. Fenestration changes include new Kolbe aluminum clad STDL windows throughout in the place of existing replacement, aluminum clad windows, a new front door and sidelight, and new patio doors. New materials and trim will match existing, siding is lapped wood. The detached garage is approximately 23' in height, cementitious lap siding is proposed with mitered corners. All vinyl siding will be removed. Gutters will be added.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposed addition, fenestration changes, and accessory building meet the guidelines.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information and further design study, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** THE application. Revised plans will show:

- An exhibit with the entire front elevation showing proposed front porch maintaining the existing roof slope and the front door with sidelights.
- A restudy of the garage. Additional information will show the garage is clearly a secondary structure to the primary house.
- The language of the garage will match the house.
- Mr. Phares friendly amendment which was accepted. Consider incorporating the closet bump-out on the right side into the house without the need for a bump out.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: PORCH AND GARAGE CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 684, 300 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is at the edge of the Dilworth Local Historic District and within the South End Transit Overlay District. The existing building is a c. 1930 one and one half story Bungalow style structure. Due to the insensitive changes over the years, the house is listed as Non-Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. A previous application for demolition was reviewed June 2017. A motion was made that this is a contributing structure to the Dilworth Local Historic District. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the structure. The property is zoned B-1 which allows residential

development. The site slopes from front to rear approximately 8-10 feet. Adjacent structures are a mix of one and two story residential buildings, mixed use, and institutional buildings.

PROPOSAL

The project is an addition to create a single family house. The front elevation would be restored to an open front porch. The building addition would start behind the existing front dormer and continue to the rear of the property. A portion of the original house is being incorporated into the new plan. Design features include wood shakes, wood trim, exposed rafters and roof trim to match existing, a rear deck, side porches, and dormers. The detached garage has design features that match the house.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either for or against this application...

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The HDC will determine if the project meets the guidelines for additions and accessory buildings or if exceptions are warranted.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with Charlotte *Historic District Design Guidelines* and no exception warranted, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the application.
Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION/GARAGE DENIED AS PROPOSED.

Ms. Walker left the Historic District Commission meeting at 7:00 pm and did not return.

Ms. Parati left the Historic District Commission meeting at 7:00 pm and did not return.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-719 1508 SOUTH MINT STREET, SIGNAGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story commercial building which is being renovated. The zoning is TOD-M. The subject property is a restaurant at the corner of South Mint Street and West Summit Avenue. The entire building abuts a narrow sidewalk along South Mint Street and West Summit Avenue. The length of the entire building is approximately 147 feet.

PROPOSAL

The project is a sign for the restaurant with the request to enlarge the sign for visibility. The sign would be mounted above the windows. The HDC sign regulations restrict the signage area to 6 square feet, or 9" in height for this application. The applicant is requesting an exception to allow a sign height of 16" atop the canopy. It would be impossible, with the multiple lanes of traffic and speed limit, to read anything smaller.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Titus' invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the request for additional signage size warrants an exception due to location and context.

MOTION: Based on exception warranted to *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the increase in the size of the sign because of the length and size of the building and the context.
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIGNAGE APPROVED.

The Historic District Commission ended at 7:10 pm with a meeting length of six hours and 9 minutes.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Keich
Staff, Historic District Commission