

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
April 13, 2015**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, April 13, 2015, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Chairwoman Susan Besser
 Lisa Marquardt
 Mel Thompson
 Jim Roberts
 Rusty Womack
 Trisha Nesbitt
 Kate Reynolds
 Mary Pearce, recused herself from Item 6

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Catherine Powers, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Steve Haynes, BNS Department
 Chris Bridgewater, BNS Department
 Kristen Corn, Law Department

Chairwoman Besser called to order the April 13, 2015, Historic Zoning Commission meeting at 5:00 p.m.

**Item 1:
Minutes: March 9, 2015**

Mr. Roberts moved to approve the March minutes as submitted. Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion, and the motion passed (8-0).

**Item 2:
Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**

Open for Franklin citizens to be heard on items not included on this Agenda. As provided by law, the Historic Zoning Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director for administrative consideration, or to schedule the matter for Historic Zoning Commission consideration at a later date.

No comments for non-agenda items.

**Item 3:
Consideration of New Construction (Accessory) at 1319 Adams St.; John & Kacie Dunavan, Applicants.**

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 1 ½ story garage accessory structure on their property at 1319 Adams St. Ms. Hall stated an existing prefabricated accessory structure is planned for removal from the lot. Ms. Hall stated the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its March 16, 2015 meeting. Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed accessory structure with the following:

1. As a condition of approval, the accessory structure must remain shorter in height than the principal structure, as indicated on the application materials, in order to ensure compatibility in relationship as recommended by the *Guidelines*.
2. Staff requests the Historic Zoning Commission to direct the applicant to submit siding, window, garage door, and shutter specifications to staff for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a COA.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness.
4. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval, including, but not limited to, height and placement.

Mr. Dunavan stated he was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Reynolds stated she needed clarification on the ridgeline of the garage and wants to make sure it would be 23-feet tall and not more.

Mr. Dunavan stated the rendering shows the garage at 23-feet tall and the house at 24-feet tall.

Ms. Marquardt moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5812 for the proposed accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the staff report and recommendation dated April 13, 2015. Ms. Pearce seconded the motion, and the motion passed (8-0).

Item 4:

Consideration of Alterations to Previously-Approved Construction (Principal, Accessory) at 126 Harlinsdale Ct.; Doug & Tamela Swanson, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to the previously-approved principal and accessory structure construction of a single-family residence yet to be constructed at 126 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 5 Harlinsdale Manor). Ms. Hall stated the existing COA was approved for the principal and accessory structure construction on January 12, 2015. Ms. Hall stated the proposed alterations to the previously-approved plans include the following:

Principal

- Modification in front elevation to include a left gable and three dormers over the porch area, as opposed to one large centered gable with a dormer on either side
- Modification of the rear elevation roofline
- Alteration in overall building height from 34'-9" to approximately 36', due mainly to increase of previously-approved foundation height from 2'-5" to 3'-9"
- Addition of porch railing (due to increase height from grade)

Accessory

- Modification of the right side elevation through the use of a shed dormer, as opposed to the previously-approved Gothic Revival-inspired hipped dormer
- The addition of a shed roof over the garage door, with brackets
- The substitution of garage doors with glass to those with no glass

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed alterations to the previously-approved principal structure and accessory structure with the following:

1. As a condition of approval, any deviation from the overall height (36'-0 ¼" for principal and 28'-8 ¼" for the accessory structure), foundation height (3'-9"), finished floor elevation (638'), or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction.
2. As a condition of approval, metal roofing and garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
4. A scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - Foundation height with proposed/conceptual grading from front property line to foundation of house, and proposed/conceptual grading along the front façade of the house (if such information cannot be provided, foundation height details should be given for the largest and smallest foundation heights envisioned for the site); and
 - All approved building materials, including porch steps.

Ms. Pearce move that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5813 for the proposed alterations to the previously-approved principal structure construction and accessory structure with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 13, 2015. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion, and the motion passed (8-0).

Item 5:

Consideration of Additions (Principal) and Alterations (Windows) at 1323 Adams St.; Jane & Donald Britt, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of two rear additions onto the noncontributing residence at 1323 Adams St. Ms. Hall stated one rear addition has been partially constructed (demonstrated as "Proposed Addition #1 on the plan set). Ms. Hall stated the attached exhibits provide more information about the house, the partial addition, and the other proposed addition location. Ms. Hall explained a Stop Work Order was placed on the project due to lack of necessary building permit and COA. Ms. Hall stated the applicants are also proposing to relocate one window on the south (right side) elevation. Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the construction of the two additions with the following:

1. As a condition of approval, if the use of fiber cement siding is approved by the Historic Zoning Commission, the lap exposure should be lessened from the proposed 12" to around 10-11" so as to help differentiate the additions from the existing residence, as recommended by the *Guidelines* (p.52, #2).
 - If the Historic Zoning Commission approves the use of Masonite siding on the additions, so as to provide consistency in material, staff directs the Historic Zoning Commission to consider a smaller lap exposure for the Masonite siding, so as to further differentiate the additions for the main form of the residence.

