



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

February 12, 2020

Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim Haden (Chairperson)
Ms. Kim Parati (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. Chris Barth
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
Mr. John Phares
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. PJ Henningson
Mr. Jim Jordan
Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. Chris Muryn

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairman Haden called the regular February meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:05 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **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 discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be

made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is a quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. 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. Chairman Haden said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room. Chairman Haden swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

Index of Addresses:

Consent Agenda

HDCRMI 2019-00819, 933 Berkeley Avenue Dilworth

New Cases

HDCRMI 2019-00816, 501 W Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2019-00746, 1911 S Mint Street	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2019-00762, 1028 Isleworth Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2019-00812, 329 W Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2019-00783, 1545 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCADMRM 2019-00577, 1542 Wickford Place	Wilmore
HDCRDEMO 2019-00795, 509 E Tremont Avenue	Dilworth

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINERGER, MURYN, HINDMAN

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00819, 933 BERKELEY AVENUE – ACCESSORY BUILDING ADDITION, SCREEN PORCH

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story brick Colonial Revival constructed in 1933. Architectural features include one-story side wings, 6/6 double-hung windows, and a classical cornice detail with dentil molding and pent eaves. The lot size is an irregular pie shape measuring 171 x 177 x 71 x 88. The Dilworth National Register Nomination specifically mentions a garage. However, the architecture of the existing carport indicates that it is not an original structure but built more recently to compliment the main house.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is in two parts:

1. Main House: Addition of a wood frame screen system to the existing rear porch. All traditional materials proposed, and the screen system is completely reversible. The rear porch was a 2004 addition to the house.

2. Accessory Structure: Changes to the existing carport, including a one-story addition. The addition will be approximately the same size and location as an existing concrete pad located behind the carport structure. A carriage-style wood garage door and German lap wood siding will convert the open carport to an enclosed garage space. All traditional materials to match existing, including double-hung wood windows, wood doors, brick/mortar, etc. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees; ornamental trees may have to be removed to construct the carport addition. Post-construction, rear yard impermeable area will be approximately 40.5%.
1. **STAFF ANALYSIS:** The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2, and Accessory Buildings, 8.9.
 2. All landscaping and site features (walkways, fences, etc.), may be reviewed and approved at the Administrative level.
 3. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the screen porch and carport changes/addition for meeting all Guidelines and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item.
 4. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: RUMSCH

2nd: PARATI

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application as submitted.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ADDITION AND SCREEN PORCH APPROVED.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINERGER, MURYN, HINDMAN

APPLICATION: HDCCMI 2019-00816, 501 W PARK AVENUE - ADDITION [COMMERCIAL]

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The Greater Galilee Baptist Church was constructed in 1932, and the McKissick Building, was constructed in 2003. The campus is located in the heart of the Wilmore Local Historic District, with the sanctuary and fellowship hall located in a triangle of West Park Avenue, South Mint Street and Spruce Street. Wilmore Drive is on the back side of the campus. A long process was completed in 2010 to reconfigure the campus and relocate houses. The Commission approved the project on March 9, 2011 and the COA was issued August 22, 2011 (COA# 2010-080A). On November 13, 2019, the Commission approved plans for changes to existing door/window openings and the relocation of access stairs on the McKissick Building, COA# HDCCMI-2019-00695.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the construction of a one-story addition and elevator shaft to the main church building on the Greater Galilee Baptist Church campus. The addition is oriented to West Park Avenue. The only proposed alteration to the original building that is to a large second story window on the 1932 section of the church building, which will be altered to accommodate the new elevator shaft. It is unclear if any windows on the first level will be removed to accommodate the elevator shaft. Non-historic elements proposed for removal include the metal awning over the walkway and a monument sign. All materials and architectural details are inspired by the architecture of the church. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees; ornamental trees/bushes may have to be removed.

