



*Minutes of the Hammond Historic District Commission
August 21, 2019
Hammond City Council Chambers – 312 East Charles*

- Meeting called to order by Chairman, Mr. Ryan Faulk, at 11:00 a.m.
- Verification of meeting notice given by Director, Ms. Jennie Garcia
- Roll call taken:
 - Present: Jessica Shirey, Susan Seale, Ryan Faulk, and Jen White
 - Absent: Shauna Seals, Howard Nichols, and Marguerite Walter
- Motion to approve the minutes from June 19th, 2019 by Jessica Shirey. Second by Jen White.
 - Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seal (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)
 - Motion Approved: 4-0
- **Old Business:**
 - **113 N. Oak (Restaurant 113) – Work without permit**
 - Application presented by: Jennifer Lee
 - *Essentially 113 N. Oak was notified on May 29, 2019 that work without approval was conducted on the north façade of the building. A stop work order was issued by the City of Hammond and a certified letter was sent out. At the June HHDC meeting, a grace period of 30 days was granted by Commissioners for the applicant to restore the North façade to its original state. If not a fine would be assessed. Since then, the North façade has not been restored. The applicant’s representative stated that returning the north façade to its original state would harm the building even further. Today, the applicant is submitting an application for the work that was conducted without approval. A proposal for work consists of the following:*
 - *Installing a new 2 X 4 wood stud wall anchored to the bottom of the existing steel beam with exterior siding panel painted dark grey to match the existing building color.*
 - *Installing new 1-1/2” X 1-1/2” steel tubes mounted to face of new wall, secured to steel columns, painted to match dark grey to match existing building color.*

- *Reinstall original vertical wood slats, mounted to steel tubes and held 2? Away from face of new wall.*
- *Ryan Faulk recuses himself and hands the application over to Jessica Shirey.*
- *Jennifer Lee – We are here today, 113 is applying for a permit and we are also responding to a letter that the Historic District sent out previously regarding work that was completed without a COA (certificate of appropriateness). And unfortunately 113 got a little too excited about completing its addition and started work before submitting an application or obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work. And upon receipt of the letter from the Historic District and Ms. Garcia, immediately ceased and desist work until this is resolved and that included painting as it intended to and reinstallation of the original wood slats. So 113 understands that the work was not done in accordance with UDC (unified development code) section 8.1.10 and that requires submission of plans to the HDC (Historic District Commission) for any exterior changes to the building. It also understands that the Commission may deem it appropriate to issue a fine but would request that no fine be issued as it proposes work that would meet the Design Guidelines for an addition. So, onto the proposed work. An application was submitted for proposed work on the North side of the building and that included installing a new 2 X 4 wood stud wall anchored to the bottom of the existing steel beam with exterior siding panel painted dark grey to match the existing building color and installing steel tubes to the face of the walls secured to the steel columns painted dark grey to match the building color and then reinstallation of the original wooden vertical slats mounted to those steel tubes. And a drawing was attached to the application where you can see that proposed work. So the Historic District's Design Guidelines contain a section specifically describing additions to historic properties. And it provides that additions to historic buildings are acceptable if the addition is not visually overpowering the original building, compromise its historic character, or destroy any significant features and materials. And importantly, the Design Guidelines also state that additions that echo the style of the original structure and additions introduce compatible contemporary design are both acceptable. So we went through the nine Guidelines that set forth regarding additions and applied those to the proposed work. So, one, additions must be constructed so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric. And this addition features no loss of historic fabric. There are no character defining features of the historic building that will be obscured, damaged, or destroyed. The original vertical wooden slats are to be reinstalled. So they are not going to be obscured, damaged, or destroyed. Two, the size and the scale of the additions must be limited so that they do not visually overpower the building. And the addition is small – its 5.6 X 28.6 which is only about 106 square feet and the building itself is a little over 3,200 sq. ft. So the addition represents less than 5% of the building. So it does not visually overpower it. Three, it must be located as inconspicuously as possible, on the rear or least character defining elevation of the historic building. And the most character defining elevation would be the east façade. This addition is inconspicuously,*

virtually unnoticeable from the street though up close you can see it is distinguishable from the historic structure but from the street it is undistinguishable, it is inconspicuous because it is behind previously approved screening behind a dumpster. And additions on the south side and the west façade are not possible. So, um the east façade is the most character defining. The fourth criteria is that the addition must be designed so that they are differentiated from the historic building. And because of its unique situation, it is not a true addition – increase in terms of increasing the foot print of the building this criteria may be a little less applicable but with that said the addition is within the original space of the building and there's no increase though the form, material, and style of the building are carried forward though not exactly duplicated. And it is adaptive reuse of the property. Number five, the fifth criteria, and Guideline that the Design Guidelines set forth is that the additions must be designed so that they are compatible with the historic building in terms of mass, materials, color, etc. And the addition is compatible. The materials are compatible, the wood and steel tubes compliment the original structure, the colors the same, the location of the doors the same, and the mass and the scale will complement the original building because the original building's rooflines and form is used. Number six, the predominant material has to be visually compatible with the materials of the original building and no imitation materials such as vinyl and aluminum are to be introduced. The predominant material on the addition is wood and it is visually compatible with the historic materials of the original building. All are painted similar colors and no imitation masonry, vinyl, etc. is introduced. Number seven, one of the last criteria, is that the roof form must be compatible with the original building and of course this uses the original roof line it is. And also with regard to the height and the eave lines the foundation height is exactly the same – the addition uses the building's original foundation height and eave lines. And finally, and most importantly, the addition must be designed and installed to minimize damage to the historic fabric and make removal in the future possible. And the addition and design has been installed around the building's original beams and the roof so that future removal can be accomplished without damage and effecting the historic fabric of the building. So 113's application for the addition meets all of the Design Guidelines set forth in the UDC and the addition does not visually over power and it does not compromise the historic character of the building and it does not destroy or obscure any significant features and materials and the Design Guideline provides that such an addition is acceptable. The original wooden slats, which are the historic architectural features of the façade are preserved and the addition is inconspicuous. Any changes can be removed easily in the future without damage to the building and importantly the Design Guidelines say that an addition that echoes the style, the original structure, and introduces compatible contemporary design is acceptable per the HDC Guidelines. And this proposed work meets that criteria and does that. So 113 would request that a COA be issued for this proposed addition as it meets all the objectives and the intent of the Design Guidelines.

- *Jessica Shirey asks the commission if they have any questions.*
- *Jen White – In my mind this is kind of two-fold. I think we need to assess what we requested of the owners from the last meeting. And figure out what we are going to do on that front and then assess the application. There are multiple parts of it in my mind.*
- *Jessica Shirey – So it was, in the previous meeting we did not have a July meeting so this was in June. Apparently the work was started on May the 29th, is that correct?*
- *Jennifer Lee – That was the date of the letter.*
- *Jennie Garcia – That was the date that the work was completed. There was someone working on the building.*
- *Jessica Shirey – It wasn't completed?*
- *Jennifer Lee – It wasn't fully completed. It was in process.*
- *Jessica Shirey – How far did it, did it get at that point?*
- *Jennifer Lee – I don't know.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Calls for public input.*
- *Jennifer Lee – I mean the remaining things that had to be done were structurally installed. Needed to be painted and I think the tubing for the vertical slats had to be installed. I don't think they are there and the vertical slats had to be installed.*
- *Jessica Shirey – All the electrical had been installed at that point?*
- *Jennifer Lee – I think so.*
- *Jessica Shirey – And the exterior, the original exterior doors were removed and those doorways on the interior is rendered the way they are at this point at the 29th – May 29th.*
- *Jennifer Lee – I assume. I don't know.*
- *Jessica Shirey – So to go back to the last meeting, or to what was discussed – ya'll didn't have an application at that point.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – You were called here to address the work without permit.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Which also means that there was no attempt to get a building permit from the City because then it would have been flagged as well. But what was said then was that this, the wall was built to reduce flies from entering the restaurant.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Ok. I think Mr. Wong spoke and was explaining why an addition was being added but the purpose of the addition is not relevant at this point. Or at any point. The addition – there are Guidelines for additions and the purpose for which whether you just want it and you like it or you want it for a reason does not need to be considered.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Well, it should because if there is a variance that's created to allow something that's against the Guidelines and that's the only alternative then it's something we can look at. So that is why I was stating the reason.*
- *Jen White – And we need to document the reason for the variance.*
- *Jennifer Lee agrees.*

- *Jessica Shirey – So he (Mr. Wong) said it was for the flies getting in the restaurant and there are alternative ways to protect flies from getting into the restaurant rather than building a wall there. And then we had requested that it (the wall) be brought back to the original.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – We were not aware of how extensive it was at that point. Cause we were told it was just a wall. We didn't know what was going on inside. They said they had the original slats, we did discuss that so that was going to be reinstalled it wasn't because of the cease and desist. It was also stated that it was requested to be brought back to the original.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – It was agreed upon – we had agreed to delay any fines at that point until the next meeting. Which inevitably we didn't have a July meeting so here we are in August. Obviously we have to revisit the fine at this point. I think that would be the appropriate first step.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I don't have the Guideline in front of me. So the fines should go back to the date of the letter which is May 29th until an application was submitted that would be for this meeting but that was seven days ago. Is that correct?*
- *Jennie Garcia – The thirteenth (August 13th) was when it (application) was submitted.*
- *Jessica Shirey – How many days total is that from May 29th to August the 13th?*
- *Jennie Garcia – I think I counted 75 days if I am calculating correctly.*
- *Jessica Shirey – So that the way that our fines are categorized there is a demolition fine of a \$1,000 dollars as a lump sum and since there was demolition done in my opinion I would think that would be within the realm of our Guidelines to enforce that. Also there is a hundred dollar – up to a hundred dollars a day through this 75 days to when an application was submitted. That's my – I'd like input from other (Commissioners)...*
- *Jennie Garcia passes the Unified Development Code referencing 8.1.8 Commission enforcement powers; criminal penalty; continuing violations*
- *Jessica Shirey –So yeah, UDC 8.1.8 any owner, agent, lessee, or other person acting for or in conjunction with him, who shall violate the ordinance or law or rules, regulations, or decision of the Historic District Commission shall for each offense be fined not less than fifty dollars nor more than one hundred dollars, or suffer imprisonment for not more than thirty days, or both fine and imprisonment. Any owner, agent, lessee, or other person action for or in conjunction with him. Who shall demolish a structure or edifice without having been issued a certificate of appropriateness shall be fined a single fine of not less than one thousand dollars.*
- *Jennifer Lee – And we would ask that considering the application has been submitted, considering through good faith and hired an architect, and make sure that this was done properly and so as to not damage the historic nature of the building that the fine would be not the hundred dollar maximum per day but the*

fifty dollars per day and the demolition fine did not involve demolition of a structure or edifice would not be included.

- *Jen White – To clarify, the architect wasn't hired until after this was done, correct?*
- *Jennifer Lee – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – The date on the...*
- *Jennifer Lee – When the letter was received on May 29th*
- *Jen White – Right but the work... to where it is today, that work had already been done?*
- *(inaudible)*
- *Jennifer Lee – But then an architect was retained to make sure that no damage was done to the building and that things were done appropriately.*
- *Jen White – Ok.*
- *Jennifer Lee – So I believe that was a show of good faith and trying to do the right thing and that should be taken into consideration in assessing the fine. And the other factor is the addition meets the requirements of the UDC's design guideline. And it meets all the criteria it should be approved so assessing a fine for something, understandably it needs to be assessed because things were done not in the correct order and wasn't applied for but something that may ultimately be approved.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Well we haven't gotten that far.*
- *Jennifer Lee – Right. Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – So we can discuss the Guidelines as you see them and as we see them shortly. So...*
- *Jennifer Lee – And I know there's – I don't know if we want to vote on everything at the end after their so connected and also do the application for work at the same time but I understand that there are some people who wish to speak. Some members of the public.*
- *Jen White – Jennie I know you had a discussion with Andre (City Attorney) this morning was there any relevant information about this?*
- *Jennie Garcia – We should address the fine before review the application and that the amount of the fine should be dependent on whether or not this is a good, like a someone who doesn't really follow the Guidelines or who doesn't follow the rules all the time. That's how you address the amount of the fine.*
- *Jen White confirms that assessing a fine is a case by case scenario.*
- *Jennifer Lee – I would also like to take into account that these are persons who are contributing members of the Historic District and of the City of Hammond and contributes to the economy itself with businesses.*
- *Jessica Shirey – You said you had someone else who wanted to speak?*
- *Jennifer Lee – Yes.*
- *Ed Burns – Good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Ed Burns, I'm a CPA (certified public accountant) of Hammond and I represent a number of clients and Saul Rubio (applicant) is a good friend of mine. I am here as his colleague and his friend and as his CPA. And just observing gives me a lot of respect for what you do, it's a difficult job you've got. I know it's not easy*

because you've probably all visit his restaurants and visit all the businesses in the town and have to vote for them but I know it's difficult to serve. I am really here to make sure that whatever decision is reached that I can account for it correctly. So that if it's a tear it down kind of thing then I want to give him a tax write off and get those savings back if I can but I was born and raised in Hammond and when I met Saul, I just became attached to him as a friend more than a business associate. As all my clients are the same. I would never do anything to help another client or hurt another client but I am here just to support him because I think he corrected when he saw his problem without getting permission. Obviously it is not a huge problem that he corrected without permission but he did that and I think that if you see through the lack of permission and I think you will see a good thing for the building. That's really all I have to say. I just appreciate what ya'll were doing and whatever happens as a CPA, I want to see him prevail on his tax returns, make sure he gets a return on that or hopefully not. That's it.

- *John Guerin – I certainly appreciate all of the good work you people do here. I kind of echo what Ed Burns said. One thing that really stuck out in my mind as being a property owner, I own two properties downtown is that adaptive reuse... and it's very difficult as a property owner when you make changes and you do your best to adhere to the standards and Guidelines as put forth by the Historic District but at times there should be cases where they would take that into account. But I think that as a member of the community, as a business man in the community, I think that it is important that we support other businesses within our community and what they've done to put these properties back in that reuse. Thank you.*
- *Anne Flippin – I was an Alford and grew up in Hammond and I own the office at 113. I want to say that I drove by several times before even noticing anything but maybe that's on me. But it didn't look very different to me and I would like to say that everything Saul has done to my dad's office, what I kind of considered and eye sore, he has made into an oasis. I have just become aware, very recently of what ya'll were discussing today but my sister and I are all one hundred percent supportive of Saul and whatever makes it better for him as we are ok with.*
- *Saul Rubio – First of all I want to apologize for doing this without filling out the paper and I hope you understand the need for sometimes a business you are running from (inaudible) to morning to go to the bank to pull out 1.4 million to invest in the community and you are a successful restaurant but you are still not making money you feel that this very moment you have to act instead of waiting (inaudible) weeks for a meeting with the Historic District. And I apologize, it's my fault and I really appreciate all the work that you do for the town. I know a lot of cities would like to have a downtown like Hammond some of them like Pensacola, Lafayette, Covington (inaudible). I think Hammond community is very lucky to have a few restaurants downtown that a full parking lot, I mean a parking lot that is full all the time and that is a beautiful downtown Hammond. I am trying to get better every day that's why I am trying to educate people and customers about*

food and things from around the world and I will keep working. I am going to keep work and I am going to do bigger and better and everything I can do for the community. Thank you so much.

- *Pierre Theriot – I just want to say one thing. That maybe Jennifer (Lee) left out. Oh do I need to say my name? Pierre Theriot, Holly and Smith Architects. Just for important clarification when, before any of this work – we’re talking about what was done and the slats were installed as they were, they if you recall a series of steel members between there, right that the slats were attached to. So when they started doing what they were doing they removed the slats but left all those steel frame members inside that wall. So I think that’s what Jennifer was trying to get at was that the reverse, the reversibility of this condition where these studs can be removed and the cladding could be removed. The frame work is still in there for the slats to be reattached. That is all I wanted to say.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Is there any other public input?*
- *Melanie Ricketts – Hi, I am Melanie Ricketts for those of you who don’t know me. I am a local historian and preservationist. I appreciate that Mr. Rubio has so many friends and colleagues that are willing to speak for him but the job of the Historic District Commission is to protect the resources of the Historic District. And part of coming before you, before a project is started is to get the wisdom and experience in the preservation knowledge that you all have and being able to mitigate any kind of damage. So when you do work without being reviewed that gets taken out permanently. You cannot put toothpaste back into the tube and this is toothpaste that is out of the tube. So I understand being excited but when you are talking about the Guidelines and the rules and regulations you are supposed to follow being a tenant and a building that is within the Historic District and within a city where we have building code. If those things are ignored and then they are able to be resolved because you retroactively hire an architect then what’s the point in reviewing things in the first place? So when other people make these kind of changes and they can’t have their attorney and CPA here, are they going to be given the same kind of leniency? If someone painted the Columbia Theatre purple and said “Oh we got excited. We’re sorry we didn’t know.” It’s very clear what the Guidelines are when this building was first unfortunately adapted there were some changes; but it’s not like this is something that’s just happened over night but this is something that just started to be reviewed, the Historic District has been in place since 1978 and this building a very important architectural element in that and I think that allowing people to circumvent the rules because of who they are and because of what economic impact is isn’t really fair and it’s really not something ya’ll should take into consideration. It’s about managing the resources of the Historic District fabric that we have that is existing. Thank you.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Any other public input?*
- *Jennifer Lee – I absolutely agree with Ms. Ricketts. Procedures and rules are in place for a particular reason and they need to be followed. And we understand that they weren’t and I would like to make a tiny bit of a distinction between the*

examples she made painting the Columbia Theatre purple cause that is something visible and obvious and very conspicuous. This change is minimal and is not as conspicuous to us as painting it purple. So we understand that the Historic Commission may deem it appropriate to issue fines and we understand that and we just ask considering the circumstances that it also be taken into account.

- *Jessica Shirey – Any further comment? From the public or the Commission on this matter before we go onto the application?*
- *No more public input is given nor any comments from the Commission.*
- *Jessica Shirey – What I want to say is that, this particular building and project and business ownership, conglomerate, whatever it is and whoever is involved; during the original renovations we did make a variance for an addition on the rear. It was very clear at that point what the rules are with the owners present – and we did make a variance for that because it is in an inconspicuous place. And it was done in a collaboration with us and figuring out what would be visually appropriate for that space. I am talking about the rear office on the west side of the building. So at that time I feel like the rules and expectations were very clearly laid out and it was very clearly said at that point that nothing can touch the outside of the building without coming before the Commission. It was accepted like I am talking to you, it was a yes we understand and a nod. So it was absolutely accepted that was a meeting of the minds on that. So that’s the problem that I have with this – is that this particular project with this particular ownership is fully aware and there’s no way around it of what the rules are and what the expectations are. That’s the problem that I have with this particular thing as far as we talk about the fines because the bottom line is they knew it and we will get to whether it’s conspicuous or inconspicuous in a minute. I am talking about the actual work that was done. So in my opinion, I feel that fines are – we’ve done it to other businesses, buildings, building owners, whatever you know, there really shouldn’t be an exception for – I would understand it if I did it. I did it you know, I ran a stop sign, I got a ticket. So with that being said I think that meeting in the middle of not less than \$50 dollars and not more than \$100 dollars a day, I would make a motion to enforce a \$75 dollar a day fine for a 75 day period equaling, totaling \$5,625 and to include a thousand dollar one time demolition fine bringing the total to \$6,625 dollars for the total fine. That would be my motion.*
- *Jennie Garcia – We need to address the quorum. If Ryan is recusing himself...*
- *Ryan Faulk – That is correct.*
- *Lacy Landrum – We can’t make motions. No one needs to second that motion because you don’t have a quorum present to vote on.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Because he (Ryan) can’t vote on this issue only.*
- *Lacy Landrum – Correct. Yeah, when he recused himself you went to a place where you can discuss the matter but you cannot make or second a motion. So you can discuss it but you cannot vote on it – on this item because he had to recuse himself.*
- *Jessica Shirey confirms that no motions can even be made on the application and will have to come back at the next meeting in September.*

- *Susan Seale – Well I would like to make a statement. In the past when this was a fledgling downtown we were working from scratch from empty building to empty building it was very important to be lenient with the fines because we were enthusiastic and we were new. The purpose really of the fines is more than, is not to punish – I think they need to be made aware financially that they consistently go against the Guidelines and against the Historic District rules. That needs to be brought to their attention with finances but I do feel like that the purpose in the past of fines has been not the money. Put it back into your building. You know we’ve been lenient with allowing other businesses, fledgling businesses to have less of a fine. In this case I don’t see any reason to do that. I think they need to have a full effect of the law.*
 - *Jen White – I would echo with what Jessica said as well, with this particular property the owners have been shown when they bring their applications we can work through a process and that we can come to an agreement where the business benefits, where it still fits within the Guidelines, or variances made for a very specific reason. So it’s a little bit like a slap in the face it’s a little bit like a slap in the face when we’ve worked with them before and my impression was that everyone got what they wanted out of it, a back office was added, changes were made to the exterior that benefited both the Historic District and the business. So to just do something when we’ve been more than willing to work in the past together like I said is a bit of a slap in the face and I think there’s not an excuse for it.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – Alright since we can’t do anything with that lets move onto the application so we don’t have to discuss it again.*
 - *There is quick discussion on whether or not we should review the application. It is also confirmed that the building owner, Anne Flippin has not signed the application. Anne Flippin signs application. It is discussed and asked of the applicant if they would like to table the application for next month when there is a quorum. Applicant agrees to table the application for next month.*
 - *No motion is made due to the lack of a quorum. Application will be reviewed in September.*
- **210 E. Thomas – Work without permit**
 - *Application presented by: Bezzie Landry*
 - *Essentially 210 E. Thomas is requesting approval for work conducted without a Certificate of Appropriateness. A certified letter was sent out in June & July notifying the property owner that work was done without a COA. Work consists of relocating the existing front door and replacing it with two new doors. Currently, you enter the building’s front door to access the commercial space on the ground floor and residential apartments. The ground floor commercial space is leased to a retail business with customer traffic typical of a retailer. In order to maintain restricted access to the residential units, a relocation of the existing front door “back” several feet beyond the entrance to the retail space. The plan would be to have two matching doors that were the same/similar to the door that was*

removed after it was broken. Colors of walls, doors, etc. would be the same as were approved previously for the exterior façade renovation in 2017.

- *Bezzie Landry – Bezzie Landry on behalf of Downtown Hammond, LLC my address is 802 West Thomas in Hammond. We had a, I sent Jennie a kind of a list of timeframe of what happened. I don't know if she showed you and shared that with everybody.*
- *Jennie Garcia – Before you (continue) we do have a signature. (Shows Commission a fully signed application.)*
- *Bezzie Landry – Yeah, I brought the signed application. So ultimately I think it will be good if ya'll saw that I don't need to have to go through the whole thing. I had a homeless break in two days in a row. So the door was broken, so we removed it. I also had a retail tenant at the same time moving in and so you have to go through the front door, bringing them through their door, so you have to go through two doors to get into their space. And I talked to them and told them that I would consider applying to see if we can move that door. But then I still have the issue of getting up into my apartments for the tenants not having privacy and security. So really the question is whether I can move that door back. But to be honest with ya, I really would like to see if I can just table it to next month and let me talk to them a little more and see what; and I didn't know that the work session – I didn't know about the work sessions because I've never been. I've owned this ten years and I've never had any historic dealings. I painted the façade but Tom's office did that so you know I can come to the work session and do a little more research between now and then and talk to the tenant to see what we might come up with.*
- *Ryan Faulk – In the conversation we had in the work session I think the general consensus was that the doors really need to get back in place. So is there another solution you can do in the vestibule to make it better for you and your tenant?*
- *Bezzie Landry – That's what I said. I think I will talk to them some more and see about doing that. And then come back and have that conversation for next month.*
- *Ryan Faulk – Yes that would be fine.*
- *Jen White – And the work session just so you know if we hold them will be posted and they are always just the Friday before the meeting.*
- *Bezzie Landry – Yeah I've been to a bunch of them for Planning and Zoning.*
- *Motion to table the application to next month (September 18th), by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*

New Business:

- **Cate Square Park – New Construction**
 - *Ryan Faulk – Ok moving onto new business, Cate Square Park – new construction.*
 - *There is a consensus that this application cannot be reviewed at the time. This is due to Ryan having to recuse himself and not having a quorum. Susan Seal states*

that she texted Marguerite Walter and did not get a response. This application is put on hold at the moment as the Commission waits for a response from Marguerite.

○ **106 N. Oak (Southern Elm Formal Wear) – Signage**

- Application presented by: Sandy Laird
- *Essentially the building located at 106 N. Oak is proposing new door signage and to clean the exterior of the building. Cleaning the exterior of the building consists of using soap and a bleach spray. Awnings will also be cleaned. Proposed door signage logo will measure approximately 16 inches by 21.5 inches. Door signage will also include store opening times.*
- *Sandy Laird – I’m Sandy Laird and I’m at 106 N. Oak Street with Southern Elm Formal Wear. Signage – my signage is going to be on the door and if you don’t mind, I also want a free standing signs.*
- *Jen White – Like a sandwich board?*
- *Sandy Laird – Yes. Something just right off the door. So if I could use that.*
- *Jessica Shirey – That’s something that’s moveable, you have to take it in at night and can’t leave it there.*
- *Sandy Laird confirms that she understands moveable/portable signage cannot be left over night. Discussion continues about making sure pedestrians can move around sign easily and to double check the ADA Guidelines.*
- *Sandy Laird – Signage will just be on the door for now. I will have to come back if we decide to add, in the windows I’d like to have something like “Formal Wear, Bridal...” but I can do that after. It will just be similar to font on door signage.*
- *Commissioners inform Sandy Laird that if she wants to do something that is not on the current application she can apply for it and come back for approval. Commissioners also make sure that Sandy Laird knows how to access the HHDC Guidelines and applications.*
- *Sandy Laird – I do have two issues that I need to submit to you guys. Oh, and cleaning. Did I put cleaning?*
- *Jennie Garcia – Yes.*
- *Sandy Laird – The awning is filthy. So we were just going to try Dawn dishwashing soap liquid, just so ya’ll know. And the outside, exterior of the building the same thing – with a soft brush.*
- *Jen White – So manually scrubbing it and not spraying...*
- *Sandy Laird – No, not pressure washing the building because I don’t want to be responsible for any damages. I mean there is damage already there existing.*
- *Jen White – Yeah, we were worried about that. At least from the pictures. That open window (vent) up top and if you were pressure washing...*
- *Sandy Laird – Well if you do a light, I would have a hose. It wouldn’t be like a PSI, so heavy, if you see it in person you can see you’re not even going to get to that. So the cleaning of that and what about the concrete in front?*

- *Commissioners clarify that Sandy is referring to the sidewalk. Commissioners ask C.C. Gaiennie, Building Department Director, if she can has permission or if it's the City's responsibility. All agree that she can clean the sidewalk.*
- *Sandy Laird – Two things. I want, and it's not on the application. I realize I need to submit it to you. We talked about the painting. We don't want to do anything different. We want to go with existing colors. There's graffiti everywhere and we just want to take the same color and put it over the graffiti. They have cans of paint. Do I submit a whole new application for that?*
- *Commissioners agree that they can amend the current application procedurally to include painting in-kind over graffiti.*
- *Sandy Laird explains that the current glass in the door is broken. Commissioners state that if the door is staying and it is only the glass being replaced in-kind, no additional application will be needed.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I do want to caution if you are cleaning the façade, you have an open vent right about the tree. It has a screen on it just be careful.*
- *Ryan Faulk calls for any questions or comments for public input. None is given.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I make a motion to amend the application to include the painting of the existing stucco using the same color and paint type.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Second.*
- *Jen White questions whether or not the cleaning method should be a part of the motion to clarify the cleaning process. Commissioners stress that there are some damaged areas and that Sandy should use the lowest pressure possible to avoid further damage to the building. Sandy Laird clarifies that the pressure from the hose would not be used on the stucco but rather on the awning.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seal (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
 - *Jen White – Now, I move to approve the amended application*
 - *Motion to accept the application as amended, by Jen White. Second by Ryan Faulk.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seal (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
- **210 W. Robert (Parkside Gardens Apartments) – Exterior Renovations**
 - *Application presented by: Darryl Smith*
 - *Essentially the building located at 210 W. Robert is seeking to replace the current siding. The applicant is requesting to replace current cedar boards with Hardie plank boards. The same color will be used.*
 - *Darryl Smith introduces himself to Commissioners.*
 - *Jennie Garcia passes sample of Hardie Plank to Commissioners.*
 - *Ryan Faulk – I don't think we had any questions on Friday (work session). Any questions from anyone? So the whole façade?*
 - *Darryl Smith – Yes, on both buildings.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – You're replace it all? Or just certain parts?*
 - *Darryl Smith – The entire building.*

- *Jessica Shirey confirms that the color blue will remain the same.*
 - *Ryan Faulk – Any trim around the windows?*
 - *Darryl Smith – Whatever we have there we will replace it.*
 - *Jen White clarifies the current siding is Cedar siding that has been painted. Darryl Smith states the current siding is 40 years old.*
 - *Ryan Faulk calls of public input. None is given.*
 - ***Let the record reflect that Marguerite Walter arrived to the meeting at 11:54 AM.*
 - *Motion to accept the application as amended, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seals (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), Ryan Faulk (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 5-0*
- **Cate Square Park – New Construction**
 - *Application presented by: Pierre Theriot*
 - *Essentially a new toilet room building within Cate Square Park will be constructed. The new bathroom facility will be located near the corner of N. Oak and W. Charles as per the attached site plan. Building materials will include brick veneer, painted concrete block, standing seam metal roof, painted hollow metal doors, and painted wood louvers. For detailed design elements, refer to attached drawings dated 05.14.19. Project is being resubmitted because of revisions necessitated by cost reductions.*
 - *Ryan Faulk recuses himself from the application.*
 - *Pierre Theriot – Holly and Smith Architects, 208 N. Cate Street. We are back to you today to present some changes that have been made to the Cate Square Park Restrooms. Before I describe the changes I just want to let you know that all the changes that are being made are because of cost – basically the project was over budget so we are having to reduce the scope to the available funds for construction. So there’s four major changes to it – number one, the brick arch has been removed; secondly one restroom, if you remember it was three restrooms now the total building size is reduced, it is only two restrooms; and the exterior finish on the park side of the building was as stucco on CMU (concrete masonry units) and now we are going to just painted CMU instead of the stucco. CMU is cinder blocks, sorry.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – Do we have a color or have we not gotten there yet?*
 - *Pierre Theriot – We haven’t gotten there yet. We will come back with colors. And then the last change, we are changing the roof material from a standing seam metal roof to an exposed fastener metal roof. So you may not even know the difference.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – On your application there’s a blank where the square footage is. The set back and everything is the same that we discussed before?*
 - *Pierre Theriot – Yep. It is 148 square feet.*
 - *Jessica Shirey calls for public input.*

- *Melanie Ricketts – I just want to be clear on this application. This is a new application? This is different from what was presented originally? That was approved before. This is not an adaptation, this a completely new application. Am I correct?*
- *Jessica Shirey – I mean it's the same project so I don't know. It's submitted as a new application.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – So this is a new application. Again, I am here to voice my concerns about this project. The park, this is a neighborhood park, this is surrounded by residences. The parks listed by the City, Zemurray Park, North Oaks Park, Clarke Park, Martin Luther King, Jr. Park, Mooney Park, and Cate Square. Zemurray Park is 33 acres, North Oak is 33 acres, Clarke Park is 5.74, Martin Luther King, Jr. is 5.92 acres, Mooney is 2.5 acres, and Cate Square is 2.07 acres. It is the smallest park in the City. It is surrounded by residences and this is the only review of this project. This has not gone before City Council besides being in the budget. So people who live around the park and people who are concerned about the historic value of the park have had absolutely no review of this project or any input besides Historic District meetings. And I know there are people who will argue that your job is to review the design and that's your job alone. But we're talking about placing something in a space that has not had a restroom for 150 years. That park originally was the land of Charles Emery Cate. A portion of it was his house. A portion of it was his orchard and the other portion was a very elaborate garden. In the Depression his family lost the property and it traded hands a couple of times but it became part of the City in 1950. So since Eisenhower was President there has not been a bathroom in that park. So why is there this sudden sense of urgency without being able to ask the people that live adjacent or the owners of the park which are the people of the City, I am very confused by. I feel like punishing people by not having a voice because they didn't know they were supposed to look through the budget and find something that would affect their property. The property on the corner of Magnolia and Charles – those people know more about the park than anybody else because it is their front yard. So having a toilet 200 feet from your front porch, I don't know that anybody would expect that. When they purchased that, there's the park but they should know that there's a chance that would change but there should also be an expectation that they would have some say about it. There's a new property owner on the corner of Magnolia and Charles on the opposite corner and I'm so grateful that he was able to renovate that building because losing that building would have been really devastating and I don't like to count other people's money but that's probably hundreds of thousands of dollars that he's invested in that property and when he sits on his porch now, he's going to be looking at a restroom. And I just think that there needs to be more review of this. I think that being able to ask people – that's the thing, where is the request for that people are asking for this? Who are these people? Where's the data? Are they voters? Are they people who live in that area? Are those people ok with a toilet a hundred feet from their front porch? This is not Zemurray Park, it's not North Oaks Park. It's not a park where*

you go spend the day watching baseball. It's where you swing and you go home. And if you get the information from the people asking for this finding out if they're passing a park closer to home or are they not going to that park for a reason? When you don't ask for peoples' input, you are missing out on information. For example, if you have children, children can't always wait – those kinds of things and I understand that. But if you ask the people who are asking for it, what they want, then maybe we are missing out on some opportunities. I used to run a restaurant on Cate Street, it was a coffee shop. The running joke was that I ran a bathroom with a coffee shop. Because as many people came in for the restroom facilities as they did for the coffee. And the coffee probably wasn't that great. The point was, I monitored that restroom constantly and this isn't polite, people would flush things down the toilet that shouldn't be flushed down the toilet, and then things that should be flushed down the toilet weren't flushed down the toilet. It was used as a phone booth, it was used as a dressing room, and it was used as a romantic retreat. So without it being constantly monitored it was impossible to maintain. And now we are talking about having that in someone's you know in the vicinity of someone's residence. I was also concerned in the last meeting of the safety. And I appreciate Ms. Landrum's reiterating that the City is concerned about safety and that there will be locks on all the doors, which I couldn't imagine a restroom that wouldn't have a lock. But unfortunately we are in culture where people do victimize other people and locks work both ways. So I really think there's an opportunity to get more input on this project and I know its listed as an improvement – I don't think it's an improvement and I have a feeling other people don't see it as an improvement and are unaware of what's happening and when it starts to happen there will be push back. So I am just, silence is compliance and as a historian changing this site is unacceptable to me without having data and without having any input of the people. So you are not just talking about the design. If it was something that was existing I would agree with that but voting for this is disenfranchising people that have invested in that area and not taking into account there are other options.

- *Jessica Shirey – Melanie have you gone to City Council and voiced your opinion or speak to specific council people? You don't have to answer that, maybe it's more rhetorical.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – Well they don't have any review of this.*
- *Jessica Shirey – My concern is – but they can bring it up I would imagine with their colleagues about – if they brought it up to their constituents, what are your concerns? They can do the research. That's kind of what their job is to figure out what their district may want.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – I made some of them aware so (inaudible) but I don't know if it's been made clear that any other review is possible besides this one. So I can't answer that for them and I don't know their understanding of that is. For me as a citizen this is the only place where there's an opportunity to do that. If I knew that I needed to attend the budget, pick through it, and decide when they were going to make decisions about public property that is historic that's within a*

residential area I would've been there. But that's not something I understood or was privy to.

- *Jessica Shirey – I appreciate your input about it. The same as I said last time, I don't feel like this is really in our space. I would like, I would love to have it go through somebody else or whatever. That would be great. I don't want that. It's not what we do, it's not our – it really isn't.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – You're being told the only thing you're determining is the design and that is inaccurate. I just want to make sure that is clear.*
- *Jen White – We did hear from one home owner last time. I don't know how they knew about it or if they talked to someone else.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – And they might've thought that it was passed and it was a done deal and they didn't have any recourse. So that's why I came today. Thank you again.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Do we have any other public input?*
- *Lacy Landrum – I'll speak and just reiterate what was said at the last meeting. This has been a request made continuously made over the years. It is not just a new request. This has been a request for all of our restrooms. It is not just a swinging park where you come to swing and enjoy the park with your kids. It is a park that is used every day. It's rented for many events, reserved rather for many events. The movie in the park that the Rotary Club provides, in Christmastime we have all our Christmas trees that are out there – so there's a lot more use of the park then there has been in the past. Over and over and over again there are parents who say we need restrooms here. We know, just like she was describing we know the restroom that is used the most is at PJ's and they have to buy a coffee to be able to use the restrooms. So a lot of kids cannot make it that far. It doesn't seem like it's that far but if you're 2, 3, 4, 5 years old distance is not what's on your mind.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I have a question Lacy and I don't know if you have an answer for it but just curious. Whenever you have the 5K runs or things like that a lot of them begin at the park...*
- *Lacy Landrum – And they bring port-a-potties*
- *Jessica Shirey – And that was what I was going to ask you. (inaudible) I was going to say at least there's not a port-a-potty there. But how often are port-a-potties brought into the park?*
- *Lacy Landrum – Port-a-potties in honesty brought in once a month. We have had occasion where those port-a-potties are not picked up the following Monday so they stay out – they're there for another week or two weeks. I personally, I think the last ones we had were for the run in May or April, I had to call Pot of Gold and that's not my job. That's what we did to get them gone because we know what an eyesore they become especially in Cate Square Park which is a smaller park and in the middle of town. So you really have two choices. Do you want to continue to see port-a-potties there? Do you want to see something that could fall over and not be as sanitary because those don't get cleaned every day; these bathrooms will be cleaned every day. A park ranger cleans these bathrooms. We*

take care of them in other locations. We have done that for years, we will continue to do that. They will not be opened at night. They will be locked at the end of the day. Parks are open from sunrise to sunset. That is the time period that the bathrooms will be available. They won't be open at two o'clock in the morning when the bars let out and all that other kind of stuff so all these issues of discussion, you know they're going to turn into areas of mass chaos situation. I appreciate that but that is not the condition of any of our bathrooms and will not be the condition of these bathrooms. We are doing a single stall, not multiple stalls in one building for those safety reasons. Those safety reasons have been addressed multiple times and looked at what are the best restrooms to be installing. I think too you will notice this is a scaled down version of what you approved. So I think this is a great way to move forward. It's important for our community and it establishes having restrooms in every one of our parks to make them more accessible and more useful and helpful for our families.

- *Jessica Shirey calls for any other additional public input. None is given.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I would just like to note that I voted against it this last time because of the feel of it and the arch. I felt that was obstructive of the view and so in my opinion I appreciate the reduction of it regardless of financial reasons or otherwise. I think that it's a better – it's more minimal. Anybody else?*
- *Jen White – I am just toying with I don't know if there's a way to take what Melanie said into account and get a little feedback before; I don't want to delay anything further and obviously this Commission had approved a previous application in which this is a new one and up for discussion. But I'm just trying, I don't have a good solution in my head but I was just – if this truly is the last and only place that it goes, I wonder if there is a way that we can facilitate discussion if we feel that it warrants – if you know what I mean any more input. I don't know what anyone else says.*
- *Susan Seal – Does this have to go before the Zoning Board or anything?*
- *Lacy Landrum – This is the final stop.*
- *Commissioners discuss that this was decided at the March 2019 meeting.*
- *Susan Seal – And our charge is to say whether or not it's appropriate not whether it should happen. That the architecture is appropriate or not.*
- *Jen White – Well I think have a slightly, Melanie is correct that this is a historic park and what happens on those properties falls under our prevue. So I would argue that whether a facility is put there or not does fall under our prevue regardless of the architecture. And maybe everyone disagrees.*
- *Susan Seal – I'm not sure that it is.*
- *Jen White – Ok, perhaps I misinterpreted.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Marguerite, anything?*
- *Marguerite Walter – I am torn too.*
- *Susan Seal – New buildings are allowed in the district. So maybe that kind of fits that.*

- *Jen White – But whether or not they are appropriate I think is the question. I mean I don't know. I am not saying that I disagree with this building I – just like Jessica said a reduction from the previous application...*
 - *Jessica Shirey – Going back to the previous application I voted against it last time. I would not tend to do that this time.*
 - *Jessica Shirey reminds Jen White that she voted for the bathrooms last time.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – I make a motion to approve the application.*
 - *Motion to approve the application as presented, by Jessica Shirey. Second by Susan Seal.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seal (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Jen White (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
- **224 W. Thomas (PJ's Coffee) – Balcony & Awning**
 - *Application presented by: Charles Miller*
 - *Essentially the building located at 224 W. Thomas is proposing to repair and replace the awning and balcony on the S. Magnolia side of the building. Both the balcony and awning will be painted black. Steel Gun Fabrications will make and replace the current balcony. The proposed awning will be a single-sloped awning complete with frame and cover with a 4" drop X 4" projection X 7" wide with 6" rigid valance and 6" soft valance. The frame will be constructed out of 1" X 1" aluminum tubing, welded, and mill finished. The awning will be covered by black Sunbrella Hemlock Tweed.*
 - ***Let the record reflect that Jen White had to leave the meeting at 12:17 PM.*
 - *Charles Miller – I am Charles Miller. I am representing my mom, Donna Miller. There were some questions that we needed to answer, why is the balcony being replaced? Do you have any drawings for the balcony replacement? What material will the new balcony be made out of? Color? What is the size of the proposed balcony replacement? Where is the new awning going to? Is this just an awning for the balcony space? So I hope you guys got the diagram. (Charles passes out a drawing for the proposed balcony.)*
 - *Jessica Shirey – So it's just an awning for the balcony space? And we are replacing the balcony with what material? It's all going to look basically the same.*
 - *Charles Miller – It's pretty much going to be the exact same. It's rusting right now so we need to take care of it.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – And it will (inaudible) and will it be painted?*
 - *Charles Miller – It will be sealed that gun powder black that you see there. (referencing a drawing brought to meeting) Awning, the awning was actually there before it got torn down in a storm a long time ago. So it's not necessarily new per say but yeah because it's not there right now. Any other questions?*
 - *Jessica Shirey – Your awning will, I'm sure it will reuse the same mountings, points that were there before.*
 - *Charles Miller confirms that the same mounting place will be used to reinstall the new awning as well as the new balcony.*

- *Marguerite Walter – Is the balcony height, the height of the balcony is that the correct for people not falling over the top?*
- *Charles Miller – I hope so, yes ma’am. Its 8 feet, I think that’s on the diagram right there and I think that’s what it is right now.*
- *Ryan Faulk – No, she’s talking about the railing.*
- *Charles Miller – No, that’s not 8 feet. The railing should be up to code.*
- *Commissioners discuss that the new railing on the balcony will need to be up to code which is 42 inches high. Commissioners also confirm that the awning will only hang over the balcony.*
- *Ryan Faulk – Are there any other comments or questions? Public input? None is given.*
- *Susan Seal – I move that we accept the application as presented.*
- *Motion to accept the application as presented, by Susan Seal. Second by Ryan Faulk.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seals (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Ryan Faulk (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
- **126 N. Cate (The Brown Door) – Awning/Painting**
 - *Application presented by: Gabrielle Carter*
 - *Essentially 126 N. Cate, The Brown Door, is seeking approval to repair the current awning. Repair work will consist of sanding and painting the underside and the fascia black. Sanding will be done on the underside and sides as needed.*
 - *Gabrielle Carter – Hi, I am Gabrielle Carter and I am representing The Brown Door. We sent in an application for the awning to paint it black. The only thing that will be changing is the color if that is an issue. We will just repaint white so it won’t – it’s just a little rusty, ugly looking. We just want to freshen it up.*
 - *Ryan Faulk – Well one of the things that came up at the work session had to do with the – the canopy spans from The Brown Door across to the adjacent salon. So are ya’ll doing the entire canopy?*
 - *Gabrielle Carter – It will be the entire canopy.*
 - *Ryan Faulk – Now ya’ll, a portion of that – it’s a separate address, but it’s the same building owner?*
 - *Jennie Garcia confirms that the salon building is the same building owner for The Brown Door.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – There’s a lot of neglect with that building in general. It’s not to be necessarily held against the business owner but the building owner. I think one of the things that we discussed was before we approve anything additional we need to address some of the other issues with the building and with the building owner. That’s what I took away from that. There’s a lot of intrusive vegetation...*
 - *Gabrielle Carter – Yes, ma’am we spoke with Mr. Vincent (building owner) about that and he is supposed to be filling out an application to have everything re-done.*
 - *Jennie Garcia – I also want to let ya’ll know that C.C. (Building Department Director) and I have gotten together – cause he’s contacted Vince on numerous*

occasions. I sent out a certified letter on Monday letting him know that his building is in disrepair.

- *Jessica Shirey – Ok so then we can...*
- *Susan Seal – Table it.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Either table this or deny it until your building owner comes and deals with the...*
- *Gabrielle Carter – Other issues.*
- *Jessica Shirey – other issues. It’s unfortunate.*
- *Gabrielle Carter – No it’s no problem.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I’m sorry.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I’d like to see this happen because it needs to happen.*
- *Gabrielle Carter – Yes, sir.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I move that we table this until next month.*
- *Gabrielle Carter – Ok.*
- *Motion to table the application as presented, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Ryan Faulk (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
- **106 W. Morris (Parlour 106) – Painting & Exterior Renovations**
 - *Application presented by: Bridgette Brooks*
 - *Essentially 106 W. Morris is seeking approval to seal the brick wall on the back façade of their building. Once the brick is sealed, it will be painted red. 106 W. Morris is also proposing repair around the windows; work includes removing peeling plaster, replacing with wood, and painting white to match windows.*
 - *Bridgette Brooks – Hi, I am Bridgette Brooks. I own the building and there’s a slight revision, on that building there’s three addresses. That building where the address is 124 SW Railroad Avenue, 106 & 104 West Morris. And where the brick needs to be done, needs to be done on the whole building. And I didn’t put 124 on the paperwork.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – 104 & 106 that’s Morris.*
 - *Bridgette Brooks – And 124 SW Railroad – Antoine’s occupies the front of the building. But it is one building.*
 - *Jennie Garcia – And you are referring to the windows correct?*
 - *Bridgette Brooks – The windows and the back wall of the building that needs to be sealed and I want to paint it to try and match the brick on the front of the building. And the back of the building faces the parking lot of I guess it’s Brady’s parking lot. If you look on top of the windows you can see where it’s starting to peel and pieces of it are starting to fall off.*
 - *Ryan Faulk – That’s a paint coating. That’s not – I think there’s mention in the application...*
 - *Jessica Shirey – It’s not wood.*
 - *Bridgette Brooks – It’s not wood. It’s either a plaster or concrete. I had a man come look at it and he said what it looked like they did is they just took concrete*

and went like this (sweeping motion) over the metal part. So what needs to be done, is it needs to be sanded down. Then it needs to be sealed and he said what he would like to do is put the wood over the metal part of it and then I would paint it the same color as the windows which is white.

- *Ryan Faulk – I don't think you would even need to put the wood. I think if you treat the rust, clean*
- *Bridgette Brooks – But you have cracks.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Those can be filled.*
- *Ryan Faulk – The cracks there that needs to be sealed before they get painted. The crack between, that's a lintel a steel lintel. Between that and the window it needs to be sealed before it's painted.*
- *Bridgette Brooks – You're just saying just sand that down?*
- *Ryan Faulk – Yeah.*
- *Commissioners and applicant discuss the process to repair lintels over the windows; discussion is also focused on what part of the windows need work.*
- *Ryan Faulk – Now the other stuff that you had.*
- *Bridgette Brooks – Is the back of the building. What it is, I had a leak and my roofer called up and said that my roof wasn't leaking. He said the brick was leaking and that I needed to seal it.*
- *Ryan Faulk – Yea, but...*
- *Bridgette Brooks – It's never been sealed.*
- *Commissioners and applicant discuss the water issue on the back wall; sealing brick is not a first step & Commissioners reference the Guidelines that prohibit painting of unpainted brick.*
- *Bridgette Brooks – Can I seal the brick?*
- *Ryan Faulk – Yes, absolutely but we need to know the product you are planning to use. But if you are getting water intrusion through that brick though you will need to get a mason involved to point up wherever there is damage where the water is getting through the brick. You either have damaged mortar or holes, penetrations where...*
- *Bridgette Brooks – I can show you where the pipes are.*
- *Ryan Faulk – All that's going to have to get sealed up because that's where your water is coming.*
- *Commissioners and applicant discuss the need to repoint and fixing mortar before using a clear sealant.*
- *Jennie Garcia – But that would have to come back as a separate application.*
- *Bridgette Brooks – So I will have to tell you about the mortar and the type of sealant I would like to use.*
- *Ryan Faulk – Yes.*
- *Jennie Garcia – The other thing, make sure he tests the type of mortar that you use because if they use the incorrect mortar it can cause more problems.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I don't think this building is old enough that he needs...*
- *Jessica Shirey – Yeah but that rear, I don't know – the front is definitely not but I don't know what that rear is.*

- *Ryan Faulk – So where are we?*
- *Jessica Shirey – How about we, since you have to come back – we just need more information and to make sure that, I'd like to hear from somebody more about repairing the mortar. You can't seal over something that you haven't repaired properly and so since you are kind of unaware of that at this point I would feel better if you had whoever is doing the work either they can come with you or really educate you on what to tell us. Like on what we need to know.*
- *Bridgette Brooks – Can we go ahead and do the windows?*
- *Ryan Faulk – I can amend the application to just include the window work.*
- *Jessica Shirey – We need to amend the application to include the correct addresses involved.*
- *Ryan Faulk – We can do that but first I want to get any public input or comment. None is given. I am going to make a motion to amend the application to include the addresses of 104 & 106 West Morris and 124 SW Railroad Avenue as well as to only include work at the lintels above the windows facing those streets – treating the rust, priming and painting of the lintels.*
- *Motion to amend the application as presented, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Marguerite Walter.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), AND Ryan Faulk (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
 - *Motion to approve the application as amended, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Ryan Faulk (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
- **108 S. Pine (Miller Memorial Library) – Awning**
 - *Application presented by: Charles Borchers*
 - *108 S. Pine Street is seeking to update their original roofline application that was submitted by the City and approved by the HHDC in March. Contractor Roofing Solutions, LLC has proposed an alternate drainage solution for the front canopy of the Miller Memorial Library that the City agrees is functionally better than the original, which would have still rain water running back TOWARD the Library before being redirected off either side of the canopy roof potentially splashing tenants and visitors and potentially spilling into the main lobby. The newly proposed solution would build up the canopy roof, so it directs rainwater AWAY from the Library, north west to south east across the canopy roof, into an internal gutter along the south edge of the canopy. This solution is not all that different from the solution detailed in the specifications and drawings for draining the main roof. The solution would add approximately 3.5-4.5" of tapered ISO and SBS to the canopy that would be concealed by trim matching the trim around the main and addition's roofs.*
 - *Charles Borchers – I brought up some additional aids and photographs. Jennie said she would distribute them. So there were two main comments given out at the work session. One was had we considered doing two internal gutters on the*

awning as opposed to the one that was proposed. And the second question or comment was could we use a square profile gutter downspout to kind of conceal the downspout better. So C.C. and I actually, I communicated that to C.C. and Robert Morgan – C.C. and I actually went over there yesterday that's when these photos were taken. Concerning the dual gutter system C.C. felt pretty strongly and the roofer also kind of confirmed this that the single gutter should be more than sufficient for draining that awning. There is a concern that if we were to do two internal gutters the amount of buildup that would be required to get the proper drainage, we might end up with a peak in the center of that awning. Particularly if you remember it slopes back towards the building so we are already pitching it forward you might be able to see unless we increase the trim around the awning.

- Ryan Faulk – Well you are breaking the span that you are sloping it that much one way now you are sloping it half that much.
- Charles Borchers – Correct, but there's a concern between the center where you would slope to either side and trying to pitch it might be an issue.
- Jessica Shirey confirms that Charles means that the awning won't be flat anymore and will now have a pitch in the center that would become visible. Charles confirms that Jessica is correct and further states that there is not a real need for two internal gutters as the original proposal will be more than sufficient in draining water off and away from the building.
- Charles Borchers – Relating to concealing it, I tried to do a rough rendering of this its a few pages back. There is a concern that if we do try to do a square profile gutter or downspout we're going to end up with something that's about 6 inches wide which is about the width of those 2 I-beams. If we did it on one side you're going to have an I-beam that doesn't look like an I-beam on the backside. There's also a question of what to do at the base – we have to somehow get that water off of the slab unless we want to cut through the webbing of that column.
- Ryan Faulk – You will have to do the same thing with the pipe.
- Charles Borchers – Yes but with a three inch pipe we proposed I think it will be less obtrusive. I think it will be less noticeable – less of a pipe or gutter or downspout to see as you are exiting the building. That we try to conceal it within the width of the webbing and of the column. There's also an issue at the top that I had noticed since the last time I went out yesterday. On one side of the building where the I-beam meets the horizontal I-beam supporting the canopy there is no webbing so it's a T. On the rear side of the canopy the webbing has been preserved. So you can't just simply go up the back side. You have to either cut out that webbing which would potentially...
- Ryan Faulk – With a PVC pipe you will still have to do.
- Charles Borchers – But a PVC pipe is smaller and less obtrusive.
- Ryan Faulk – Well I understand. Charles I am going to have to tell you that this is the main entrance to this building. It's a mid-century modern Desmond building and you are going to put a white PVC pipe down the back of the column at the main entry to this building. The roof aside – the roof is fine. You know with the

trim and what you are planning to do, pitch it to one side that's great. I'm ok with it but to run that kind of thing surface mounted, exposed front entry of the building without consideration on how to visually address that...

- *Susan Seale – Can you do something smaller? A smaller square?*
- *Charles Borchers – I think the issue is going to be whether – if I understood you correctly, you wanted something that sort of fit within the I-beam so that...*
- *Ryan Faulk – I understand that it would have to cant out from the top because of the web. I understand that.*
- *Charles Borchers – Our feeling is that you're going to see it more if we try to conceal it that way. I don't know if there is a better option than the 3 to 3 ½" PVC. That is what is in front of you. I don't know of a better solution without making a modification to the I-beams or to the wood beams under the deck. Those beams are about 4 inches – they're not 2 X 4's. They're actually three separate pieces of wood that are laminated together to make that 4 inch width and they are spaced about 4 inches apart so we would have to cut into and through those.*
- *Commissioners look at the application and have a brief discussion.*
- *Charles Borchers – The other possibility we had discussed and this is sort of a hybrid of the two. We might be able to put some type of sheet metal and we went with a three inch pipe and it fit within the depth of the I-beam we might be able to put a piece of sheet metal behind it so that it appears solid from the main entrance side. That could be an option but like I said when we looked at it...*
- *Jessica Shirey – Even if you went with the PVC, how would you go around that T.*
- *Charles Borchers – The T at the top? We would simply kick it out. So there will be something that wraps around that gutter section. I haven't discussed if we could notch out since we aren't moving the full part of the webbing, if we could notch out the webbing for the smaller downspout. I don't think we could notch out all of the webbing because there isn't webbing on the other side.*
- *Jessica Shirey – What was the reason why you didn't want to do the square or (inaudible)*
- *Charles Borchers – I think you are going to see it more. If the goal is to preserve the existing architecture that if we try to conceal it – I'm sorry with a six inch wide downspout that kind of wraps around the I-beam at the top and then at the base it has to be directed off of the walkway, you're going to see that. You're going to see a foot at the base ...*
- *Susan Seale – But at eye level you're going to see plastic pipe.*
- *Charles Borchers – Correct.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I think that, I'm just trying to understand why – you're going to see both of them...*
- *Charles Borchers – Correct but the difference is a 3 or 3 ½ inch round pipe...*
- *Ryan Faulk – You don't have to do a six inch downspout. I mean you're only using a 3 ½ inch pipe that's less than three inches in diameter.*
- *Discussion is had on whether or not the size of the downspout is appropriate. Commissioners also discuss the use of plastic/PVC is appropriate and placement of the downspout.*

- *Charles Borchers – If it is an issue of square vs. round, I think we can address that. The concern that we have and what I’ve understood is fill in the back of the I-beam, I think that is going to be more noticeable.*
- *Commissioners then discuss the downspout fitting into the profile not necessarily fill it in all the way. Discussion also covers it should be square and metal and of the same color of the I-beam. Charles will discuss with the roofer on doing what they are requesting.*
- *Ryan Faulk calls for public input.*
- *Melanie Ricketts – I have a question. If we are worrying about what it is going to look like is there any way you can mock up – just run a piece of PVC pipe behind the I-beam just to see what it looks like? I mean would that help?*
- *Ryan Faulk – I think it would.*
- *Discussion is had on how to make it easy for all commissioners to visualize downspout options. Agreement is made that a round PVC downspout is visually unacceptable.*
- *Tracie Schillace (City Planner) – I do have one question. Did ya’ll talk about where the water is being redirected and the drainage in that area?*
- *Jessica Shirey – We discussed that at our work session and there will be a discussion going to the City about sub-surface drainage.*
- *Tracie Schillace – I just want to make sure it doesn’t pool in that little area. That it goes somewhere and doesn’t just sit there.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I understand that and it could also go back into the building.*
- *Discussion continues on the importance on keeping the water away from the building and that sub-surface drainage is a City responsibility.*
- *Jessica Shirey – The motion is and what I’m reading in the application, we don’t have the material, we have a size but we don’t have what it is in the application.*
- *Charles Borchers – Well it was going to be PVC and there seems to be a preference for a square profile metal downspout.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I move that we accept the application with the provision that the downspout be considered with a four inch square pre-finished metal profile.*
- *Motion to approve the application with provision made by, Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- **Vote:** Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Ryan Faulk (Y)
 - **Motion Approved:** 4-0
- **2 W. Thomas (Downtown Development District) – Signage**
 - *Application presented by: Chelsea Tallo*
 - *Essentially 2 W. Thomas is seeking approval for window signage on the front and back façade. Signage will be made of vinyl with a font that matches the DDD’s brand. The front and back signs will mirror each other.*
 - *Chelsea Tallo – Chelsea Tallo with the DDD, 2 West Thomas Street. I want to point out on this that there is on the application a large white square behind the logo. That’s actually going to be much smaller. He said that in order to see all the colors they will need to put a white backing behind it. So it will be much smaller it won’t*

be a very abrupt little square. It will be about a 1/8" white background. It won't be this large. And the sign that says the "Farmer's Market" that is hanging off the building, it actually says "Farmer's Market and Craft Market" – it is actually incorrect so that will be coming down when we put the Farmer's Market logo on the building.

- *Ryan Faulk – So no more hanging sign to represent the Farmer's Market.*
- *Chelsea Tallo – No.*
- *Chelsea Tallo – We are doing the back of the building and the front of the building. So there's six windows and a door on both sides and it will be mirrored except for where the door is.*
- *Ryan Faulk asks for additional comments from the Commissioners.*
- *Susan Seale – Was it ever considered that all the little signs would have the same background?*
- *Chelsea Tallo – We looked at it but we wanted it to be more of our brand, more of our colors so that is what we went with. I've gone through three different places and gotten a ton of renderings. This was the cheaper one so.*
- *Ryan Faulk – Are there any other applied graphics to the windows right now that are going to be removed?*
- *Chelsea Tallo – Historic District sign. It says that the Historic District is in the DDD and then the old tree logo.*
- *Jessica Shirey – The only thing that we discussed was the hanging sign that is coming down and we're not doing anything with the building sign? That's remaining the same.*
- *Commissioners discuss this is the sign that is attached to the building. Chelsea states that eventually she would like to take it down – the one on the brick will not be touched.*
- *Ryan Faulk calls for public input. None is given.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I move that we accept the application as presented.*
- *Motion to approve the application as presented, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Susan Seale.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Ryan Faulk (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*
- **207 & 211 W. Morris – New Construction**
 - *Application presented by: Tom Pistorius*
 - *Essentially 207 & 211 West Morris are proposing to construct a new apartment complex.*
 - *Tom Pistorius – Good Afternoon I am Tom Pistorius of PA Architects, 109 W. Thomas. I am here representing two separate applications for Mrs. Rownd and Mr. Rossie. For the development of 207 & 211 W. Morris Street.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – Tom, can I interrupt you for just a second? We received a letter by email yesterday asking that we revisit a demolition basically of the buildings.*
 - *Tom Pistorius – Correct. Yeah, so instead of moving the buildings.*

- *Jessica Shirey – The reason why I’m asking is because I am trying to figure out which way to move forward because we shouldn’t be – if they’re requesting this, they should be their own application and we will have to review it again.*
- *Ryan Faulk – For me this is fraught with some complications because this was an application and we denied it, it went to the City Council they reversed it but I don’t know...*
- *Jessica Shirey – Not this one.*
- *Commissioners discuss what application was reversed by the City; the application to demolish the buildings or the application to move the buildings. Commissioners determine the application to move the buildings was reversed by City Council.*
- *Spencer Rossie – The City Council decision was on having the houses moved.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Right, not the demolition.*
- *Spencer Rossie – What we are requesting today is to be able to have the houses dismantled.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Yes so when we left the work shop, it was brought to my attention that there was also an idea to actually have it dismantled which I...*
- *Jessica Shirey – Which is what they (applicants) came to us first.*
- *Jennie Garcia – That was in their January application.*
- *Jessica Shirey – That was the initial application for the whole project.*
- *Tom Pistorius – To have it dismantled?*
- *Ryan Faulk – Yes.*
- *Susan Seale – And take them to Denham Springs.*
- *Tom Pistorius – So this man is coming in and not charging them. It’s a complete adaptive reuse, it’s repurposing a building which to me is very green – but if it has to be a separate application...*
- *Ryan Faulk – This has separate conditions.*
- *Tom Pistorius – We will then revisit it later.*
- *Susan Seale – Isn’t this application contingent upon what’s going to happen to those two houses?*
- *Ryan Faulk – I’ll tell you what. Wait, wait, wait*
- *Jessica Shirey – You even said in the work session at the end of it that those houses are moving to Ponchatoula. Right? That was last Friday and they said yes. So between Friday afternoon and yesterday afternoon there was a change of plans to go back to the original – because this is the original guy, this is not a new thing. This is the original guy that wanted to do this in the first place.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Instead of demolition this was a third option?*
- *Ryan Faulk – Well, hold on. We are getting ahead of ourselves. Our agenda is set. This is not on out – THIS is not on our agenda. Right now we are here to talk about the new work that is proposed. We will have to come back to this and it may be after we do this.*
- *Jessica Shirey – That is why I’m asking if they’re wanting to change it then what’s the point of reviewing this?*
- *Tom Pistorius – Will it change your decision on the development?*
- *Ryan Faulk – It could.*

- *Jessica Shirey – Well if we were, if we go back to this proposal to dismantling then it's a new application. So it does change the whole idea because we denied it in the first place.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Ok, I wasn't a part of that.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I understand that.*
- *Tom Pistorius – It was denied to demo the building.*
- *Jessica Shirey – By the same method. That is demolition if you take something apart.*
- *Ryan Faulk – We went back and forth on this when it was finally brought to us to move it and ultimately we were still fraught with the issue.*
- *Tom Pistorius – So ya'll saw that dismantling to rebuild was a demolition?*
- *Jessica Shirey – It didn't meet the criteria for the buildings to even move in the first place. To be out of the district in the first place. Our decisions were to deny it. That decision was taken to move it – we denied that too. That was appealed by the City Council. City Council inevitably overturned that, so if we are going back to reviewing this then we are going back to square one. And that is why I'm asking if it is going to change.*
- *Spencer Rossie – So we wanted to bring this up and at the quick conversation it seems as if there's a firm stance that the original decision is the same one that you have. With that being said, let's ignore that letter.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Yeah we don't want to stop...*
- *Spencer Rossie – Based on the quick conversation that we had, ignore the letter. We're going to go back to the City Council's decision to have the houses moved and focus on strictly...*
- *Jessica Shirey – That is why I was asking. It's either one direction or the other.*
- *Conversation continues on what should be looked at first.*
- *Susan Seale – You're still willing to have the houses moved to Ponchatoula?*
- *Spencer Rossie – Right. The reason we wanted to do this, Mr. Walter is a great guy. This is a great opportunity for him to be able to build a family house for himself without the expense of material. This is someone that's had some unfortunate situations in his life. This would be an incredible opportunity to help him and his family. Almost a sense of Habitat for Humanity. That was the approach that we would like to see. If that's not the approach you would like to see we want to move on with the application.*
- *Tom Pistorius – I brought it up because as an architect, what a wonderful idea this is. Demolition to me is demolition crushed and moved to a landfill.*
- *Jessica Shirey – We have to label it as something and...*
- *Tom Pistorius – But I think you guys ought to reconsider this. I don't want to do that today, I want to move on.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Well we will reconsider anything with a new application.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Well let's add it to the application today if it will help us.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I wouldn't be willing to make that decision today.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Ok let's table it. The houses will be moved but I'd like to potentially come back with a new application and have you guys reconsider it. I think it's an*

opportunity to just suggest it. Instead of demolition it's going to be reused and it's going to be brand new.

- *Susan Seale – You didn't go through the steps that we went through in order to determine the historic value of that to our District.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Did he give any kind of description or spec of...*
- *Susan Seale – It doesn't matter (inaudible). You did not, you were not privy...*
- *Jessica Shirey – Those houses should not be moved from the District.*
- *Susan Seale – You were not privy to all the steps we went through to prove they were significant architectural fabric in our landscape. And we went through all of that and it was all proved that they were significant American Small Houses. You missed all of that. So that's why we didn't want them taken apart and gone to Denham Springs. It would be nice for that man to have a nice house but they came to the agreement that they would move – they had the guy who came and said we could move them to Ponchatoula, it would go to a little village, and they would remain in Tangipahoa Parishes landscape.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Correct.*
- *Susan Seale – So there was a lot of steps prior to that.*
- *Jessica Shirey – It's not about denying the poor man a house. That's not it.*
- *Spencer Rossie – The first thing, we are still going to have the houses moved. If there's a decision made we want to pursue dismantling them. Before that's done we will submit an application.*
- *Jessica Shirey – So just to be clear if that goes, we go back to square one and we will have to re-review everything. And if that were to be denied then the project gets denied.*
- *Spencer Rossie – Ok.*
- *Jessica Shirey – I'm just clarifying. Is that correct?*
- *Spencer Rossie – Let's address that when the application is submitted. Until the application is submitted...*
- *Tom Pistorius – I know where this is going. Look we're here to talk about a new development.*
- *Commissioners agree that's why the applicant is there today.*
- *Tom Pistorius – So we have a new development, nothing has changed since the work shop. There's eight separate units, apartment units – they're loft style, two-story. The two will be on each lot so the center lot down the center will be a two hour party wall. And so that's why we have two separate applications. Architecturally I know you guys have the same renderings that I have but the idea was to kind of fit in with the context of the adjacent properties and pull in the old historic brick from the old Hammond Junior High and kind of match the mass and void of some of the massing of the City Hall, the police station across the street.*
- *Jessica Shirey asks is a rendering from the east side was submitted since this was a request made at the work session. This rendering was submitted and distributed to all Commissioners. Tom describes how the building fits into the space. Commissioners discuss the Cow Oak in the back and it is discussed that the applicant is going to try to keep the tree but it is contingent on whether or not the*

City will approve open lime stone pavement. Commissioners confirm that materials for new development will come back on a separate application. Commissioners state that they do not want the tree removed before anything is approved.

- *Tom Pistorius – Yeah cause we will need to go into the actual construction drawings now and do the sewerage and drainage plan – we need to shoot some topo’s and elevations in there to see how we can go up over the roots and how we will address that.*
- *Commissioners state that today is just approve the concept. Tom agrees that it is the concept and the design.*
- *Jessica Shirey – No ground will break until we get the final...*
- *Tom Pistorius – Yeah we will get ya’ll the final drawings.*
- *Jessica Shirey – Just for clarification.*
- *Tom Pistorius – Just like we did for the pavilion, we will come back with that. We need time to select the proper red color scheme and all of that. This is just our initial schematic design.*
- *Ryan Faulk asks if any other Commissioners have additional questions. Calls for public input. None is given.*
- *Ryan Faulk – I will move that we accept the application as amended for the approval of the design of this project with the understanding that a subsequent application will be coming for materials in consideration for the drive...*
- *Tom Pistorius – And really for the final drawings.*
- *Commissioners agree to Tom’s statement.*
- *Ryan Faulk – for final drawings for the project before construction begins.*
- *Motion to approve the application as amended, by Ryan Faulk. Second by Jessica Shirey.*
- *Vote: Jessica Shirey (Y), Susan Seale (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Ryan Faulk (Y)*
 - *Motion Approved: 4-0*

- **Updates From Director:**

- Banners – One banner at Fifths for an August 17th event; should be coming down soon.

- **Demolition By Neglect**

- The Stassi Building – photos were put on the Google Drive for Commissioners to view
- A Blue Bench outside Samurai Ramen – 111 East Morris
 - Says Under the Lake Seafood Bar and Grill
 - Skirting around requirements for signage
 - Bobby Mitchell from City has been notified to take a look; letter will be sent regarding signage
- Susan’s General Store
 - Signage is in disrepair; letter will be sent

- **Hammond Florist**
 - Repainted front façade yellow; COA issued for in-kind repair since building was once yellow many years ago.

- **Map Outside DDD & Train Depot**
 - Chelsea Tallo was supposed to stay to let Commissioners know about map update.
 - Drawings have not been submitted yet.
 - Maps are in disrepair.
 - Trying to get this updated in time for Downtown Destination Conference

- **Budget**
 - Good Standing

- **Public Input**
 - *Melanie Ricketts – I might as well round it out since I am still here. I thank ya’ll for being here and I think if anybody knows how hard ya’ll work – I am one of those people. So I know how this has been difficult since there’s been a lot of complicated issues. Just housekeeping, and Lacy I am very glad you are here to hear this, it’s very hard to hear back there. Now this is all a reflection from being on that side instead of this side. It’s really hard to hear in the audience and sometimes applicants here so you might want to consider turning on the microphones. Also, if there, Lacy I don’t know but other places where there are meetings and drawings and stuff there’s like an overhead projector or something but where people could...*
 - *Lacy Landrum – We could do that. We could pull out the computer and project it right there.*
 - *Jessica Shirey – I think that’s a good idea so that everybody can understand.*
 - *Melanie Ricketts – I think it would also make it more inclusive for the people that are here so they can know what you are talking about and what you are doing and it’s not arbitrary and capricious. And again I appreciate everything that you do and I know it’s not good form for me to be here because when you give up that position you are supposed to leave town and join the witness protection program but I still live here and the things that ya’ll get to determine are still very important to me. I hope that ya’ll understand that it is out of respect and honor and not arbitrary.*

- **Adjournment:**
 - Motion to Adjourn by Ryan Faulk and seconded by Marguerite Walter.
 - Vote: Ryan Faulk (Y), Jessica Shirey (Y), Marguerite Walter (Y), and Susan Seale (Y).
 - Motion Approved: 4-0