2. As a condition of approval, the ridge line of both additions may not exceed the ridge line of the original portion of the residence.
3. Staff recommends that the applicant finish the concrete block foundation with paint or a stucco/parge coat for uniformity with the original portion of the residence.
4. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
 - A scaled set of elevations notating the height of the existing building eave and ridge lines, the height of the addition ridge lines, and all approved building materials must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Britt stated she has a small house and these improvements will help with the looks of the house and allow for more space.

Ms. Reynolds questioned there not being an offset at the addition location.

Ms. Hall stated the proposed plans would have a cross gable to make the addition distinguishable from the main house.

Ms. Reynolds stated she feels it would be nice to have an inset on the second addition and to follow our guidelines.

Mr. Womack stated from the photo this makes it look like Masonite siding and asked if staff stated that as a generic term.

Ms. Hall stated it is some type of 1950s siding material.

After discussion Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #5814 for the construction of the two rear additions with staff's comments and that the smaller addition would be set in at least 8-inches and a vertical board be put on the north side to make the transition between the hardi-plank with historic exposure and that the other addition be wrapped with the hardi-plank, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated April 13, 2015. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the motion passed (8-0).

Item 6:

Consideration of New Construction at Harpeth Square PUD Subdivision, located at Various Properties within the Block of E. Main St., 1st Ave. N., Bridge St., and 2nd Ave. N.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.

Ms. Pearce requested to speak and disclosed why she was recusing herself from this item. Ms. Pearce stated it had come to her attention that some people feel she may have a conflict of interest on this vote due to the Heller's being contributors to the Heritage Foundation. Ms. Pearce stated the Heller's have never expected any favors for their donations. Ms. Pearce stated they recently made a donation to the Old Old Jail. Ms. Pearce stated she sought advice from counsel and they stated under the Franklin Zoning Ordinance that she does not have a conflict of interest. Ms. Pearce requested the Heller's receive a just and fair review on this project. Ms. Pearce stated this is a huge project for this commission, and from looking at the proposal, the facades have too much articulation. Ms. Pearce showed example photos. Ms. Pearce stated this application is appropriate to consider more height. Ms. Pearce stated legal advised her to leave the room for this item since she recused herself.

Alderman Martin stated she wanted to speak before this item was started.

Chairwoman Besser stated she could speak after Ms. Hall and the applicant had completed their presentations.

Mr. Thompson revealed on record he has had many conversations with different people about this subject and that there has been no influence at all for his vote.

Ms. Hall stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of retail spaces and attached housing on a majority of a city block within the Downtown Franklin Historic District, specifically the block bounded by 1st Ave. N., Bridge St., 2nd Ave. N., and E. Main St. Ms. Hall stated the development plan (including a boutique hotel and a freestanding building proposals, which are not included within this particular COA review) has recently received a favorable recommendation from the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission and has been recently approved by the Franklin Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Ms. Hall stated the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its December 1, 2014 Special meeting and again at a Special Design Review Committee meeting held on April 6, 2015. Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends partial approval with conditions of the proposed new construction with the following:

1. The proposed building is not entirely consistent with the *Guidelines* in respect to height, as the *Guidelines* recommend that new buildings “not exceed the average height of buildings on a block or neighboring blocks by more than 10 percent” (p.106, #16) and that one “make new buildings compatible with adjacent buildings through massing, size, scale, and architectural features” (p.104, #2). Given a lack of building context on 1st Ave. N., however, the proposed 3-4 story scale, height, and massing at that location of the block is more appropriate than at those proposed elevations immediately adjacent to buildings to remain on the subject block.
2. As a condition of approval, fiber cement siding (or “Hardi”) and stucco may not be utilize as a construction material per *Guidelines*. If stucco is approved as a building material by the Historic Zoning Commission, it must consist of true stucco and not EIFS material.
3. As a condition of approval, glass-and-metal may not be utilize as a construction material per *Guidelines*. Revised elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. If the use of the proposed glass-and-metal building section is approved by the Historic Zoning Commission, staff recommends that the applicant utilize a lighter anodized aluminum look with limited mullions as opposed to a darker material and multiple mullions. Darker material and multiple mullions may draw more attention to the section, thus emphasizing height.
4. As a condition of approval, the rooftop patio should not be visible from the street per *Guidelines*. A parapet wall may be extended upward to screen the view. The proposed glass railing appears to mitigate building height at that location, however, so alternatively, the Historic Zoning Commission may choose to direct the applicant to screen the patio rooftop from view in another manner. The use of plantings is not recommended, as the *Guidelines* state that “green roofs” on commercial buildings are “appropriate as long as they are not readily visible from the street” (p.114, #5).
5. As a condition of approval, none of the proposed box bay windows may be utilized, as the *Guidelines* recommend against the use of historically typical details “such as bay windows” (p.105, #14). Revised elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
6. As a condition of approval, all masonry materials must be compatible in size, profile, and detailing with historic materials in the historic district.
7. Staff requests the Historic Zoning Commission to direct the applicant to submit window specifications (excluding storefront windows) and metal roofing specifications to staff for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a COA.

8. If the projecting balconies proposed at the 1st Ave. N. and E. Main St. building portion are not eligible for a building permit, the applicant may recess those balconies accordingly. If so, revised elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner and/or the Historic Zoning Commission for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. Any proposed retaining walls, signage, awnings/metal roof overhangs, building-mounted lighting, and individual storefront configurations require additional specification information for determination of eligibility for Certificates of Appropriateness. The applicant must submit this information in the form of COA application(s) at a later date.
10. Any proposed outdoor seating is subject to issuance of Outdoor Café permits through the Building & Neighborhood Services Department.
11. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval, including, but not limited to, height, setback, material, and façade configuration/element alterations.

Mr. Gamble stated he has slides to show concerning questions from DRC. Mr. Gamble stated they have been working with staff, which has helped influence the design process of this project. Mr. Gamble stated staff did recommend approval to Planning Commission and the Planning Commission recommended approval to BOMA. Mr. Gamble stated there 155 residential units, 115 hotel rooms and 33,000 square feet of commercial. Mr. Gamble stated in the 2009 Land Use Plan update it states 4-story buildings may be appropriate for buildings east of Second Avenue closest to the river. Mr. Gamble showed this on a slide. Mr. Gamble stated there are already existing buildings that are at 56' and 52' height. Mr. Gamble showed the slide. Mr. Gamble stated in the HZC guidelines, #19 states that in special area 1, the maximum height is 3-stories or 42 feet and a PUD may be up to 56 feet with transitional features. Mr. Gamble explained a PUD development encourages innovative land planning and design. Mr. Gamble stated that is what they are trying to achieve. Mr. Gamble showed the master plan on a slide and explained the 4th story is recessed and two conditions of approval added from Planning Commission are the revise elevations plans of First Avenue façade to further comply with transitional features specifically near the corner of First and Main Street and the 4th story shall be recessed for the length of the adjacent restaurant and parking lot property until the building has changed in material. Mr. Gamble pointed out the change they made for that condition. Mr. Gamble stated the second condition was to revise the elevation and site plan to make the section of the building at First Avenue North and Main Street further comply with the transitional features, specifically the 4th level shall be recessed from the Main Street façade the depth of Landmark building. Mr. Gamble showed the compliance of this condition as well. Mr. Gamble referenced Jamison Station as an example. Mr. Gamble stated they are building on pieces already in place in the area. Mr. Gamble stated they have asked for two modifications of standards to have the buildings line up with the others that exist. Mr. Gamble showed the distances from the building to sidewalk. Mr. Gamble continued to show slides.

Mr. Hathaway stated they made changes from the comments from the DRC. Mr. Hathaway stated they revised the corner element at First and Main, and this has been lowered. Mr. Hathaway stated the glass section was revised as well. Mr. Hathaway stated there were several areas of stucco along First that they changed to brick, and he showed on drawings. Mr. Hathaway stated he appreciated the hard work with Ms. Hall and staff. Mr. Hathaway stated they were okay with conditions 4 & 6 but wanted to discuss the other conditions.

Ms. Margret Martin stated she was offended that Ms. Pearce was not in this meeting for this vote due to citizens threatening commission members and wishes something could be done before this vote.

Chairwoman Besser stated she would confer with council for a moment and council stated Ms. Pearce made the decision to recuse herself and that once she does that, the decision cannot be changed.

Mr. Jullian Bibb, from 918 Fair Street, spoke in favor of this item.

Mr. Bernie Butler spoke in favor of this item and agreed with Mrs. Martin's comments.

Mr. Eric Ross, from 220 Lewisburg Avenue, stated he was in support of project, but his concern is that it should be made to feel more historic.

Chairwoman Besser noted she did meet with Mr. Ross to discuss some of these issues and closed the public comment portion.

Mr. Roberts stated BOMA has approved setbacks respectful of neighboring buildings and asked if there are any other modifications of standards the commission does not have a voice in.

Ms. Powers stated BOMA is a different commission than this one and that this commission is not bound by those modifications of standards.

Ms. Marquardt requested Mr. Hathaway to explain about the lowering of the piece on the corner of Main & First.

Mr. Hathaway explained the glass panel rail section on the roof deck has been taken down and a guard rail of planters will be used that cannot be seen to mitigate height.

The commissioners looked at drawing for clarification purposes.

Ms. Reynolds stated the height for some of the building is okay, but her issue is that the whole city block, minus a couple of little setback areas, is proposed at 54-feet tall. Ms. Reynolds stated that seems massive and heavy and not enough difference.

Mr. Hathaway stated the perspective shows that with landscaping, the fourth story just about goes away, and he explained from the drawing.

Chairwoman Besser stated there is a setback on First Avenue, but on the courtyard side, it is not set back, and so therefore it is not set back at the Landmark Booksellers side.

Mr. Gamble stated they are 135 feet from the street and that the four stories portion does not come all the way to First.

Mr. Thompson requested to know the distance from Landmark and the new building.

Mr. Gamble stated 45-feet.

Mr. Womack requested to know if the main focus tonight was height, mass, and scale.

Chairwoman Besser stated the height is critical and suggested a motion should be made on each thing.

Mr. Womack requested to know if they could look at Ms. Pearce's submittals she left.

Chairwoman Besser passed the material around.

Ms. Marquardt stated she wanted to go on record concurring with what Ms. Reynolds stated. Ms. Marquardt requested clarification on page two of the staff report.

Mr. Gamble stated they understand that typically this commission looks at smaller projects and that they have been working with planning staff identifying where these transitional features around the block would take place and a lot of the existing architecture that is around, like on Second Avenue, and do not hold as much historic value that you see in the historic corridor. Mr. Gamble stated they do recognize the guidelines of historic, but they also look at this Special Area 1 and explained.

Ms. Marquardt stated there has not enough height transition feature with design in relation to the historic structures that exist and requested to know if they had any flexibility with the height.

Mr. Gamble state no, due to square footage.

Mr. Thompson stated he was happy with transitional feature changes that have been made.

Chairwoman Besser stated she has heard that the applicant needs the height or this project is not viable. Ms. Besser stated that the commission should vote on this to help this move along for the applicant.

Ms. Reynolds stated the height is her issue, and while she does support a development here, she cannot support the height.

Ms. Nesbitt stated she has some reservations, but buildings in any city are not going to be straight across the board, so she can support this project.

Mr. Womack moved to approve this project in regard to the height, mass and scale. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts moved to amend to vote on just height. Ms. Marquardt seconded for discussion.

Mr. Womack stated he feels height is being confused with massing and scale.

Mr. Gamble stated they would need height, mass, and setbacks to be considered at one time.

Mr. Roberts stated he wished to withdraw his amendment, and Ms. Marquardt agreed.

Mr. Roberts stated the setback on the Main Street front is 8-feet and the current setback with the building that is there now is 25-feet, so from a visibility standpoint, this will clog that intersection. Mr. Roberts stated that he has concerns with the building projecting out too far.

Mr. Gamble referred to a slide showing the area Mr. Roberts was talking about and explained there will be a lane improvement done that should help with that issue.

After discussion on setbacks and view shed, a vote was taken on the original motion, resulting with Chairwoman Besser, Ms. Marquardt, Mr. Roberts and Ms. Reynolds voting no, causing the motion to fail (3-4).

Mr. Heller stated since this vote may end the project, he feels he should speak. Mr. Heller stated the fundamentals of this project are that it was conceived about two years ago and he feels Franklin could be a great historic center and he wanted a great project and we have been tough on this project. Mr. Heller stated they want a four-star hotel and have high standards. Mr. Heller stated this project has to make financial sense and they cannot make any more adjustments due to losing square footage. Mr. Heller stated they cannot do this project with the changes being requested.

Ms. Reynolds stated she did not understand why they were there as a commission when the commission is given guidelines, and then there is a project that, besides details, there is no working room, and it is either approve or kill the project with the given ultimatum.

Mr. Gamble stated it is clear tonight that more discussion is needed, and at his client's request, they would like come to back in one month.

Ms. Reynolds moved to defer the project as a whole to a Special DRC meeting to be scheduled at a later date. Ms. Marquardt seconded the motion, and the motion passed. Mr. Womack opposed (6-1).

Item 7:

Items Approved by the Preservation Planner on Behalf of the Historic Zoning Commission, pursuant to the *Historic District Design Guidelines*

- **Signage/Awning at 415 Main St.; Ben Williams, Applicant.**
- **Signage at 435 Main St.; Dawn Craig, Applicant.**

Ms. Hall stated she had approved signage/awning at 415 Main St and signage at 435 Main St. Ms. Hall stated she was available to discuss if commission had any questions and no one did.

Item 8:

Other Business.

- **Discussion of Current Project at 119 Lewisburg Avenue; Majors Construction LLC, Contractor.**

Ms. Hall stated she has invited the contractor on this project to attend this meeting due to some concerns voiced by staff and citizens of Franklin on the project taking place at this location.

Chairwoman Besser stated the commission can express their concerns and ask questions. Chairwoman Besser stated the issue is that the community is asking if the commission approved what was done to this home. Chairwoman Besser requested to know how this happened.

Ms. Reynolds stated she didn't know the whole story on how this happened.

Mr. Majors stated he approached the project from day one to replace the roof. Mr. Majors stated the demo plan was given to him by the architect and he followed the plan. Mr. Majors stated it never occurred them to not take the roof off.

Ms. Reynolds noted on the drawing it said to keep the existing roof.

Mr. Majors stated it said existing but did not imply the roof could not come off.

Ms. Reynolds stated that the roof plan provided demonstrated what the roofing was to look like, with the existing labeled as such and the new also labeled. Ms. Reynolds stated maybe in the future we must be clearer on statements so there is no question with the applicant.

Ms. Hall stated it was her understanding that staff and commission were reviewing an addition to an existing home and it was never noted the existing roof would be removed. Ms. Hall stated if in the future she must get very specific on guessing what may happen and not anticipated on staff reports, she can do that.

Ms. Pearce stated she thinks this sets a terrible precedent for future projects.

Ms. Hall stated she would like Mr. Majors to speak more on this because she believes it was nothing on the City's part to cause this issue.

Mr. Womack requested to know if a demo permit had been issued.

Mr. Bridgewater stated no, due to the COA mentioning removing roofing materials (shingles) only.

Mr. Womack voiced he was appalled by this and did not approve what was done to this house, and how it could slip through, he did not understand.

Ms. Reynolds stated a site visit was done on this project and that this was never mentioned being done.

Mr. Thompson stated he was appalled as well and does not understand why the applicant did not get a demo permit.

Ms. Nesbitt requested to know what repercussions have occurred with this.

Mr. Bridgewater stated a permit is issued from what they are told the scope of work is and that the department issues correction notices to make the applicant do what they were approved to do. Mr. Bridgewater stated he does know the issue is once it is down, it is done, and he doesn't know how they can prevent that.

Ms. Pearce requested to know if a permit was issued at all for the roof.

Ms. Hall stated any permit that was issued was not commenting on the roofing.

Mr. Bridgewater stated he was not aware of one being issued.

Ms. Pearce requested Mr. Bridgewater to find out if a permit was issued. Ms. Pearce stated she received phone calls about this and was told the City told them this was approved.

Ms. Hall verified she did not make any comments to that affect.

Ms. Pearce stated she was glad tonight that there are two press people here to convey the message of what really happened.

Ms. Nesbitt requested to know what can be done now since this has already happened.

Mr. Bridgewater stated it must be built back like it was.

Ms. Reynolds requested to know if the architect was here.

Ms. Hall stated no, but he was invited.

Mr. Roberts requested to know from Mr. Majors if the architect was involved with pulling the roof off.

Mr. Majors stated yes and that he had plans.

Ms. Pearce requested to invite the architect again.

Ms. Harriet Harms of W. Main St. wished to comment, stating this has happened many times before and asked what can be done.

Ms. Powers explained a stop work order was issued and the building had to be stabilized and only a \$50 dollar charge is required a day.

Mr. Thompson stated to him it is a process issue that needs to be discussed.

Ms. Powers stated that is currently being done with staff.

Item 9:
Adjourn

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Acting Secretary