

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**April 17, 2013**  
**Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall - Council Chambers**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Johnson called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Argenta, Field (left at 8:17 p.m.), Gudritz, Hoffman, Luikart, Johnson and Vernacchia

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Sally Elmiger

**3. CITIZEN COMMENTS:** Limited to brief comments for items not on the agenda.  
None

**4. MINUTES: March 20, 2013**

**A correction was made on page 3: *Voice Vote: All. Nays: Gudritz. Motion Carried 6-1, 4-1 with Gudritz opposed.***

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Gudritz,** to approve the minutes of March 20, 2013, as amended.

***Voice Vote: Motion Carried unanimously.***

The Historic District Commission discussed adding to the agenda the demolition request from the last meeting, which came in at the last minute. The request was to be reviewed by Ms. Elmiger, and it was agreed that it required a separate motion.

Commissioner Luikart mentioned the material that came in regarding the Sports Den.

Chair Johnson said the Sports Den was added to the agenda as item 6.; and the demolition was added as part of case number 5.

**5. REPORTS**

**A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None**

**B. CITY COUNCIL: None**

**C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER: None**

**D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None**

**6. CASES**

**CASE #1**

**DOWNTOWN WALK-THRU**

**125 E. MAIN STREET**

**PLAZA CONSTRUCTION**

Lori Ward was present on behalf of the City of Northville Downtown Development Authority. She presented updated plans for the plaza at the rear of the Walk-Thru and the Comerica building.

The DDA is proposing materials in the plaza that are used throughout the downtown streetscape, including charcoal colored concrete, Brussels Block planters with wrought iron decorative fence, and bollards. Two planting beds are also proposed at grade level; one along the Comerica building to the east, and one that separates the Walk-Thru sidewalk and the adjacent building's entrance to the west. Ms. Elmiger's reported indicated that all of the required information has been provided, except for a manufacturer's brochure of the proposed landscape lights.

Ms. Elmiger's reported indicated the following: A new stairway on the adjacent building to the west (123 E. Main St.) is shown on the site plan. Installation of the Walk-Thru plaza is coordinated with the installation of the new stairway. The building owner at 123 E. Main St. received HDC approval for this stairway in April, 2009. If work on the new stairway (issuance of a building permit) had not commenced before April, 2010, then this approval has expired. The property owner will need to return to the HDC.

Ms. Ward said they were on some final items, such as fire extinguishers and exit lighting. She said they were working on signage, and would be returning with proposed temporary canvas sign; and a way-finding study has commenced, and would reach conclusion in about 6 months. Following the study, she said they will return in May for a full signage program for implementation. She spoke about the following:

- A plaza to the north of the walkway, to greet people, and direct them to the plaza on Main Street;
- Regarding the Marquis parking lot, it will be resurfaced this summer, led by the Department of Public Works;
- They were working with the property owners behind Van Dam's and Edward's, all the way to the Marquis parking lot;
- The property owners proposed providing long-term easements to the City, and not assign any parking for their own use and customer use, if the City would accept it as part of the public parking system, assign it as public parking, with the City taking on the liability and maintenance of the lot;
- The two projects will marry, and one set of documents will be issued

Ms. Ward spoke about the long-term design on a connection through the alleyway out to Center Street. She said it was privately owned, and they would work with the property owner to acquire an easement to keep it as a public cut-through. She said they would connect also in the area of Rebecca's, to keep the areas as part of the circulation system that the City maintains.

Ms. Ward showed preliminary designs for the alley to show the direction of the plans. She pointed out a modification from the packet that included a change that included a gentle curve for the park lot for drop-off behind the plaza to the north of the walkway project. A small island will be shrunk down, some utilities will be moved, with a 1% grade change from the threshold of the walkway to the edge of the pavement area; and a zero clearance flush with the pavement; six lighted bollards will be added. A cut sheet was included in the packet; the pavement will be hand-trowelled regular color concrete. A treed seating area was introduced with decorative fencing. A planter area is planned to soften the wall of the gray cinder block wall of the bank; and they look to establish a spot near the end to add a future directory sign.

Ms. Ward showed rectangles of colored concrete; the walkway has electric doors in back; the footprint of the plaza was expanded to include the back of the Northville Gallery, with hedge-height landscaping to soften it with path lighting in the bed. She provided additional information for Ms. Elmiger regarding that lighting.

Ms. Ward said another project feature relates to the Spagnola Trust, who was before the Historic District Commission in 2009 with a plan to switch the stair at the current location on the east side of the property. That project lapsed, and is part of the new application; the DDA will pay a share of the cost. They proposed to relocate the AC unit from the plaza to the roof, with a common downspout and gutter system between the two buildings. She referred to what was previously approved and now the stair tread will be metal and no awning will be required.

Ms. Ward referred to the packet, and the interest in trying to provide some benches in the plaza area. She said the last drawing was a little skewed, but showed inset two benches, down lit lighting, a banner pole with a 'welcome' potential; and an effort to better screen some of the utilities. Ms. Ward discussed the eight-foot wide sidewalks which were planned to run from the plaza and would be ADA compliant, with several door swings that open out for deliveries; all the way to Orin's alley.

Ms. Ward reviewed the rendering in detail that included the following: a wandering path with landscaping features ; an entrance arch off Center Street; other areas, i.e. Ford Field, steps next to Sizzling Sticks that may include an arched element that says 'portal to downtown'; festoon lights to provide a ceiling through the alleyway; low level path lighting; several subcommittee members are fairy advocates, so there will a number of fairy doors, possibly a garden, areas available for murals or climbing vines where the Arts Commission could be represented; to be utilized in a varieties of different ways. Additional parking would include a large bike rack for seasonal use.

Ms. Ward said they look for approval of the concept, not the approval of the alleyway.

Discussion took place regarding the bus drop off area in front of the Marquis that stops traffic; and that the proposal could alleviate that inconvenience. Because of the reduction in the size of the island, no parking spots were lost, but some spots were gained. Discussion took place regarding the lighting in the curve, and the potential need to protect the lights from being struck by a vehicle. Discussion took place regarding the materials.

Ms. Ward said the lights are set back, there is no curb, it is at a 1% grade, and the last bollard is at the slightly mountable curb.

Commissioner ~~Field~~ Hoffman suggested a six inch curb could be considered.

Regarding the modified sign for the walkthrough, Ms. Ward said it was part of the earlier approved design. Tomorrow the ATM would be installed, so all wall mounted signs will be installed tomorrow.

Commissioner Hoffman applauded the design in terms of rear façade development.

Discussion took place regarding the evolution of the downtown area, and Chair Johnson did a presentation of same to the State of the Community today.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Luikart, to accept the application as complete, as based on the drawing 8-2.1., with a revision date of 4-16-2013.**

***Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.***

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Gudritz, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing the Secretary of Interior standard number 10; and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-28, adaptive reuse; 4-27, rear façade development; 4-12, streetscape amenities; 4-13, pedestrian orientation; and 4-21, materials.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**CASE #2 (Returning)  
ROBERT SCHWARTZ  
317 RANDOLPH**

**DEMO & RE-BUILD  
OF PORCH**

Homeowner, Robert Schwartz addressed the Historic District Commission, returning for approval to demolish and remodel his porch and carport. He said he submitted a revised packet regarding the request that included detail of exterior lights, and a clarification of the baluster to be used.

Regarding the baluster, the Applicant said the intention is to use a square baluster. He said a change was noted on the plan, and it was changed to wood. He said he did not know the year the home was built; he received some information from the seller, who indicated that the carport and enclosed porch was done in the 60s; and it has a shallow Michigan foundation, so it may have been built in the 1930s. He said he was not expanding the footprint of the house; he sought approval for demolition and re-build, contingent on Board of Zoning Appeals approval; and he goes before them on May 1, 2013.

Commissioner Luikart referred to the Historic District Commission standards for carports. She said while normally they would not allow a carport to be included on a house of this age or style, but since it was pre-existing, it could be allowed; and it was an improvement.

Commissioner Argenta said Mr. Schwartz had answered all the items requested last month.

Discussion took place that a demolition permit was not normally needed for a porch; and that in the application process, if there is any amount of demolition on a structure, that it is indicated on the application, including the percentages. Ms. Elmiger noted that the Applicant modified the application to indicate same.

**Motion by Field, supported by Luikart, to accept the application as complete.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Argenta, supported by Hoffman, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing the Secretary of Interior standard number 10; and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-5, roofing; 3-8, doors; 3-10, porches; 3-14, setbacks and spacing; 3-16, mass; 3-17, height; 3-18, scale; 3-22, materials; and 3-23, garages and carports; and conditioned upon the Applicant being granted variances for the front and side yard setbacks, and if the if denied the variances, the Applicant must return to the Historic District Commission.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**CASE # 3-A  
EVERGREEN DEVELOPMENT  
350 N. ROGERS**

**DEMOLITION**

&

**CASE # 3-B  
EVERGREEN DEVELOPMENT  
350 N. ROGERS**

**NEW CONSTRUCTION**

Todd Allen, with TK Design & Associates was present and explained his request for approval of demolition. He spoke about the history of the ranch home, built in 1972; and emphasized its lack of historical significance; that it is on the edge of the District, and that it does not have the same cadence as the surrounding homes in the Historic District. He noted the rear deck, not designed for safety or code; so he requested the demolition.

Mr. Allen explained the proposal build a new 3,500 square feet farm-style home on the parcel. He said it was in keeping with other houses nearby; the footprint is in the same location on the front as the existing houses, and they put the porch on the front and recessed the garage. He said no variances should be required. He reviewed the drawing of the existing house; and the proposed floor plan of new home, designed for modern consumers. He spoke about elevations for the simple farmhouse style house, with reverse gable, with simple details and strong mass. Mr. Allen said there are proposed sections and details regarding the spindles on the front porch and brackets.

Commissioner Field inquired about the property elevation and the typical window designation, noted as 4 and 4. He said it was inconsistent.

Mr. Allen said the window designation was there to show the size of the window; and all the windows are 2 over 2. He spoke about the sliding glass door on the rear elevation and walk out; and that it needed to be revised. He agreed to provide an update and confirmed that there were two windows either side of the clear-glass door wall; single-hung vinyl windows 2over 2; with moyens. He said they proposed false dormers. Also proposed was a fiberglass front door, stained medium oak; two single steel garage doors, with carriage door details; exterior basic coach light; wood composite siding—sample provided of material and black asphalt Landmark shingle. Views were shown of the existing and proposed house.

Ms. Elmiger said she still needed the site calculation for the square footage to calculate the lot coverage.

Commissioner Luikart inquired about the square footage of the neighboring home. She said the City website indicated 1,700 square feet.

Discussion took place regarding the sizes of the houses, and that the neighboring home looked much larger than 1,700 square feet.

Mr. Allen said they were requesting to demolish the existing house and construct a new home.

Commissioner Field said the plans looked good, and he questions the siding at the left and right elevation. He said there was no belt, and it seemed like all siding.

Mr. Allen said the entire house is sided, they do not propose a belt, but could consider it.

Discussion took place regarding the Smart Side trim product, which is an engineered wood siding. Commissioner Argenta commented that it looked similar to the Hardy board.

The homeowner said it was a product by Louisiana Pacific; it was developed to compete with Hardy Plank; it is a wood impregnated resin, with a 50 year warranty.

Commissioner Luikart questioned the proposed demolition. She spoke about the guidelines and responsibility of the Historic District Commission. She read the application requirements, and said it can be confusing and open for interpretation; it talks about a contributing and a non-

contributing resource, and cited Section C., the Requirements of the Applicant, and read same. She said it does not differentiate between a contributing and a non-contributing, or historic or non-historic resource. She said number 6 was there, written evidence that alternatives to demolition or moving have been evaluated; including but not limited to rehabilitation, sale, adaptive reuse.

Commissioner Luikart confirmed that the house was just purchased; and had been on the market for six months. She said it was purchased knowing the size of it, and that it was in the Historic District. She said the question relative to its historical significance was discussed at the last meeting, but she was not in attendance at that meeting. She emphasized that while this particular house is not historic, when it is torn down, it affects the District; and replacing it with a larger house affects the District. She spoke about Section 2.3 in Historic District design standards, noting it states there was potential for inappropriate changes to detract from the District. She said the Historic District Commission is to review non-contributing buildings with respect to the impact that changes would have to the surrounding significant and contributing buildings.

Commissioner Luikart mentioned the small historic house next to the subject parcel; that is smaller than the proposed house. She said that would create a significant impact to the house next door. She questioned the responsibility of the Historic District Commission and the obligation to have a Public Hearing regarding plans that may take place in the District. She recalled few demolitions in the past.

Commissioner Vernacchia said if the home meets the requirements for mass and height relative to the adjacent homes, and if the streetscape view shows that it is approximately the same size, maybe a little bigger, he questioned the concern.

Commissioner Luikart stated that the drawings often look different from what later on is built. She referred to the guidelines, and said she would like to have a Public Hearing to inform the neighbors. She said she questioned whether the guidelines under C., is applicable.

Discussion took place regarding the Historic District Commission discussing the guidelines and requirements last meeting, including the drawings and renderings; and that they did not see any problems with the proposed building, and thought it was a good thing; and that the Applicant responded at this meeting to the list of missing information noted at the last meeting.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the subject house was built 1972; and it was the consensus of the Historic District Commission that it was this house that was out of place in the District, except for the house next door on the other side. He said house next door is not 1,700 square feet, and it is larger than this house.

Mr. Allen said the other houses nearby are much bigger, and this proposal fits in far better than what is existing there right now.

Commissioner Luikart expressed concern with people purchasing smaller houses and then requesting a demolition 'for the good of the community.' She said she did not believe the house is historically significant, but there were many similar other houses in town.

Commissioner Vernacchia said Commissioner Luikart's concern was valid; but that the proper due diligence relative to this request was done by the Historic District Commission at the last meeting. He said the correct checks and balances were done to prevent a free opportunity to demolish smaller homes; and that his comfort level was quite high that adequate discussion has happened to prevent Ms. Luikart's concern.

Commissioner Gudritz said he raised the question last week, that as a Committee, they were careful to allow neighbors the opportunity to express concerns; and in this case, he has no problem with this demolition. He said he thought the Historic District Commission needed to be concerned to protect the District, and that Public Hearings can be a useful tool; however, he did not think they could do that in this case, because of what was discussed last month.

Commissioner Luikart requested clarification regarding the guidelines, in looking at the District as a whole.

Chair Johnson said he asked the Applicant to run through the entire Applicant as opposed to just the demolition, as what goes into that parcel was significant to the Historic District Commission, in that it relates to the entire District. He said the renderings provide the perspective to the neighborhood. He said the Historic District Commission asked a lot of Commissioner Luikart's questions last month, and encouraged the Applicant to in this fashion rather than calling a Public Hearing.

Discussion took place regarding the concerns relative to looking at the Historic District as a whole; including the footprint of the proposed new construction, the design, grade change, etc.

Commissioner Hoffman said the Applicant could have made the new construction much bigger, and that the rendition makes him comfortable with the placement in the District.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field, to accept the application as complete.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Field, supported by Vernacchia, to waive the Public Hearing in this matter.**

*Voice Vote: Motion carried, 6-1, with Luikart opposed.*

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Argenta, to grant the application for demolition as presented by the Applicant.**

Commissioner Luikart confirmed that the Applicant needed to provide more information regarding the demolition process.

The homeowner said the demolition would take two days, using an excavator with a claw; it would be smashed, rolled over, scooped up and removed. He said they would install the basement footings and concrete, and would be a three day process at the most, depending on the weather. He said they were waiting on gas abandonment and permits.

