CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
November 21, 2013

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were Chairman Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Salkin, and Mr. Fisher. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Fisher moved for approval of the agenda as submitted, seconded by Mr. McDaniel and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

Mr. McDaniel moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of September 19, 2013, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Summary of 2013 and 2012 Activity

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that included in the packet was a summary of activities. The first ones consist of the applications that have come before the Historic District Commission for 2013 and 2012. To date in 2013, the Historic District Commission has considered five (5) applications. In 2012, the Historic District Commission considered seven (7) applications. Some things have changed since the last meeting. Final Plan approval was given to the Lands of Boyles Parking Lot project.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if this was the project near Elm Terrace, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied yes, the plan is to create a seven (7) space parking lot in the back of the building.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that for the Family Dollar project located at 300 W. Loockerman Street the Planning Office has seen some Check Prints on their Site Plan. The plan is moving through the process to get final Site Plan approval.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if they had done anything since August, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there had been one submission that came in this past week.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question if they had a Demolition Permit to do work at that location, Mrs. Melson Williams stated that they may be doing asbestos removal. In order to get a Demolition Permit, the Planning Department will need to have documentation of the asbestos report.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question regarding a wall that would remain, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was discussion that part of the existing wall would remain for part of the project, but she had not seen the building plans.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he was told that a basement was found that wasn't there and he assumed that they have had settlement from the previous owners.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if there was any additional information from Christ Church regarding the demolition, Mrs. Melson Williams stated no, but there was a meeting regarding a controlled burn of the building. This would require some coordination amongst City Departments and the Fire Department in order for it to happen. She was not sure if it had been given full approval or if they are looking at other methods to demolish the building. In order for them to demolish the building, they would need a permit.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if they had completed the documentation, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. She met with an individual from the church that had done floor plans of each floor and a series of other photographs of the building. Their next step is to apply for a Building Permit for demolition.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions regarding the applications and their status.

Summary of Architectural Review Certifications for 2013

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Architectural Review Certifications for 2013 consisted of any permit applications within the Historic District that required Architectural Review Certification.

There are a total of 78 permits through October that had activity in the Historic District for exterior type items. Majority of them were related to signs and temporary signs. Majority of the seventy-eight permits were eligible for Staff Review. If there are concerns when reviewing the permits, the Planning Office has the ability to refer it to the Historic District Commission for consultation if needed. Only three (3) of them involved action by the Historic District Commission. Some of the permits included the different phases at the Biggs Museum and now the Sign Permit to replace the sign.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel regarding his review of the permit summary where someone put up a sign without a permit and noticed that the fee is doubled, Mrs. Melson Williams stated yes, if work is done without a permit they must get a permit and the fee is doubled.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question regarding the rational for the Woodburn work not coming before the Historic District Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there are three (3) or four (4) permits associated with the work at Woodburn. One of the Permits was site related as they were doing work on the driveway, re-grading, and some sidewalk relaying related to ADA using the same material or brick material which is recommended in the *Design Standards and Guidelines.* There was a Permit for a black ornamental fence under four-feet in height. The fence was proposed at three-feet. There was a Permit for a handicap accessible entry into the building. It

is situated where it is not very visible from the public way. It is located on the north side of the building using wood materials for the deck and the railings. There is some similar type work on the back side of the Hall House for improving handicap accessibility. Planning Staff did not think it was anything too controversial; they were using appropriate materials from the District Guidelines. Planning Staff did not feel that there was anything that needed to be referred to the Historic District Commission for review. This was very different than the roof work that was brought before the Historic District Commission. The next phase is a landscape plan related to the former vegetable garden that is on the property. It will be a path network to reconnect to the house.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's inquiry that landscaping permits did not come before the Historic District Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. In some cases landscaping does not need a permit at all anywhere in the City except when you get into major clearing of woodland areas. A Permit was needed for the garden area because there is a gazebo element being placed on the property. The proposed gazebo is wood with a cedar shake roof.

Mr. McDaniel stated that it seems as if the project has taken so long. There used to be a pavilion behind the building and they were allowed to put the pavilion behind the Elizabeth W. Murphey School. All of the property behind the Governors House is owned by the Elizabeth W. Murphey School. In the recent redo they wanted to take the pavilion down and put it on their property. Currently, the gazebo has been taken down. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it will not go back where it was originally located. The people who are doing the work now are not the people who are going to move the gazebo. He stated that they do a lot of conferences at the school at E. Anger Hall and the gazebo will be moved to that location.

Mr. Salkin stated that all-in-all they seem to be doing a very nice job. He thinks that the totality of the project should have come before the Historic District Commission. It has been split into little pieces and you easily rational each piece that does not belong before the Historic District Commission. When someone has a project of that magnitude with traumatic changes to the historic structure of which most is visible from the street the project should come before the Historic District Commission piece by piece. At the very least they should have seen it even if they did not have jurisdiction. The impact on the north side of the building (ADA ramp) is very significant. He is not sure if it could have been done any better or if he would have had any comments, but it is all brick and metal railing.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if there was a deck added, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that they called it a deck, it is off of the kitchen, the very east end of the building.

Chairman Scrafford stated that if something is approved by Staff they would like to be made aware of it. There was one significant area (The Green) that if anything was approved by Staff that the Historic District Commission would be informed; not that they are going to change anything.

Mr. McDaniel stated that the Woodburn property would be as important because it is such an important piece of property in the City.

Mr. Salkin stated that he missed the meeting and apparently did not read the minutes closely. He

would like for the Historic District Commission to be notified of high profile projects that are being considered whether it be via email or tentative approval brought before them before it is given to the applicant. He does not want the Historic District Commission to be a stumbling block. He stated that he has observed the property daily and thinks that it is a great project and the impact is significant. They would have allotted them review of the design, but they were not given a chance. Especially with the fence, it seems years ago there was a fence issue that came before the Historic District Commission.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the fence was going to be over 4-feet in height in that case.

Mr. Salkin stated that it would be in everyone's best interest to be able to say that the Historic District Commission reviewed and approved the project. He stated that he was very surprised to see that there was going to be a fence built around it. It was included in the minutes, but he did not read the minutes.

Chairman Scrafford stated that he read about the project in the newspaper.

Mr. Salkin stated that he thinks the project is much more significant than the temporary solar panels that were proposed that you cannot see from the street.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the location was changed than what was originally proposed for the solar panels.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question if the banners in front of the Governor's Café were legal, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the ones hanging on the street light are not necessarily legal. Planning Staff was aware and concerned about it since other businesses may want to do the same. She was not sure if they were granted permission to attach the banner to a City light pole or how it happened.

Chairman Scrafford stated that they all agreed to be involved or informed that decisions have been made on projects in the Governor's Mansion vicinity because it is as equally important as The Green so that everyone is on the same page.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if the State wanted to do something on Legislative Mall do they need to come before the Historic District Commission for approval? They recently installed a World War II monument and previously the State Police monument of police officers who lost their life in their line of duty. He stated that they were told about it, but did not have to approve. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the monument question is not real clear and it is not addressed clearly in the Building Code as to whether or not a permit is needed. If it is truly a structure then it would have other implications on the City side.

Mr. McDaniel commented that he loves monuments and he knows that they are not going to be like Richmond who has a monument street, but every monument that has been installed recently looks like a glorified tombstone except for the minutemen on the other side of Legislative Hall where they have actual statues.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if the structure is something that is designed to be occupied, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no not necessarily. There is a definition in the *Zoning Ordinance* of what a "building" is and the fence comes under that ordinance. It gets a little tricky. On the minute-men statue there probably was some type of foundation permit that was done because of the sheer weight and size after the fact.

Mr. McDaniel stated that it is a very neat one and was very cleverly done. The ground goes down so that it cannot be reached to cause vandalism very easily.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question if there were any of the permits/applications were getting ready to lapse or have to come back to the Historic District Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she would need to look. For some of the larger projects where the Historic District Commission made a recommendation and the Planning Commission made the final action, the Planning Commission final action has a timeframe of two (2) years before it expires. The Duncan project near the train station has expired. It ran out of its timeframe for the Site Plan. If they wanted to build something they would have to go back through the process and it would include the Historic District Commission.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she would need to check on the application for 509 South State Street and the demolition for that building. It originally came before the Historic District Commission and then it took some time for them to get the information together before the Historic District Commission could ultimately take action. They are not at expiration on this application.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if the timeframe started with the Historic District Commission action, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. They may be pushing a timeframe and she will check into it.

Mr. McDaniel stated that Christ Church was given final approval in February. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she will check to see if it is a one year timeframe and if it does not happen by February then the Historic District Commission may have to revisit it for an extension.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Sub-Committee

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there is a Bicycle & Pedestrian Sub-Committee for the City. It was created as a sub-committee of the City Council's Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee. It has a number of appointed members to it of both the bicycle and pedestrian world. In the past year the Sub-Committee has worked on making an application for designation as a bicycle friendly community. This application goes to the League of American Bicyclists. They look at the overall application of information that was reported such as how many places have bike racks, bike lane mileages, etc. The outcome is a designation and the City received an honorable mention. They also make a series of recommendations on how you can improve your bicycle facilities and amenities throughout the City. The honorable mention was celebrated roughly a month ago when they received notice. We are still expecting a report to come in.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if they would be the committee that recommends the signage for

the painting of lanes, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. The Sharrows is the correct term for the little bicyclist person with the two (2) arrows on the top that you see in the Downtown area and it is related to transportation. In the Downtown area there is signage where vehicles will need to share the road with a person on a bicycle. It is consider a moving vehicle and they should follow the same rules as a moving vehicle.
Mr. McDaniel stated that the State has nearly completed the bicycle lane and the path that runs from Legislative Hall area down to Winner Ford.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that a lot of the landscaping has been completed and that is part of the Capital Trail Project. The Historic District Commission heard this project regarding the brick patterns at the bridge crossing. The Historic District Commission also heard and saw the concept for Phase II which connects from the point just east Legislative Hall. The path is to be east of the Archives parking lot to come over to Loockerman Street where they have installed the mid-block crossing ramp because of the other street work project that was being done on Loockerman Street.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question if that segment would come back to the Historic District Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the Phase II is by the piece by the Archives and there is potentially a third element that will take it along Park Drive which is outside of the Historic District. It is still in design phase as to what will happen.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the committee has had maps available to the members to mark up to verify problem areas. If the Historic District Commission has areas that are having problems that you notice in your travels let the Planning Office know. They are hoping that in the long run to feed that information to the City Public Works Office so that they can help prioritize where they need to be dealing with sidewalk.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if it was for bicyclists and pedestrians, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes both. If there are sidewalk issues that you are aware of, please let the Planning Office know.

Central Dover Community Plan

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if anyone had heard of the Central Dover Community Plan.

Responding to the Historic District Commission member's questions if it was the Master's Plan or the Plan with Gregg Moore, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated not exactly. The Central Dover Community Plan is a plan that is currently underway. There is money that was received from the Wells Fargo Foundation that through a collaborative effort of the Downtown Dover Partnership, NCALL, and the City are moving forward with the plan. The plan focuses more on the residential areas in the immediate vicinity of Downtown Dover. It was an issue that was brought out of the downtown safety series of meetings and a grant opportunity came about to apply for the Wells Fargo Foundation grant. Central Dover Community Plan was successful in receiving the grant. NCALL is the lead agency and there is a Steering Committee that includes membership from the City. They have hired an outside planning consultant who is basically on the ground now doing work. They will really take a look at the area from what existing land uses are there, condition of housing stock and, a door-to-door survey of residences.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question regarding the area, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated the correct area goes from William Street in the north down to Hope Street south of the hospital, basically from State Street, west to the railroad tracks, and the area of Lincoln Park.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question that the grant was $100,000, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. It is the first of a potential for a second grant. The first grant is a planning grant which could make you eligible for an implementation grant.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question if Lincoln Park was around the Coca-Cola area, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes.

Mr. McDaniel stated that Downtown Dover owns property on the railroad and there is talk about Clarence Street.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question if there was any historic preservation component or could there be, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she was not sure how they were looking at it and she had not seen a full scope of work, but the question could be asked.

Mr. Scrafford stated that if they were going from State Street west it would pick up the Historic District. Gregg Moore came before the Historic District Commission and talked about that area.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it was the Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan that focused on the transit center and how it came into the Downtown area and making the linkages. This study plan focuses a lot more on the residential side than the previous studies.

Mr. McDaniel stated that it is more of a quality of life study.

Mr. Salkin stated that if it is on their agenda then the Historic District Commission can help highlight it. If preservation of the historic fabric in the whole thing is not on their agenda then the Historic District Commission needs to get it on the agenda, otherwise they will not be able to support or decide on any proposals. It must be recognized that the Historic Preservation is a quality of life issue and if it is not on the planner's agenda everyone loses.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she would take the question back.

Mr. Salkin stated that the Historic District Commission does not want to turn anything down, but would like to be proactive in the issue and that is not the way they need to operate.

Mr. Fisher stated to make sure that they are aware of the overlap issues in the Historic District.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question of the lead person and if it was Gregg Moore, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. The lead agency is NCALL. There is a steering committee and she is not sure how many people are on the committee.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question of who is NCALL, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated they are involved in homeownership counseling and housing aspect; they are non-profit and have been

around for years.

Mr. McDaniel stated that Mr. Reuben Salters was considering borrowing money for the Inner City Cultural League and NCALL might be involved with the project.

Mr. Scrafford stated that he was sorry to see another committee doing another study and then after they are done and read they are then put on a shelf with the other studies from someone else. It does not seem as if it is coordinated. It is just another study.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this study may have more life to it because of the potential for the next step of funding which is a little different than most types of planning studies.

Mr. Fisher questioned what the planning study involved, if was painting, fixing up windows, etc.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she would keep the Historic District Commission members posted. She stated that they will have an Open House where they will take over a vacant store front and you will have the ability to go in and look at proposals, leave comments, interact with those who are doing the study. She is not sure when it is scheduled to happen, but will keep them posted.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if there had been any movement, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there have been some stakeholder's type meetings and they are out on the ground doing the door-to-door survey. It is a three (3) or four (4) page questionnaire. She is not aware of their response rate.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford's question if there was anyone in the City that was involved in the study, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. The City Manager and Ann Marie Townshend are members of the Steering Committee. Tracey Harvey is also involved with the Steering Committee because of her housing related connections with the Community Development Block Grant program that has worked in that area before. The City Police Chief is also on the Steering Committee along with a mix of individuals and representatives of the other partnership groups from NCALL and the Greater Dover Committee and Downtown Dover Partnership.

Review of 2008 Comprehensive Plan

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the City is required by State Code to have a Comprehensive Plan which is a vision document for how a number of things would operate in the City. The current adopted plan, if you recall we spent a lot of time working with the Historic District Preservation Chapter of it a few ago, dates to 2008. There have been some minor amendments, but not to your chapter since that point. We are required every five (5) years to review that plan. Every ten (10) years they are required to do a much greater and involved update and rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan. We are still working through how we plan to do the review. It is outlined in the document. There are a number of studies one of which is the Central Dover Community Plan that are working on things that are very close to what the Comprehensive Plan itself deals with. There is also a concept of a Transportation Improvement District which is a new concept to deal with transportation planning on certain corridors. We have the Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan that was done since 2008 and there is also a task that has risen to the surface of

doing some type of Parks and Recreation planning and needs assessment for the City. There are all these studies that will play into any kind of review update of the Comprehensive plan document. We are looking to see how we can utilize the things that have already been done or are in process to then update the Comprehensive Plan. It will probably be a series of documents or things that get amended to the current plan document. It is not a total rewrite of the plan document. We will probably be looking at the implementation chapter of the current plan that states these are the things that you should focus on first, reporting on what you have already done, what still needs to be worked on, and what priority should be higher than another priority. It will be one of the key winter projects for doing the review of the *2008 Comprehensive Plan*. There may need to be some interaction from the Historic District Commission.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question if there was any type of schedule or plan for the Parks and Recreation assessment, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. It has kind of come out of the whole question of what to do with the building at Dover Park that is currently closed and not being used and the debate of what should happen to that building. There have been a lot of questions on if we are providing the appropriate types of amenities for parkland and/or recreation activities throughout the City. There is actually not a formal overall plan or needs assessment that has been done recently. It was identified in the *2008 Comprehensive Plan* that should be done for the City. There have been Capital Improvement Plan elements that have been related to various park activities, but it wasn't looked at wholelistically from a city wide prospective. The task has been given to the Planning Office.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether there was a Parks and Recreation Department, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is more of a division because the Parks and Recreation Department Director is Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question of Zach Carter's position, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that he was the Director of Parks and Recreation and now Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend has those responsibilities.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether Zach Carter was replaced, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no, some of the responsibilities were divided.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question of Ms. Janelle Cornwell's replacement, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that they are in the interview process.

NEW BUSINESS

Review of Building Permits Referred to Commission

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was one property that was discussed. If a Building Permit was filed it would be referred to the Historic District Commission for a consultation. At the current time the roofing permit for the project has not been filed.

Certified Local Government (CLG) Program

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated they have not worked on the application, but needed to update the resumes of each Historic District Commission member.

Mr. McDaniel stated that in order for the City to participate in the Certified Local Government program will need to have a Historic District review body. Mrs. Melson-Williams concurred.

Annual Meeting of Historic District Commission

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that November is actually the Annual Meeting of the Commission. It dates to when the body was originally established.

Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman

Mr. Fisher moved to elect by acclamation Mr. Scrafford as Chairman and Mr. Salkin as Vice Chairman for the Historic District Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. McDaniel and unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the By-laws give a timeframe for an individual to serve as Chair.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether he has reached his time as serving as Chair, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this will be his last year of service as the Chair. Someone else will have to rotate into that position. The Chair and Vice Chairman may serve two (2) appointed terms (6 years). Therefore, a person can serve as Chair for a period of six (6) years before rotating.

Meeting & Deadline Schedule for 2014

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the meeting date will remain as the third (3rd) Thursday of each month. The deadline date to file an application has to be at least 30 days prior to the meeting date.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford regarding a fee structure issue that was discussed over time that was associated with the Historic District Commission and the Planning Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it has not been looked at it. There was a recommendation if there was a way to do a combined type of application when there is a situation that it goes before the Historic District Commission and also to the Planning Commission. She was not aware if it affected anything in Code.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether it would take Council action to alter the fee structure, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. The fees are actually part of the Code for the entire City. There is a fee schedule. If there was a different fee for doing a combined application it would need to be identified.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether they should notify Council or even be involved in it, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Planning Staff would have to look at logistically how it would need to happen. If they wanted to do that type of filing and deadline they would need to make sure that you are meeting the deadline to come before the Historic District Commission and the Planning Commission.

Responding to Chairman Scrafford's question whether the fee structure was part of the By-laws or established by others, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no, it was not part of the By-laws. It is

established by reference; the *Zoning Ordinance* references the fee structure.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question if it would be appropriate for the Council to be aware that it is a sense of the Historic District Commission that the fee structure be combined rather than separated, Chairman Scrafford stated that based on the information received from applicants the Commission feels that Council should look at a fee structure that includes both the Historic District Commission and the Planning Commission.

Mr. McDaniel stated that a letter could be sent to Council stating that information if needed.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question of the fees, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the filing fee for the Planning Commission Site Plan is $325.00; Architectural Review Certification is $250.00.

