

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 17, 2026

Commissioners Present: Ralph Hammond-Green, Stan Smith, Jim Welter, (Vice-Chair), Jim Brewer, Jim Boyd, John Falvo

Commissioners Absent: Cheryl Jones, (Chair), Lauren Matoian, Edward Sine

Staff Present: Sam Hayes, Planner II, Daniel Heyman, Assistant City Attorney, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director

I **Call to Order.** Chair called the regular meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 pm.

II **Agenda.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond Green and seconded by Commissioner Falvo the agenda was revised to include Public Comment and approved.

III **Public Comment.**

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street thanked the Commission for the award he received.

IV **Minutes.** On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Boyd the minutes of the regular meeting of May 20, 2026 were approved.

V **New Business**

V(A) **Certificate of Appropriateness** – Susan Kohler/Jared Mathis – 1507 Druid Hills Avenue (File No. 26-32-COA).

Vice-Chair stated tonight we have one public hearing to consider, an application for a certificate of appropriateness permit in the Druid Hills Historic District. Any persons desiring to testify in this hearing must first be sworn as a witnesses and will be subject to cross-examination by parties or persons whose position may be contrary to yours. A copy of the procedures and rules for a quasi-judicial hearing is provided on the back table next to the agenda. Since this is a quasi-judicial hearing, it is very important that we have an accurate record of the hearing. Therefore, we ask that you refrain from speaking until recognized by the Chair and, when recognized, that you come forward to the podium and begin by stating your name and address. Anyone present who has knowledge of anything of value that has been given or promised in exchange for a position to be taken on these applications should disclose it now. Anyone who wishes to speak during the public hearings should come forward to be sworn in. Vice-Chair swore in Jared Mathis, Sam Hayes, Susan Kohler.

Vice Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated the city is in receipt of an application, an after-the-fact application for Certificate of

Appropriateness for the property address 1507 Druid Hills Avenue, and this is for window and door replacement. The applicant is Jared Mathis, who's the contractor on the project, and the property owner is Susan Kohler. The PIN for the property is 9569-42-9792, and the project acreage is .4 acres. This is located in our R-10 Medium Density Residential District, and it is within the Druid Hills Historic District overlay. It's a major work, it's an after-the-fact request. I will note, and this was explained a little bit in the staff packet that was provided to you all, a zoning compliance permit was issued for work on this home, I believe in 2025, and, in that, no mention of windows was included within that. It was all specific to the interior work that was being done. And so, because of that, staff was not aware that the windows were being replaced. It came to staff's attention while doing a drive-thru of the neighborhood, and staff then, along with code enforcement, intervened, reached out to the property owner and the applicant, and now we are here today for you all to hear this after-the-fact application.

A map of the Druid Hills Historic District was shown with the subject property shown. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

An aerial view of the property was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A history of the subject property was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes pointed out the addition on the house.

A brief overview of the COA description was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. There are 15 windows that have been replaced with vinyl windows.

Site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. The photo dates back to 2025 and shows the previous windows. Mr. Hayes is going to say previous windows, because we're not sure if they were the original windows. The applicant has through conversations with staff, said that they were wooden windows, and the applicant can speak to the condition that they were in. The previous door, I will note, does not match the description that was in the architectural description.

Site photos were shown of the new windows. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

A site photo provided by the applicant was included in the presentation.

The Design Standards that apply were included in the staff report and presentation along with the Artificial Materials Policy.

The suggested motions for approval and denial were included in the staff report and presentation. There is a proposed condition regarding the muntins.

Vice Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Smith asked how does this compare with the Locust property? It looks like it's the same builder. Mr. Hayes stated he is not sure, he is not sure if it's the same builder, and they are similar homes, home styles, both kind of that craftsman bungalow-type style.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff. There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Jared Mathis, 85 Bayview Trail, Zirconia, North Carolina stated he is a lifelong resident here in Henderson County, and the contractor for Ms. Kohler. He has been a GC in the area for a little over 12 years, and built homes in Nose River, Flat Rock, Hendersonville. This is my first in Druid Hills, and so I wanted to first apologize and express my lack of knowledge until my client received a letter stating violation. I wasn't aware of this committee or the protocols that go into that. I want to address a couple of things that Sam said just for correction. One is not all the windows were replaced. There's a vinyl window that was existing, that's still in place there, and it's located on the bathroom, at the right side of the house. When my client hired me, it started as an interior renovation, restoring the floors of the structure, redoing the kitchen cabinets in the kitchen, and as most remodels go, when you begin to peel back layers, you find things that also have to be done. There was prior work there, I think the previous owner had done, that covered up quite a bit of structural issues in the roof. That led to us discovering quite a bit of rot in the windows, probably 90% of the windows in the house. Also, I'd like to state that, to second what Sam said, there's no way for me, looking back on the fact now, knowing what would be original window, as there was three different window types, on the home. Some of that as a byproduct of previous remodels or conditions. Some of that, probably just previous owners replacing windows that had already gone bad. When we begin to look for windows for Ms. Kohler, it wouldn't be something that typically I would add to a permit, because it's nothing that's inspected from a building standpoint. So, we priced out multiple windows, including wood, including aluminum clad. My biggest concern for her was protecting the structural integrity of the house. It's a brick house and block mortar, and the vinyl windows gave us the ability to retrofit within the existing footprint without having to cut any of the structure or compromise any of the structure that's there. Also, the evidence of moisture that seemed to be an issue over the past. I felt, as her contractor, that the best advice I could give her was to use a vinyl product not to have that again. Again, expressing that from a standpoint of not knowing this committee and the architectural requirements there. So, I'll be glad to answer any questions that you may have about the windows or about the doors.

Chair asked if the Commission had any questions for the applicant.

Discussion was made about there being two or three kinds of windows there. Mr. Mathis stated they weren't all the same type of window. So the front part of the house, which would be 8 of the 14 windows, is probably what I would consider the original, at least time-sensitive windows of the house. They were all wood. There were several that were just aluminum, windows that, at some point in time, I think probably that addition by the carport led to some of those windows, and then there were two vinyl windows that were already in the house, so there wasn't a consistent window material.

Commissioner Smith stated the front was the original set, and the ones on the side were vinyl. Mr. Mathis stated so the front porch, those two that you can see in the picture, and then what wraps right around, there's another two on each side, those would be, they were all the same type of window. Everything moving back from there got different.

Vice Chair stated you couldn't make any kind of guess whether those front windows were original to the house? Mr. Mathis stated he could not tell him that, no.

Commissioner Smith stated there was one that was intact that was a lower window. Mr. Mathis stated it's on the bathroom side. It's a smaller window, but probably done during the remodel of the previous

owner. It was a newer, vinyl window. There was no need to replace that one. A photo was shown of this window. It was stated that one opens by sliding.

Daniel Heyman, Assistant City Attorney had a question for the applicant. He stated in your testimony, you mentioned, that you selected vinyl because it fit within the existing opening? Are you saying that if you went with a different window type, you would have had to do brickwork? Mr. Mathis stated correct. You have more flexibility with the retrofit style with vinyl windows. The sizes are a lot more options, as opposed to aluminum clad or wood windows, so for probably 40% of the windows, a wood window would have maybe fit in the space that was there, but there was a large majority that would have required modifying the concrete block and brick structure. Mr. Heyman stated would you have had to fill in or cut additional brick down? Mr. Mathis stated both.

Commissioner Smith stated they do customized wood windows. Mr. Mathis stated it's about a 6-month turnaround currently, and her windows were in pretty bad shape, but coming out of the ice storm, it was very evident, the problems there.

Vice Chair stated I know, in after the fact, it puts us in a little bind, because you probably have gone back and looked at the standards since then and you find that vinyl windows are specifically prohibited. Mr. Mathis stated he did see that. He stated he was quite shocked to drive around the road and see quite a few homes in there with vinyl windows, and many of which would have been in the past four to five years, based off research pulling permits that were on the property, because I did see that, and viewed it sort of as a contextual standard, and, if I'm looking at incongruity and not seeing a definitive majority being a particular window type, it was, I did notice that, yes sir. Vice Chair stated depending on when things have happened in the past, the state has required us to use standards over the last couple years that weren't in place before. So, that might answer to some of your question there.

