

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

September 8, 2016

Members Present

R.J. Lackey  
George Davis  
Sheri Chaney  
Peyton Keesee  
Courtney Nicholas  
John Ranson

Members Absent

Justin Ferrell

Staff

Anna Levi  
Tracie Lancaster  
Ken Gillie  
Clarke Whitfield

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

**ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING**

1. *A request has been filed for the commission to reconsider the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness at 729 Loyal St to paint the Danville River District logo. At the meeting of August 18, 2016 the Commission granted a COA to paint the logo with the condition that the phrase "Reimagine That" be omitted.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Laura Ashworth, with Economic Development. I am here if you have any questions. I control the brands for the City, the River District Logo and the City Logo.

Mr. Ranson stated can you say that again slower.

Mrs. Ashworth stated I work for Economic Development. I do the marketing and I also control the City logo and the River District logo to make sure it stays within our brand standard such as the colors, quality and what we can and cannot do with it.

Mr. Whitfield stated you might want to explain why you came back with regard to those words because they may not know that.

Mrs. Ashworth stated our River District logo has the Reimagine that on it. That is our slogan, our tagline that is what makes the logo. Now for certain events we can alter it for example the bottom half is the only market that can be altered. So we can have reimagine running for an event. We can have reimagine festival. We can have reimagine living once it has been approved within our standards. So this is our overall

logo. So for it to be painted I think it would be appropriate for it to have reimagine that on it just like our water tower has for example.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so I know at the time we were concerned that reimagine that is only supposed to be the tagline for a certain amount of years.

Mrs. Ashworth stated I am not sure of that. I have not heard that as far as I know it is going to be on going. So that is not what I have been told maybe there was confusion with the events.

Mr. Whitfield stated that was me I was told it would be about ten years and then we might go to something else.

Mrs. Nicholas stated that was our concern because this is being painted on the building it's permanent.

Mrs. Ashworth stated I can understand that but I haven't heard that. Again, I think an example would be our water tower we have reimagine that on it. We don't plan on taking that down in ten years and changing it. So there might have been some mis-confusion. But as far as I know there is not going to be any changes and I follow the brand and control it. I spoke to Corrie and Ken and I have not heard of any changes in the next ten years.

Mr. Whitfield stated what I heard was not correct then.

Mr. Davis stated is there a possibility that down the road if the reimagine that is changed and we do not or whoever the Commission is doesn't particularly like the new logo then it could be painted over?

Mrs. Ashworth stated absolutely I don't see a problem with that. Again I think it would be interesting to see if it were to change in ten, twenty, thirty years if it would change completely or just the bottom part. So I think that all in all it would have to be reviewed if it needed to completely repainted or just the bottom.

Mr. Lackey stated so if you can have reimagine running which means that whole part is not permanent why can't you have it blank?

Mrs. Ashworth stated that is our tagline and our slogan.

Mr. Lackey stated reimagine that. But you just said earlier you can have it as reimagine running so reimagine that is not that important.

Mrs. Ashworth stated well I think for certain events it promotes the reimagining of the River District. So reimagine that reimagine running, reimagine walking down the streets of the River District. So that is the starting slogan that is the mother logo of all of the

other logos that tie off of it. The reimagine running only comes out for one event. Reimagine living. Hampton at Wilkins is using that to promote living in the River District. But I think over all the reimagine that is what it needs to be.

Mr. Lackey stated is there a legal requirement that requires it to stay on the logo or is this preferred from the City's perspective.

Mrs. Ashworth stated as of right now it is the preferred as what the City wants within the standards. I guess that's a discussion for Ken.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Chaney stated seeing the proposed with River District that big I don't like it. That is my personal opinion but I don't like it. I think it distracts from the Coca Cola sign. I started thinking about it after we left. If you do it too small you not going to be able to make it out. It is just going to look like a big blob. I have been to two or three other places where they have done the Coke signs and I have seen Historic Mebane or Historic whatever City over the last two or three weekends. It's just my personal opinion.

Mr. Keesee stated how big do you want it Sheri?

Mrs. Chaney stated I don't like it at all.

Mr. Keesee stated oh you don't want it on their period.

Mr. Davis stated she wants it like this.

**Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-2 vote.**

2. *A request has been filed for the Commission to review the appropriateness of an outdoor carwash at 234 N Union Street and the adjacent parking lot. Abdulla Nesmith is seeking a Special Use Permit to operate an outdoor carwash. The request will be presented to the City Planning Commission on Monday, September 12, 2016.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Abdulla Nesmith, the applicant. I am the present owner of Denim Stax clothing store at 234 North Union Street. We would be opening it behind that store. If anyone has any questions I am here to answer them.

Mr. Lackey stated that is in the First State Bank parking lot?

Mr. Nesmith stated on the other side of the street in the corner.

Mr. Gillie stated the building at the end across from the ABC store.

Mr. Lackey stated oh okay I was at the wrong end of the block.

Mr. Ranson stated what is going to be the nature of this business?

Mr. Nesmith stated it will be car detailing and things like that.

Mr. Ranson stated will you have to construct or build a sign or anything?

Mr. Nesmith stated no sign it might be a sign in the window on that side.

Mr. Ranson stated so the sign would be in the window?

Mr. Nesmith stated not too far off of the side of the building I can have a sign right there.

Mr. Ranson stated you would have to have approval for the sign.

Ms. Levi stated you would have to come back to this commission for the sign approval.

Mr. Nesmith stated approval for the sign?

Ms. Levi stated yes.

Mr. Keesee stated is there a car wash there now?

Mr. Nesmith stated no.

Mr. Ranson stated so it's just a paved lot?

Mr. Nesmith stated yeah actually its cemented.

Mr. Ranson stated so it's really just the use is going to change from a parking to somewhere where you wash cars.

Mr. Nesmith stated yeah and it doesn't have to be a sign.

Mrs. Chaney stated the parking lot or driveway to the left that is gravel is that your property or is that City property?

Mr. Nesmith stated the gravel is our property and the concrete behind the building is also our property.

Mrs. Chaney stated that is where you are going to do the car wash?

Mr. Nesmith stated yes behind the property.

Mr. Davis stated when you say you are going to do it behind the property you mean in the area that is adjacent to Memorial Drive?

Mrs. Chaney stated directly behind his building.

Mr. Nesmith stated yeah.

Mr. Davis stated the only problem I have with it is that when you are coming down Memorial Drive and you are going to that fork right there that is part of the entrance into downtown. To have a car wash there which is very similar to what they have two blocks up on High Street. I just have a problem with people coming into our City and that's what they see. You know a bunch of guys out there washing cars. I feel like it would be better if it was some sort of structure there but I don't know if that is what you are even contemplating. That's the only problem I have with it is what it looks like when you are coming into our downtown area.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I am concerned about the environmental impact. Can you explain how you would handle waste water, the suds from washing the car, Etc.?

Mr. Nesmith stated I will buy an oil containment mat and the car will pull on top of that. That will collect all the water and then we will buy something like a vacuum but it has a pump on it and hook a hose to it and run it back into the inside of my building into the toilet.

Mrs. Nicholas stated do you have facilities inside of your building that will be able to take that volume of water?

Mr. Nesmith stated yes. I will probably only be able to do one car every thirty minutes. We will set it up by appointments or something like that so I don't think it will be that much water.

Mr. Keesee stated you have the hours 7-7 is that Monday thru Friday?

Mr. Nesmith stated no it is 8:30-5:30.

Mr. Keesee stated Monday thru Friday?

Mr. Nesmith stated Monday thru Saturday.

Mr. Keesee stated it didn't say here that why I was asking.

Ms. Levi stated those are conditions that we put on it not that he has.

Mr. Gillie stated now if you think it should be more restrictive and he goes with that and you agree then we can modify that in front of Planning Commission.

Mr. Lackey stated you are asking for our recommendation to Planning Commission we are not the approval body on it?

Mr. Gillie stated correct.

Mr. Lackey stated so regardless of which way we decide Planning Commission can say yay or nay independent of us.

Mr. Gillie stated correct. But in the past they have deferred these back to you because they feel that this is your area of purview so they do take that into account.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lackey stated someone correct me if I am wrong. Von Wellington when he came we were very concerned with an outdoor facility we only approved when we found out it was going to be indoor.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I think after that we approved the one on High Street and it's outdoor.

Mr. Lackey stated I wasn't here.

Mr. Davis stated I thought High Street was already there.

Ms. Levi stated High Street was already there.

Mrs. Nicholas stated didn't they come to us for something as part of that?

Mr. Davis stated we voted on the building across the street where the façade was. That is still going to fall down on someone's head. Yeah High Street was already there. The reason I liked the one that was mentioned on Ridge Street was because it was inside. I have expressed my concerns on it.

Mr. Lackey stated I have the same concerns.

Mr. Keesee stated so do I.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I wouldn't be opposed to it if it was indoor in that space.

Mr. Davis stated I don't think he has the facility to go indoors.

Mr. Lackey stated is this recommending of a vote whether we recommend or deny?

Mr. Gillie stated yes. The reason being is that you have to approve it as well as Planning Commission. In fact, if Planning Commission gives the okay for the Special Use Permit other things are still going to have to come back here. So we can forward that on to them and then if they make that decision and it goes to City Council and they approve it, it kind of sets precedent for it. I need something to track it along so I feel that

you do need to make some sort of recommendation to them and have a vote on it that can be presented to them.

Mr. Lackey stated I hate when someone is trying to make a living to get in the way. I just thought it was the Planning Commissions job to make that decision but if it is our job then we have to make it.

Mr. Whitfield stated all you are doing is making a recommendation that they deny the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Gillie stated it's the same when City Council makes their decision; Planning Commission is just making a recommendation to Council.

**Mrs. Chaney made a motion for Planning Commission to not allow the outdoor car wash at that facility. Mr. Lackey seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-1 vote.**

3. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 528-536 Craghead Street to restore the Hughes Building and the Venable Building. Four (4) commercial storefronts are to be installed and residential apartments are to be installed on the second floors of both buildings and in the rear of the Hughes Building.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Rick Barker, the applicant. I am available if you have any questions. I would like to thank Anna for her help in getting the materials received and distributed as quickly as possible. I would maybe add that both of the buildings are historic tax credit projects. So part 1 and Part 2 have been filed with the Department of Historic Resources and the Park Service. So everything in your package has already been approved on a State and Federal level.

Mrs. Chaney stated so part 2 has been approved?

Mr. Barker stated yes.

Mrs. Chaney stated according to this it hasn't.

Mr. Barker stated it has been since we applied.

Mr. Davis stated what are you going to do with the little triangular building?

Mr. Barker stated it is not a part of this. Are you speaking of the courtyard?

Mr. Davis stated yeah.

Mr. Barker stated that is 548.

Mr. Davis stated oh that is not part of this? I'm sorry.

Mr. Barker stated I would be happy to answer that though. That building was originally Eldridge Drug Store. It looks as though the courtyard was originally built as a triangular shape at one time but the roof has collapsed. We think that is going to make for some dramatic before and after pictures because we acquired that a couple of years ago and it actually had trees growing above the roof line. We have got that cleaned out now. We think that will be a nice courtyard space to attach with 550 if that were to become a restaurant. Then the courtyard area could be outdoor sitting.

Mr. Davis stated you have already done great work down there and I commend you for taking on this size project. I'm sure it is going to be wonderful.

Mr. Barker stated I don't know if you all have driven by recently but I didn't include any current photos. But we have completed the demolition phase and taken out all the materials in the buildings that won't appropriate. So you can see the bones of the building.

Mrs. Nicholas stated am I correct in saying this is where Happy's was?

Mr. Barker stated yes.

Mrs. Nicholas stated okay.

Mr. Barker stated yes we have researched these buildings to understand who the original developer or tenant was for those buildings. The ones that are not branded we intent to brand them with family members of the historic town. Actually the Hughes building has there last name on the top of that building already.

Mr. Davis stated by your drawing three of these buildings are going to look pretty much the same as far as the façade of the building or are they each going to have different characteristics?

Mr. Barker stated actually the Hughes building that façade has been modified recently. Interestingly if you look at the four different store fronts there are some original elements that we have identified an original topper, panel bottom and we are going to go back and recreate what was there originally. So they will all match.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I'm looking and I see that you have two different pictures here of this one. Are there going to be awnings and are they going to match? This has been an issue recently.

Mr. Barker stated yes actually there is one photo. The one that is gold right now will become this beige color and this black swatch is a black canvas swatch that will become an awning color. So they will be solid.

Mrs. Chaney stated that is just on that building?

Mr. Barker stated yeah.

Mrs. Chaney stated the red brick building will not have awnings?

Mr. Barker stated yes ma'am the brick building has awnings today. But they are covering up some fabulous modern detail of the windows. So we plan to remove the awnings to expose that wood work.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I'm just trying to get a sense of it looking at the drawings again there are 7 doors maybe eight doors. Is that because of access to the upstairs what is the purpose?

Mr. Barker stated on the Hughes building there are currently three doors and we are adding a door which is a staircase leading to the upstairs there is a code requirement for a secondary entrance. The primary entrance to the apartment will be a staircase that added to the exterior of the side of the Hughes building. So you would go up the exterior staircase or the primary.

Mrs. Nicholas stated will there be rear access to these buildings?

Mr. Barker stated yes. There is to be a new parking lot constructed behind these that is a City project. We have met with the designer for the parking lot yesterday and I think we are actually going to hire the same time to manage the integration from the City's private parking lot down a grade to service these buildings. We have estimated about three feet will have to be filled in to get back to the original grade.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

**Mrs. Chaney made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Keese seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**The August 18, 2016 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.**

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

---

Approved By: