CITY OF DOVER
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
JANUARY 19, 2012

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, January 19, 2012 at 3:00 PM with Chairman Scrafford presiding. Members present were: Mr. McDaniel, Mr. Jackson (arrived 3:20 pm), Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Salkin.

Staff members present were Mrs. Melson-Williams, Ms. Cornwell, Mrs. Metsch, and Mrs. Purnell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF DECEMBER 15, 2011

Mr. Salkin moved to adopt the minutes of the regular Historic District Commission meeting of December 15, 2011, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that in your packet for the meeting are two summaries. The first is a summary of applications being tracked for calendar years 2009-2011. The status was updated on projects as they made progress or were completed. Last year, five (5) formal applications were considered by the Commission, which is probably about average over time.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there are a lot of projects well underway Downtown. She stated that we have the most recent application, HI-11-05 for the North Street Area Improvement project, which just completed its review with the Planning Commission back in December. We should be expecting the Check Print process for the project to continue along to the next step.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions regarding the application summary. There were none.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the second summary presented is the Architectural Review Certifications for 2011 that consists of tracking all permits that involve properties within the Historic District and that involve the Architectural Review Certification process whether that is something that staff completes through the Building Permit submission or a project that moved through your group and/or the Planning Commission to receive Architectural Review Certification.

Mrs. Melson-Williams further stated there were sixty-one (61) permits that involved Architectural Review Certification. Sixteen (16) of them were tied to formal applications that came before this body. Some of the projects had multiple permits associated with them. A lot of them deal with building renovation projects. Next in line of the permits in the Historic District are signs and

there were sixteen (16) of them that were permanent Sign Permits and additional ten (10) Temporary Sign Permits. We are maintaining a note/status column on the permits.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked if there were any questions regarding the application summary. There were none.

OLD BUSINESS

Finalization of Letter pertaining to Role of Historic District Commission

Mrs. Melson-Williams handed out a copy of the letter as staff has revised it to include who it was going to and a signature block area. She stated that she had the official copy for signature. At the December meeting, it was moved to forward the letter/memo to the Legislative Finance & Administration Committee in response to their October 2011 meeting. Once the letter is signed a copy will be forward to City Council, the Mayor, and the City Manager.

Mrs. Melson-Williams also had a handout from the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions of which you are a member. It has The Alliance Review, a bi-monthly publication. The publication this month focuses on the Historic Preservation Commission and Local Government Structure. She stated that she copied two (2) articles from the document. One deals specifically with the role and placement of Commissions and they are actually found in all different segments of governmental bodies. The second article focuses on "Beyond Certificate of Appropriateness: Historic Preservation Commission Role and Historic Preservation."

NEW BUSINESS

HI-11-01 Building at 326 West Loockerman Street: Building Demolition – Request for one year extension of the Architectural Review Certification granted on February 17, 2011 to allow Demolition of the existing commercial building at 326 West Loockerman Street.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there is a letter of written request. She stated that Mr. Greg Scott is representing the project. She stated that the Commission reviewed this application last year in February. She stated that since the Historic District Commission was the final action on the Architectural Review Certificate to demolish the building, the extension request would need to come before this Commission. The Demolition Permit has been reviewed and issued. There are some questions as to whether they will be underway with the activities.

Representatives: Mr. Greg Scott, Scott Engineering and Ms. Stephanie Hansen, Attorney

Ms. Stephanie Hanson stated that shortly after their approval last year, they were contacted by a potential owner who wanted to keep the building. Due to negotiations, six (6) months was lost in getting the project completed. Around mid-summer, Mr. Greg Scott did a Request for Proposal to demolish the building. She stated that if you recall there were some issues related to the building such as environmental concerns, potential underground storage tanks, asbestos, contaminated soil and groundwater. The Request for Proposal had to incorporate a number of different plans and approvals with the Department of National Resources. A Health & Safety Plan and a

Contaminated Materials Management Plan had to be done. It went out for bid and Sunnyfield Demolition will be doing the demolition. She stated that the asbestos has been removed from the building and certified by Data Environmental. She stated that EPA & DNREC has been notified of the demolition date. She stated that at first they were hoping to start the week after Christmas, but ran into some issues because they could not get confirmation from utilities particularly the gas line that they had disconnected the service. Therefore, they could not demolish the building. She stated that the latest issue was that Sunnyfield needed a contractor with particular training in how to handle hazardous substance/soil material. She stated that this particular training was 40-hour OSHA training certificate that they needed to have. Staff did not have the necessary training and they had to get a new sub-contractor. We now have that. We will begin demolition on January 24, 2012. They are expected to be complete by the end of February 2013.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if they had all the approvals needed from all the governmental agencies such as EPA, DNREC, and contractors. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Ms. Stephanie Hanson replied yes. They needed a ten working days' notice.

Mr. Salkin questioned if everything that was presented the last time was the same except for the time. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Ms. Stephanie Hanson replied correct. Mr. McDaniel questioned if they needed to worry about the Demolition Permit process. Mr. Scrafford replied no.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that basically you need to act upon their request for an extension; typically, a one year extension is given.

Mr. Scrafford questioned if the one year extension would be February 2013. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied yes.

Mr. McDaniel moved that the one year extension be granted, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0 with Mr. Jackson absent.

HI-10-04 Wesley United Methodist Church: Elevation and Canopy Addition: Review and Recommendation of a Revision Request for the fence height originally approved with the Architectural Review Certification of the project; the request is for an increase in height to five (5) feet from the approved height of four (4) feet.

Mr. McDaniel recused himself from the application. He stated that he took a tour of the facility and had discussion with the applicant regarding the fence.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that HI-10-04 Architectural Review Certification was originally reviewed by the Historic District Commission in May 2010. The Commission recommended approval of the certification and specifically addressed the fence component of the project and recommended that a four foot fence be installed as part of that project. That recommendation then moved on to the City of Dover Planning Commission in June 2010 with the Site Plan consideration of the project. The Planning Commission actually took final action on the Architectural Review Certificate basically granting approval to it and incorporating the recommendation from the Historic District Commission. The fence was set at a four (4) foot height. The Site Plan received its final approval in January 2011 and then a Building Permit was

issued in the spring of 2011. She stated that construction had started. The permit did reflect the four (4) foot height aluminum picket fence and gate.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that behind her was the landscape plan from the Site Plan that shows the location of the fence. It continues off the side of the original building. The addition of the elevator/canopy is located further to the east. They are requesting an increase in the fence height from four (4) feet to five (5) feet.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated the *Zoning Ordinance* has a limitation of four (4) feet for fences that are located within the front yard setback of the property. The front yard setback is the area moving back from the street before you can actually start physical construction of the building. If a fence is located in that area and is allowed to be there, the maximum height is four (4) feet. If you go beyond that setback, then the height could be higher than that. However, because this project is located in the Historic District zone the height of the fence is considered an architectural element that the Commission can do an alternative for dealing with the style, height and location through the Architectural Review Certificate process. In reviewing the fence, we refer to the *Design Standard and Guidelines.* This generally states that fences should not exceed four (4) feet in height in the Historic District.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that today the Commission needed to consider the revision request. The recommendation on the request will need to be forwarded to the Planning Commission for final action as they are the final acting body on the Architectural Review Certification for the project.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Ms. Janelle Cornwell braved the elements today and took pictures of a very active construction site. The wooden fence located in the picture was an existing wooden fence, six (6) feet in height located on the site. It was actually moved from its original location to serve as a construction fence during construction activities. It is to be removed and replaced with the new fence along with the other landscaping elements around the area once the site is completed.

Representative: Jim Skeans, Wesley United Methodist Church

Mr. Jim Skeans stated that the existing fence is located between the church and the parsonage building. The fence is five (5) feet in height. He is requesting to increase the aluminum fence to five (5) feet in height with the double rails on top to match the fence on the other side of the church. He stated that before coming to the meeting he looked at another fence by Silver Lake after crossing the bridge near the curve and Richardson Park; it is the exact fence they are requesting. He stated that the fence is five (5) feet. He stated that his actual request is a 4.9 foot fence.

Mr. Scrafford asked in the original proposal, is there a gate across the new exit on the south side? Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jim Skeans replied yes.

Mr. Salkin asked if Mr. Skeans had an original plan or representation of what the fence will look like. He stated that he remembered the discussion. He asked if it was a rolling gate. He stated that it would be helpful to have some pictures to refresh their memory.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Skeans replied it was a swinging gate.

Also responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the approved plans show a fence that basically begins at the front face of the existing church building and continues all the way over to the brick wall of the adjoining property. There are swing gates that swing out towards the sidewalk; the setbacks are about five (5) feet off the sidewalk.

Mr. Scrafford asked if the new fence was going in place of the wooden fence near the brick wall. Will the segment extend to the north from the portico and a segment that will extend south from the portico? Is there a gate? He asked if he wanted to replicate the existing fence.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Skeans replied yes. It will go across the front of the new addition and elevator and attach to the gate. He stated that he just wanted to change the height of the fence and keep the aluminum. He did not want to replicate.

Mr. Scrafford asked if the finish height would be the same as it is to the north. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Skeans replied yes.

Mr. Salkin asked Mr. Skeans if he could help him understand why he wanted a five (5) foot fence other than the fact you want it to match the other side.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Skeans replied it has a six foot fence now to keep pedestrian traffic from jumping over the fence and going through and destroying items on the property. He stated that a four (4) foot fence, they would be able to jump over. He is requesting the five (5) foot fence because it would be better.

Mr. Salkin stated that the same information was mentioned when the request was last reviewed. He stated that the Commission suggested that it be four (4) feet. He needed to fully understand the request.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Skeans replied that he did not have the examples. He did bring to the floor the five (5) foot fence that Silver Lake and DSU currently have with the double rail and aluminum at the top. He also stated that the Governor's Club has the same five (5) foot fence.

Responding to Mr. Skeans, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that she did not think the Governor's Club fence was a five (5) foot fence, because that fence came before the Historic District Commission and it was held at four (4) feet.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there was any discussion. There was none.

Mr. Fisher moved that that the additional height of the fence be approved (allowing a fence five feet in height), seconded by Mr. Jackson and the motion was unanimously carried 3-1-1 with Mr. Salkin opposing and Mr. McDaniel recused.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there were any discussion.

Mr. Salkin stated that he recalled that this other fence was discussed at the last meeting and it was stated that they did not realize the fence was there because it could not be seen. Whatever decision is made is not relevant. The fence does not stand out. He felt strongly that the fence should be four (4) feet and just wanted to know the change. He stated that he would remain with his original decision.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their next meeting on February 21, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. for final action.

HI-12-01 Building Permit #12-0018 for Frankfurt Bakery at 323 South Governors Avenue

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that this is a Building Permit that was filed; because the building is located in the Historic District it requires Architectural Review Certification. Planning Staff began the review process and found that they had some questions and concerns. Planning Staff exercised their right as it exists in the *Zoning Ordinance* to refer the permit to the Historic District Commission for their input. She stated that a summary report was prepared. Information from the permit is included as well as photos of the property and building. She stated that Staff gave a series of recommendations on the project.

Mr. McDaniel recused himself from the application. He stated that his property is adjacent to the property.

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave an overview of the project. She stated that they are proposing changes to the exterior wall finish: It is a one (1) story building constructed mid-to-late 20th century and part of the building is concrete block with wood siding and roof asphalt shingles. There are no changes to the roof. She stated that it was previously used as the Ellis Furniture Works.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that their proposal is to add a brick veneer to the front of the building (red painted concrete block area) and vinyl siding to the side of the building in a horizontal placement. The other part of the project involves the entrance door which is currently a double leaf wood door, probably made by the previous tenant. Applicant would like to insert a new door with a side decorative light and glass and the replacement of the front façade windows. At the current time, there are very large paired set of windows that are a divided pane network. They are proposing a replacement with a paired set of windows, but no grid system and actually smaller in size. This would be a smaller window opening. The building does not have a gutter down spout system which would be recommended. They have been working on improvements to the lot itself and reestablishing a paved parking lot area. There is a service drive area on the north side of the building.

Representative: Andreas Jankes owner of Frankfurt Bakery

Mr. Andreas Jankes stated that the reason for his exterior proposal was safety issues. He stated that the current window size is one hundred (100) inches wide and seventy (70) inches tall. It is very low off the ground. He stated that he would like to raise the brick and put in smaller windows. He stated that the current door is very old and not up to code per the Health Department. The door is

deteriorating due to water damage and there are no down spouts. He stated that he selected the door because he did not want something commercial; he wanted to have a nice clean building. He selected the panel because he wanted more lighting inside and smaller windows. He stated that the door opening is 63"x81" and everything in the building is not standard size. He stated that it was craftsmanship. He stated that his main concern was safety and he does not have a lot of funds.

Mr. Andreas Jankes stated that his current bakery is located on 429 South New Street and they have had their windows broken twice. He stated that he would not have funds for a large window. He stated that the siding would be gray in color with matching brick veneer. He wanted a historic look, easy on maintenance, and safety. He also stated that he wanted to be able to protect the assets inside of the building. He stated that he would like to grow and generate business.

Mr. Scrafford asked if the door that he was proposing was a residential door? He asked if the door was strong enough for the protection of the assets.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied it can be used as a residential or commercial door and it was strong enough.

Mr. Jackson asked if it was a steel door?

Responding to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jankes no, it is vinyl. He stated that he selected the vinyl door, because of it durability. He also stated that it was easier to open and close.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there were other windows that he could select that would not take away from the approach of the building.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes stated that he was open for suggestions. He stated that he just wanted to downsize the windows. He stated that he wanted a smaller window that was off the ground. He stated that he could order a window with grids.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the Commission was trying to accommodate Mr. Jankes and bring it into the area that he is building without imposing.

Mr. Fisher stated that you could still have the grid window with the smooth surface inside and outside, but you have the appearance of a pane window.

Mr. Scrafford stated that he understood Mr. Jankes needed to protect his investments, but the Historic District Commission is trying to protect the area that Mr. Jankes is in.

Mr. Salkin asked Mr. Jankes if he was open to repainting the block as one of Staff recommendations in the front of the building. He stated that in his own view this would be more attractive and appropriate and less expensive. He stated that under these *Guidelines* the vinyl siding is not acceptable. He stated that he understood the back needed some work.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Jankes replied that he chose brick because a majority of the buildings in Dover are brick.

Mr. Salkin stated that he was thinking of brick on the side, but you wanted brick on the front. He stated that he would suggest a different color.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Jankes stated that he wanted brick on the front. He was trying to avoid the patches being noticeable.

Mr. Salkin asked why did the side of the building need any new surface.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Jankes replied that he had already replaced two (2) windows because they were custom made he was not sure how to frame it. He stated that he is trying to avoid patchwork and have a solid building.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Jankes if he was mixing the vinyl siding over the wood?

Mr. Salkin stated that the further away you are from the street (if it is the main consideration) the exceptions become easier. It would be inappropriate to put vinyl siding over the block. As you get to the back of the building there is a whole range of possibilities of what it could be covered with if the concern is the view from the street. He stated that he did not think about other views from other perceptions that would matter. He stated that you could go with a different type of siding in the back even though it could cost more it would be a less expensive than covering the entire three sides.

Responding to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jankes replied that his reason for selecting vinyl siding for the remainder of the building is because the wood is not in good condition. He stated that the top of the building was in good condition. He stated that he wanted to have a uniform look instead of a patched building. He stated that he selected a neutral color.

Mr. Salkin asked if the siding above the brick was the same vinyl siding he would be using for the side of the building?

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Jankes replied yes. He stated that he would need to replace some of the wood above the windows because there are no downspouts. He stated that the building was abandoned for a long period of time.

Mr. Fisher stated that he was not clear of the plan for the side of the building. He asked if the side of the building where the wood is located was going to be brick or vinyl siding.

Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Jankes replied that the plan was to façade the front in brick, the top would be vinyl in the gable, and the remainder of the building would be vinyl.

Mr. Jankes stated that in the back of the building is the cooler and freezer unit. He stated that he would like to have it covered so that it is not noticeable. He stated that he was suggesting metal post instead of wood.

Mr. Fisher asked if he needed outside access to get to the coolers? He asked about the mechanicals

of the cooler. Responding to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Jankes replied no. He stated that the mechanicals of the cooler are on top.

Mr. Salkin asked how many doors were in the building. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mr. Jankes replied that there are two doors. He stated that one is on the side and the other is in the back. He stated that the back door would be for delivery.

Mr. Jackson stated that the vinyl siding is an improvement as far as visibility and weather proof. He stated that most of the building other than the front and part of the side is to be covered in vinyl siding. He stated that the building is not located on The Green. He stated that it is on a commercial street. He stated that the vinyl would improve the appearance of the building. He stated that the gutters and downspouts were a good idea.

Mr. Scrafford asked if they needed to offer any suggestions regarding the front window if the size proposed was approved.

Mr. Jackson stated that the size of the window shown solves a lot of the problems. He stated that the style of the window could be more commercial. Instead of two (2) lights it could be one (1) light.

Mr. Salkin stated that the style of the door could be something more commercial. He stated that it looks more like a residential door. He stated that he did not have any opinions regarding the size or where the windows are located.

Mr. Fisher stated that you may want to see who is standing at the door and with the proposed door you can't see who is standing there.

Mr. Jackson stated that a cleaner and commercial door would take care of that issue.

Mr. Salkin stated that regardless of the treatment and façade of the front building, he would like something other than vinyl on the front façade gable. He stated that he did not agree with wrapping the three sides and the top in vinyl. He was not sure if there was a different style or configuration. He stated that the front should have some architectural integrity. He stated that he does not agree with the color. He stated that he is not proposing something that is not affordable. He stated that it is a design issue. He stated that as a community the Commission, the Downtown Dover group, and all the people that care about the Downtown that we could help make this project happen as described, but make it more attractive and sensitive. He stated that it is easily redeemable at a reasonable cost. It needs some work.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes if he had contacted a sign business. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied no.

Mr. Jankes asked if it would be helpful to change the brick color to red to make it look more traditional. Responding to Mr. Jankes, Mr. Scrafford stated that it might solve one problem.

Mr. Salkin stated that he did not think particularly red. He suggested looking around the

neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson stated that the red range of brick would be a better color.

Mr. Jankes stated that it would not be a problem because the bricks have not been ordered.

Mr. Salkin stated that he liked the idea of going all the way up to the top with brick.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the view through the door was not good. From a Fire Marshal and Building Code stand point you will have to provide visibility for people to see each other coming in and out.

Mr. Jankes asked if the door could be half and half with the top being clearly visible.

Responding to Mr. Jankes, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that he has been given some guidance that the decorative glass is probably not the way to go and that the clear glass is more appropriate. The Staff recommendation suggested a concept of a door that is all glass or a door with clear glass at the top and a solid panel below.

Mr. Scrafford stated that the Historic District Commission was looking at more of a commercial look than residential. He stated that the window treatment needs to be examined because it is not appropriate for the area. He stated that the door and window appearance needs to be more commercial.

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied that he did not have a problem with the recommendations. He stated that the window and door had not been ordered.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes if he could submit to Staff the proposed changes.

Mr. Salkin asked Mr. Jackson if the building was going to be reddish brick going all the way up and if there was a preferred design.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Jankes if he planned to put a sign in the gable portion. Responding to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jankes replied yes.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes if he would be attaching the brick veneer to the existing wall and not freestanding. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied that he would be attaching channels to the stand-up blocks and anchors that will not move.

Mr. Salkin stated that it was all very positive, but he still had concerns about the extent of the vinyl on the side of the building. He thinks that it is unnecessary to cover the block with vinyl siding. He stated that it would look better painted. He asked if the applicant should have come to the Historic District Commission before the site was paved.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied yes.

Mr. Salkin asked if Mrs. Melson-Williams could articulate the recommendations or options that would have been given if the landscape had come before the Historic District Commission.

Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that the *Design Guidelines* for the District talk about parking and screening from the street. In this case, the entire area from the sidewalk to the building is paved. Depending on the dimensions you might have had the opportunity to create a planting area that would do some of the screening of the pavement. It may have resulted in a different arrangement of parking. There was a gravel surface area in front of the building and running down the side of the building. Over the years, it had been overgrown with grass.

Mr. Salkin asked if the Commission had acted on the landscaping issue should they be given the opportunity to talk about it and be given the opportunity to make up for the planter or anything else that would enhance the front of the building and nearly break up the asphalt.

Mr. Fisher suggested that in the front of the window section of the building if there were planters that were out two (2) feet, it could prevent people from running into the building with their vehicles.

Mr. Salkin stated that there is room according to the photo in the no parking area in front of the window.

Mr. Fisher stated that it is only striping at the current time. Normally, people tend to pull up until they hit something.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes what did he currently have at Frankfurt Bakery?

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied three (3) parking spaces and one (1) handicap space.

Mr. Scrafford asked if it was concrete block?

Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied he put down concrete block. He stated that for the new building the striping in front of the window is required for the handicap parking space that has not been painted. He stated that he has three (3) parking spaces other than the handicap parking space. He stated that he will park in the back of the building.

Mr. Scrafford asked if you were able to drive around the building. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied you can drive around the building, but there is a property located next to the building.

Mr. Scrafford asked if you could drive through. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. McDaniel replied it is his property and you can't drive through or over his property.

Mr. Scrafford asked if there was a City alley or access to Bank Lane. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jackson, Mrs. Melson-Williams, and Mr. McDaniel replied no.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes if he could drive to the back of the building, but he couldn't drive around it. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied correct.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes if he was limited to three (3) parking spaces in front of the building. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied correct and one (1) handicap space.

Mr. Scrafford stated that there was some information in the assessments from Staff about the areas that are not paved being grass planted. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied that he will do that also.

Mr. Fisher moved to approve that the plan for the door be changed to a clear glass element in the upper portion, that the window replacement and size have a design change to a commercial appearance, and the façade of the front of the building to be brick all the way up in a red tone, seconded by Mr. Salkin and the motion was unanimously carried 4-0-1 with Mr. McDaniel recusing himself as he is a property owner within 200 feet of the subject property.

Mr. Salkin asked if the sign will be coming in front of the Historic District Commission at a later date. Responding to Mr. Salkin, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that a sign in the Historic District is normally Staff review of the permit unless there is some reason that Staff is uncomfortable with what is proposed then it would come back to the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Fisher moved to approve vinyl siding for both sides and rear of the building for a uniform appearance, and the applicant's proposal of wood fencing around the exterior of the cooler, seconded by Mr. Jackson and the motion was unanimously carried 3-1-1 with Mr. Salkin opposing and Mr. McDaniel recusing himself as he is a property owner within 200 feet of the subject property.

Mr. Scrafford asked if it was open to public hearing. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mrs. Melson-Williams replied that it is not subject to public hearing because it was a permit referred to the Historic District Commission for consultation.

Mr. Salkin stated that he did not agree with the first part of the motion regarding the vinyl siding, but he did support the wood fence around the exterior of the cooler.

Mr. Scrafford stated to Mr. Jankes that from this point forward he will be dealing directly with Staff on the approvals of the material and sizes.

Mr. Jackson stated that gutter and downspouts need to be added.

Mr. Scrafford asked if it could be mandated. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jackson replied yes, it is not on the existing building. Also responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is not on the existing building, but it is recommended.

Mr. Jankes replied that the will put them on the building in order to preserve the building.

Mr. Salkin stated that he agreed that the downspouts should be on the building, but it is already a staff recommendation.

Mr. Scrafford asked Mr. Jankes if he understood all the approvals. Responding to Mr. Scrafford, Mr. Jankes replied yes.

ON-GOING PROJECTS

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there was nothing to report.

Mr. Salkin moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Fisher and the motion was unanimously carried 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 4:23 PM

Sincerely,

Maretta S. Purnell
Secretary