Mr. Mathis stated let me mention one other thing, because Sam brought it up. The muntins that he referred to, the original windows that I'm calling original had the 6 over 6, and that is why we chose that design. You could do the muntins on one part of the window, but you couldn't on both, because the way the windows open, the gap's not big enough to add a dimensional muntin there. I think probably it would draw more attention to the window to only do it on one part and have it dimensional on the upper part, not if they were casement windows that opened out, you could certainly do it on the full window, but I did research the muntins and tried to figure out what would be feasible there on those windows.

There were no further questions for the applicant.

Susan Kohler, 1507 Druid Hills Avenue, Hendersonville, North Carolina stated her name for the record. She stated she purchased the home at the end of July 25. She moved from South Carolina here. Her husband passed away, and she moved to be near her daughter and her husband, and she was so fortunate to find that small house. She was asked if her realtor told her this was a historic district. Ms. Kohler stated it did state that it was a historic district, but that meant nothing to me other than it was a historic district, because no one gave me any parameters for what you had to do to be in this historic district and renovate a house. Her agent did not inform her. Ms. Kohler stated no, it was in the deed from my attorney when I read that. But no, it was not told to me by my agent.

Ms. Kohler stated I just wanted to renovate that house, not so much preserve it. There's been a lot of discussion with the windows, if I might. Those windows several of them had cracks and that had been taped with, like, scotch tape. They had cheap brass window pulls on them. And in my non-professional opinion, they were not original to that 1922. You get various dates, 22, 26, house. None of that was original. They certainly, in those days, didn't paint their trim black. I just wanted to renovate it and make it my home and live here with my family. And I thought, through Mr. Mathis and his expertise, I thought that I had achieved that, and I was quite taken aback by this deal. I would do anything to preserve, and I mean that word, preserve a house to its original form. This house should last another 100 years now. Everything has been redone on it. Everything. Except some of the mortar and the cracks on the brick that the inspector told me about.

There were no further questions for the property owner.

Vice Chair asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of the application. No one spoke. Chair asked if anyone would like to speak against the application. No one spoke.

Vice Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed when the historic status was added to the Henderson County GIS. Discussion was made on interior and exterior projects and the process for zoning approval and building permits.

Vice Chair reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes stated the way that we would catch this is through our zoning compliance permit. It's kind of the first step in the process. Once they get that, they can go get their building permits. If they, let's say they're just doing windows, they'd come to us, get their Certificate of Appropriateness, Zoning Compliance Permit, they wouldn't have to get a building permit. And so, we recognize that it is an imperfect system. We're doing our best to improve that system. This is an example that is great for us to learn from and find ways to better improve our system to catch those sorts of things.

Discussion was made on notifying residents of the historic districts and what that entails.

Vice Chair closed the public hearing.

Discussion was made on the applicant coming to the Commission first and the positive thing in this being that the masonry was not touched. The Commission has never asked anyone to take windows out. They have asked them to disguise them a little better. The Commission thought the door was beautiful and the solid wood door does meet the standards. Discussion was made on the snap-on muntins. The Commission discussed vinyl not being acceptable.

Mr. Hayes stated to take any action you would need five votes in support.

The Commission discussed setting a precedent.

Mr. Hayes stated the enforcement is on staff to do, so you all would not be telling them, you have to replace them with windows, or whatever it is. It is for staff to, on the back end, to work with the applicant, and then, theoretically, a new application would come before you.

Commissioner Smith stated so if we don't approve it, then it's up to you to figure out how to move forward with the homeowner. Mr. Heyman stated yes, basically, the application before you is what's been presented and the request of the Commission is to either approve or deny it. If you do work without a COA in a historic district, it stands to reason that you're in violation of the ordinance, and so the city's code enforcement would take the appropriate action to enforce the ordinance, and I can't tell you exactly what that would be, it is case by case, but usually starts with the notice of violation. Commissioner Smith stated and we took an oath to represent the interests of the historic district. Mr. Heyman stated I represent staff and not the board. I just remind you of that as often as I can. But, it would be staff's opinion that even though, and you've heard the distinction, and I'm not disagreeing with how it's been described, the standards are the standards, that there is some unique application of them to every case, and so otherwise it wouldn't be before you. It could be an administrative approval if it were as simple as black and white. It's up to you to determine whether or not it meets the standards.

Discussion was made on whether or not it meets the standards. Mr. Heyman stated the question is whether or not, and staff's opinion, the question is whether or not the application is congruous with the character of the historic district. And the way you determine congruity is whether or not it meets the standards. You may determine that any given application does or doesn't meet the standards. I'm being coy because it's not my place to tell you how to vote. As you have recently learned staff can make a legal argument as to whether or not staff thinks it meets the standard, but you're the decision maker.

Vice Chair stated I think for discussion, the positive side of this is the exterior of the house and the masonry has been preserved. The doors are cracked. We've, in the past, approved an after the fact on Ridgecrest. I think it's Ridgecrest, with an attempt by the homeowner and builder to make them look a little bit less vinyl. And I don't know how to say that in this particular instance. We also heard testimony here that there were windows that were cracked, and they were trying to seal the house up from the weather, and this was the most expeditious way to buy the standard windows.

Discussion was made on putting a condition on the approval. Mr. Heyman stated it'd be staff's opinion that you could put a reasonable condition, if that condition is to make the application meet the standards. If it goes to congruity with the district. If the condition, it meets the standard, but staff would suggest that maybe you question the contractor, the applicant, as to whether or not they could do that.

Vice Chair reopened the public hearing.

Vice Chair asked is there any way to make the windows look a little bit more non-vinyl? Mr. Mathis stated I would be glad to research, that you could get the wooden muntins to put on. Again, it would just be on that lower, part, so I'm not sure that, from an eye test, that it would, disguise it more or draw attention to it more. I have a little concern about putting wood around the jam, just because of the water, problems that were obviously there, previously. Vice Chair asked if the jam was wood or vinyl. Mr. Mathis stated on a vinyl window, everything is vinyl. Vice Chair stated so that whole section that we're looking at there, all white is vinyl. Mr. Mathis stated no, not vinyl trim, just the window itself. Vice Chair asked if the trim was wood. Mr. Mathis stated the trim is a composite material, which was also what was there previously.

Mr. Mathis stated there were two, windows, the one in the bathroom, which we left, it was a newer vinyl window. There was an addition to the home that wasn't the original footprint, that had one big fixed glass aluminum window that didn't match anything, and it had a window on the back that was an

older, vinyl-type window and it was completely broke. It was a single pane, just sort of cheap window, so we replaced it.

Ms. Kohler stated there was one window that didn't even have a window. It was just a storm window. The top and the bottom. And to keep the weather from blowing, you couldn't move it, or the whole darn thing would blow out, so I put duct tape around it to hold it in, and to keep the cold out, and to keep my heat in. They were just in pitiful shape. I understand your predicament, but I'm sort of prejudiced toward my predicament, because I thought I was doing a good thing.

Commissioner Hammond Green stated we appreciate you preserving, the home, and, it's unfortunate that when you purchased, you were given insufficient information. But we have to deal with the facts and the requirements that are in the zoning regulations and the historic overlay district.

Mr. Mathis stated can I speak to one thing? And I'm not a lawyer, and you may, speak to this, but hear the word incongruent, and so I did a little research there. In 2018, NC Supreme Court said for a preservation committee to claim incongruity, that the majority of the district would have to have that particular standard in place in order for you to enforce it onto a homeowner. And I've done work in Asheville and Grove Park. If you go up to there, you see every roof is the same shingle, in that district. And so they could say incongruity there, but if you drive around that neighborhood, it's 60-80% of the homes, different in windows, vinyl, some wood, some aluminum, so to call it incongruent, I guess I'm asking, is it incongruent with what the Preservation Committee's material types are, or incongruent with the historic district? Vice Chair stated it has to be congruent with the historic district. But we're also dealing with a standard that says do not use vinyl windows. Mr. Mathis stated right, but that would be a contextual standard, is what the NC Supreme Court would say, and for you to do that, incongruity would have to happen because the majority of the district has that standard that you're trying to invoke, and that was the case, again, I'm not lawyers, APS versus Raleigh 2018 or 19, where a similar type situation was occurring. Commissioner Falvo stated what our decision is, is based on the incongruity with the standard.

