

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

October 24, 2017

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Candace Pearce – Chairwoman	Alice Arnold
Kerry Carlin	Myron Caspar
Mary Ellen Cole	William Gee
Justin Edwards	Bernard Schulz

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Collette Kinane, Planner II; Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner and Betty Moseley, Acting Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Donald Phillips, Assistant City Attorney; Ken Graves, Assistant City Manager and Kelvin Thomas, Communications Technician

Election of Vice Chair

Attorney Phillips stated that the election of Chair at the April 2017 meeting created a vacancy in the Vice Chair position. The Commission tabled the election of Vice Chair to this meeting. The Chair and Vice-Chair are both one year terms with elections each January. The duties of the Chair is to conduct and preside over the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The duties of the Vice-Chair is to preside as Chair in the absence of the Chair. The procedure of the elections for both are: 1- Open for nominations. Nominations do not require a second. 2- If no further nominations made, close the nominations by declaration of the Chair or vote by the Commission. 3- Vote in order of the nominations given. The first nominee to receive a majority vote is elected.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the nominations.

Ms. Cole nominated Kerry Carlin.

Ms. Arnold nominated Bernard Schulz.

No other nominations made.

Chairwoman Pearce declared the nominations closed and called for a vote for Kerry Carlin as Vice Chair. All were in favor. Mr. Kerry Carlin was elected Vice Chair.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

With no comments made, the Commission unanimously accepted the agenda as is.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the June 27, 2017 minutes as presented, Ms. Cole seconded, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Cole made a motion to approve the July 25, 2017 minutes as presented, Mr. Carlin seconded, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Cole stated Ms. Kandie Smith should be added to "Others Present" since she was in attendance. Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the August 22, 2017 minutes with the addition stated by Ms. Cole, Ms. Arnold seconded, and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Attorney Phillips stated pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 168-388 and Section 4-H of the Historic Preservation Commission Rules of Procedure:

Conflict of Interest. No member of the Historic Preservation Commission shall participate in either the discussion or vote on any certificate of appropriateness in any manner that would violate the affected persons' constitutional right to a fair and impartial decision maker. Prohibited conflicts include but are not limited to a member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter and not willing to consider changing his or her mind; undisclosed ex parte communications with the person before the Commission, any witnesses, staff or other Commission members; a close familial, business or other associational relationship with the affected person; or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter before the board. On any other matter before the Commission where such decision by the Commission shall be in an advisory capacity only, no member shall participate in the discussion or vote on such advisory matters where the outcome on the matter being considered is reasonable likely to have a direct, substantial, and readily identifiable financial impact on the member. Decisions on either a request for recusal by a member or objections by a person appearing before the board shall be decided by a simple majority vote. A member so disqualified will not be counted or included in the count to determine the appropriate voting majority for the issue before the Commission and will not negate a quorum of the Commission.

If a Commission member has had an ex parte communication that also needs to be disclosed at this time.

As a reminder, please keep in mind as members of the Commission, conversations among yourselves during the discussion periods of this meeting and your Committee meetings are not ex parte communications.

Minor Works COAs

2017-0025: 410 Student Street; Exterior paint - Approved

2017-0031: 404 S. Eastern Street; Re-roof - Approved

Major Works COAs

Ms. Kinane stated the applicant was not present.

COA 17-0021: 211 S. Eastern Street

Applicant: Rob O'Conner, property owner

Project: ATF (after the fact) Demolition of Garage/Shed

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The House, built circa 1935, is a one-story gable-ell frame house that has been substantially altered by the enclosure of the front porch. The historic district report does not mention the garage as a significant or historic contribution to the property. This application is for the after-the-fact demolition of the garage located in the rear of the property. The garage had been substantially damaged by a tree that was growing alongside the garage – as the tree grew, it began to lean into the garage and caused the garage to lose structural integrity and collapse on itself. Though this application has been submitted after-the-fact, it should be considered as if the action had not yet occurred. Additionally, as per the City's Historic Preservation Commission's ordinance and North Carolina state law this application cannot be denied. Chapter 7, Section 9-7-17 (A), states: "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the relocation, demolition, or destruction of a designated landmark or a building, structure or site within a designated district may not be denied. However, the effective date of such certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of approval. The maximum period of delay authorized by this section shall be reduced by the Historic Preservation Commission **where it finds the owner would suffer extreme hardship or be permanently deprived of all beneficial use of or return from the property by virtue of the delay.** During this period the Historic Preservation Commission shall negotiate with the owner and with any other parties in an effort to find a means of preserving the site. **If the Historic Preservation Commission finds that a building or site within a district has no special significance or value toward maintaining the character of the district, it shall waive all or part of the period and authorize earlier demolition, or removal.**"

For this application, Design Guidelines 1 and 2 of Chapter 5 Demolition, pages 101-102, are applicable.

Staff findings:

Without having seen photographic documentation of the garage taken directly before the structure was demolished, it is impossible to say whether this structure could have been moved and repaired. However, noting the photographs submitted by the applicant from 2012, it is apparent that the garage gave the appearance of nearly collapsing even then and would have likely continued to lean further each year. As this application is after-the-fact and involves demolition, this hearing is largely a formality to legalize the demolition that has already

occurred. Without proper detailed documentation and dimensions of the structure, it would be fruitless to request that the applicant rebuild the garage as the result would not return the potentially historic quality of the garage to the property but would instead result in a guessed facsimile.

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on September 21st, 2017 to discuss this application and recommended approval.

Mr. Schulz asked if there was a process of fining individuals who have not complied.

Ms. Kinane stated no, just an application fee. It is something that can be looked in to if the Commission desired.

Ms. Cole asked if a resolution made by the HPC would need final approval from City Council.

Ms. Kinane stated yes.

Mr. Schulz asked if staff could provide research information before the HPC moves on this.

Chairwoman Pearce stated before there was no application fee. No there is which might discourage applicants. She suggested removing fees and only charging fines for not complying.

Ms. Cole stated that all fees should be looked at including the application fee and compare to other jurisdictions.

Chairwoman Pearce read the Finding of Facts for application #2017-0026 for 211 S. Eastern Street, parcel number 13995. The COA was completed and submitted on August 10, 2017. The COA application is for an after the fact demolition of the garage/shed on the property. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 10-16-2017 and 10-23-2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 10-06-2017. This hearing was held on 10-24-2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and the applicant was not present. For this application, Design Guidelines 1 and 2 of Chapter 5 Demolition (pages 101-102) are applicable. No guidelines are appropriate because it is after the fact. This is a non-contributing property.

Ms. Cole stated the guidelines state a site plan illustrating the site after demolition be submitted. She also requested a current picture of the area after the demolition.

Mr. Edwards made a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact, Mr. Schulz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Cole made a motion to approve the application with two conditions: 1-per Design Review Guidelines #2 in Chapter 5 Demolition: *Submit a site plan illustrating proposed landscaping*

and any other site development to be completed after demolition; and 2-a current picture of the area after the demolition. Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

COA 17-0027: 401 Student Street
Applicant: Rob O'Conner, property owner
Project: Driveway installation

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The House at 401 Student Street is similar in design to other Craftsman Bungalows located on Student Street. This example has a typical gable-front orientation, hip-roof front porch and a cross-gabled porte-cochere. Matchstick balusters and square tapered post-one-pier supports define the porch. Additionally located on the property is a storage shed: this small utility shed is prefabricated and was purchased from a local building supply store. The shed is considered non-contributing to the district. This application pertains specifically to a proposed driveway entering the rear yard from Fourth Street. This application is for the installation of a driveway. The driveway installation is somewhat after-the-fact, due to the fact that the driveway in question already exists. However, the previous driveway installation was not done legally – there is no driveway permit on record. The driveway was created at some point before 1998 (the earliest year available of aerial photography documenting a driveway at the location). The property owner would like to make improvements to the driveway, adding proper curb-cuts and a driveway apron. In order to do so, the applicant must apply for a driveway permit and a COA to make the existing driveway legal. Additionally, because the property owner is making the driveway legal, the resulting parking area must be screened by a fence or shrubbery as per City ordinance. The applicant proposes screening with evergreen vegetative materials that will be 3' in height at the time of planting and will grow to a height of 6' in height within two years.

For this application, Design Guidelines 1 through 15 of Chapter 4 Driveways & Off-Street Parking, pages 91-92, are applicable.

Staff findings/conditions:

Original driveways in the historic district are typically composed of concrete wheel strip with permeable brick paving or grass between. The 2004 aerial photograph shows a gravel wheel strip driveway in place on the property. New driveways should be compatible with existing driveways in spacing, width, configuration, and paving material. They should be introduced in locations that do not compromise historic site features, including landscaping, walkways, and retaining walls. Because the historic district is predominantly residential, large scale off-street parking areas are not typical. The introduction of additional off-street parking must be weighed carefully and should only be considered if the parking area can be located unobtrusively in the rear yard or rear side yard, can be visually screened from the street and adjoining properties, will not abut the house, and will not destroy the residential character of the site by eliminating significant landscape features or a substantial portion of the rear yard. Off-street parking must comply with city zoning ordinances. Impermeable surfaces are restricted to less than forty percent of the site for any property. Staff views this application as a formality and recommends

approval. The completed project will bring the driveway into compliance with Historic District Design Guidelines and the City UNRI Parking Standards.

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on September 21st, 2017 to discuss this application and recommended approval.

Chairwoman Pearce asked about the sidewalk.

Ms. Kinane stated she could not get a definite answer. The sidewalk will remain but she is unsure how the transition will appear. That decision will be made by Public Works.

Ms. Arnold stated that Design Guideline #12 about large off-street parking areas is too vague and should include a percentage of the area for off-street parking.

Ms. Kinane stated the UNRI guidelines do list the area as a percentage. She also stated that this initial application is to make the driveways, as they exist now, legal so that future improvements can be made.

Chairwoman Pearce asked if the Design Guidelines apply to the application.

Ms. Kinane stated the application is to legalize the driveway. This application and the next three lead to a large rear parking area. The Commission is to look at the application as if it is a new driveway.

Chairwoman Pearce read the Finding of Facts for application #2017-0027 for 401 Student Street, parcel number 02623. The COA was completed and submitted on August 26, 2017. The COA application is for a driveway installation. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 10-16-2017 and 10-23-2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 10-06-2017. This hearing was held on 10-24-2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and the applicant was not present. For this application, Design Guidelines 1 through 15 of Chapter 4 Driveways & Off-Street Parking (pages 91-22) are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Ms. Cole made a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact, Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Arnold asked about parking at the rear yard.

Ms. Kinane stated that single family dwellings shall be limited to 4 (four) vehicles for parking and/or storage

Mr. Edwards asked if the applicant needed to submit a new application for driveway changes.

Mr. Caspar asked if the driveway was to become a parking lot and if so should go before the appropriate Commission.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that this application is to approve or deny legalizing the existing driveway. This is to be done before Public Works can approve a request to improve the existing curb cut/apron for appearance and proper water drainage.

Ms. Kinane stated that if the applicant is altering the current driveway, he would need to come before the HPC again.

Mr. Caspar stated the driveway at the sidewalk/apron looks like an entrance to a parking lot. There are more than 4 vehicles on the property.

Ms. Kinane stated it is a Code Enforcement issue if there are more than 4 vehicles.

Mr. Caspar stated the parking lot area has to be delineated and the HPC cannot make that decision since no additional information has been provided.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that this is an incomplete application for doing anything to the driveway with the exception of fixing the curb cut.

Ms. Kinane stated that both the HPC and Public Works would receive applications for any alterations to the current driveway.

Ms. Cole asked if the application is just to legalize the driveway so the curb cut can be fixed.

Ms. Kinane stated yes.

Mr. Edwards suggested a motion to approve the application with the staff recommended conditions, to follow the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 for driveways, and a new application for any alterations to the existing driveway be made to the HPC.

Chairwoman Pearce asked for another vote on the Findings of Fact.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact, Mr. Carlin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommended conditions, to follow the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 for driveways, and a new application for any alterations to the existing driveway be made to the HPC. Mr. Caspar seconded the motion. In favor: Caspar, Arnold, Edwards, Schulz, Pearce, Cole, and Carlin. Opposed: Gee. Motion carried.

Mr. Gee stated he didn't understand and therefore opposed the application. He then left the meeting due to illness.

COA 17-0028: 309 Student Street

Applicant: Rob O'Conner, applicant

Project: Driveway installation

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The House at 309 Student Street, was, at the time of designation, considered one of the best preserved one-and-a-half story Colonial Revival houses in the district, this example is beautifully detailed with novelty siding (also referred to as German siding), a Doric surround at the front entrance, a slate roof and two, tall gable-roof dormers with molded surrounds. The central interior chimney and steeply pitched gable roof gives the house the character of a Cape Cod cottage--a popular expression of the Colonial Revival style, particularly during the 1940s. This application pertains specifically to a proposed driveway entering the rear yard from Johnston Street. This application is for the installation of a driveway. The driveway installation is somewhat after-the-fact, due to the fact that the driveway in question already exists. However, the previous driveway installation was not done legally – there is no driveway permit on record. The driveway was created at some point before 2004 (the earliest year available of aerial photography documenting a driveway at the location). The property owner would like to make improvements to the driveway. [The proper curb cuts already exist at the proposed location.] In order to do so, the applicant must apply for a driveway permit and a COA to make the existing driveway legal. Additionally, because the property owner is making the driveway legal, the resulting rear parking area must be screened by a fence or shrubbery as per City ordinance. The applicant proposes screening with evergreen vegetative materials that will be 3' in height at the time of planting and will grow to a height of 6' in height within two years.

For this application, Design Guidelines 1 to 15 of Chapter 4 Driveways & Off-Street Parking, pages 91-92, are applicable.

Staff findings/conditions:

Original driveways in the historic district are typically composed of concrete wheel strip with permeable brick paving or grass between. The 2004 aerial photograph (included as an attachment) shows a gravel driveway in place on the property. New driveways should be compatible with existing driveways in spacing, width, configuration, and paving material. They should be introduced in locations that do not compromise historic site features, including landscaping, walkways, and retaining walls. Because the historic district is predominantly residential, large scale off-street parking areas are not typical. The introduction of additional off-street parking must be weighed carefully and should only be considered if the parking area can be located unobtrusively in the rear yard or rear side yard, can be visually screened from the street and adjoining properties, will not abut the house, and will not destroy the residential

character of the site by eliminating significant landscape features or a substantial portion of the rear yard. Off-street parking must comply with city zoning ordinances. Impermeable surfaces are restricted to less than forty percent of the site for any property. Staff views this application as a formality and recommends approval. The completed project will bring the driveway into compliance with Historic District Design Guidelines and the City UNRI Parking Standards.

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on September 21st, 2017 to discuss this application and recommended approval.

Chairwoman Pearce read the Finding of Facts for application #2017-0028 for 309 Student Street, parcel number 10401. The COA was completed and submitted on August 26, 2017. The COA application is for a driveway installation. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 10-16-2017 and 10-23-2017. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 10-06-2017. This hearing was held on 10-24-2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and the applicant was not present. For this application, Design Guidelines 1 through 15 of Chapter 4 Driveways & Off-Street Parking (pages 91-22) are applicable. The project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact, Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Pearce recommended adding the same conditions as the previous application: staff recommended conditions, to follow the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 for driveways, and a new application for any alterations to the existing driveway be made to the HPC.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommended conditions, to follow the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 for driveways, and a new application for any alterations to the existing driveway be made to the HPC. Ms. Cole seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

COA 17-0029: 703 E. Fourth Street
Applicant: Rob O'Conner, property owner
Project: Driveway installation

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The Fleming House, built in 1928 is one of two brick Craftsman Bungalows located on the block. This one-and-a-half story side-gable house is the more elaborate of the two with half-timbering in the dormer, cross gable on the front facade, and gabled porte-cochere. Paneled square posts on brick piers support the engaged porch. A brick apron wall with pierced openings encloses the porch. This application pertains specifically to a proposed driveway entering the rear yard from Johnston Street. This application is for the

installation of a driveway. The driveway installation is somewhat after-the-fact, due to the fact that the driveway in question already exists. However, the previous driveway installation was not done legally – there is no driveway permit on record. The rear parking area was created at some point before 1998 (the earliest year available of aerial photography documenting a driveway at the location). Due to the dense tree coverage in the rear yard, it is not possible to say if the proposed driveway existed in 1998 or just the rear parking area. The property owner would like to make improvements to the driveway, adding proper curb-cuts and a driveway apron. In order to do so, the applicant must apply for a driveway permit and a COA to make the existing driveway legal. Additionally, because the property owner is making the driveway legal, the resulting parking area must be screened by a fence or shrubbery as per City ordinance. The applicant proposes screening with evergreen vegetative materials that will be 3' in height at the time of planting and will grow to a height of 6' in height within two years.

For this application, Design Guidelines 1 to 15 of Chapter 4 Driveways & Off-Street Parking, pages 91-92, are applicable.

Staff findings/conditions:

Original driveways in the historic district are typically composed of concrete wheel strip with permeable brick paving or grass between. The 2004 aerial photograph (included as an attachment) shows the existing parking area adjacent to the driveway, but, due to a large tree, the driveway itself cannot be seen. New driveways should be compatible with existing driveways in spacing, width, configuration, and paving material. They should be introduced in locations that do not compromise historic site features, including landscaping, walkways, and retaining walls. Because the historic district is predominantly residential, large scale off-street parking areas are not typical. The introduction of additional off-street parking must be weighed carefully and should only be considered if the parking area can be located unobtrusively in the rear yard or rear side yard, can be visually screened from the street and adjoining properties, will not abut the house, and will not destroy the residential character of the site by eliminating significant landscape features or a substantial portion of the rear yard. Off-street parking must comply with city zoning ordinances. Impermeable surfaces are restricted to less than forty percent of the site for any property. Staff views this application as a formality and recommends approval. The completed project will bring the driveway into compliance with Historic District Design Guidelines and the City UNRI Parking Standards

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on September 21st, 2017 to discuss this application and recommended approval.

Ms. Caspar stated he believes trees have been removed.

Mr. Edwards questioned if this was historically a drive access or used as a parking lot.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that Johnston Street is a subpar street. She believes they created this drive/parking area by driving over the curb.

Mr. Caspar stated that curbs are part of driveways. The properties at 703 and 705 E. Fourth Street make up more than 50% of frontage on Johnston Street. He referenced the applicant's email in the packet that stated the applicant is required to pour the driveway entrance and curb. He said the new wipe down would need to be connected to something. He asked if they could include that the applicant reinstall the curb along these two properties also be poured with the driveway entrance.

Ms. Cole asked who is responsible for the curb, the applicant or Public Works.

Ms. Kinane did not know.

Chairwoman Pearce stated it is in the City easement and all work in the easement would require City approval. She stated that the request is a mess and the only way to tidy it up is to give the applicant only what he is asking for which is to legalize the driveway. Any other changes will need to come before the HPC.

Ms. Kinane stated that Johnston Street is a City public street.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that Doctor Johnston of the Johnston House on Johnston Street used it as a back alley to get to the hospital, which was torn down.

Mr. Edwards asked what motivated the applicant to make all these driveways legal since his email stated he is not planning to alter the driveways.

Ms. Kinane stated the initial request was to improve the curb cut. He approached Public Works for approval and that is when it was realized they were not legal driveways.

Mr. Edwards stated that the applicant probably has no intention of altering the driveways. Therefore using this as an opportunity to make the parking lots in compliance will not happen.

Mr. Caspar read from the applicant's email: "if I am required to pour the driveway entrance and curb to the street, I will do that". He suggested they hold the applicant to his words.

Mr. Edwards stated if they can use this as a chance to get the applicant to improve and bring it up to standards so that there is not a gravel parking lot in the back of the house and make sure City Code is enforced so that there cannot be more than 4 vehicles, they should use this opportunity.

Chairwoman Pearce stated it appears everyone shares Mr. Edwards' concerns but she feels like they have no authority to do so.

Mr. Caspar suggested if they approve the request, they should include that the curbing be replaced at the same time.

Ms. Cole stated she believes the applicant does not have ability to install the curbs.

Ms. Kinane stated that if the City is doing curb cuts, they will bring the curbs to City standards.

Attorney Phillips stated after the HPC there is a detailed application process by Public Works before any curb work can be done. He suggested, at the time of the Public Works application, making a recommendation to include the curbing. He stated included in the applicant's request is the curb cut only and no driveway/parking area improvements. Since the applicant is not present, Commissioners need to base their decision on the information in front of them.

Ms. Kinane stated the pictures with this application are labeled existing drive and existing driveway. The request is for the wipe down and curb cut.

Attorney Phillips stated with Ms. Kinane's clarification, it appears there is no COA application for the actual driveway nor parking area.

Chairwoman Pearce asked if there are any requirements for the applicant to do something about the driveway because he will now have a curb cut.

Attorney Phillips stated the Design Review Guidelines can be placed on this request. His recommendation is to enforce Chapter 4 Design Review Guidelines and all City zoning and other ordinances must be complied with.

Mr. Caspar stated the applicant has created a problem by not being present and not being clear in his request. He suggested to table the request until better information is available.

Attorney Phillips stated that the Guidelines state that proposals for new driveways or off-street parking areas must provide the Commission with in-scale site plan including all landscaping and proposed lighting. He stated if they find that was not inclusive in the materials presented, then according to the Rules and Procedures the Commission may in their discretion obtain an on-site inspection and obtain additional facts concerning the application before arriving at a decision.

Mr. Edwards stated he doesn't see this application any different than the one they approved and that someone probably just smashed out a curb. All we are approving is the curb cut.

Ms. Cole stating it is just for the curb cut. Any changes to the existing driveway will have to come before the Commission.

Attorney Phillips stated that the submittal of the application shows that the applicant is trying to comply.

Mr. Caspar stated they have an opportunity now to take a blighted area and have it improved all at one time. If the curb cut is approved, then excessive vehicles will continue to park. The applicant is obviously trying to be helpful but he needs to fully explain and improve the whole driveway area at the same time.

Ms. Cole stated that the applicant cannot move forward to improve the driveway until the curb cut is approved.

Mr. Weitnauer stated it is admirable that the applicant wants to make improvements but it is an opportunity to improve the big picture. He agreed it would be appropriate to table the request until further information is received.

Ms. Arnold suggested to table all the requests and that the applicant come to speak to the Commission.

Ms. Cole stated the first two requests had the additional information and were already approved.

Mr. Caspar stated there is no need to undue the first two request.

Chairwoman Pearce stated the first two approved requests lead to a driveway. She recommended the current and next request be tabled.

Mr. Schulz made a motion to table the requests 17-0029 at 703 E. Fourth St. and 17-0030 at 705 E. Fourth St. and ask the applicant to provide documentation/plans for the driveway that comply with City requirements. Mr. Caspar seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment Period

No public comments were provided.

Committee Reports

Design Review. Chairwoman Pearce stated they met in August regarding tonight's COAs.

Publicity. Ms. Arnold stated they met and discussed post cards.

Selection. Chairwoman Pearce stated they did not meet.

Announcements/Other

Ms. Kinane stated a draft copy of the annual report was left at each members' seat. She stated to contact her if additional comments need to be made. The annual presentation to City Council will be November 13, 2017.

Chairwoman Pearce asked if there was an update of the house on Evans Street that was to be moved. She stated pieces of trim is falling of the building.

Ms. Kinane stated no update and that she also noticed the falling trim.

Chairwoman Pearce asked staff to try to get an update by the next meeting.

Mr. Caspar asked about the information they want regarding the two tabled requests.

Ms. Kinane stated she understood the information they wanted to be documentation and specific driveway plans in conformance with the Design Guidelines and City ordinances. The Design Review Committee will review that information.

Mr. Caspar stated that due to the multiple cars parking on those properties, he doubts anything will grow. The heavily graveled lot is now in the soil which will make it difficult to grow trees.

Ms. Cole suggested to start the Commission meetings with the Pledge of Allegiance and encouraged members to think about it.

With no further discussion, Ms. Cole made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Arnold seconded, and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II