DANVILLE
RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN
COMMISSION

POST OFFICE BOX 3300

DANVILLE, VIRGINIA

(434) 799-5260

FEBRUARY 11, 2016
4:00 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
AGENDA

I. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. OLD ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 3 ft x 2 ft metal projection sign at 508 Spring Street

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 12, 2015

V. OTHER BUSINESS

VI. ADJOURNMENT

DANVILLE
RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

POST OFFICE BOX 3300

DANVILLE, VIRGINIA

(434) 799-5260

MEETING OF FEBRUARY 11, 2016

SUBJECT

508 Spring Street

A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 508 Spring Street to add a 3ft x 2ft metal projecting sign.

EXCERPT FROM DESIGN GUIDELINES

Section 7.2.2.f Projecting signs between the first and second floors

> These signs can add great visual interest to the streetscape. Their size is limited to 4 square feet per side, or 8 square feet total for a two-sided sign. This does not include the bracket. They should project no more than 4.5 feet from the building, and the bottom of the sign may be no lower than 10' from the sidewalk. Only one such sign is permitted per business. These signs may not include neon or internal illumination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request to hang a metal projecting sign at 508 Spring Street. Staff recommends limiting the size of the sign to 2ft x 2ft so that it meets the 8 square feet total recommended by the River District Design Guidelines.

DANVILLE
RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN
COMMISSION

POST OFFICE BOX 3300

DANVILLE, VIRGINIA

(434) 799-5260

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

The guidelines will be administered through the River District Design Commission (RDDC) appointed by City Council. This Commission will review any changes to buildings or sites within the District and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) if the changes meet the guidelines. Work on buildings and sites within the District cannot commence until a COA has been issued and other required permits and approvals have been obtained (see Section 1.2 for information on the Commission and Section 1.5 for more information on the process).

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY APPLICANT

Important-Please read before completing application

a) All questions on this application must be fully answered
b) The application must be signed by the property owners or representative with written authorization by the owner
c) A drawing, photo, plan or sketch of proposed project with dimensions

Property Location: 508 Spring Street, Danville, Va. 24541

Name of Applicant: Wilbert Jeffries

Applicant's Address: 1089 Graves Rd. Reidsville, NC. 27320

Applicant's Phone Number: 434-713-5582 Email Address: Wilbertj61gmail.com

Work Proposed (please circle one): Alteration/addition/rehabilitation/new construction/sign

_____

_____

_____

Type of material(s) to be used: _____

Have you read and understand the Design Guidelines for the River District of Danville, Virginia? _____

Are you aware of the federal/state tax credits for potential reimbursement/credit of money used during substantial rehabilitation projects? NO

Would you like more information about these programs? yes

Which one(s)? federal/ state tax credits, reimbursement/credit of money

Wilbert A Zaffuer

Signature of Property Owner (if not applicant)

_____

Signature of Applicant

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY PLANNING DIVISION

Application Number: _____

RDDC Date: _____

Date submitted: _____

Received by: _____

Tax Map Number: _____

Zoning District: _____

Additional Zoning Information: _____

_____

All buildings, structures or improvements located in the River District and visible from a public right-of-way shall not be located, constructed, reconstructed, altered, or repaired unless a Certificate of Appropriateness has been issued by the River District Design Commission. The Commission meets once a month on the second Thursday of the month at 4:00P.M. in the fourth floor City Council Conference Room located in the Municipal Building. All questions or applications should be submitted to the Planning Division, located on the second floor of the Municipal Building, 427 Patton Street, Room 207, Danville, VA 24541; (434)-799-5260.

NATURE MAN.

SEAFOOD

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

January 14, 2016

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff
Peyton Keesee	R.J. Lackey	Ken Gillie
George Davis		Tracie Lancaster
Sheri Chaney (entered at 4:23 pm)		Clarke Whitfield
John Ranson		
Courtney Nicholas		
Justin Ferrell		

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

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Whitfield called for nominations for Chairman.

Mr. Keesee nominated Mr. Davis as Chairman. The nomination was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Whitfield called for nominations for Vice Chairman.

Mr. Davis nominated Mr. Keesee as Vice Chairman. The nomination was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Whitfield called for nominations for Secretary.

Mr. Keesee nominated Mrs. Chaney for Secretary. The nomination was approved by a 5-0 vote.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove razor wire from the fence surrounding the former Durham Hosiery Building, 523-525 Lynn Street.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Laura Ashworth is present on behalf of this request from the Economic Development Division.

Mrs. Ashworth stated I am here to represent Corrie Teague. We want to have it removed and the only thing that would remain would be the barbed wire and the chain link fence until further development.

Mrs. Nicholas asked what is the difference between razor wire and barbed wire?

Mrs. Ashworth stated I believe the razor wire has sharp edges.

Mr. Whitfield stated razor wire has sharp edges and it is round.

Mr. Davis stated it has sharp edges all the way around.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so we are taking off the round wire but leaving the straight?

Mrs. Ashworth stated yes it will make it look a little bit more attractive.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

2. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 401 Patton Street to replace the roof of the original 1972 courthouse. The roof replacement will require several overflow scuppers to be added as well as metal coping that will be visible from Loyal, Court, and Lynn Streets. A request to replace the wooden entry doors at the 1997 courthouse addition with wooden doors containing clear glass view panels is also included.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request is Mike Burton from the Public Works Department and Alan Burchett from Dewberry Design.

Mr. Burton stated we come before you once again for a roof replacement on the court house. The same situation as before with the scuppers we are adding insulation so it will require the overflow scuppers to be raised and added to meet code. There are a couple of items with this building moving the scuppers and adding metal coping to cap off the wall on the roof. Also, the entry doors for the court house the Sheriff brought to our attention the safety issue with those solid doors in the main entrance and exit of the building. There have been some close calls, People coming out of the building at the same time that someone is coming in nobody can see either way coming in or out. There have been some close calls as far as people getting hit by the door. The Sheriff is

here and can speak about his experience. Also, I have Alan Burchett with Dewberry design who is doing the roof for us so he can go a little bit more into detail about the scuppers and coping.

Mr. Burchett stated the scuppers will be the same thing that you approved on the Municipal building. The coping that Mike mentioned will probably match the color with the glass panels so that you don't see them.

Mr. Ranson stated the roof doesn't currently have a coping?

Mr. Burchett stated it doesn't right now.

Mr. Ranson stated why are we adding one?

Mr. Burchett stated it was back when we used to be able to come up and terminate the bar on top of the coping and that's not approved anymore. Even though it worked on this building when we did it 25 years ago, it's not approved anymore. They must have had a lot of problems with that bar coming loose. So now we have to put a metal coping on it. It will match the previous as much as possible.

Mr. Davis stated I have a question about the doors. Is it absolutely necessary to have clear glass? I mean couldn't opaque do just the same by showing that another person is coming in. I mean it just looks like the clear glass panels would take so much away from the door themselves.

Mr. Burchett stated I think the deputies want to be able to see who is entering prior to getting to the door and the other part of the project is that we are involved in would be going inside and doing interior vestibules. They want to be able to see who is coming in prior to getting to that interior vestibule.

Sheriff Mondul stated there are two primary issues visibility being the big one from a safety and security standpoint. The security aspect of it would be our deputies. It is their job to guard the courthouse and to be effective in guarding the courthouse they need to be able to see. If you are familiar with the courthouse there are several windows but there is a great big blind spot right in front. We do have a camera but it is a very detached view of the plaza area. There is a brick column and you can't see anything either on the camera or through the doors as you note they are solid oak doors. I'm not opposed to having something that you can see through as opposed to clear. The big thing is that they can see someone that is "A" going to cause them some kind of harm to the public or to the deputy. As Mr. Burton mentioned from a public standpoint everyday there are a lot of close calls. Last week we had a woman get whacked in the back by somebody leaving the courthouse in not such a good frame of mind because of something that happened in one of the court rooms and she complained of injury and

the possibility of a lawsuit. As I see it's just a matter of time before someone gets seriously injured. We have had three or four cases in my tenure as Sheriff, which is six years now, where someone has been seriously struck. It's just one of these accidents wanting to happen. The visibility in whatever capacity that the River District Committee approves is going to be an enhancement over what we currently have. I'm not a structural expert or anything but I do know security and you have no visibility there in the front and this would be an enhancement over what we currently have which is none. You can't see through those doors at all.

Mr. Ranson stated what you are doing is taking the six panel door and replacing with glass?

Mr. Burchett stated yes.

Mr. Ranson stated I think I understand the reason for that but wouldn't it be just as easy to have a half glass door with some panels below?

Mr. Burchett stated whatever you all approve.

Mr. Ranson stated that to me would be more normal thing in this situation rather than just replacing the panels with glass.

Mr. Burchett stated you can do any design that you want.

Mr. Davis stated Sheriff do you ever see us getting to the point where you would have solid glass doors all together with a lock that would open them up from the inside? I mean is this just a temporary fix to where you are going to have something later on where you are going to want something more secure and more visible than what you are proposing here?

Mr. Burchett stated this is intended as a permanent fix.

Mr. Mondul stated it is. I think we were trying to be respectful of the integrity of the original construction by modifying. The doors are very handsome they are just not functional from a practical standpoint. However, from a security standpoint I'm not opposed to those that have pretty thick glass that you are talking about. From a security standpoint it doesn't pose an additional threat because we have windows in the building already so from a break in standpoint; which I don't know who would break in the courthouse but our criminals aren't on the intellectual side. Again, this is a visibility issue, the solid glass I don't know how the construction experts feel about that. But, from a security standpoint the more visible the better off. Banks have them and I'm not opposed to that. I don't know how Mike and Alan feel about it.

Mr. Davis stated don't get me wrong I love wood doors. Especially ones like this but it just seems like to me this is just a pre-requisition to something else that is going to be coming down the road. I think security is the main issue as far as the courthouse is concerned in my opinion.

Mr. Burchett stated its visibility so that the deputies can see who is entering the building.

Mr. Mondul stated yeah it's a twofold issue security of the deputies and enhancing their responsibility of protecting the court house. If they can't see oncoming threats it's hard for them to protect the court house. Then from a day to day type of stand point you have the traffic and it's a lot of foot traffic that comes in and out. We have upwards of 200 people coming in, in an hour sometimes when we have jury cases. There is a lot of in and out traffic that you can't see what's on the other side of the door.

Mr. Ranson stated the door is always unlocked right?

Mr. Mondul stated not after 5 it isn't.

Mr. Ranson stated what I mean is during normal business hours. So even if it were a bullet resistant type door its open they can come in. I think it's more important. I see what you are saying but to me if the doors are going to be unlocked it really don't matter what kind of door it is.

Mr. Davis stated but it could be locked. You could make them locked doors and have the deputies unlock them or push a button or whatever from inside.

Mr. Burchett stated that wasn't part of the project it can be done in the future but we can't change anything.

Mrs. Nicholas stated some cases do go until nine or ten at night though.

Mr. Ranson stated but in that case the door would be locked.

Mrs. Nicholas stated right you wouldn't have people at that time there to unlock the door. So you would want something more durable.

Mr. Burton stated I think we could entertain the idea of half glass with the bottom panels as wood.

Mr. Ranson stated the stuff they used at the Pittsylvania county court house the fiber glass you could put in there. I think you could have panels and still use that but I'm not sure.

Mr. Burchett stated we have looked at the bulletproof glass and the cost was more than what they wanted to spend. We were going to do an alternate to laminate glass but right now it would just be a clear tempered glass.

Mr. Ranson stated they are asking for this and so if they come back in a few years and want to do something more secure we can look at it then. I didn't realize budget was an issue. So I mean I think the half glass would be more appropriate for that exterior type door.