Vice Chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed the approval and the denial of the application. They discussed adding a condition and also holding open the hearing for more information.

Commissioner Hammond Green moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as identified in File 26-32-COA and located within the Druid Hills Historic District, If added according to the information reviewed at this hearing, and with any representations made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards, (Residential), for the following reason: 1. Doors, the original front door is no longer present, therefore obtaining, repairing, and preserving it is not possible. (Section 3.7.2, 3.7.4, 3.7.5). Commissioner Falvo seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Hammond Green moved the Commission to find as fact that the proposed application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as identified in File 26-32-COA and located within the Druid Hills Historic District, If added according to the information reviewed at this hearing, and with any representations made by the applicant on record of this hearing, is incongruous with the character of

the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission Design Standards (Residential) for the following reason: 1. Windows, the applicant has proposed vinyl windows which are incongruous with the design standards that prohibit the use of vinyl windows. (Section 3.7.6 and 3.12.1.) Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. The motion was four in favor and two opposed. The opposing votes were Vice Chair and Commissioner Falvo. Mr. Heyman stated It would be, staff's opinion that it's effectively a denial of the application. But there's not a majority voting to approve it. The application was denied.

V(B) **Tree Pruning** – Vice Chair discussed Duke Power having the trees pruned in the historic districts. Photos were shown. He discussed them pruning a lot of old oak trees. He discussed a magnolia that was butchered. He talked about having a 30 day warning before they just show up and start cutting. Can staff talk to Duke about this? He would like to make a presentation to City Council. We claim to be a tree city and then things like this happen. Mr. Hayes stated as citizens of Hendersonville, you're always able to reach out to City Council. I know our City Council is aware of this. They've been made aware by some of your neighbors And, so therefore, our City Manager is aware of this as well. So Daniel had some items that kind of get into the legal side of what we can and cannot regulate, so if he's able to come back in while we're still discussing this, I'll let him do that. I have made contact with Duke, they've actually got a local government, liaison who works with, several counties in this area. So I talked with him, and where we've gotten to is, he's open to doing some site visits, so meeting with me, and they have an arborist as well, for every area. So we'd all meet together, in Hyman Heights. I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, but Druid Hills, all of the lines are buried. And then Main Street is, obviously, all the lines are on the alleys. So, Hyman Heights is really our only, local historic district that has power lines that run through it. Obviously, the national districts are a different story. Mr. Hayes discussed talking with other municipalities. He stated he would be happy to speak with Duke about the noticing as well. No action was taken.

Mr. Heyman stated I was expecting to find something in the State Administrative Code, or the Public Utilities Commission, with some, like, mandate for Duke to provide, and they would rely on that. Say, we have a state mandate to provide uninterrupted service. I couldn't find anything to that effect, but I did find something very on point in Chapter 160D, which is the land use and development regulation for local governments. And so in the historic preservation section, very on point. It read nothing in this part, the part being the part on historic preservation, nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent the maintenance, or in the event of an emergency, the immediate restoration of any existing above-ground utility structure without approval by the Preservation Commission. Mr. Heyman stated so, basically means, the way I read it is that they can maintain their existing above-ground utility structures, and I don't think it would be a stretch for a court to determine that maintenance includes regular trimming. I still think we would rely on the requirements to get a Certificate of Appropriateness and things like that. Regardless of whether or not you need a COA, you still got to do it by the standards, which is the case for some things we call that aren't even minor works, there are things that don't need a COA. In a historic district, if you repoint a little bit of your mortar, you don't have to come get a COA. That doesn't mean you could put bubblegum in there. You still have to do it by the standards. So, that's the argument we would make. This is just an update on what I have talked to the staff about. I think everybody agrees that ordinarily, a tree, a mature tree, is something you need a Certificate of Appropriateness for to remove or to do some sort of heavy pruning on. And that there's not, like, some blanket exemption just because this is an existing above-ground utility structure. That's just the argument we would make. Commissioner Smith wanted to know what their policy was. Mr. Holloway stated we have never required a COA for Duke Energy to trim the trees. Commissioner Smith felt like this should be added to their policy.

