

**MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**July 11, 2007
reconvened to July 18, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika, Vice-Chairman John F. Golumb; Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, City Council Representative Edward Reynolds, and Planning Board Representative Jerry Hejtmanek

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elena Maltese

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Approval of minutes – June 13, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

B) Request for one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 92 Pleasant Street – submitted by Deborah Phillips, owner

Mr. Hejtmanek made a motion to grant the extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for one year. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golumb. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Calvin L. Wels and Jane M. Vacante, owners**, for property located at **291 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 24 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Calvin Wels, owner, spoke to the petition. He stated that he would like to replace the existing windows with double glazed windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Wels to explain the problem with the flanking windows. Mr. Wels replied that Andersen does not make double hung flanker windows. He continued to say that Trim line would be able to make them so they are proposing to use that manufacturer for those particular windows. Mr. Wels added that the Andersen screens would be made of stainless steel while the Trim line screens would be a standard screen.

Ms. Kozak asked about the two different color proposals. Mr. Wels explained that the colors proposed, sandstone and beige, was as close a match as they could get.

Chairman Dika asked how many windows would be replaced. Mr. Wels replied thirty one. She asked how many windows would be the Trim line brand. Mr. Wels replied that it would be eight windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be touching the casings. Mr. Wels replied no.

Councilor Reynolds commented that the color differential should not be a problem since the windows would be separated enough from each other as to not be noticed.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. Chairman Dika asked if there was discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the applicant was not changing anything on the exterior and that he felt the proposal was very appropriate for the house.

There being no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

2. Petition of **Donald Koleman and Joanna Brode, owners**, for property located at **122 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install steel chimney cap) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 23 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Donald Koleman and Ms. Joanna Brode were in attendance to speak to the application. Mr. Koleman explained that he had a chimney cap fabricated out of sixteen gage epoxy coated sheet metal with expanded steel mesh in light gray color to replicate the color of bluestone. He said that they had explored the possibility of using bluestone, but found that it was not only impractical, but dangerous as well. Because of the largeness of the chimney, a bluestone chimney cap would weigh approximately 1,600 and 2,000 pounds. They thought it would be too much weight for the chimney and roof and would be difficult to get it up on the roof. Mr. Koleman said that they had an adult seagull that came down through the chimney and into their dining room.

Mr. Koleman included in his packet to the Commissioners sixty five photos of metal chimney caps on homes inside and outside the Historic District. He said that he felt that his was a good design and a good alternative. He felt it was in keeping with the Historic District.

Mr. Koleman pointed out that this was a decision made out of necessity. The amount of rain that they have had this spring resulted in leaking.

He shared with the Commission that in 1997, the Portsmouth Advocates gave Mr. Koleman and Ms. Brode the residential award for excellent renovation of 122 Mechanic Street.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked how long they were without the cap before they installed this one. Mr. Wels said that last fall and this spring they were getting water into the residence. The house has had a new roof and the chimney repointed.

Chairman Dika explained that there are many residents who do not know that they need to come before the Commission for approval to install a chimney cap. She mentioned that many of the pictures that Mr. Wels submitted were chimney caps that had not been approved.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. David Adams of 210 Gates Street spoke in opposition to the application. He said that he was not pleased to see metal chimney caps in the Historic District. He saw it as a failure of the city and the Historic District Commission to allow these things to happen. He wondered if contractors were not apprised of the rule or that they just did not care. Mr. Adams continued to say that he did not see metal caps as a historic solution to the problem. He agreed that Mr. Koleman was correct about the weight of the bluestone but he pointed out that the Masonic Temple has four bluestone chimney caps on them. It is a very old building but it handles the weight. He felt that metal caps detract from the historic nature of chimney and to approve this application was to move toward a metal sort of decay.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone else from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one else rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that he would not be supporting the motion because he thought the opening was very large and a stone cap would be more appropriate. He felt that a steel cap would detract from the historic nature of the chimney.

Mr. Wyckoff said that from the applicant's photograph, the steel cap seemed to blend in quite well. He pointed out that many of the caps in the photos that Mr. Koleman submitted were pre-made caps. He felt that if they turned down this cap, they would have to go after all of the people in the submitted photos and that was impractical. He did not feel that this particular cap would detract from the historic area.

Mr. Katz did not think that the historic nature or the quality of life in the city would be affected with the approval of the steel chimney cap. He said that he did not see a solution to rodents and

birds with a bluestone cap. He would prefer to see a bluestone chimney cap but he felt that the applicant had presented good enough reasons to approve the application. Mr. Katz pointed out that the Commissioners are not curators. He felt that the impact was negligible.

Councilor Reynolds stated that he was in agreement with Mr. Katz and Mr. Wyckoff. He said that he appreciated the comments of Mr. Adams. He added that he would find it difficult to turn the applicant down. He added that he would like to have a conversation at some point about how the city can deal with chimney caps.

Chairman Dika acknowledged that they did have a problem with chimney caps. She explained that the Commission prefers the stone; however, stone masons prefer the steel cap because the chimneys are more easily serviced and an easier way to protect the chimney.

There being no more discussion, the Chairman called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a vote of 6-1 with Vice Chairman Golumb voting in opposition.

3. Petition of **Forum Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **67 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate kitchen exhaust ventilator) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 53 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Peter Loughlin and Mr. Anders Albertson spoke to the application. Attorney Loughlin explained that there was currently a ventilator on the north side of the building. He pointed out that the current location would soon become a problem when the Martingale is developed. Their proposal was to relocate the ventilator. The blower equipment would be located under the stairs with the 8"-10" exhaust pipe running up the side of the building. He said that the pipe would be painted the same color as the brick.

Mr. Albertson explained that the exhaust pipe would be mounted right up against the building. He said that the current ventilator is located 10 feet away from the building projecting onto the Martingale property.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if there would be screening. Mr. Albertson said that he did not think that the looks of it would be too much of an issue to require screening.

Mr. Albertson said that at some point, the river walk would be going through and he did not want the exhaust pipe to interfere with pedestrians on the stairway.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be grease coming out of the pipe. Mr. Albertson replied that all of the grease would accumulate in the machinery located under the stairs. He explained that all of the restaurants are required to have their systems cleaned regularly.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Albertson if he was confident that the pipe would hold paint. Mr. Albertson replied that they were planning to use a heavy gage pipe that would accept paint.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Reynolds made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Katz stated that he saw minimal impact for passersby. He did not see it as posing a great threat to the historical heritage of the city.

Chairman Dika added that it just might be an improvement.

There being no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Blair W. and Janet B. McCracken, owners**, for property located at **212 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (revise north wall height, reduce garage door height, revise garage door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 26 and lies in the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano, architect for the project, and Blair and Janet McCracken, owners, were present to speak to the application.

Ms. DeStefano stated that she was called to the site by the owners when they realized that there were issues that were contradictory to their HDC approval. She determined that in order to get positive drainage, the slab of the garage got raised higher than what their assumptions were when they got their approvals. She reminded the Commission that their original concept for the garage was taken as to how it would relate to a three car garage on an abutter's property. They were looking to carry across eave and ridge lines to match the abutter's garage lines. She said that in order to get the positive drainage away from the site, it was difficult to meet the HDC approvals, specifically at the height of the north front wall. Ms. DeStefano explained that what they were presenting tonight was the same wall height, door size, and door proportion as the abutter's garage. She added that they would be following the same roof pitch and eave details. She also stated that they would now be able to match the garage door with the abutting garage doors.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Hejtmanek made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golumb.

Mr. Hejtmanek stated that he felt the garage door matching the abutter's garage doors would look better. He felt that the changes were modest. Vice Chairman Golumb agreed.

Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to approved the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

5. Petition of **Nancy Grigor, owner, and Ralph DeMarco, applicant**, for property located at **16 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow signage (install projecting sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 37 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Ralph DeMarco, applicant, and Attorney Bernard Pelech spoke to the application. He stated that they recently received Board of Adjustment approval to hang a projecting sign. Attorney Pelech showed the sign to the Commission.

Mr. Clum stated that the Commission probably recognized that not a lot of signs come before the Commission; however, the Board of Adjustment remanded the application to the HDC for final consideration.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if the sign would be mounted to the side of the building and if so, where would it be located. Mr. DeMarco replied yes, and explained where it would be placed.

Mr. DeMarco pointed out that River Run Bookstore also received Board of Adjustment approval and they would be coming before the HDC at a later date.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Golumb made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Reynolds. There was no discussion.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

6. Petition of **Kelly W. Warren Revocable Trust, Michael J. and Martha A. Mulhern, owners, and Scott C. Warren, applicant**, for property located at **132 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows and doors, replace fence and front stairs with black iron railing and granite stone) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 6 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Scott Warren spoke to the application. He stated that the building needed a facelift. He was proposing to replace windows and doors and replace the wooden fence with a granite stone wall and black iron railing. He was also proposing to replace the front steps with granite and an iron hand rail. The replacement windows would be a 6 over 1 configuration. The doors would have a single glass pane.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if he would be placing the new windows in the existing openings. Mr. Warren replied yes.

Chairman Dika pointed out that there was not much in the way of sills in the building. Mr. Warren agreed and said they were about two inches.

Chairman Dika asked if the door on the second floor would be replaced. Mr. Warren replied no, that he had replaced that door in 1996.

Mr. Katz shared with the Commission a book that showed the same door design that the applicant was proposing and stated that the door was a typical design of that era.

Mr. Warren explained that the area has a lot of brick and granite. He said they would like to do something more permanent for fencing. They are proposing a granite wall that would measure 50” and taper down to 34” with a black iron fencing on top of it.

Chairman Dika stated that they would need a picture of the wall and the rail. Vice Chairman Golumb said that a drawing of how the fence will sit on the property would be helpful also. Mr. Wyckoff added that they would need more details

Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the fence and steps proposal be removed until further details could be submitted. Mr. Warren replied that he was agreeable to that.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented with the removal of the granite wall, granite steps, iron rail, and iron hand rail from the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. There was no discussion.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the removal of the granite wall, granite steps, iron rail, and iron hand rail from the application passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

7. Petition of **Temple Israel, owner**, for property located at **200 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (addition of landing, stairs, and handicapped ramp) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 65, 66, and 75 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Tom Emerson, architect for the project, spoke to the application. He stated that the current approved design has created an angle to the parking lot that is too steep for some of the parishioners to negotiate. He said that they would like to add three steps, a landing, and provide a handicapped ramp as a solution to the situation. He added that the landing would be made of concrete and that the handrails would be made of black steel.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. There was no discussion.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

8. Petition of **Michael J. Lacroix, owner**, for property located at **145 High Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (change window manufacturer) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 19 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Michael Lacroix was present to speak to the application. He stated that about a year ago, he received approval for Green Mountain windows. He would now like to change to a local window supplier and use Andersen, in particular, the Andersen 400 series window. He added that the windows would be exactly the same, just the manufacturer would change.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be simulated divided light. Mr. Lacroix replied yes.

Chairman Dika asked about the grill. Mr. Lacroix said they would be the same grill approved with the original application.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that there was no change from the plans from last year except for the manufacturer.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

9. Petition of **68 State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **68 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (minor adjustment to building footprint, relocate various window and door openings, enlarge carriage door opening and window bay above) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 13 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Dika stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote. Vice Chairman Golumb facilitated the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey spoke to the application. She explained that the proposed changes were in response to a building use change. She pointed out that the adjustment to the footprint was on the Court Street side. The changes to the State Street elevation affected the lobby, which would now be the main entrance to the condominiums along with two retail spaces.

Vice Chairman Golumb commented that the change balanced that side of the building.

Ms. Ramsey stated that on the Court Street side they were proposing to enlarge the garage door and the bay window above it. They have also adjusted the window sizes on the first, second, and third floors. She added that the changes to the courtyard elevation were to replace some of the arched doors with arched windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked for clarifications of the doors on the front elevation. He noted that the proposed awnings were removed.

Ms. Kozak asked about the dormers on page 6. She said that the new dormer over the garage door was of a different proportion from what was originally submitted and it was different from all of the other dormers. Ms. Ramsey explained that it was plan driven.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that he was uncomfortable with garage door and the dormers. He felt that it was overpowering that side of the elevation. He wondered if there was a way to split the mass of the garage door. Ms. Ramsey replied that the Technical Advisory Committee and the Planning Department were pushing for the larger door for the safety of cars exiting off of Court Street.

Mr. Katz stated that this was a situation where elevations lead them astray. He pointed out that the structure was 17 feet back from Court Street and so he did not think it would be as obtrusive as the plans would suggest.

Mr. Wyckoff felt that Vice Chairman Golumb had a legitimate point about the size of the garage door. Ms. Ramsey replied that it would be a custom built door so they can work with the manufacturer to break down the scale of it. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there had to be a door there. Ms. Ramsey replied yes, that it was for vehicular access.

Ms. Ramsey offered to remove the garage door from the application and come back at a later time with an alternative.

Mr. Clum asked how one gets to the garage doors. Ms. Ramsey said that off of Court Street, the garage is on the setback ell of the building. She pointed out that the page 12 elevation was a view from inside the garage.

Mr. Clum asked if the 58 State Street and the 68 State Street front facades would line up. Ms. Ramsey replied yes. He also asked if the two buildings on their common property line would line up. Ms. Ramsey replied yes.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, he asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. David Adams of 210 Gate Street spoke to the application. He said that what had started out as a large single car garage door has now grown to be as wide as the ell itself. He added that he felt that the current proposal would have a significant impact on the community and that it did not reflect the sensitivity that the rest of this project has been brought to the Commission with.

Mr. Clum stated that the size of the garage doors was being driven by the city's Traffic and Safety Committee. Ms. Ramsey replied that was correct.

Mr. Wyckoff wondered if it would be possible to redesign the garage door and the arched roof over the door. He added that redesigning the arch over the door would mean reworking the bay. Mr. Wyckoff asked how far out the roof and the bay projected. Ms. Ramsey said that the roof was a 2 foot projection and the bay was 1 foot 6 inch projection.

Mr. Katz said this was a result of circumstances beyond the applicant's control, but that reworking it might be helpful.

Ms. Kozak suggested that the applicant look at the roof and the door design as two different elements to reduce the scale. Councilor Raynolds agreed and thought they could make it look like two garage doors.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if there was anyone else from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as presented with the removal of the garage door and the bay window above from the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. There was no discussion.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the removal of the garage door and the bay window above from the application passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

Ms. Kozak recused herself from the discussion.

A) Work Session requested by the **M.H. Wentworth Home for the Chronic Invalids, owner**, for property located at **346 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (extensive correctional work, adjustments to the façade). Said property is located on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Mr. Todd Hanson, architect, spoke to the project. He stated that because of the existing conditions that they found, they have removed the brick and are proposing a different cladding system. He said that at the last work session, clapboards were proposed, and there were some concerns expressed about the use of the clapboards.

Mr. Hanson explained that they have changed the scale of the materials on the lower level. They are proposing to use hardiplank with a 4" reveal. They are also proposing to use a plank system

around the window areas. He shared with the Commission some information about the plank system. He added that they are looking to use a beige color instead of white which was originally proposed.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was uncomfortable with the height of the demarcation point for the material change between the first and second floors. He did not like the idea that it was put right at the sill line. He thought it looked awkward. Mr. Hanson said that it was a very prominent line on the mansion so they used that as the guide. Mr. Wyckoff said he could understand their justification for using that point but the grade drops down and everything drops down from Pleasant Street and still maintaining that height looks awkward. He said that he would put it between the first and second story window.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why they were maintaining the opening from the bricks. Mr. Todd replied because that structure was in place. There are window lintels in every one of the window openings. Mr. Katz said he understood what Mr. Wyckoff was saying but there are cost considerations with the scope of the project. He asked if the windows were so egregious that the applicant should incur greater costs.

Mr. Hanson explained that this was a re-cladding and re-windowing of an existing building. Mr. Bob Iafolla also pointed out that they already have the windows that were approved by the HDC with the first approval.

There was extensive discussion as to where the demarcation point should be.

Mr. David Adams of 210 Gates Street asked to speak to the topic. He said that Mr. Wyckoff point was well taken. He explained that with Queen Anne architecture, you see the demarcation line at the head of the windows.

Mr. Hanson said that he was agreeable to dropping down the demarcation point.

There was discussion among the Commission concerning the detailing that would accompany the demarcation line.

Mr. Iafolla expressed a desire to have some sort of consensus before they leave. Mr. Katz said that he liked the direction that they were going. He felt three stories of clapboards were too much and he felt that their proposal had real possibilities.

Chairman Dika said that she liked the paneling better than the clapboarding.

Councilor Raynolds stated that he liked the detail on the top and the vertical separation.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he would keep an open mind.

Vice Chairman Golumb said that he agreed with Mr. Katz and felt that they were heading in the right direction.

Mr. Hanson said that given the feedback that they have received, he felt confident that they could respond.

Mr. Adams asked that if there were going to be more work sessions at next week's meeting, then perhaps the applicant could come back and show his changes. Chairman Dika advised the applicant to speak with the Planning Department about the possibility.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission Meeting on August 1, 2007.