Ms. Sonya Ingram stated I'm with Preservation of Virginia I just wanted to say as far as the doors are concerned that in order to keep it strict to the guidelines as possible that you should keep the door design as close to it is now. I understand the need for security I would agree to the glass but keep as much wood as possible and not change the design of the door. They even ask for that. They are not really asking for full glass.

Mr. Ranson stated it's not exactly a historic building.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ferrell made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-1 vote.

3. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 508 Spring Street to make exterior alterations so that the building may be converted into a seafood market. The request includes putting an addition onto the rear of the building that would have wooden framing and rubber roofing. The request also includes the placement of an exterior walk-in cooler and freezer behind the building and the addition of a 3' x 3' plastic, backlit sign.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf is this request is Mr. Wilber Jeffries.

Mr. Jeffries stated I'm buying this building to open up a fish market to bring fresh fish to Danville. The architect I'm using is getting ready to do the drawing for the building and the guy that is doing the demo has already got a quote for all of that. I'm trying to get everything situated. It will mainly be seafood, fresh fish and crab. The front door will have to change to a bigger door that is handicap accessible.

Mr. Davis stated driving by today I noticed it was a 508 A and 508 B. Will this be occupying both spaces?

Mr. Jeffries stated yes the two buildings together is going to be 508. Also the architect is going to open up the center wall and make it one whole building. So there is going to be an I beam in the top of the building that will be stationary for the fish market.

Mrs. Nicholas stated can you tell us more about the choice to use the backlight plastic sign instead if something that is more recommended in keeping with the district.

Mr. Jeffries stated well the sign haven't changed. I'm thinking about two different signs to put up on the building. I had planned on doing one just mounting it to the building flat but they want to do something so people can see it coming from one side to the other side. It will be a metal sign.

Mr. Ferrell stated so what you are showing us here might not be what actually goes up?

Mr. Jeffries stated its two different pictures that I want to use. One is called Nature Man's Seafood that's the name of the business. That logo is one of the logos that I chose. I have really haven't decided whether that's the one I'm going to use or not.

Mr. Davis stated so what are you bringing forth today proposing that you would like to use or like to see done?

Mr. Jeffries stated nothing is going to be changed. The only thing that will be changed are the front doors are going to have to be changed the one on the left side because they are going to have to be handicap accessible and on the back entrance will have to cut a wall in for the walk-in coolers. Pretty much the outside of the building will pretty much stay the same color. They will be no add-on's or anything like that only where the door will have to be handicap accessible.

Mr. Ranson stated so you are putting in a front door with handicap accessibility? Will the design be the same as the old front door?

Mr. Jeffries stated yes.

Mr. Ranson stated it will just be a different size or something?

Mr. Jeffries stated yes.

Mr. Jeffries stated so people with wheel chairs can come in.

Mr. Ranson stated so in essence it's the same door and design just a bigger door, a wider door.

Mr. Jeffries stated yes.

Mr. Ranson stated I like your sign. So what you are saying is that you're going to have a sign that is on the wall? This won't be the design?

Mrs. Chaney enters at 4:23PM.

Mr. Jeffries stated that might be the design. I might just go ahead and use that design. A lot of people like it.

Mr. Ranson stated I see this as a wall sign but I don't see it as a projecting sign.

Mrs. Chaney stated you see it as a flat sign but not a projecting sign? Not perpendicular to the building.

Mr. Ranson stated yeah.

Mrs. Chaney stated I interpreted from what he sent that it was going to be a flat against the wall sign.

Mr. Jeffries stated I talked to a lady first about having a sign flat against the building.

Mrs. Chaney stated which it can't be according to the rules. A plastic flat back according to the River District guidelines.

Mrs. Nicholas stated you can have flat mounted and potentially lit.

Mrs. Chaney stated like from above.

Mr. Jeffries stated yeah that's what she said.

Mr. Gillie stated you can't have the lights behind it. You can mount the sign flat to the wall and have wash lights. You can't have a square with bulbs behind it and a plastic face like you see in most other shopping centers.

Mrs. Chaney stated so your question was?

Mr. Ranson stated I guess I wanted to say if we approve the sign it would have to be this sign because this is the only thing we have.

Mr. Jeffries stated that will be fine.

Mr. Ranson stated it would have to be a wall sign and not a projecting sign; unless you were going to make this a projecting sign? Can he have both a wall sign and a projecting sign?

Mr. Gillie stated yeah. The code does allow for a wall and a projecting sign.

Mrs. Chaney stated both at the same time?

Mr. Gillie yes.

Mr. Chaney stated or does it restrict them based on square footage?

Mr. Gillie stated there is a square footage limitation. We allow you to kind of break it up.

Mrs. Nicholas stated could you come back to us with a more finalized proposal for the sign? So that we will know because you have said maybe it is going to be projecting maybe it will be a wall sign.

Mr. Jeffries stated the lady I talk to on the first floor she was talking about either put it against the wall and I really didn't want to put it against the wall. I wanted it to stick out. So I ask her how many feet the sign could be. It can be over 3 feet there.

Mr. Ranson stated I understand what you are saying that you want something to stick out.

Mr. Ferrell stated you want something like this?

Mr. Jeffries stated yes that's what I want.

Mr. Ferrell stated so I guess my dilemma is and it goes back to what Courtney was saying earlier. I may be wrong about this, totally wrong, but the integrity of the District when I look at the sign should we be directing him to submit to his final proposal to us; then to keep with the integrity of the district and the river. I'm seeing crab and lobster and I don't know if we have that in the Dan River. Are we supposed to question that?

Mr. Ranson it's his business I understand that's what he is saying.

Mr. Ferrell stated okay I see what you are saying. Okay well the major issue is that we don't know what the final looks like.

Mr. Davis stated that's my question what are bringing to the table today to vote on today?

Mr. Ranson stated the way I see it if we vote on to approve the seafood place then you could come back later for the sign. Does that sound feasible to you?

Mr. Jeffries stated that will be fine.

Mr. Ranson stated that's what I see us doing here today, If you are okay with that?

Mr. Gillie stated we have two requests here. We have the request for the new cooler and addition and the request for the sign. As a Board you have the option to of approving one part and tabling another part for more information. If you deny it he has to reapply and pay another 25 dollar fee.

Mr. Whitfield stated yeah it you table it you will save him a little bit of money.

Mr. Gillie stated you will save him some money that's the only thing. I'm just trying to point out the fact. It's going to take more than thirty days probably to do the addition get the cooler and do the other work so he would have time to come back to you with a completed design.

Mr. Ranson stated so the motion would have to be to approve the cooler and addition.

Mr. Whitfield stated as one motion and then you would do a second motion for the sign. As far as the sign the motion would be to table the sign so it would be two motions.

Mr. Gillie stated if that is the pleasure of the Board just trying to save the gentleman some money.

Mr. Ranson stated well we are all in favor of that.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion to approve the exterior alterations, the addition in the back of the building and the placement of exterior walk-in cooler and freezer. Mr. Ferrell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion to table the sign until the next meeting. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

Mr. Ferrell exited at 4:32PM.

4. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install stainless steel bicycle racks at various locations throughout the city, at least three of which will be within the River District. The installation of the bicycle racks will be funded through a grant received by the City of Danville.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request is Marc Aldeman from the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Aldeman stated we have received a grant from the state that provides federal funding to obtain some bike racks that we would like to install throughout the City. I communicated with Parks and Recreation regarding their preference for bike racks and they recommended a vendor. The top sheet identifies the model we are looking to purchase. The attached Aerial image shows the proposed area for the bike racks. We have a bus stop location at Patton and Craghead where there is a passenger bench and we propose to construct a concrete pad for each one of these sites. That would be approximately 4x5; four inches of concrete. The second location the Union Street bridge

proposed site there are cars there so the top middle of that image I think we can get a pad in there. The idea is to try to improve access for bikers that might want to get to the location there on Union Street Bridge. The final site proposed for the River District would be for the Transfer center which is on the last page on the handout. In the middle of the image right below where it says Spring Street. Currently there are brick chips located in that area and a couple of very small bushes. This pad would be located adjacent to the sidewalk. So at this time our grant is good through this fiscal year. We approved the request of the Board to locate these bike racks in the River District. This is an effort to try and better the connective between bikers and the transit system. We did complete a transit development plan with an consultant and they are recommending that the transit system consider installing bike racks on the buses; which is something we will be looking at very closely over the next couple of years. We have some issues with Walmart going in at Nordan that we want to sort out so that our service schedule can accommodate it. Securing bike racks to buses adds time and our service schedule is link to whether we can accommodate securing bikes to our bike racks with them being attached to the buses. I'm trying to start this process of facilitating bike access and connectively to the transit system.

Mrs. Nicholas stated the site for the Union Street Bridge why is it so far away from the walking trail?

Mr. Adelman stated well I have driven the site several times and I think it's more dangerous as you are going through a curve. I don't think people are anticipating that a vehicle is going to stop in the curve. There is not a lot or area for a car to drive around a bus anywhere on that side. We do have a couple bus stops locations on Union Street Bridge Road that's the issue. I would like to get closer there is more room to develop a site. But I think it could be dangerous.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so it's based on the buses rather than just an individual bicycle?

Mr. Adelman stated correct.

Mrs. Chaney stated in association with the bus you may put a bus stop there later to accommodate the times or just for a bus in general to stop?

Mr. Adelman stated we would establish a bus stop at all these sites that we proposed a bike rack. In this case there is not bus stop there. So we this would be a new bus stop for Patton and Craghead.

Mrs. Chaney stated how does the car dealership feel about having that there?

Mr. Adelman stated I haven't asked them. This is in the right away. That is something we would consider getting their input before we do this and if we have any problems

and they are not supportive we won't do it. We would just limit it to these two bike racks but I wanted to first get your input and then go to Mr. Woodall.

Mr. Keesee stated how many loops per bike rack?

Mr. Adelman stated this is a one loop and it supports three bikes.

Mr. Keesee stated that's it?

Mr. Adelman stated yeah. This bike rack right here if you order this online is 450 dollars without stainless steel and without shipping. So you are looking at approximately 600 dollars after we bid this out for a bike rack. I really don't anticipate a great deal of use. So going up to the 600 or 700 dollar bike rack I don't think would be as financially prudent.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

5. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 30" x 14" wall mounted sign at 530 Main Street.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson stated I'm really impartial to this type of sign but it looks like it's going to be flopping around because it has no connection at the bottom. Is it made out of wood?

Mrs. Chaney stated it says two wall brackets.

Mr. Ranson stated I see it does say two wall brackets. Well if you look at the picture you can see the brackets. I just didn't look hard enough.

Mrs. Chaney stated I think the second picture is the current sign now.

Mr. Keesee stated if that is the sign that's not where the business is.

Mr. Whitfield stated I think there is a note that states that the way the picture was done it is on the wrong business.

Mrs. Nicholas stated it says in the email it will not be a hanging sign.

Mr. Gillie stated do you have the email? I just got it to come up.

Mrs. Chaney stated it says please see attached photo and rendering of a new sign I have for the Lavinder Group. It will not be a hanging sign as shown in the mock up and of course it will be installed at the Lavinder's building and not the dance the studio building. It will mount directly to the wall and protrude out in a much smaller and thinner version like the new Dell'annos sign. It is 30" tall by 14" wide and would mount directly to the façade of their offices using two wall brackets.

Mr. Ranson stated thank you. I actually read that when I got the email and just forgot it.

Mrs. Chaney made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The November 12, 2015 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

_____

Approved By: