

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**July 13, 2011
reconvened from on July 6, 2011**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak; City Council Representative Anthony Coviello; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elena Whittaker

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

9. Petition of **Anders E. Albertsen Revocable Trust, Anders E. Albertson, owner and trustee**, for property located at **67 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes to exterior stairway) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 53 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Councilor Coviello recused himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Michael Labrie, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he purchased Mr. Albertsen's share of the property but the City records have not reflected the change in ownership yet. He explained that Mr. Albertsen was involved in the initial design and approval process that came before the Commission relative to this project. Mr. Labrie became involved with the project at the time it was commencing. In executing the project, he thought the materials chosen needed to be upgraded and faced with a winter situation; he did not have time go through the process. So as a result, he was asking the Commission for an after-the-fact approval.

Mr. Labrie explained the modifications to the approval. The side wall materials running adjacent to the stairwell were approved as wood but were changed to red brick and mortar. Also, the wooden decking material was changed to red brick pavers which blended well with the brick sidewalks. The dumpster enclosure extension was increased by five feet so that it would hold two dumpsters instead of one. The last modification was to the door that accessed a utility room.

It was changed to a solid door with louvers. He explained that the door needed the ventilation to accommodate the equipment inside.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant did a good job of explaining himself. He said it was not often that they have applicants admitting errors in a project. He felt the final product was better.

Ms. Kozak asked where the door that was changed was located. Mr. Labrie pointed out the location on the submitted plans.

Mr. Almeida commented that the changes were appropriate. He felt it was all in keeping with the spirit of what the Commission was looking for at this location.

Chairman Dika asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. 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 grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant used better materials and it was very appropriate for the area that it was in.

Chairman Dika added that they did not want to encourage people to do work that has not been approved. In this case, it was clear that the applicant had the spirit of what the Commission would want to see but she cautioned about doing it again.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

10. Petition of **Harris Hanover Street Project, Inc. owner, and Brian Schneider, applicant**, for property located at **55 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 23-6A and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Almeida recused himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Liz McStay, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. She stated that they were seeking permission to place a condensing unit behind the building.

Mr. Melchior asked how the condenser would be mounted. Ms. McStay explained that it could be either mounted to the building or placed on a mounting system. She added that it would be approximately about one foot from the wall.

Mr. Wyckoff had questions as to the exact location for the condenser. Ms. McStay explained where it would be located and pointed out that it would not be seen by passersby.

Chairman Dika asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. 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 Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak.

Vice Chairman Katz noted that the size of the unit was about the size of medium sized suitcase. He wondered if the Commission should explore an exemption for some units that are smaller in size.

Ms. Kozak added that the unit would not be seen at the back of the building behind a fence.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

11. Petition of **Seth F. Peters, owner, and Random Acts of Sweetness, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **112 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install kitchen venting system) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 54 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Tiana Conlon, co-owner of Random Acts of Sweetness, LLC was present to speak to the application. She stated that they were proposing a kitchen ventilation system for their business. She said that the plan was to go through the building with the venting system.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how high the unit would sit off of the roof line. He thought it looked fairly low. Ms. Conlon thought it was about 13 inches high. Mr. Clum said that the curbing alone was 12 inches so at a minimum it would be at least 25 inches high. Because of those figures, he felt the unit was exempt from review.

Ms. Kozak asked where the hood would be located on the roof. Ms. Conlon said it would be located on the right rear of the roof.

Mr. Almeida pointed out that this was a very difficult spot to see so he felt the hood would be hidden. Chairman Dika commented that it was probably visible from the neighbors' yards.

Mr. Clum said that if a unit is not over 48 inches high or 27 cubic feet, then it was exempt. He added that the louvers were also exempt because they did not project out more than 12 inches from the wall plane.

Ms. Kozak applauded the applicant for running the ductwork inside of the building.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

No action was taken because it was determined that the proposal was exempt from HDC review.

12. Petition of **Helen C. Brewster, owner**, for property located at **16 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. changes to windows and door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 11 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Dika pointed out that this property recently changed ownership.

Mr. Paul Burke, of Classic Building and Design was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was representing Peter and Emily Urquhart, the new owners. He explained that the proposal was to renovate the rear of the structure by removing the vinyl siding and replacing several windows with Brosco six over six divided light windows. Mr. Burke gave the Commission a revised plan for their review.

Mr. Burke explained that at a later date, they would remove the rest of the siding and replace the remainder of the windows.

Mr. Almeida commented that the proposal was more than appropriate and it was exciting to see the house finally get the attention it deserved in its location. He also felt the window choice was appropriate.

Mr. Melchior asked what the plan was for the shutters on the front of the house. Mr. Burke said that they were vinyl shutters and that they would be happy to remove them.

Councilor Coviello asked what the trim material would be for the corners. Mr. Burke said that they hoped to find the original trim underneath. The intention was to caulk all of the holes of the original clapboards and repaint it.

Mr. Burke clarified that work would only be done on the back elevation and the ell. No work would be done on the gable sides. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the removal of the outside corner posts. Mr. Burke explained that the only corner that would be one interior corner and one outside corner on the left side of the ell.

Chairman Dika asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. 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. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That approval is given to replace the remaining windows in the structure provided they are the same window (Brosco) with the same specifications.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida stated that the application was very sensitive to the age of the house and the plans were very clear and complete. He was pleased that the Urquharts have come along to give the house the attention it deserved.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

13. Petition of **Theodore M. Stiles and Joan Boyd, owners**, for property located at **28 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace two windows with French doors, reposition one window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 43 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Adam Butler, representing the owners, was present to speak to the application. He stated that they would like to replace two windows with a set of French doors, construct an 8' x 5' low deck that would be 17" off of the grade, and move a window.

Mr. Almeida commented that the application seemed very simple and crystal clear to him. He pointed out that the house has already gone through a renovation and he wondered if the same window specifications would be used. Mr. Butler replied yes.

Councilor Coviello asked about the duct that was located next to the relocated window. Mr. Butler explained that the duct would be removed.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the same casings and mouldings would be used. Mr. Butler replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be any head flashing on top of the door. Mr. Butler said they would use a lead drip cap.

Chairman Dika asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. 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

Ms. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Coviello. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak stated that this was a very simple and modest request and that the changes were in keeping with what was already there. She did not feel it would have a negative impact on the historic fabric of the house or its surroundings.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

V. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct 4 and 5 story mixed use building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Jen Ramsey of Somma Studios was present to speak to the application. She passed out plans and explained that the first sheet showed a wall section indicating the different materials being proposed. She also said that she would like to get the Commission’s thoughts on the proposed landscaping that included structures over 18 inches that would require their review.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the mansard roof continued around the entire building. Ms. Ramsey replied yes but that it was not consistent.
- Ms. Ramsey pointed out a skylight type window that she wanted to get the Commission’s opinion on. Ms. Kozak asked if the skylight window had a screen system. Ms. Ramsey said that there were two screening options. One was a venetian blind and the other was a

roller shade. Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they have seen these skylights installed. Mr. Almeida said that he has seen them in Boston. Mr. Almeida asked Ms. Ramsey if they were custom made for the roof pitch. Ms. Ramsey said it was her understanding that there were certain pitches that would work with this style.

- Mr. Almeida asked if they had considered a balcony. Ms. Ramsey said that they could do one but she thought it might look very busy.
- Ms. Kozak asked if the skylight window, when opened, would project out past the balcony below or beyond the parapet below. Ms. Ramsey replied no.
- Mr. Wyckoff felt that the mansard roof should have more pitch to it.
- Ms. Kozak commented that it was a really interesting idea. It was clearly not mirroring anything historic for a window opening but this was a brand new building with some traditional treatments. The massing and scale meshed with the district quite well.
- Mr. Wyckoff had a concern about what the window style would be on the first floor. He asked Ms. Ramsey to have those well detailed at some point for their review.
- Chairman Dika stated that she would like to see the skylight windows where they are already installed.
- Ms. Ramsey said that a nano wall would be used at the penthouse level.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that some of the landscaping plan involved structures. She told the Commission that Terra Firma put together some landscaping schemes. She said that it was their plan to create a landscape barrier from the busy Maplewood Avenue intersection. A water feature was being proposed to help deter the traffic sound in the area and create a nice place to sit. There would also be a retaining wall going down Maplewood Avenue that would break in several locations to offer sitting space.
- Ms. Kozak expressed concern about the landscaping obscuring the front door. Mr. Almeida said that it would be a nice pedestrian experience along all of the plantings. Mr. Gladhill pointed out that a rendering would be helpful.
- Ms. Kozak stated that the goal of the master plan was to keep Portsmouth friendly. She felt that the landscaping plan felt like a fortress and was keeping people away from the building. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the front should be announced. Vice Chairman Katz wondered if they were limiting themselves rather than willing to look at a non-traditional approach to this area. Ms. Ramsey said they would explore the situation more closely.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested some type of major pergola that might guide people in but would allow for landscaping.
- Mr. Gladhill commented that he liked the landscaping at this end of the City because it was very limited in the area.

B. Work Session requested by **Martingale Wharf Limited Partnership, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (change to west end parapet, install lighting). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Councilor Coviello recused himself from the discussion.

- Chairman Dika informed the public that a site walk was held at the site prior to the meeting.
- Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture and Mr. Mark McNabb, owner of the property were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that there were several issues to discuss pertaining to the property. He started discussion with the metal siding on the building that required a change. He passed out plans to the Commission. Page one of the plans showed good and bad examples of parapet wall features.
- One option that was presented was to paint faux bricks onto the metal siding. Another option was to apply a thin veneer brick to the siding. Chairman Dika comment how nice the painted faux brick looked but also recognized how costly it was. Mr. McNabb said that the longest term solution was to allow the siding to stay as is and let the metal patina over time.
- Ms. Kozak asked what the metal material was. Mr. McNabb said it was lead coated copper. He said it would patina.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that they found a successful solution by painting the faux brick on the metal. He thought that worked.
- Mr. Gladhill asked how long the painted bricks would last. Mr. McNabb said that they would seal it with a lacquer finish and it might outlast the brick veneer.
- Mr. Melchior did not think painting the faux brick was the best option. He thought doing nothing was the best option.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that the entire top of the building was reflecting light and was very awkward. Mr. McNabb pointed out that the shininess would go away over time. He preferred to leave it as is.
- Mr. Melchior stated that they should err to the integrity of the material itself. He felt to go in there and compound the error would look fake with a fake finish. And it would not age and it would not show the natural features as the building ages. Vice Chairman Katz and Ms. Kozak agreed with Mr. Melchior.
- Ms. Kozak complimented the artist who painted the faux brick. She pointed out that you would still see the standing seams with the painted faux brick.
- Chairman Dika stated that it looked the like the Commission was going to let the metal siding stand. Mr. McNabb said that it was their first choice.
- Mr. McHenry talked about the proposed lighting on the building. He explained that they picked a series of light fixtures, all of a scale that would provide safe lighting.
- Ms. Kozak was confused as to why these light fixtures required review but the other light fixtures did not. She said that she has heard the explanation but it did not make any sense to her. She pointed out that the light fixtures already in place look nothing like the light fixtures being proposed. Mr. McNabb explained that when they are simple in nature, they get approved and installed and that was what happened. He said that the lights that were already installed were emergency lighting fixtures.
- Chairman Dika asked the applicants if they had a preference on the lighting. Mr. McHenry said that he liked the lighting on Page 4 of the submitted plans.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he preferred the light fixtures on Page 5.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that appropriateness needed to be decided and he felt all of the choices were appropriate. Chairman Dika stated that the concern the Commission had was that they did not want conformity across the front of the building.

- Discussion shifted to the proposed balustrade on the roof. Mr. McHenry said that the idea of the baluster was to help screen the mechanical units.
- Ms. Kozak asked what material the balustrade was made of. Mr. McHenry said that it was polyurethane. She wondered how thick it was. Mr. McHenry said it would be 2 3/16” overall and the main members being an inch thick. There was considerable discussion about what was an appropriate choice. The applicant’s choice was option 2. Chairman Dika asked the Commissioners if they were opposed to option 2. Only Mr. Wyckoff voiced his opposition to that choice.
- Mr. McNabb showed the Commission the area where they were proposing open air gates. He said that they were powder coated black metal. The Commission was comfortable with the gates.
- Ms. Kozak asked about the rebuilt door on the Martingale section of the building. She stated that she was bothered by the fan light over the door, specifically the plane of the glass being flush with the plane of the brick with the door set back from it. She also was bothered that there was no brick arch over it. She did not feel it was a replication of the original. Mr. McNabb explained that they were dealing with steel beams and pushed the window back as best they could. Ms. Kozak said that if they pushed the fan light back two inches it would make a huge difference. Mr. McNabb said that he would see if there was anymore relief that could be given to the fan light. Chairman Dika commented that she appreciated the effort.
- Mr. Almeida stated that the attention to the oriel was very well done.

C. Work Session requested by **51 Islington Street, LLC and Arthur and Joan Jones, owners**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendment to a previously approved design (add dormer, lighting, infill one window). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic Districts.

Councilor Coviello recused himself from the discussion.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios was present to speak to the application. She guided the Commission through the packet. Page one showed the fence enclosure on Parker Street that would screen the transformer and back up generator.
- Ms. Ramsey showed the Commission the proposed lighting on all of the elevations.
- She pointed out a window on the first floor at the back of the building that they were proposing to infill. She also pointed out the proposal to construct a large dormer for a unit owner. The pitch would stay the same but it would be a much larger dormer condition.
- Mr. Almeida commented that he did not object to the size of the dormer but he said that he would like to see more reveal of the dominant roof. There was discussion concerning this feature. Mr. Almeida suggested a blow up detail of the dormer when they come back for a public hearing.
- Ms. Ramsey said that the door to the fence enclosure needed to be non-combustible because of the transformer and generator. She also said that it was required by the

Planning Board to have soundproofing material inside of the fence. She indicated that she would have more information on these requirements for the public hearing.

- Ms. Ramsey guided the Commission through the specification sheets showing the lights. She explained that the larger light fixtures would be on the Islington Street elevation, the smaller ones on the rear of the building and Tanner Street. The gooseneck lighting would be for the parking lot. Mr. Almeida expressed concern for the neighbors about the height of the parking lot fixtures. Ms. Ramsey said that the minimum height was ten feet but the neck dropped down so the light would be sitting at about 8'6".
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that it would be helpful to have a proposed side view of the dormer for the public hearing. Ms. Ramsey said that would be possible.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked about Phase 2 of the project. Ms. Ramsey said that they would be making a decision soon as to whether they will be moving forward immediately with Phase 2. Mr. Wyckoff had a concern that the current cement tower and blank wall was what they would be looking at for a while. Ms. Ramsey stated that they were hoping to begin building Phase 2 soon.
- Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to the proposal. Mr. William Brassil of 7 Islington Street Condominium Association asked specific questions about the phasing process.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that if Phase 2 did not happen quickly, then windows would be installed on the blank wall.

D. Work Session requested by **Gilman Anderson and Winifred Amato**, owners, for property located at **129 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to back ell and second floor) and new construction to an existing structure (construct garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 47 as lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

Councilor Coviello recused himself from the discussion.

- Ms. Lisa DeStefano and Ms. Sarah Horihane of DeStefano Architects, Mr. Gil Anderson, and Ms. Winifred Amato, owners of the property were present to speak to the application. Ms. DeStefano explains that the entrance to the building faced the side but it also fronted State Street and Sheafe Street.
- Ms. DeStefano said that the new addition would have a gable end similar to what currently existed on Sheafe Street.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be reworking the roof on the existing building. Ms. DeStefano replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would interfere with the two existing windows. Ms. DeStefano said, yes they would be removed. She said that they preferred that rather than shed dormers.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the chimney that would be removed was historic. Ms. DeStefano said no, it was a gas chimney.
- Ms. DeStefano stated that the addition would have one garage door that would accommodate two small cars with living space above. The proposed addition also showed two closed shuttered windows because of they were too close to the lot line.

- Mr. Wyckoff commented that he was saddened to lose the two windows. Mr. Almeida agreed. Mr. Wyckoff said that it looked like one window could be retained. Ms. DeStefano said it probably could be retained; however, the addition would have to be shifted to the left. Mr. Wyckoff said that it would take away some heartache for him and he encouraged her to take a look at that possibility. Ms. DeStefano added that she could look at a different head height as well.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that he was not offended by the massing. Mr. Almeida agreed. He pointed out that this was a very significant building in a very significant location.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that he felt the addition on the State Street side was successful but there was an awful lot going on on the Sheafe Street side. He said that he understood that people want light and to enjoy their space but he was not sure the addition sat well with Sheafe Street. Chairman Dika commented that it looked very suburban for that location. She also did not think the gang windows on that stretch of Sheafe Street were appropriate. Mr. Almeida, Mr. Wyckoff and Vice Chairman Katz agreed.
- Ms. Kozak commented that there were different languages going on. She felt the massing was very respectful of the original building.
- Mr. Almeida said that he would like to see the closed shutters hung on traditional hardware to make it more convincing. He also commented that the amount of glass could be reduced on the garage.
- Mr. Gladhill commented on the proposal of the garden doors and asked if there were any garden doors in Portsmouth. Ms. DeStefano said that they have been approved in the Historic District but she did not think it was close to this area.
- Ms. DeStefano said that they were also looking to put a wrought iron fence and gate up to replace the chain link fence that was there currently.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that the whole fenestration was a problem for him. He suggested they take a look at the Lord House barn.
- Mr. Almeida commended the application for taking on the project as it was a huge undertaking.
- Chairman Dika asked if the public would like to express their thoughts.
- Mr. George Dodge, an abutter to the property stated he thought the issue of the third floor windows could be solved by using a flat roof. He also said that he would like to see step flashing only. He added that he would prefer to see two windows on the gable end.
- Mr. Jon Sobel of 49 Sheafe Street said that the Commission has been very perceptive about the details of the addition but he wanted to address the streetscape. He asked if Sheafe Street was a street or an alleyway. His principle concern was that Sheafe Street would be converted to an alleyway. He said that the owners of the homes on Sheafe Street have spent millions of dollars in maintaining the look and feel of a historic street. So he felt the proposed addition was creating a suburban landscape that has a different feel than what is on the street right now.
- Mr. Mark Bodi of 121 State Street said that the building was very historic. He pointed out that the park was made possible by Jay Smith whose efforts to resurrect Sheafe Street as a street and recognize its historical significance were successful. He said that great care and caution needed to be placed in the expansion of this building. It needed to be scaled proportionately reflecting the history of the community on that street.

- Mr. Todd Spencer of 37 Sheafe Street stated that he was concerned that although the scale and massing look to be within reason, when the project is actually completed it may look out of place. He just cautioned them about that possibility.
- Vice Chairman Katz commented that they have a proposed structure attached to a large brick building. He said that the addition should be subordinate to the brick building. He thought that this might be one of the most important projects he has viewed in the last thirteen years. He said it should be approached with respect and caution because the end results were very important.
- Mr. Almeida agreed and thanked the abutters for their comments. He said that a model and renderings would be important. He added that maybe a two car garage won't make it in this location.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:15 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Sept. 7, 2011.