Mr. McDaniel stated that many people who come in to file an application may not be aware that they need to file a Historic District Commission application.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether the Planning Office makes people aware that they need to file an application, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes. If they are working in the Historic District and depending on the type of project it may be something that just comes before the Historic District Commission which is a fee of $250.00 and then they can move to the Building Permit process. In other instances for, major new construction and new buildings, you go before the Historic District Commission to get a recommendation because the Site Plan has to go on to the Planning Commission. This would be for anyone doing anything over 3,000 S.F. in floor area or land disturbance.

Mr. McDaniel suggested that the application and the fee be combined.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's question whether there would be a case where an applicant would go before the Historic District Commission and not the Planning Commission, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated yes.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether the Historic District Commission rejected an application and the applicant goes before the Planning Commission that the Planning Commission can overrule the Historic District Commission, Chairman Scrafford concurred.

Mr. Salkin stated that there are times that they could come before the Historic District Commission and not pursue the project and then they would have paid the combined fee for both applications.

Responding to Mr. McDaniel's question whether this happens often, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she did not think so.

Mr. McDaniel stated that Mr. Duncan did not build his building, but he went before the Planning Commission. She stated that there would be a different fee if the applicant wanted to do the combined application and the other two (2) fees would stand alone.

Mr. McDaniel stated that if the fees are $325.00 and $250.00 it does not solve any of the combined

fee problems because you would be trying to reduce or eliminate the fee.

Chairman Scrafford stated that you would receive a reduction by combining the two (2). It would be up to Council to determine the combined fee.

Responding to Mr. Salkin's that he did not understand the rationale for the fees; Mr. McDaniel stated that the Planning Department has to devote their time.

Mr. Salkin stated he understood the Planning Department process, but was not sure how Council precisely selects the fees that we currently have. He was not sure how they would go about recommending changing the fees. Responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the fees have not changed since 2004.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question that if all of the applications that the Planning Staff has to review the applicant fee is $250.00, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated no. If the applicant is filing an application for the Historic District Commission the fee is $250.00. If it is a Staff Review as part of the Building Permit the applicant is only paying a Building Permit fee. There is not a $250.00 fee on top of the Permit fee.

Responding to Mr. Fisher's question whether the application is in the Historic District, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated even if it is in the Historic District there is no additional fee.

Chairman Scrafford stated if the Historic District Commission requests a change and the architector engineer has to produce new plans they will get paid. Therefore, everything the Historic District Commission does can have an additional impact on the proposer.

Mr. Salkin stated that he liked the idea of entire process being as transparent and simple as possible for the applicant. He was not sure that he would support the Historic District Commission taking initiative that they wanted it to be changed.

Chairman Scrafford stated that he agreed with the other members, but if they look at it from the Historic District Commission is it their function to be involved in the fee structure?

Mr. McDaniel stated that the Historic District Commission functions could be anything. He stated that Mr. Salkin wanted to see streamlined bureaucracy if that is possible. Maybe the Historic District Commission did not realize the fees that were involved in dealing with the Historic District Commission and they would like to see that change made better.

Mr. Salkin stated that he would feel uncomfortable recommending that they be combined and lowered because the City is short on money. Maybe they should both be increased, but he was not sure.

Mr. Salkin stated the Historic District Commission could advise the powers from the City that the issue has come before the Historic District Commission in public meetings and discussions. They have concluded that they have no jurisdiction over that aspect, but encourage them to take a look at it.

Mr. McDaniel stated that he did not like saying the Historic District Commission does not have any jurisdiction, but they have an opinion.

Mr. Salkin stated that the Historic District Commission has an opinion, but they cannot take any action.

Mr. McDaniel stated that they could lobby. Chairman Scrafford agreed and Mr. Salkin stated if the Historic District Commission liked the proposal.

Chairman Scrafford stated that a person may have a good point as a public citizen but as a member of the Historic District Commission he was not sure.

Mr. Fisher stated that there could be additional fees if an attorney was involved.

Mr. McDaniel moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Fisher and unanimously carried 4-0. Mr. Jackson was absent.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell
Secretary