*Voice Vote: Motion carried, 6-1, with Luikart opposed.*

**Motion by Argenta, supported by Vernacchia, to accept the application as complete.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-14, setback and spacing; 3-17, height; 3-21, materials; 3-24, garages and carports; 5-9, asphalt shingles; 5-14, windows; 5-17, siding; 5-18, color; 3-16, mass; 3-18, scale; 3-19, proportion; and 3-20 hierarchy.**

*Voice Vote: Motion carried, 6-1, with Luikart opposed.*

**(Commissioner Field left at 8:17 p.m.)**

**CASE #4  
GREG PRESLEY  
404 W. MAIN STREET**

**ALTERATIONS &  
ADDITIONS**

Greg Presley was present with homeowners Robert and Cynthia Steinberg. He spoke about the iconic house from 1860; its evolution as a medical institute, then a Schrader Funeral Home; and its style and Italianate architecture. He spoke about the wide overhangs, the gothic influence, and eclectic nature of the home. He said the owners want to make some changes to the house and they want to get it right. He provided the site plan, noting it is a non-conforming structure, and they propose a conforming addition to the house.

Ms. Elmiger said the setback requirements have been met; as well as height and lot coverage requirements. She said one question related to the pitched roof over the flat roof over the garage, as it is within the 25 foot rear yard setback, which contains most of the garage. She noted it would only be used for storage; and the Zoning Ordinance has a provision that allows for improvements such as this, "based on maintenance and repair" and flat roofs tend to be high-maintenance; therefore no variance would be required.

Mr. Presley discussed the structure with the flat roof masonry that wraps on the north and west side; the original structure was most likely a kitchen; so they want to put a pitched roof over the flat area to help shed water; and hope to gain space under the new roof, over the kitchen area; shown best in the east elevation. He spoke about changes the existing structure has gone through. Two ridges were added on at some point. They propose to modify the existing roof over the kitchen; add a new floor; add a new roof; gain a couple feet higher than the existing ridge line to create a few rooms. They want to liberate the laundry from an uneven space; create a workout area; have the same number of bedrooms, and a small amount of add square footage. He said they propose to paint the house green on that side of the house only; they have spoken with neighbors who were supportive of the proposal. He said they plan to run siding on the side that has exposed masonry block on the east and west side. (Applicant to provide color of green for file.)

Commissioner Hoffman said he saw no problem with siding on the side with exposed masonry block.

Discussion took place regarding the original stone foundation, and the kitchen may have been an addition.

Mr. Presley noted no changes to the windows; but a change relative to moving a window 1.5 feet on the north elevation so it misses the new roof line. They proposed to use paint colors and materials to match existing colors and materials. The beveled cedar clapboard would match the existing. Regarding the garage doors, he said they would like to propose a single Clopay door, which looks like two doors, with window lights at the top. Cut sheet provided.

Commissioner Luikart urged the Applicant to comply with a two-door garage door.

**Motion by Vernacchia, to accept the application as complete, and that the Applicant has provided for the boarding on the garage, the painting of the green wall and siding and the rear area; the site plan was added; and the garage door as presented.**

Commissioner Gudritz said the plan is contrary to Historic District Commission standards.



Commissioner Luikart said they already have a two-car garage, so she asked that they maintain it as two bays; to follow the standard 3.24 of the Historic District Commission.

Discussion took place regarding the garage doors.

Mr. Presley said an eight foot wide door was not sustainable, so the only way would be to go wider on two separate doors. He expressed concern that the garage was not wide, and two separate bays would make it more difficult relative to the sidewalls.

Commissioner Vernacchia said because of the circumstances as presented, and the effort on the part of the Applicant to make it look like two doors, it would be acceptable as presented.

Commissioner Hoffman said it would look worse if they were extended out. He spoke about the elements being setback from the edges, so the proposal would look better and is sensitive to make it look like two doors.

Mr. Presley said the garage door would be custom-made.

**Support by Commissioner Argenta.**

Chair Johnson called the question.

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Argenta, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing the Secretary of Interior number 10; Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-14, setback and spacing; 3-16, mass; 3-17, height; 3-18, scale; 3-19, proportion; 3-20, hierarchy; 3-21, rhythm and materials; 3-24, garages; 5-19, shingles; 5-18 paint colors; and 3-23, dormers.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**CASE #5a (Returning)  
DANIEL SCHNEIDER/SWARTZ  
552 W. DUNLAP**

**ADDITION**

Dan Schneider was present, returning from last month, requesting a demolition of a small addition on the rear of the original carriage house; and approval of the design for an addition off the carriage house and a house. He said he addressed the issues requested at the last meeting. He said the demolition application was submitted late for the small circa 1950 addition off the back of carriage house. He said based on the information, the addition was built in the 1950s. He said they want to move the addition, preserve the original carriage house, and to do so, make it adaptable as a garage addition. He said it has a very low ceiling and a very small carriage door, and is impractical to convert it into a garage; and has no historic character.

Mr. Schneider said the new porch and garage additions have been moved to fit within all the setbacks; and the location was adjusted to fit with the setback; and he adjusted the porch roof, with a membrane roof, and to correct the slope so shingles can be used.

Owners Ken and Denise Swartz were present.

Discussion took place regarding the parapet and the reasons for parapets.

Mr. Schneider said the carriage house addition was changed since the last meeting and extends out further. The garage door was changed to two nine-foot doors with center pylons. A cut sheet was submitted. Regarding the fence, he said it was noted on the site plan that the contractor should survey the fence and repair only the damage; and a new 6.6 foot high fence will be added on the east side between the porch and the abutting property.

Commissioner Argenta said all questions were answered. He inquired about the exposed rafter tails.

Mr. Schneider said he did not show that, and it will go with the beveled siding on the carriage house. All painting will be white, a Benjamin Moore. The two shingles will be matched with what is on the house, Estate Gray. He will provide samples of the landscaping pavers at a later date.

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Gudritz, to accept the application as complete.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing the Secretary of Interior standards numbers 9 and 10; and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-20, hierarch; 3-21, materials; 3-24, garages; 5-9 for asphalt shingles; 5-18, color; 5-14, windows; 3-9, ornament and details; 3-4, fences; 3-8, doors; 3-6, windows; and 3-13, additions.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Gudritz, supported by Vernacchia, to waive the Public Hearing.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**Motion by Gudritz, supported by Vernacchia, to approve the application for demolition for the rear end of the carriage house.**

*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

#### **Case #6, Discussion regarding Sports Den**

Commissioner Luikart referred to applicable meeting minutes, relative to a subcommittee review of the final color selections, which was done, i.e. Red Brick; and the arbor spring material.

Commissioner Argenta recalled that the Applicant came in with a wall proposal at 36" 42"; and instead of that, the Applicant was to return with revised drawings. He said that never occurred, but he got an email today to visit the site and review the wall, which is now at about 36" high and capped off. He wondered if something was to go on top of the capped wall.

Chair Johnson said the same question was asked at the City Council meeting, and they wondered if the Liquor Control Commission had the same rule. He said following discussion, it was determined to return to the subcommittee to determine the actual standard, relative to the LCC; in that it does not need to be a specific height, but a demarcation to display whether a person was inside or outside of the wall; and it could be something temporary; with a sturdy material used to prevent someone from falling

Ms. Elmiger said she would get an answer to that question

Discussion took place regarding the height of the wall.

Ms. Elmiger spoke about the Applicant not returning to the Historic District Commission, and noted that it was her understanding that they did bring the lattice design material and one other thing for the subcommittee to review; not long after the meeting. She said it could be a miscommunication between the Applicant and Building Department.

Commissioner Argenta said upon his review, it looked nice.

**DISCUSSION**

None.

**ADJOURN**

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cindy Gray, Recording Secretary