1. **STAFF ANALYSIS:** Lot configuration results in all sides of the building being significantly visible.
2. The location of the addition on West Park Avenue is the less intrusive than placement along Spruce Street, especially as viewed from South Mint Street, a main thoroughfare through the Wilmore neighborhood.
3. The addition appears to be completely reversible with minimal changes being made to the church structure.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: PHARES 2nd: BONAPARTE

Mr. Phares made a motion to approve this application with the condition the signage treatment and façade treatment come back for commission review.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH THE CONDITION THE SIGNAGE AND FAÇADE TREATMENT RETURN FOR COMMISSION REVIEW.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINERGER, MURYN
MS. HINDMAN ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 1:34 PM

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00746, 1911 S MINT STREET – ADDITION WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a brick American Small House built c. 1940. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival/Tudor elements as visible in the 6/6 window configuration and the front gable roof detailing. The metal awnings and metal porch rails/posts appear to be later 1960s additions.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project includes three main elements:

1. Replacement of all existing double-hung wood windows with new double-hung wood windows.
2. Fenestration changes to an infilled front porch. Changing the existing window size and configuration and installing new casement windows.
3. A small addition at the right/rear corner of the house.

There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. No change to the rear yard permeability.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Additional documentation needed for the existing conditions of the wood windows proposed for replacement.
2. Fenestration changes on the front elevation changing from symmetrical to asymmetrical, and the introduction of a new window style on a primary elevation.
3. Removal of the vent detail on the right elevation.
4. Clarification on the siding to be used throughout the project. On sheet A-4.0, the Existing Front Elevation drawing is noted that damaged lap siding will be replaced to match existing. Proposed Front Elevation drawing is noted that the damaged lap siding will be replaced with James Hardie lap siding. If Hardie is being proposed, then:
 - a. Issue with existing German lap wood siding being proposed for removal and replacement with Hardie siding.
 - b. Does the profile of the proposed James Hardie lap siding also match the existing German lap siding?
5. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED/CONTINUED

1st: PARATI

2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Parati moved to approve the addition because it meets guidelines 7.2. The siding will be German lap siding to match the existing siding on the house. The applicant showed evidence the double hung wood windows, according to guideline 4.14, were beyond repair and the replacement of the double-hung wood windows should match the existing windows. The fenestration on the front façade is continued for a restudy. The vent detail on the right elevation will remain.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND REPLACEMENT WINDOWS APPROVED. THE WINDOWS ON THE FRONT FAÇADE ARE CONTINUED FOR A RESTUDY.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00762, 1028 ISLEWORTH AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story, Colonial Revival House constructed c. 1930. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival elements visible in the side gable eave returns, gable end chimney, and the symmetrical façade. There is a one-story rear ell, and a one-bay, one-story side porch projection, which has been enclosed with windows to create a sunroom. Exterior material is unpainted brick. A two-car frame garage is located behind the house. Lot size is 55’ x 200’. Surrounding structures are one- and two-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project has multiple elements, including:

1. Front portico design change.

2. A second-level addition to the existing one-story side porch projection.
3. Rear addition. Details and materials to match existing.
4. Request to paint the entire exterior of the house.
5. Demolition of the existing garage.
6. Construction of a new two-bay brick garage – may be eligible for Administrative review due to location.
7. Replacement shutters on the front elevation –eligible for Administrative review.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

Rear Addition has details to work out including:

1. Fenestration and rhythm on right elevations of the addition.
2. Window trim detailing in the areas of siding– sill dimensions and crown molding.
3. HVAC location/screening.
4. Locations of mature canopy trees on the site plan.
5. Rear yard permeability calculations.
6. Material details: siding dimensions, window material/manufacturer, etc.

Front Elevation Changes:

7. Proposed shutter changes. Even though current shutters are not sized correctly for the windows, the proposed shutters appear to be more narrow than existing.

Side Porch Projection Changes:

8. Fenestration. Window design (transoms) and the lack of windows on the second level on both the left and rear elevations.
9. Massing and Roof forms.
 - a. Eave line is higher than the main house. Typically, when second levels are added to existing one-story wing projections, the eave line on the second story addition is lower than the main house.
 - b. Decorative rail may be appropriate for a one-story side porch projection but is incongruous with a two-story projection on a Colonial Revival-style house.
 - c. Flat roof on the second story is incongruous with the existing house. On Colonial Revival-style houses, flat roofs are typically found on one-story projections. Two-story projections usually have pitched rooflines that match the main roof and are also lower than the house’s main ridge. A gable roof with eave returns or a hip roof is more in-keeping with the design and massing of this particular house.
 - i. High-style examples of one-story projections with a flat roof and railing in Dilworth include: 1316, 1318, 1326 Dilworth Road and 708, 734, and 827 Berkeley Avenue.
 - ii. 1017 Isleworth is an example of a two-story side projection.

Painted Brick:

10. The Commission will determine if the brick may be painted based on the evidence provided.

Garage – New Construction:

11. Garage doors should either be two separate doors or detailed to appear as two-separate doors, per page 8.9, #6.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED/CONTINUED

1st: PARATI

2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Parati moved to continue the side porch, for a restudy, according to guidelines 6.5, 6.10, 4.8# 5 and 6, and the federal guidelines. A restudy of the portico according to guideline 4.8, and a restudy of the right-side elevation historic windows according to guidelines 4.4, #6.

To continue the addition for the stepping down of the ridge line, fenestration, rhythm, the massing, the materials, trim, and window head heights for compatibility. Included in the massing, the massing of the fireplace projection and vent shown on the elevation according to guidelines 7.2, #2, 3, 5, 6, 6.5, 6.10 numbers 3 and 4, and 4.7.

Applicant to provide more information about the replacement windows and a restudy of the fenestration once the massing has been addressed. The existing elevations to be updated to show accurate fenestration. Applicant to provide a site plan including the trees, HVAC system and rear yard calculations. As well as, the footprint of the house, in relation to the surrounding structures and accurate calculations of the current square footage.

We move to deny the painted brick according to guidelines 5.8 and 5.5 and the change to the brick opening for the door according to guidelines 4.10, #4.

Staff to address the garage and shutters.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED. CHANGES TO THE FRONT DOOR OPENING AND PAINTED BRICK DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00812, 329 W PARK AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926 with a partial front porch with a gable roof. Other features include a side-gable roof with brackets, a brick chimney and painted brick foundation. A rear addition was added in 2008 prior to the creation of the Wilmore Local Historic District. A previous application for an addition that would raise the main ridge approximately 5'-3" was Denied by the Commission in November 2018 (HDC 2018-00584).

PROPOSAL:

The project is an addition that raises the main ridge approximately 4'-6". No changes will be made to the existing footprint. A glass block window on the right elevation will be removed and replaced with a fixed sash window to match existing. All new windows on the addition will be wood with exterior muntins in a 4/1 and 3/1 pattern to match existing. New windows on the second level will be wood casements with a muntin pattern to match existing. Requested siding material is Hardie shingle siding and Hardie 'cedarmill' grain lap siding.

There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. No change to the rear yard permeability.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Staff has the following concerns with the application:

1. Historic Ridge Heights – West Park Avenue: 304, 308, 312, 316, 320, 324 and 321.

2. Non-Historic Houses: 327 and 328.
3. Most of the massing changes are oriented away from the street elevation, toward the neighboring property.
4. Materials:
 - a. Hardie shingle shake has not been approved by the Commission.
 - b. Hardie 'cedarmill' textured siding has not been approved by the Commission.
 - c. Window size/design on left elevation addition.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: PHARES

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application as submitted referring back to the preamble for additions, Chapter 7, the first paragraph which explains the addition reflects the design, scale, and style of the original house; with the exception of the two, left-side, casement windows to having mullions to mimic the 4/1 like the existing windows. . Siding should be wood to match the existing wood shakes Staff to approve the wood siding, shakes and shingles.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: JORDAN, HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00783, 1545 WILMORE DRIVE – ROOF REPLACEMENT [MATERIAL CHANGE]

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The subject property is a one-story Bungalow constructed 1999. Architectural features include a front gable roof, an engaged full-width front porch supported by square columns, and 1/1 windows. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a change in roof material. Existing roof is asphalt. Proposed roof material is metal. The new roof is a galvalume concealed 1" self-locking system. Applicant has been advised to bring a material sample to the public hearing.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The Commission shall determine if the proposed roof material is incongruous or not incongruous with the house and the district.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application, for additional information showing bungalows that may have a similar metal roof in a historic district.

VOTE: 5/3 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ROOF REPLACEMENT CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 WALNUT AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure one-story Bungalow with Tudor elements constructed in 1937, located at the edge of the Wesley Heights Local Historic District. Architectural features include brick porch columns, and stucco with timbering in all three gables. All windows and doors are replacements and not original to the house. According to the National Register nomination, the front door used to have a glazing pattern similar to the 6/1 windows. Siding material is unpainted brick. Lot size is approximately 50' x 190'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family and multi-family houses. The garage at the rear was also constructed in 1937 and is considered a contributing element to the Wesley Heights National Register Historic District.

PROPOSAL:

A rear addition was approved by the HDC in October 2019 (COA# HDCRMA-2019-00479). One mature pecan tree was approved for removal to construct the addition and the other tree was required to remain with a Tree Protection Plan provided to staff. On December 6th, both the Certified Arborist and Property owner emailed staff separately to provide a Tree Protection Plan (attached). On December 10th, staff requested additional information be added about construction fencing and debris. On December 11th, the property owner contacted staff to indicate that the tree was just removed by the tree company.

1. **STAFF ANALYSIS:** The property owner was actively working with staff on a Tree Protection Plan for the pecan tree, as demonstrated in the attached Tree Protection Plan and email correspondence.
2. The Commission will determine if replanting is required, including size and general locations of new trees.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: RUMSCH

2nd: PARATI

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application for the applicant to bring back a plan from a landscape architect with thoughtful replanting to replenish the canopy that was removed.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDCADMRM 2019-00577, 1542 WICKFORD PLACE WAS NOT HEARD DUE TO THE APPLICANT NOT BEING PRESENT.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION: HDCRDEMO 2019-00795, 509 E TREMONT AVENUE – DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1915. Architectural features include a side gable roof with a front gable porch supported by brick columns, original 8/1 wood windows, wood shake shingle siding brackets. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family and buildings. The building is listed as a contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for full demolition of the building. The applicant is requesting approval for immediate demolition and a waiver of the 365-day delay. The following information is presented for the Commission's review and consideration:

- Digital photos of all sides of building
- Digital photos of significant architectural details
- Property survey
- Zoutewelle survey
- Intelligent Design Engineering letter
- Termination of contracts documents
- Real estate listing activity report

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With an affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property is does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE

1st: PARATI

2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Parati moved to say this application is complete.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 2: APPROVED

1st: PARATI

2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Parati moved to determine the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District, because it is a contributing property, because of its year of construction and because of its architectural style.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 3: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: PARATI

2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Parati moved to approve the demolition with a 365 day stay due to its special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the district. The receipt of accurate measured drawings of the building to be demolished are required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this commission.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH A 365 DAY STAY.

MR. RUMSCH MOVED TO APPROVE FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THE OAKLAWN PARK LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION REPORT TO THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE FOR REVIEW. MS. WALKER SECONDED AND THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

MS. WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 11, 2020, HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES. MR. PHARES SECONDED AND THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

MR. HADEN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 6:06 PM.

LINDA KEICH
CLERK TO THE BOARD