Commissioner Hammond Green stated they could discuss this with City Council and get them to add this to their procedures. Vice Chair stated I don't know that we're going to ask City Council to change the actual COA application to include tree trimming, I think I would like to see us require, before Duke Power does any more trimming, that we do a ride-around with the arborist and Sam or somebody from the city to approve that. I know we can't prevent them from pulling things, but I think it needs to be done a lot more judiciously than it has been. And somehow, I'd like to see that in writing from a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission to City Council. Commissioner Hammond Green and Vice Chair plan to attend the July City Council meeting to discuss this.

VI **Old Business.**

VI(A) **Findings of Fact – 314 N Main Street (26-011-COA)**

On motion of Commissioner Hammond-Green and seconded by Commissioner Falvo the Findings of Fact for File No. 26-011-COA were approved.

VII **Other Business.**

VII(A) **Edwards Park Project**

Commissioner Smith stated I'm not sure whether it's within our bailiwick as a commission or not, because it involves the backs of the buildings on Main Street, rather than the fronts of the building, rather than the facades. But we have this street that starts here, where I'm pointing, at 6th Avenue, and continues all the way to the Ecusta Trailhead, called Edwards. It's interrupted in some places, but the beauty of it is that when people park. They're always facing Edwards Street before they get to Main Street and we've got a bike plan that is emerging in the city. I would like to suggest that we think about Edward Street as being a bike or cyclist's channel from 6th Avenue all the way to the Ecusta Trailhead. The economic benefits are significant. There's grant money that is potentially available, etc. I don't know whether it is in our bailiwick or not in our bailiwick to support an endeavor like this. But there are three cities, within 100 miles of us that have already done this. Asheville has done this with Wall Street. Huntersville has done it. Greer, South Carolina has done it. Rapid City, South Dakota did this, and it has transformed the city, apparently, because folks are doing paintings on the backs of the buildings, and it's really rejuvenated the city. So, I provided materials to you. I also provided materials to, Jennifer Hensley, who is with the Bike Commission. And I'm not suggesting we take any action today. I just wanted to introduce the notion to you, because think about it, there's a lot of thought that needs to go into it. It's a big project, it would cost about two million bucks. We could find the money, but it would still cost us about two billion bucks. And, I think it would help businesses in town, it would certainly help all the tourists that come to town to get routed, it would leverage our parking spaces, there's all kinds of benefits. Can't find anything that would be a losing proposition for it. It's possible there are negatives, it's just I haven't been able to turn any up. We could, as a Commission recommend to City Council that they adopt a resolution to proceed with exploring getting this done. And then we are in a position to do the grant work, which is necessary. But, we need some impetus for City Council to start that process. And then there's this Bike Committee, which you started seeing signs about it, and if we're going to be doing a bike plan for the town, why not facilitate cyclists getting from 6th Avenue all the way to the Ecusta Trailhead and have our parking leveraged for the Ecusta Trail, which happens to have had a significant impact on our downtown business history. So, I think we can do it, but I don't want to push

an idea that people haven't had a chance to think through. I'm inviting you to think through it. I've got all kinds of materials for you. No action was taken.

Mr. Hayes stated he would connect Commissioner Smith with Matt Manley as he is the one leading the Bike Plan project.

VII(B) **Budget Adoption**

Mr. Hayes discussed the budget with the Commission. He also discussed the work plan for the Commission.

Commissioner Smith moved the Commission to approve the adoption of the budget. Commissioner Hammond Green seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VII(C) **Staff Report**

Mr. Hayes gave a brief update on the COA process and he discussed looking at different municipalities on their processes. He would like to share this information and get feedback from the Commission. He discussed having a staff analysis in the packet. Vice Chair liked the idea but would also like to see a summary of the interaction with staff and the applicant. The Design Standards were also discussed. No action was taken.

VIII ***Adjournment. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:16 p.m.***

Chair