

Minutes
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Wednesday, January 2, 2008, at 7:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Jessica Dockery, Mark Bell, Joseph Council, and Holly Snyder.

ABSENT: Vice Chair Mark Rhoades.

STAFF: Tom King.

WITNESSES: Saragene Boericke, James Boericke, Wendy Cash, Fred Stewart, Dorothy McGee, Charlie Smith, David Roberts, and Elizabeth Hays.

ITEM #1: Call to order, roll call, and confirmation of quorum.

Ms. Dockery called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m., and Mr. King called the roll and confirmed the quorum.

ITEM #2: Reading of the Commission's Mission Statement.

Ms. Dockery read the Commission's Mission Statement and provided information on the Commission's processes.

ITEM #3: Additions to the agenda and agenda adjustments.

Mr. King indicated that Item #7, the Hopper and Byrd Construction, Inc. application, had been withdrawn by the applicant on December 31, 2007. There were no other additions or adjustments to the agenda.

ITEM #4: Consideration of Approval of additions to the approved minutes of December 5, 2007.

Mr. Council noted that on page 28, last line, it should read "He said he did not see...", and on page 30, second line, the words "from here" should be eliminated.

MOTION: Mr. Bell moved to approve the minutes of December 5, 2007 as amended.

SECOND: Mr. Council.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #5: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Saragene Boericke to replace an existing metal shingle roof with a metal, standing seam roof at 153 West Margaret Lane (TMBL 4.36.E.3)

Ms. Dockery swore in Saragene Boericke, James Boericke, and Senior Planner Tom King. Mr. King provided information regarding the architecture of the home, noting it was built between 1905 and 1911. He said that the proposed work was to replace an existing metal shingle roof with a slate-grey metal, standing seam roof, and provided photos of the existing roof and samples of the proposed material.

Mr. King stated the Standards that applied were H for roofing material and I for exterior color, and the Design Guidelines that applied were Roofs and Paint and Exterior Color.

Ms. Boericke stated that with the exception of the right sun porch and the east porch, the remainder was the original house.

Ms. Dockery asked if the existing shingles were deteriorated. Ms. Boericke stated they were deteriorated and that the existing type of shingle was no longer manufactured.

Mr. Council noted that since they could not go with the original material, he believed the Boericke's had chosen the next best thing.

Mr. King reminded the Board and those present that because there were only four HDC members in attendance this evening, votes would have to be unanimous in order for an application to be approved.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the Saragene Boericke application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards H and I, and the Design Guidelines for Roofs and Paint and Exterior Color.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #6: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Tyson Sign Company to replace an existing freestanding wooden sign with a new 16.25 square foot, 6' tall textured wood sign at 115 East King Street (TMBL 4.30.B.5)

Ms. Dockery swore in Wendy Cash. Mr. King provided some information on the architecture of the building, noting that the proposed work was the replacement of an existing freestanding wooden sign with a new 16.25 square foot, 6' tall textured wood freestanding sign. He provided photos of the existing site, pointing out the deterioration that had occurred with the existing sign. Mr. King also provided a scaled drawing of the proposed sign and a photo rendering of what it would look like superimposed over the existing site.

Ms. Cash stated they had now scaled the sign down to 5 feet rather than 6 feet.

Ms. Dockery stated that the scaled drawing said the equal housing logo was vinyl on flat aluminum. Ms. Cash stated that language should have been deleted, noting it would

be textured finish over wood. Ms. Dockery stated that for the record, that error on the scaled drawing needed to be made clear in the motion.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved to find as fact that the Tyson Sign Company application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards C and O and Design Guidelines for Signage.

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved to approve the application with the specification that the equal housing logo listed as vinyl on flat aluminum was an error on the drawing and would not be a part of the sign.

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #7: **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Hopper and Byrd Construction, Inc. to install low-profile skylights on the west porch roofs of the house at 327 West Tryon Street (TMBL 4.29.E.6)**

This item was withdrawn by the applicant on December 31, 2007.

ITEM #8: **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Stephen and Nancy Demorest to replace an existing first floor window on the south facing façade with new French doors at 318 North Churton Street (TMBL 4.19.F.1)**

Ms. Dockery swore in Fred Stewart. Mr. King provided some information on the architecture of the structure, built around 1908. He said the proposed work was to replace an existing first floor window on the south facing façade with new French doors.

Mr. King stated the Standards that applied were C for materials, F for architectural details, I for exterior color, and J for proportion of openings. He stated the Design Guidelines that applied were Windows and Doors.

Ms. Dockery asked what the end staircases would be like. Mr. Stewart stated the temporary stairs would be wooden.

Mr. Council commented this plan was very attractive and closely matched the door and wall.

Mr. Bell asked were there other French doors on the house. Mr. Stewart replied there was a pair on the front of the house that did not have a transom light, which he was proposing to have on the new French door. He pointed out the location of those doors on the plans.

- MOTION:** **Mr. Council** moved to find as fact that the Stephen and Nancy Demorest application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards C, F, I, and J and Design Guidelines for Windows and Doors.
- SECOND:** **Mr. Bell.**
- VOTE:** Unanimously approved.
- MOTION:** **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with no conditions.
- SECOND:** **Ms. Snyder.**
- VOTE:** Unanimously approved.

ITEM #9: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for Dorothy McGee to erect a 5-foot tall mesh cat-proof fence in the rear and western side yard at 408 West King Street (TMBL 4.29.D.10)

Ms. Dockery swore in Dorothy McGee and Charlie Smith. Mr. King provided some information on the architecture of the structure, noting that the proposed work was to erect a 5-foot tall cloth-like mesh cat-proof fence in the rear and western side yard of the property. He provided some photos of the materials proposed to be used.

Ms. McGee provided the HDC with a sample of the material, noting that the bottom of the fence would be of black metal.

Mr. King stated it appeared that the fence would not extend to the property line, but would be closer to the structure. He stated the Standards that would apply were C for materials, I for exterior color, and Q for walls, and the Design Guidelines that applied were Fences and Walls.

Ms. Dockery asked how far the metal section of the fence ran before it switched to the mesh material. Ms. McGee provided photos of such a fence and indicated how the black metal showed very little, particularly when viewed against trees or shrubbery. She added that she had two yard cats that she needed to be able to contain or she would be forced to relocate them.

Ms. Dockery asked if anyone else wished to speak to the application. Mr. Charles Smith was sworn in. Mr. Smith stated his property was on the right side of Ms. McGee's house, and although he was somewhat relieved to see her plans he still had objections. He stated that he and his wife opposed the application for three reasons:

- The material and the size of the fence were inappropriate to the character of the historic district. They did not see the proposed fence as enhancing the site; they did not see the cloth-like material and configuration as being compatible with any other fence material commonly found in the historic district, noting it was a modern material and design. They also questioned the material used for the fence posts, noting they were most likely galvanized steel.

- The installation of the cloth-like fence would be noticeable from the front of the property, although he now was not positive about that based on what had been proposed this evening. He pointed out that the landscaping on the front of the property had been neglected for many years, with very little pruning or management of the growth. Adding the fence would not enhance the property.
- The reason for the application was to contain stray cats that had originally come onto his property and taken up a home in his shrubbery sometime in late spring or early summer. Animal Control had been unable to trap the cats, and setting those traps had forced the cats from his property onto Ms. McGee's property. The cats were feral and were not domesticated, but Ms. McGee had decided to keep the cats and they were now living under her crawlspace. The cats entered and exited her property via his property and spent a lot of time on his property, and at one point had scratched the paint on his car. They did not believe private residences in the historic district should be turned into animal rescues, and allowing a cat-proof fence would enable Ms. McGee to rescue even more cats.

Mr. Smith stated they were trying to maintain their property and keep its value up, and did not believe Ms. McGee should be using her residence for something other than a residence in the historic district.

Ms. McGee responded that the cats Mr. Smith was speaking of was a mother and 3 kittens that had come over from his property to her property about a year and a half ago. She stated that Mr. Smith had been feeding the cats and when they came over onto her property he had given her a bag of cat food. Ms. McGee stated she had called Independent Animal Rescue and they had trapped the mother cat and two of the three kittens. She stated after the mother cat had been spayed, she had returned her to the yard to take care of the last kitten until he could be caught. Ms. McGee stated the last kitten had proven unfriendly after keeping it inside, and she was forced to return it to the outdoors with the mother cat. She said both cats had been vaccinated and were not totally feral, in that they were dependent, and that she had tried several methods to keep the cats on her side of the property line.

Ms. McGee stated that apparently Mr. Smith had been pouring mackerel oil on his side of the property to lure the cats onto his property so that Animal Control could trap them. She said she believed another cat in the neighborhood may have been responsible for the damage to Mr. Smith's car. Ms. McGee stated she was fearful for the cats' safety, noting if the fence was erected the cats would no longer have access to Mr. Smith's property. She said it was not easy to relocate the cats into a safe environment, but she was continuing to look into that. Ms. McGee said she had no intention of acquiring any more yard cats, and would not be using her residence as a shelter for such animals. She implored the HDC to allow her to erect the fence.

Elizabeth Hays stated her family's cat had been killed in Mr. Smith's yard by his dogs, and he had shown no feeling to her or her family for that loss. Ms. McGee said that was because he had thought it was one of her cats.

Mr. Smith stated he was sorry for Ms. Hays' loss. He stated they had two dogs that were maintained on their property, and they abided by all animal control ordinances. Mr. Smith stated the one morning he had let his dogs out in the sealed space, Ms. Hays cat was in his yard and his dogs had attacked it. He said he did not realize until he had knocked on Ms. McGee's door that the cat was not one of hers. Mr. Smith stated Ms. Hays' cat was likely on Ms. McGee's property because she fed cats and had crossed onto his property.

Mr. Smith stated he had photographic evidence that the cats were not remaining on Ms. McGee's property, he had a photograph of one of her cats on top of his car taken on December 30, and had other photos as well. He stated he believed Ms. McGee now had three cats, noting that he had witnessed a black cat crossing from her property onto his property. Mr. Smith stated that everyone should be abiding by the animal control ordinances, which required that pets be maintained on your own property. He said he had not brought Ms. Hays' cat onto his property, and it was likely because Ms. McGee fed it. Mr. Smith stated he was sorry that Ms. Hays' cat was killed, but it was on his property.

Ms. Dockery stated this appeared to be an unfortunate situation, but the only thing the HDC could address was the material for the fence. She said unfortunately, the material was not one that was in keeping with the Historic District. Ms. McGee stated she had chosen that material because it was virtually invisible and would be well back onto the property. Ms. Dockery reiterated she believed the material was inappropriate.

Mr. Bell stated that, in the recent past, John Snipes had requested erecting some type of non-traditional fencing to keep his dog on his porch. Ms. Dockery stated they had required him to use a traditional fence, so his request had been denied. Ms. Snyder commented that it was basically a porch railing with screening.

Mr. Bell stated he was inclined to agree that the proposed material was not found in the historic district, and wondered if there were other solutions. Ms. McGee asked if she enclosed the outside of the cat fence with a picket fence, would that be acceptable. She said the proposed mesh material would sag if the cats started to climb it and they would fall off, so they would not be able to get to a wooden fence behind it.

Ms. Dockery stated if it were screened with a more traditional material, she would be more inclined to accept it. Ms. McGee stated she would be willing to erect a wooden fence slightly behind the cat fence.

Mr. Bell asked would Ms. McGee be willing to table her request to provide her time to think of some other ideas. Ms. McGee stated there was some urgency in providing safety for the cats.

Ms. Dockery stated the HDC could approve the picket fence to screen the cat fence, and then if Ms. McGee found it cost prohibitive or found another option, she could come back to the HDC to amend her proposal.

Mr. Council stated he was sympathetic to both Ms. McGee's position as well as her neighbor's position, but it came down to the appropriateness of the proposed material. He stated he did not support the application because of the modern aspect of the material. Mr. Council stated the compromise being discussed about having a traditional picket fence on the outside of the cat fence was an interesting proposal, but he was concerned that once something was approved in the historic district it became a precedent. He said he could foresee in the future that if Ms. McGee ever sold her property, the new owner could remove the picket fence. Mr. Council stated he was not sure that such a precedent should be set.

Mr. Council stated he believed they were "designing by committee" by saying that to have the cat fence you had to have a secondary wood fence. He said although he was sympathetic, he could not support the application as it stood and he was very hesitant to support the double fencing because of the precedent it might set for future applications. Mr. Council said he was willing to hear more arguments to support the use of the double fence, but as of now he remained unconvinced that it was a good idea.

Ms. Snyder agreed their only concern was the proposed fence, and there was nothing in the Guidelines to support that type of fence. She said it appeared that Ms. McGee should be able to erect the cat fence inside a wood picket fence that met the Guidelines, since it would then not be seen.

Mr. Council stated his comment was geared towards the future if the wooden fence deteriorated and was removed, leaving the cat fence.

Ms. Dockery asked if removal of the fence at some future point would have to come before staff. Mr. King stated he believed that it would, but he would have to check on that.

Mr. Bell stated if a request was made for a COA to build a wooden fence, did the Town care? Ms. Dockery said removal of a fence would be something that staff or the HDC would have to look at. Mr. King stated that the removal of the fence would require HDC approval if it was over 4 feet in height. Ms. Dockery stated then if someone wanted to remove the wooden fence, removal of the cat fence could be required as well, so that might be the best solution.

Mr. Council stated that made him feel more comfortable in a technical sense, but to erect any fence in the Historic District, whether it be an outer fence or an inner fence, wouldn't it have to come before the HDC. Mr. King stated the Guidelines did not differentiate. Mr. Council stated he could not approve the application as it now stood.

Ms. Dockery stated the rescue wire fence would be acceptable, but not the black mesh fence. Mr. Council stated he would not vote for either one based on the Guidelines.

Ms. McGee stated her neighbor's fence was basically chicken wire, and not chain link as was mentioned in the Guidelines. She asked did she need to resubmit her application with the outer wooden fence added.

Ms. Dockery asked the board, if the applicant was willing to propose a 6-foot tall wooden fence with the cat fence on the interior, not visible, would the HDC be willing to vote on that.

Mr. Smith stated if Ms. McGee erected such a privacy fence, he had no objections as to what was placed behind it.

There was some discussion as to what type of fencing would be most suitable, including the spacing of the slats, if any, and the type of support posts that would be most appropriate.

Mr. Bell suggested that a motion with particular conditions could be made that would empower staff to make the final determination. Ms. Dockery stated since the cat fence would be erected as well, the HDC should have final approval. Mr. King agreed. Ms. Dockery suggested Ms. McGee provide Mr. King with a drawing of the final product to include in the record. Ms. McGee agreed to do so.

MOTION: **Mr. Bell** moved to find as fact that the Dorothy McGee application is in keeping with the overall character of the district and complies with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards C, I, and Q and the Design Guidelines for Fences and Walls.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

DISCUSSION: Ms. Dockery asked if the fence would be painted or unpainted. Ms. McGee stated she would paint it white, since the house was white.

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: **Mr. Council** moved to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: that it be 6 feet in height; made of pressure treated timbers and pickets; up to ¼ inch spacing between slats; structural supports to the inside; painted white; flat picket tops; and, cat fence on interior; not visible from exterior.

SECOND: **Ms. Snyder.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #10: **Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for David and Elizabeth Hays to replace the existing second story single pane windows on the east and west façade with new wood insulated windows at 324 West King Street (TMLB 4.29.E.21)**

Ms. Dockery swore in Elizabeth Hays and David Roberts. Mr. King provided some information regarding the architecture of the structure, as well as details of other changes and renovations that had been made to the house over time. He stated the

proposed work was to replace the existing second story single pane windows on the east and west façade with new wood insulated windows.

Mr. King stated the Standards that applied were C for materials, F for architectural details, I for exterior color, and J for proportion of openings, and the Design Guidelines that applied were Windows and Doors. He displayed photos of the existing windows as well as elevations showing the proposed windows. Mr. King stated the only change was that window "B" would have about a 3" difference from what was existing; in that it would have a reduction in height.

Ms. Hays stated the windows on each side of the house were in their children's bedrooms, and both rooms, one in particular, had not responded to any climate control measures. She said subsequently, the children could not sleep in those rooms during cold weather.

Mr. Roberts stated they would be working from the inside to insulate and seal the new windows to make them more energy efficient.

Ms. Snyder remarked these must be original windows to the house. Mr. Roberts stated they were. Ms. Snyder asked if these windows matched the windows on the first floor. Ms. Hays responded yes, but they were not the same size. Ms. Snyder stated the Guidelines told them to preserve original windows, and all the windows on the original façade had its original windows. She asked if storm windows were used.

Mr. Roberts asked if the HDC would rather see storm windows or wooden windows showing. Ms. Snyder reiterated that the Guidelines told them it was important to keep original windows. Mr. Roberts replied that a storm window was not original. Ms. Snyder said it was a way to assist with climate control but still preserve the original windows.

Mr. Council stated he was in complete agreement with Ms. Snyder, and quoted from the Guidelines regarding the preservation of original windows. He asked Ms. Hays if the panes were wavy. Ms. Hays replied that some of the panes had been broken and replaced, and that none of the upstairs windows were wavy although some of the downstairs windows were. Mr. Council quoted from other sections of the Guidelines regarding the preservation of historic windows and other architectural details. He said if windows deteriorated to the point that they had to be replaced the Guidelines stated they should be replaced with windows that matched the original dimensions, design, materials, sash, underpanel configuration, detail, texture, and color. Mr. Council went on to say the Guidelines also said it may be necessary to have replacement windows custom made.

Mr. Council stated the application called for shortening one window by 3 inches and replaced by a pre-fab unit. He said to do that would be to violate the Guidelines. Mr. Council said even if the HDC approved replacement of the windows, he did not believe a pre-fab unit could be used because it would shorten the window by 3 inches. He said

these were original windows and should not be replaced at all, and it was his sense that because of the amount of additions that had been made to this house that as much of its original historical aspects that were left should be maintained.

Mr. Council stated that based on the Guidelines and Standards of Evaluation there was no way he would vote in favor of the application.

Mr. Bell stated he was sympathetic to Ms. Hays' problem, but agreed that approving this application would totally disregard the HDC Guidelines. He said he would be interested to know if Ms. Hays had thought about removing the sashes and having them remade or reworked, and then continuing with re-insulation and replacing the weights and ropes. Ms. Hays said they had not discussed that as an option. Mr. Bell encouraged Ms. Hays to consider restoring the windows rather than replacing them.

Ms. Dockery stated she also was concerned about the change in dimension. She said in terms of storm windows, there was a method by which storm windows could be made to look like old-fashioned wood frame screen windows. Ms. Hays stated she had understood you were not supposed to add anything.

Mr. Roberts asked if Ms. Hays would have to come before this Board to add a storm window. Mr. Bell stated no, that they were exempt. Mr. Roberts asked what if they reworked the sash liners. Mr. Bell stated if they were repairing damaged material, he believed it was allowed.

Ms. Dockery stated as long as the materials and configurations were the same, it would be allowed. Mr. King added such activity was a Minor Work and could be approved by staff.

Mr. Council quoted from page 27 of the Guidelines regarding utilities and retrofit guidelines, which suggested installing storm windows and doors if historically appropriate, and installing narrow profile storm windows so that they did not obscure or damage the historic window sash and frame. He stated that clearly the Guidelines allowed for low profile storm windows to be installed. Mr. Council asked if they were confident enough that they could ameliorate thermal loss through the walls that it was even practical to consider the windows at this time. And if so, he said, wouldn't it arguably be better to consider something that was mid-range, such as removable storm windows. Ms. Hays responded that her insulation contractor had stated that was pointless because the windows needed replacement. She said the contractor had indicated that adding insulation would not solve the problem.

Mr. Council asked if Ms. Hays would consider the narrow profile storm windows. Ms. Hays stated she was open to whatever would work, looked good, and was historically appropriate. But, she said, she also wanted her children to be able to sleep comfortably in their rooms, so somewhere in between there had to be a solution. She said she was willing to be very flexible about how to get to that solution.

Mr. Council said in his opinion, he could not approve the application as it stood. He said if she wanted to take the intermediate step and consider narrow profile storm windows that matched the color of the sash and the dividers, he could support a modified application to do that. Mr. Roberts stated they could do that without an application since it was a Minor Work. Mr. King stated the HDC could deny this application and then Ms. Hays could ask for a Minor Work.

Ms. Hays asked what would happen if she installed a storm window and the sash did not match in color. She stated the major trim was off-white and the minor trim was eggplant.

Mr. Council stated if a white frame storm window was installed, after six months it would likely fade to off-white.

Ms. Snyder said she wanted Ms. Hays to continue to consider restoring the windows, noting they were antiques and some solid insulation could be added to the back of the pockets. She said to have those windows restored and operating would be preferable. Ms. Hays said her understanding was if she did that they would not operate. Ms. Snyder said not if they were full of insulation, but there was enough room to put a half inch or so of caulk and that would still allow the windows to operate.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved to find as fact that the David and Elizabeth Hays application was not in keeping with the overall character of the district and does not comply with all relevant standards of evaluation based on the discussions of the application and the standards of evaluation in Section 21.6.3 of the zoning ordinance, and adherence to Standards C, F, I, and J, and the Design Guidelines for Windows and Doors.

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

MOTION: **Ms. Dockery** moved to deny the application as submitted.

SECOND: **Mr. Council.**

VOTE: Unanimously approved.

ITEM #11: Commission and Staff Reports/Updates

Mr. King stated that Mr. Rhoades had asked about contacting Kevin McGraw regarding 420 West King Street, and he had contacted Mr. McGraw on December 27, 2007. He stated that Mr. McGraw had indicated that work would continue on the home, possibly within 30 days. Mr. King stated Mr. McGraw would have to renew his building permit and possibly his COA.

Mr. King stated there had been a question about the John and Mildred Long property at 131 West Queen Street, noting the COA was issued on June 6, 2007, to replace the brick front path with flagstone, replace the cinderblock stairs with stone steps, and build a 15' x 30' rear addition to the house. He stated the HDC had placed a condition on the COA that the roof pitch of the addition must match the roof pitch of the rear dormer.

Mr. King said subsequent to that, the Board of Adjustment issued a Special Exception Permit on August 8, 2007, for the addition to encroach into the required side building setback. He stated he had checked the file on December 27, 2007 and no zoning permit and no building permit had been issued for the addition. Mr. King stated the COA was good for 12 months, so the Longs may have changed their minds or just put the project on hold.

Ms. Snyder stated the stone steps in the back where the addition was planned had not been approved. Ms. Dockery stated the front steps and walkway were an after-the-fact approval.

Ms. Dockery stated there was also an unapproved change on the addition to the house on the corner of Margaret Lane and Occaneechee. She stated the owners had placed Victorian brackets on the front porch posts.

Ms. Dockery asked if the red ATM had been removed from Churton Street. Mr. Council responded it had, and had been replaced with a non-intrusive silver ATM.

Regarding the Long property, Ms. Dockery asked when the rear addition had been done. Mr. King stated the only date he had was June 6, 2007. Ms. Dockery stated the COA included replacing the existing front porch square posts with wood tapered posts. Mr. King stated he would have to check on that.

Ms. Dockery stated there had been a modification on September 5, 2007 for the rear addition. Mr. King stated he would have to go back and check the file, since he was not showing that September modification. Ms. Dockery stated the September plans mentioned wood steps and a blue stone patio.

Ms. Dockery asked if they would hear about the Hopper skylight application at some later time. He stated he did not know why Mr. Hopper had chosen to withdraw his application regarding the skylight. He went on to state that staff were still working on providing feedback on the Board of Adjustment's decision on the Jeff and Kelly Hopper appeal from November 2007.

ITEM #12: Adjourn.

Ms. Dockery moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m., seconded by Mr. Council. The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom King, Secretary