

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

July 11, 2019

Members Present

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

Members Absent

Staff

Lisa Jones
Holley Preston
Clarke Whitfield
Bryce Johnson

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

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Certificate of Appropriateness at 109 Bridge Street, Suite 600 for a wall light projection system to illuminate the third floor north facing wall of the North Annex with a static display of the Cotton at Riverside Mill logo and a 25" x 60" hot rolled steel sign that reads: "Cotton".

Present on behalf of this request was Anne Dickerson, here on behalf of Cotton at Riverside Mill and the Perry Restaurant Group. Ms. Dickerson stated we think the projective sign is very exciting, unique and it is a great draw to the downtown. The other one you only really see if you are in the parking lot or if you are going up the back steps to the patio. We would very much like it if you guys would like it as much as we do. We are requesting your approval.

Mr. Davis stated thank you very much for coming back and I am sorry at our last meeting that we had to table the motion. We just felt like at that time we kind of were caught off guard with it already being put up, and it did not give us time to adequately look at it and form an opinion on it. I do not know if any of you have had chance to go by and look at it in the dark or early in the morning. I like it and I think it is a neat sign and I vote my approval.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Davis stated again I know that the sign is a little bit larger than the requirements, but due to the size of the building I really don't see a problem. I thought that it was really well done.

Mr. Ranson stated is it larger than the sign ordinance allows?

Mr. Davis stated it is a little bit larger and then if you add the two signs together they are defiantly larger.

Mrs. Nicholas stated but the guidelines give you flexibility when the building itself is significantly larger than typical.

Mr. Lackey stated I do understand that but I think that is for potential multiple tenants to have multiple signs. I like the lighted sign and I think it looks neat. I have more concerns about the second sign, which puts it at 40 ft. instead of the 32 ft. that it is supposed to be. I understand that every business desires to have as much advertising as display as they can. I do not like the dual sign but I am concerned about the second one.

Mr. Davis stated my problem with not having both signs is that you cannot see this sign at all during the day light and so there is the smaller sign that lets them know that the restaurant is there. That is why I do not have a problem with it.

Mrs. Nicholas stated we drove by it at 4:00 am in the morning and that light sign really pops. When you have little kids, you travel late or early. Definitely, in the dark that attracts your eye to that space. I have also walked all around it in the evening and I do not know that I could easily find where Cotton was without the roll sign, but I do not know that I could find where Cotton was without the light as well. I see the need for both.

Mr. Ranson stated the City has been like a bulldog with their sign ordinance. Two feet no you're dead. What is the deal with the deal all of a sudden changing?

Mrs. Preston stated the guidelines give you the option to be less restrictive. If this were a regular zoning request for any other business, it would not have this caveat. The guidelines give you all the discretion to give them a larger sign if the building is larger.

Mr. Ranson stated I thought it was a larger sign than the guidelines said provided for or up to the size the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Whitfield stated it all has to do with how council design this particular commission and what powers invested in this particular commission as opposed to other commissions.

Mr. Ranson stated I had no objection at all to the sign and I think it is great.

Mrs. Preston stated to further expand on what I think you are asking. If this were not in the River District, the sign would not be a problem because it meets the zoning regulations if it were not in the overlay district.

Mr. Ranson stated that is what I asked. That was my original question. You could have saved all this stuff.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that part of the two signs do not meet the guidelines as presented. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the Commission consider the discrepancy of the two signs as minor and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the wall light projection system provided that it may not be used as a digital sign that flashes, moves or changes, and the image projected must be the image shown in the photo for a 25" x 60" hot rolled steel sign that reads "Cotton". Mr. Keese seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-1 vote.

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 534 Bridge Street for addition of an aluminum storefront to completely fill the former storefront location on the Bridge Street façade. Storefront color to match the existing storefront door with clear glass. There will be a section at the corner, approximately 6"-8", which will be brick veneer due to a structural pipe column.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Jeff Bond, owner of Solex Architecture. Please feel free to ask any questions that you may have or state concerns that you may have. It is a straightforward request to put windows back where it formerly was and materials and colors with other buildings nearby.

Mr. Davis stated right now there are four individual windows right?

Mr. Bond stated I believe so.

Mr. Davis stated so those are going to be taken out and be completely glass or aluminum?

Mr. Bond stated the four windows will come out and what will go back is an aluminum store front that will be metal with black frame and clear glass. You should have a drawing of what the proposed storefront will look like.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I know that we have approved other things on the building is this completely separate from that?

Mr. Bond stated yes.

Mr. Keese stated this came before us in 2017 but he did not put in what he was told to put in.

Mr. Bond stated that is correct this is a similar but the time line has past.

Mr. Keese stated so Jeff is this what you were doing the first time?

Mr. Bond stated similar the first request had glass on Bridge Street and Calhoun Street but this time the request is just for Bridge Street.

Mrs. Nicholas stated can I ask why the change?

Mr. Bond stated owner preference.

Mr. David closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that this request meets the guidelines and a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued and to add a window to the storefront that will match the existing store front door in color with clear glass.. Mr. Keese seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

2. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 523-525 Lynn Street for placement of a temporary, 4'x8' vinyl sign to announce "now leasing" of the River District Lofts.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion that the request meet the guidelines as presented with the understanding that the sign shall be moved by December 21, 2019 and shall not be placed on the same wall as other temporary signs and facing the street as specified in the zoning ordinance and they should issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mrs. Nicholas seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-1 vote.

3. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 311 Court Street for installation of the following:*
 - a. *14" x 14" wall sign – to be placed next to the door displaying KG Graphics logo and hours of operation;*
 - b. *Wooden door, to be painted blue, with upper solid window pane; and*
 - c. *Window sign (decal) of Owl (part of the company logo) to go in the bottom of the door window.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Brad and Kristen Gusler, owner of KG Graphics. Mr. Gusler stated we just want to change the color of the door. Originally, it was approved to be a fiery brown; after seeing the visual door decided it would probably be best a blue color with all the other colors that we have. It will be the same blue that was approved before. The sign is just our sign it will not be bigger than what is required and a small owl decal to stick on the window of the door.

Mrs. Nicholas stated where is this door?

Mr. Gusler explained where the proposed door was located.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion that Items A, B, and C meet the guidelines as presented and they should issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented within the notes. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

4. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 502 – 506 Craghead Street to:*
 - a. *construction of two (2) exterior staircases;*
 - b. *addition of awnings; and*
 - c. *installation of signage for future businesses.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Chuck Cooper, 502 Craghead Street. Mr. Cooper stated this has been an extraordinary journey. I bought the building about 15 years ago and am finally to the point of beginning renovations soon, we hope. We intend to follow all the rules, regulations, and compliance with zoning. We will present specifics as we go forward.

Mrs. Nicholas stated how many awnings are you requesting?

Mr. Cooper stated three.

Mrs. Nicholas stated and are they the colors that are represented in the drawing or was that just a placeholder.

Mr. Cooper stated a placeholder.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I know that in the past, we have discussed colors and I do not know if we will be in that position at this time.

Mr. Cooper stated I would be glad to submit those color choices when they become available.

Mr. Lackey stated why not an interior second exit as opposed to an exterior staircase.

Mr. Cooper stated we have two exits that are on the front and two exits on the side of the patio side and we have another exit on the rear alley.

Mr. Lackey stated why exterior staircase?

Mr. Cooper stated fire code.

Mr. Lackey stated but why not an interior one?

Mr. Cooper stated we do have some interior stairs but the building is built in such a way that these are non-continuous stairs. They will have stairs from the second and third floor in that corner and stairs from third and fourth floor from that corner so there is no continuous stairs inside the building.

Mr. Ranson stated I run into this situation many times and I think essentially often you will close the staircase in and the materials are?

Mr. Cooper stated steel.

Mr. Davis stated RJ I think your question "why not inside" they just could not make a continuous staircase inside?

Mr. Lackey stated why they did not do it inside. I get the problem, but to me I do not know that it is keeping within the community and what we are here to do.

Mr. Keesee stated it is an eye sore.

Mr. Cooper stated I would add that we just received our final approval from the Department of Historic Resources in Richmond. They did approve this design.

Mr. Davis stated and you said that there is another staircase on the rear of the building?

Mr. Cooper stated in the rear alley.

Mr. Davis stated because the alley is like this wide.

Mr. Cooper stated it fits.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lackey stated the staff recommends the Commission determine if the addition of the staircases complement the original element and act accordingly based on that determination. What is our legal responsibility Mr. Whitfield?

Mr. Whitfield stated that is your legal responsibility. I think they are saying that it does not necessary meet the guidelines because it is not addressed in the guidelines. It would be up to you, two motions, are in order to approve that or just deny it, and, then state other two do meet the guidelines.

Mr. Lackey stated your interpretation of complement the original element of the neighborhood or building?

Mr. Whitfield stated I would think both the building and neighborhood itself. It essentially does no harm to the district or the building or district itself.

Mr. Ranson stated to me it does both of those things, there are plenty of buildings in the area that have exterior stairways.

Mrs. Nicholas stated there are several other buildings in the district that have metal staircases such as that. We have approved them in the past. Does it fit the industrial look of downtown verses a different material, like wood or something, that might not have that look? As of right now, there is no specification of size, shape and color. Do we want black steel or metal looking there are some specifics that we need to look at if we are going to approve it.

Mr. Ranson stated it does look like it's black.

Mr. Davis stated Chuck is it all right for us to assume that it is going to be black steel?

Mr. Cooper stated yes we intend for it to match the black railing along the retaining wall behind it so it will be keeping with what the city already has.

Mrs. Nicholas stated and we can assume that it will look approximately like how it looks in the drawing.

Mr. Cooper stated yes.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that Item A does not meet the guidelines. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the discrepancy for Item A be consider minor and that the exterior staircase be approved with the conditions black in color and shape, size and character shown in the drawing and should be issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-1 vote.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that Item B and C meets the guidelines and should be issued a Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions that in Item B the spokesperson return with colors to be approved for the awnings and all other requirements as stated by staff. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

5. *.Certificate of Appropriateness at 705 Main Street to:*
 - a. *expand the parking lot;*
 - b. *build a brick faced retaining wall,*
 - c. *relocate an existing River District sign; and*
 - d. *create a new egress point onto Main Street.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Tony Pratt, MCCO at PATHS. Mr. Pratt stated due to our significant growth over the past several years, and we are at the point where we do not have enough parking. We have been looking at various options that we have and downtown we are limited. We are looking at utilizing a portion of the green space that we currently own, to expand our parking lot into that area, but given the slope of that area would require a retaining wall. Which we would intend to be brick face veneer to match the current building. We would match colors as best as possible. If it ends up meeting the zoning requirements, we would like to reconfigure the parking lot and egress onto Main Street so that we can maximize parking. There is some question I believe about the site lines and distance between those two access points so we are working with structural engineers to try to make sure that all aspects are met. We wanted to meet with you and make sure that we are meeting all of your requirements.

Mr. Davis stated I am trying to follow the drawing here and I went up to your lot yesterday and drove around it. Explain to me exactly where the area, is that you want to pave.

Mr. Pratt stated if you come in from Lynn Street as you come into the parking lot there is a green space that is up hill slightly to your right.

Mr. Davis stated next to where the bus station use to be and the Audiology place is now.

Mr. Pratt stated correct. We are looking to utilize the space between the two large oak trees for additional parking. We would have to level it out and grade the current parking lot as much as we can so it would drop out 4 ft. close to the Audiology parking lot.

Mr. Davis stated how many spaces do you think you would open with that?

Mr. Pratt stated we are hoping approximately twenty spaces. It may be eighteen based off where we can get. We are trying to save the two oak trees if at all possible. We would love to get more space than that but there are limitations.

Mr. Lackey stated is this employee or patient driven?

Mr. Pratt stated patient. We have actually moved the administrative staff out of this building and into the building at 116 South Ridge Street. We have moved as many of our staff as we can out because of the increase patient load. We recognize that we are pretty much at our limit anyway and we are afraid that it will become a distraction to our patients if they do not have adequate parking.

Mr. Davis stated now does your parking go all the way to the end of the lot directly behind where Entertainers Delight use to be?

Mr. Pratt stated it is the entire parking lot. At present, the Danville facility has about seventy employees and just in the last year on average, we have added about hundred new patients each month. We are seeing somewhere in the neighborhood of 7,000 to 8,000 in the Danville office right now. We have a very significant clientele and a great amount of traffic in the parking lot.

Mr. Davis stated have you turned in any specific designs or anything into the City?

Mr. Pratt stated I have shown Bryce the drawings that we have and we are still in the works with the engineering and architectural to try to get that resolved so we can have a formal proposal for you.

Mr. Davis stated so Bryce should we hold off on the voting on this until there is definite plans made?

Mr. Johnson stated that is staff's recommendation. There are still concerns to work out.

Mrs. Nicholas stated there also concerns about the traffic flow the two egresses facing Main.

Mr. Johnson stated they are very close together and close to intersection as well.

Mr. Pratt stated and we are not as locked in to the need of the egress change as we are to the expansion of the parking lot.

Mr. Lackey stated is there a timing issues on your side of it?

Mr. Pratt stated we need to move as quickly as possible because we have people parking in the grass just to accommodate the need at this point. Unfortunately, we are non-profit, we have guidelines as far as how we go about procuring the drawings and such from the engineers. We have one estimate from Solex.

Mrs. Nicholas stated how quickly do you expect to get those?

Mr. Pratt stated I am hoping that I will get them within the month so by the next time that you meet we will have formal drawings.

Mr. Davis stated so it looks like without specifics you are asking mainly for us to be thinking it over and to get an idea of it?

Mr. Pratt I think that but also if you have any concerns that we need to address then we would like to know as soon as possible.

Mr. Davis stated I do not know of any other concerns that we might have as long as the City likes the drawings that you bring to them.

Mr. Whitfield stated just one thing to note you all as a board could recommend the removal and replacement of the sign but you will not have the authority to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to move the River District Design sign.

Mr. Pratt stated that would only be necessary if we added the additional entrance to the parking lot.

Mr. Whitfield stated that is something that could be done by somebody else other than you all.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion to table this request until next month. Mr. Lackey seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

6. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 126 S Market Street to:*
 - a. *paint the outside of the building; and*
 - b. *re-cover the existing awnings.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Tammy Poplin, here on behalf of Piedmont Lands of Virginia, LLC. Mrs. Poplin stated we submitted the application to repaint the outside of the building located at 126 South Market Street. We requested to paint the building Moth Grey, we sent in the paint swatches, and it is very close to what is on there right now. The trim on the building will be off- white and the windows we will go back with black. The awnings will be colonnadeand David Squire is covering those back with fabric. It is two awnings, one on Patton Street and one on Market Street side, and we will just re-cover those.

Mrs. Nicholas stated it will be one solid color now instead of the shredded color.

Mrs. Poplin stated no, if you see the proposed color submitted..

Mr. Ranson stated on your color charts listed I assume those are the colors for the various elements.

Mrs. Poplin yes the two that are checked.

Mr. Ranson stated I understand that but will the others be used on the building?

Mrs. Poplin stated no, we are using the off- grey and the off- white.

Mr. Davis stated but will it be the entire building?

Mrs. Poplin stated the entire outside of the building.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the request meets the guidelines as presented and be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness for Item A and B. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0-1 vote. (Mr. Lackey Abstained)

7. Certificate of Appropriateness at 530 Craghead Street, Unit 200 to:

a. install a rooftop banner; and

b. add a painted wall sign.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Rick Barker, who stated he was here to speak and support this application, which will require a variance for the total square footage of signage. Mr. Barker stated among the issues for the request we have a very special building and I would like to explain why it is special and why it might be worthy of an exception. First, if you understand this garage total square foot is about 900 sq. feet, it is much smaller than this room. It was built originally in 1940's and as a garage for the Hughes building. The Hughes building is one on Craghead Street at 530, which currently houses Mucho the restaurant. When we started that project, we took the Hughes building and the building next door, which is the Venable building, and we abandoned the property line and considered that one project. Well on that lot sets this garage and now we want to develop the garage. Interestingly even though it bears a Craghead address it's not actually on a street at all. It's now facing a public parking lot the new public parking lot that the city constructed. We find our self with a dimitive building 50 yards from Craghead Street and 70 yards from Lynn Street, which it faces. We are proposing two signs one on the facade roofline and the second hand painted sign, on the side of the building. I think your limit is for your standard is 32 sq. ft. This would total about 39 sq. ft. From no public access we won't view both sides at the same time. Not even from Craghead Street will you be able to see these signs. They would not be legible from Craghead Street. This is a tax credit project this is an extension of the Hughes Mucho Project that was approved earlier and because this is a prehistoric tax project, the signage has already been submitted to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources to qualify for State Tax Credits. It has been submitted to the National Park Services to qualify for Federal Tax Credits. What we are offering to you today has already been deemed appropriate at State and Federal level just so you know we requested more signage that what we submitted today and part of our package was deemed not to be appropriate and they didn't like my idea of red neon pick on top of the building.

Mr. Ranson stated it is true that prior to your submission you did not know the total signage of 39 sq. ft.

Mr. Barker stated yes we can and I will offer that we created these renderings before we did measurements and so I can walk you through this to have you understand and, it is a little larger in scale than the actual. If you were looking at the photograph that shows the signage on the facade, this building is about 40 feet wide so if you could understand that 12 ft. less than half the width of this building. The sign is 2 ft. tall obviously; the letters on that sign will be shorter than two ft., which will make it barely legible from Lynn Street. Our sign suggested that the distance that the letter should be 2 ft. We do not think that we will have room to do that and satisfy the Commission.

Mr. Ranson stated is it going to be a little less than the width?

Mr. Barker stated correct. We went out to the building and measured; and from the centered column it will be 6 ft. on either side of that column and these garage doors are wider than 6 ft. It will be less than the space of two garage doors. The diameter for the painted sign on the side, which is our logo in a circular fashion, is a 6-foot diameter.

Mrs. Nicholas stated Article 10 section 1 of the zoning code prohibits roof signage. Has that been resolved?

Mr. Barker stated at the State and Federal level it has. I know that does not comply with the local ordinance but we would be asking you to wave that.

Mrs. Nicholas stated do we have power of that?

Mr. Johnson stated you do not have the power to waive that.

Mrs. Nicholas stated that is Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Ranson stated I assume that the Board of Zoning Appeals would refer to us for the approval of the other aspects.

Mrs. Nicholas stated if they say that the sign is okay we would then okay the design of it.

Mr. Ranson stated we could not okay it pending zoning approval.

Mr. Johnson stated you could but that is assuming that the Board of Zoning Appeals approves it.

Mr. Whitfield stated I think you would want to act after the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Davis stated so what about the other sign on the side of the building?

Mrs. Nicholas stated do you have a problem with the pig feet signage?

Mrs. Preston stated no.

Mr. Barker stated the colors on either are not bright.

Mr. Davis stated so you will not be able to see any signage at all from Craghead Street?

Mr. Barker stated correct.

Mr. Davis stated what is on the backside of that building?

Mr. Barker stated there are several windows and a door and DHR suggested that we close two of them and leave two open for the light.

Mr. Keese stated what are you going to do with the door on the back of the building?

Mr. Barker stated it will be closed off. As, it turns out that door will be on the interior and fall in the boundary of a rest room and interior wall with tile so from the exterior it will be intact.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so you will have to come back for approval to close in two windows because it's viewable from public right away.

Mrs. Preston stated question is it viewable from the right away?

Mr. Barker stated the exterior windows will be painted and left intact and they will be covered from the inside.

Mrs. Nicholas stated could you see them from the patio at Mucho?

Mr. Barker stated from the patio yes.

Mrs. Preston stated that's private property..

Mr. Davis stated I like the sign on the side but is there no way to put like a projection sign on top of the roof so that it can be seen from Lynn or Craghead Stree?. It just looks like you are asking for a lot and you are still limited on where this thing can be seen. I like the design of the sign and I'm thinking that if it can meet the code, you can put it up on top of the roof and have it seen from both sides.

Mrs. Nicholas stated just know if you paint the one sign and then you do get approval for the roof top banner that you could run into still the square footage issue, so keep that in mind.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that we table part A of this request to install a rooftop banner for an indefinite period of time. Mr. Ranson second the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Davis stated if we grant the one on the side and we already know from the dimensions that he is going to be very limited as to what he can do as far as the other sign is concerned, are we taking that into consideration, or are we just going with the fact it meets the guidelines and go with that?

Mr. Ranson stated when he brings the banner we will put the square footage in and if we approve it then we will waive the banner as a minor discrepancy.

Mr. Davis stated as long as we are on the same page.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that Item B of this request, the painted wall sign meets the guidelines as presented and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Commissions voted to hear the add on agenda Item 8. The vote was 4-0-1 where Mr. Keesee Abstained.

8. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 401 Wilson Street to paint the existing brick exterior to match the color of the adjoining building.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Peyton Keesee; I am with K & W Properties. Mr. Keesee stated the building that we have it is the old V & J Restaurant. I know that it does not meet the guidelines and I apologize for not getting the pictures to Holley before we went through all of this. The guidelines are if the building has been damaged and if you cannot match the brick that you can paint the building. Since then we have taken some pictures, and I am going to pass them around and you will see that we cannot match the brick and that is why we want to paint the building to match the other building so it would look nice.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so your issue is the water damage, am I right?

Mr. Keesee stated you could not replace the bricks so you have to put more in it and it is not going to look right. The person that owned that originally, he did not fix anything right.

Mr. Lackey stated if approved you are going to match the color on the other building?

Mr. Keesee stated yes the grey color.

Mrs. Nicholas stated on the inside could you go from one building to another?

Mr. Keesee stated yes, she is going to expand her business into the other side and that is part of the reason that we are fixing it up.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the request does not meet the guidelines as presented. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0-1 vote. Mr. Keesee Abstained.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that due to the state of the patches on the masonry and other damage that the discrepancy be considered minor and granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint the existing brick to match the color of the adjoining building. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0-1 vote. Mr. Keesee Abstained.

A request was made from the floor to add an item to the agenda. The Commission voted unanimously to add the following item.

Certificate of Appropriateness at 406 Cabell Street to add the "dark bronze color" as an additional choice for the color of the steel roll up door.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on this behalf is Gus Dyer; I am here on behalf of Danville Historic Society. Mr. Dyer stated a couple of months ago you granted us permission to install a roll up door in the color of black I just recently spoke to my garage door person and unbelievably they have 19 colors and none of them are black. I am still going to search and see if I can find a manufacturer that offers it in black, but if that is not possible the alternative would be dark bronze. I am not asking to switch the color from black to dark bronze just would bronze to have the dark bronze color as an option, if we cannot find a black door.

Mrs. Nicholas stated could we see what dark bronze looks like.

Mr. Dyer stated and they will tell you that it is not an adequate color sort of like the color of hardware. This is not switching it from black to dark bronze just an option in case we cannot find a black door.

Mr. Keesee stated so would you be okay with the green if we said no to bronze.

Mr. Dyer stated we have adopted the black and gold as our official colors. I just felt like it was closer representation of what we were looking at.

Mrs. Preston stated what is the address?

Mr. Dyer stated 406 Cabell Street.

Mr. Davis stated does the dark bronze suit you as well as the black?

Mr. Dyer stated I haven't even taken it to them yet I just met with the garage door guy.

Mr. Keesee stated fair enough.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas stated staff do you have any issues with this change?

Mrs. Preston stated I could not see why we would.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that this item be granted Certificate of Appropriateness because it meets the guidelines as presented with the condition that it either be in black or bronze color as presented. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Whitfield stated just to let you know that on Tuesday night, the appointment committee and Council appointment committee will be meeting and they will be reviewing the applications for your two vacancies and hopefully by the time you meet in August before they will have the appointments made if they consider them Tuesday night. You will very soon have a full Commission of Seven people.

Mr. Keesee stated how many applicants are there?

Mr. Whitfield stated I haven't looked at it yet no more than two or three to be honest with you.

Mr. Davis stated we don't get to give our approval?

Mr. Whitfield stated typically not.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The May 9, 2019 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote after one change on page 1 changing Mrs. Chaney to Mrs. Nicholas.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Approved By: