

**MINUTES
THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NH**

Remote Meeting via Zoom Conference Call

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared the COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8, as extended by Executive Order 2021-01, and Emergency Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

6:30 p.m.

April 14, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Members Reagan Ruedig, Margot Doering, Martin Ryan, and David Adams; City Council Representative Paige Trace; and Alternate Heinz Sauk-Schubert

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Karen Bouffard

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
Chairman Lombardi read the four Requests to Postpone into the record.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **postpone** the four petitions, and Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Mr. Cracknell then noted that the 180 New Castle Avenue work session was withdrawn, the 449 Court Street and 279 Marcy Street work sessions were postponed to the June meeting, and the One Raynes Avenue work session was postponed to the May meeting.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff amended his motion to **postpone** the One Raines Avenue work session to the May 5, 2021 meeting and the 449 Court Street and 279 Marcy Street work sessions to the June 2, 2021 meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

I. DEMOLITION REVIEW (Referral from City Council)

Mr. Cracknell said that he and Vice-Chair Wyckoff were members of the Demolition Committee and that the City Council requested that the HDC work with the Legal Department to discuss the issues they were dealing with at the Demolition Review Committee level. He said the Committee reviewed demolition requests for properties outside of the District that were requesting partial or full demolitions so that they could notify neighbors that a significant demolition project would be done in their neighborhood, and they decided that the ordinance needed to be redrafted to be more effective than just notifying people. He said the committee had no jurisdiction to preserve a historic or cultural structure and hoped they could draft something with the Legal Department

and then discuss it at a subsequent HDC meeting. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the Demolition Committee discussed making the demolition waiting time 180 days instead of 90. He said the HDC could identify properties that were historic or important in a neighborhood and make a list of them. He said the Demolition Committee could also refer historic buildings to the HDC so that the HDC could discuss the issue with the client who wanted to tear the building down. Mr. Cracknell said the Demolition Committee was trying to narrow the field of what got reviewed. He said buildings over 75 years old with a proposed demolition of 25 percent or more of the exterior shell would have a major project review and would be subject to a 180-day delay, whereas younger buildings would remain in the 90-day track.

City Council Representative Trace said there was a list of contributing buildings for the National Historic District and that the City could give buyers of new homes a document to make them aware that they were purchasing a contributing home in the National Historic District. Chairman Lombardi said it had to go through a State Statute. Mr. Cracknell agreed and said it would require a disclosure form, and it was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig asked if the demolition reviews were still only triggered by someone who objected to the demolition or if they were for any building over 75 years old. Mr. Cracknell said it required a person who objected to a demolition to file a written request. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the person who objected to the demolition had to appear at the first meeting to explain why he felt that the building should be saved. Ms. Ruedig said she was in favor of furthering the ordinance so that it would dissuade people from demolishing a historic building. Chairman Lombardi asked about consequences for demolitions without a permit or demolitions by neglect. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was suggested that a building owner who did a demolition without a permit would be penalized one percent of the assessed value of the building. Mr. Cracknell said a penalty could have legal ramifications and that the conversation was just beginning.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Mr. Cracknell said Item 2, 100 Gates Street, would be heard at the May 5 meeting.

1. 264 South Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to install side and rear HVAC units that would probably need a variance and could be stipulated. He said there was no detail on the fence screening. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested a 4'x4' solid board fence with a cap on top.

Stipulation: The HVAC unit screen shall be a 4'x4' solid board fence with a cap on top and if required, a dimensional variance shall be obtained from the Board of Adjustment prior to installation.

2. 100 Gates Street

The item was **postponed** to the May 5, 2021 meeting.

3. 124 State Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant was redoing the door canopy to make it a more traditional shed roof bracketed one and that he also wanted to install three condensers in a garden area.

4. 410-430 Islington Street

The applicant's representative architect Sarah Howard was present and reviewed the changes. Mr. Ryan asked if the porch could be infilled. Ms. Howard agreed and said it could be stipulated. Mr. Adams said the chimney looked short and barely broke the ridge of the roof, and that the doorway didn't look anything like the historic doorway in the photo. Vice-Chair Wyckoff explained that the historic house was torn down and the stairs were built up into the first floor, so the architect had to work with what she had. Ms. Doering asked if the chimney could be made taller. Ms. Howard said the chimney and front door surround had already been completed.

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to pull the item for separate review and vote.

Mr. Adams said the chimney and front door fell short of the mark and that he couldn't support it. Ms. Ruedig said the front door surround wasn't exactly like what the historic photo showed but, in light of what happened to the building, she thought the applicant did an appropriate job in referring to the original design and that it was clear that it was a modern remodeling of the building. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he thought the shorter chimney looked better and that the steps went up inside the building due to Islington Street's grade change and were safer that way. City Council Representative Trace agreed that the chimney looked shorter than it should and she said the original door historically had a minimum of six raised panels. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the first two steps be granite since they got damaged by plowing in just one season. Ms. Doering said the chimney would be better if it were larger and made of a different material. She said she supported the doorway with a blend of referencing the history and using modern materials to meet the modern requirements of the house and the codes.

*Mr. Ryan moved to **approve** the administrative item, with the following **stipulations**:*

- 1. The entrance porch deck shall be infilled as discussed, and*
- 2. The applicant is approved to consider using granite steps within the sidewalk area.*

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Adams voting in opposition.*

5. 254 South Street

The request was for a condenser with fence screening. Mr. Cracknell suggested stipulating that the conduit going up the side be painted to match the siding. City Council Representative Trace said the fence looked like it was only on one side instead of all four sides.

Stipulations:

1. A three-sided solid board screen/fence with a cap shall be used; and

2. The conduit shall be painted to match the siding.

6. 266 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant requested that the item be **continued** to the May meeting because there were no window specs and he was doing exploratory work below the vinyl siding.

7. 75 Salter Street, Unit #1

Mr. Cracknell said the boathouse was converted into a micro apartment. He said it was discovered that the composite decking wasn't on the original application. He said the mahogany posts were previously approved to match the composite posts on the stairs, so they replicated the stair design with the cable rail system. He said there were environmental concerns about the location in making the decisions on the posts and the decking. He said the fence was replaced, the mechanical system was moved to meet code, and so on. The Commission had no questions.

8. 381 Middle Street

The request was to install two condensers with a screen that had a lattice barrier with plantings on each side. The applicant James Mulhern was present and the type of screen was discussed. It was decided to use the shutter screen without the lattice.

Stipulation: A louvered HVAC screen without lattice shall be used to screen the condensers.

9. 9 Prospect Street, Unit #3

Mr. Cracknell said the condenser was already installed and that the application wasn't complete. The Commission discussed what kind of screen should be used for a condenser that was 20 feet off the ground or whether it should have any screen at all. Mr. Adams thought the condenser was in an appropriate location. The Commission said they needed more context and details and **postponed** the item to the May meeting.

10. 232 South Street

Mr. Cracknell said Marvin Signature windows were previously approved but that the applicant wanted to use Marvin Elevate windows instead. Vice-Chair Wyckoff thought one particular window that was divided into four planes of glass should be 1/1, and Ms. Ruedig agreed. The applicant was present and agreed that the window should be changed.

Stipulation: The narrow 2/2 (Unit G) window design shall be changed to 1/1.

11. 49 Mt. Vernon Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant met the stipulation from the prior approval to have the railing system for the front porch match the one on the back.

12. 405 Pleasant Street

The request was to replace a door leading from the kitchen to the rear yard.

13. 14 Mechanic Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant needed approval for the brick veneer foundation, the storm door, and the shingle siding change. City Council Representative asked if the wooden storm door was in the front of the house, whether there was a door behind it, and what the storm door's hardware was. The applicant wasn't present. Ms. Doering said the applicant chose the storm door because he didn't want it to conflict with the dividing lights of the main door behind it. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said a storm door could swing out and had to be mounted on the outside, so it would have regular hinges and one of two possible latches. He suggested stipulating the thumb-type latch, but the rest of the Commission weren't concerned about the type of latch.

14. 229 Pleasant Street, Unit #2

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to use a particular screen for the condenser because it was visible to the public. Ms. Ruedig said the Commission previously discussed the conduit. Mr. Cracknell said he wasn't sure if the applicant was aware of it. Since the applicant wasn't present to provide more information, it was decided to **continue** the item to a future meeting.

15. 16 Porter Street

Mr. Cracknell said the item should be **continued** because the applicant did not provide the drawings that the Commission requested.

16. 166 New Castle Avenue

Mr. Cracknell said an email was sent to the Commissioners about a canopy over the door. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said wrapping the posts and mitering the corners at the top and bottom would be good. He said the bottom should be wrapped as well and have a molding or square stock around the post at the top to accentuate it. The applicant was present and agreed.

Stipulation: The corner post shall have a 7" mitered base and 2-3" mitered top cap.

17. 17 Hunking Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to install a new furnace that required venting and that there were very few options to meet code. He explained how the internal piping would be run.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **postpone** Items 2, 6, 9, 14, and 15 to the May 5, 2021 meeting, and Mr. Ryan seconded. Mr. Adams abstained from the vote. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 6-0.*

Ms. Doering moved to **approve** Items 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 through 13, 16 and 17 with their respective stipulations, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. Mr. Adams abstained from the vote. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 6-0.

III. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **One Raynes Ave, LLC, 31 Raynes LLC, and 203 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owners**, for properties located at **1 Raynes Avenue, 31 Raynes Avenue, and 203 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a 4-5 story mixed-use building and a 5 story hotel) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 123 Lot 14, Map 123 Lot 13, and Map 123 Lot 12 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and Historic Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **postpone** the petition to the May 5, 2021 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **64 Vaughan Mall, LLC, owner**, for property located at **64 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add a 4th floor, revitalize storefronts, and create entry points to the Worth Lot) and additional site improvements as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 1 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

The applicant Steve Wilson and architect Mark Mueller were present to review the petition. Mr. Wilson said the Board of Adjustment (BOA) denied their petition because a hardship couldn't be proven, so he and Mr. Mueller went back to the original form. He said they wanted to restore the old section of the building to its original construction by emulating the storefronts and openings and extending the parapet to include the brick cobbling masonry.

Ms. Doering asked why the applicant thought the placement of the whaling wall image made the building more appealing. Mr. Wilson said the building previously had a heavy parging and they wanted to cover it with the whale image, which was a landmark and would pay homage to the whaling wall. Chairman Lombardi said a different piece of art by a local artist may be appropriate, but Vice-Chair Wyckoff said art was subjective.

Mr. Mueller said the BOA didn't agree with the penthouse variance, so the building footprint would be pushed out further toward Hanover Street and would have a strip of green instead of a pocket park. He said a driveway would provide access to the underground parking. He discussed the level change and the retail entrances on Vaughan Mall. He said the entire footprint was broken up into the old and new portions and that the new portion would have different floor-to-floor heights. He reviewed the window and balcony changes and the granite base.

Ms. Doering verified that the mansard roofing was driven by code and asked what other form options were available. Mr. Mueller said other roof shapes had significant square footage reduction due to headroom limitations and that the mansard maximized the usable space within the attics. Ms. Doering surmised that it was more of a technical decision than a design one and said she didn't care for the mansard roof on that particular building. Ms. Ruedig said it didn't fit well with the older building because it wasn't subordinate to the historic building and looked like a separate building. She said the addition had a lot of windows and that she'd like to see the top level simplified if the mansards were kept. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he had no problem with mansard roofs in general but that the problem with the applicant's mansard roof was the fenestration chosen to match the second and third floors and the fact that the 4th floor mansard windows didn't have a round top. He said the mansard would be more successful if the applicant thought in terms of simple dormers instead of trying to get every square inch out of the top floor. He said he was glad that a rugged surface granite would be used so that it would make it through the winters. He said the roof material should be a simple slate color.

Mr. Ryan said he had no problem with the mansard and whether it was design or technical because he thought design was technical and architecture was an art that was utilitarian. He said it made sense to use the proposed roof to acquire a fourth floor. He said he liked that the cornice on the original building would be restored and hoped the whaling wall image could be replaced with more original art. He said the new building was a bit too fake-historic but thought the massing was fine. He said the corners looked heavy and suggested that they be infilled to make them more transparent and that they have mansard caps. He said the two buildings had a severe separation between them and suggested placing the balconies between them or having the base of the addition spill into the older building to tie them together. Mr. Adams said he also had difficulty with the open corners but didn't mind the mansard roof. He said there was too much glazing in the roof of the mansard section that made it busy and he agreed that using the balcony sections as a separation between the old and the new buildings would be good. He said he wasn't comfortable with the 'Fred Flintstone' texture of the granite base. He said he was more engaged in the revised new section of the building. City Council Representative Trace said she didn't mind the mansard roof but didn't like the busy roof line with all the windows and dormers and she agreed that placing the balconies between the two buildings was a good idea. She said she was fine with the heavy granite. She said the massing was good and that she had not been a big fan of the pocket park because she felt it was wasted space. Ms. Ruedig agreed and said the revised layout was preferable to having the park. She said it would be better for the Hanover Street façade to have more building front and doorways and activity at the sidewalk level.

Mr. Ryan said the dormers seemed too heavy and suggested adding more space between the unit separations. Ms. Doering said the building should be simplified. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he hadn't liked the pocket park because it was like a peninsula in a sea of traffic. He said he found the corners incongruous, especially from the Vaughan Mall side, due to the rough granite base and column material. He said it was strange how the exteriors of the balconies jumped out from the facades and seemed too heavy and that it would help the mass if the dormer portions appeared a little saner. He said he wasn't in favor of the miniaturized whaling painting and thought that particular elevation should be incorporated into the rest of the building.

Public Comment

Alison Griffin said she was an abutter and was disappointed with the new design because the developer had promised that it would be no higher than the existing building. She said the mansard roof added more height and that the building looked very busy and much bigger.

Ted Anastasi said he was an abutter and agreed that the abutters were all told that the building would be no higher than a 3-story one. He said the proposed building was too high and had too many windows and didn't fit the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Wilson said they needed to know if the parging on the outside of the Worth building adhered to the masonry through the coating and if there were any objections. Chairman Lombardi said it was more of a maintenance function and didn't need approval from the Commission as long as it was done right. Mr. Wilson said he needed permission to remove the loading dock on the back on the building to gain better access to the lower level. Mr. Cracknell said Mr. Wilson could return for an administrative approval at the next meeting. Mr. Ryan asked about the removal of the shed roof section of the loading dock. Mr. Wilson said there was an elevator opening behind it that would be replaced with a historic-looking double door and that he would return for an administrative approval on that item.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote, 7-0, to **continue** the work session to the May 5, 2021 meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Anne Moodey, owner**, for property located at **180 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (expand front deck and rebuild chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 101 as Lot 23 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) and Historic Districts.

The applicant withdrew the petition.

D. Work Session requested by **Mary H. and Ronald R. Pressman, owners**, for property located at **449 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (add 4th floor addition and roof deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 105 as Lot 6 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the June 2, 2021 meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **Stone Creek Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **53 Green Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of the existing structure

and the new construction of a 3-5 story mixed-use building as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 119 as Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Project architect Carla Goodnight and Jeff Johnston and Rob Simmons of Cathartes were present. Ms. Goodnight said the design team assembled the Commission's previous comments into three different building style options. She noted that all three options represented 48 units instead of the original 52 units. She reviewed the three options.

City Council Representative Trace said the Green Street side wasn't shown, and Ms. Goodnight said she first wanted the Commission's opinion on which options were appropriate. Ms. Doering asked what the overall square footage of the building was since there was a change in the number of units. Mr. Johnston said the square footage was reduced.

Mr. Adams said he gravitated toward Option 3 because the image had the drama of a pyramid but softened the top floor by switching the materials. He said the window sizes were much more acceptable. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed and said he liked the curved forms on the top floors. He asked why the small roofs weren't connected. Ms. Goodnight said it was a bit sparse and could be subordinate in a more detailed way. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he liked the big projection, even though it wasn't needed, and that the building appeared to be looking out to the river. City Council Representative Trace said Option 3 gave an optical illusion and softened the building up and made the mass more palatable. She said she had no objection to the roof and found the design successful. Mr. Ryan said he favored Option 2 because it looked like a collage of buildings instead of a medical building, but that he liked the curve caps and tops of Option 3 and thought a hybrid could be produced. He said he was disappointed that the green from the previous design wasn't used up on the side of the building. Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with Mr. Ryan and thought the way the building was broken up in Option 2 was more appealing than Options 1 and 3, which looked institutional. She said she the curves were a bit cheesy and weren't nautical. She said the design defined the roofline but was a bit heavy, and she suggested lightening it up. She said she appreciated the lightness of Option 3 overall and how it brought the height down a bit, and she agreed that mixing the aspects of the two designs would be good. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he preferred Option 3, which was more cohesive and harmonious.

Ms. Doering said she was torn between Options 2 and 3 and had concerns about the building mass, particularly due to the proposed large building just around the corner. She said she spent a lot of time at the new Mill Pond Park looking at the waterfront's context and what the building would do to the waterfront, Nobles Island, and so on. She said she liked Option 3 because it respected and worked with the slope of the land a bit more. She said there was a lot of sloping down and in, which made the building look more massive. She said she liked the gray elements of Option 2 but didn't like how they made the building look heavier and bigger. She said she looked forward to see what happened on the right and left windows because the openings looked like they could be really big without trees in front of them. Ms. Goodnight said there was a 3-ft grade change. Ms. Doering asked why the arch feature was kept the same color and material all the way through, and it was further discussed.

Chairman Lombardi said he was concerned about the overall massing the other side of the building wasn't presented and he feared that it would be monolithic. He said Option 3 was better at welcoming people to the building, but it faced the water and the back of it faced the neighbors, so he had to see the other side. He said Option 1 looked like a hospital whereas Option 2 was interesting because it gave the appearance of separate buildings but had no consistency. He said he liked the curved features of Option 3 because the City didn't have a lot of curved features. He said he didn't like the small hanging-off balconies and thought they looked like scabs on the building's surface. He said he was also concerned about the overall massing all along the waterfront because Mill Pond was disappearing due to the project, the Raynes Avenue building, and the new development further up the road. In response to City Council Representative Trace's questions, Mr. Johnston said the building would be within the 80-ft buffer and that the pier would be used by the building residents. Ms. Trace said she liked Option 3 because it looked like it would be a better fit to someone driving up to it, but she wanted to see the Green Street side.

Mr. Johnston said they discussed having a strong middle element on Option 2 and highlighting the ends more. Ms. Doering said the verticality would have to be used carefully. Mr. Ryan said the proposed building wasn't as big as the hotel and was about the same size as the AC Building, so he thought the massing was fine. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed. He said the context was off the Market Street Extension and in a newly-but area so it demanded to have a larger building. He said he had no problem with the verticality. He said he liked Option 3 but agreed that there should be something stronger in the middle. Mr. Adams said he appreciated the way Option 3 embraced the lot it was on and its position next to Mill Pond rather than trying to become a monument. City Council Representative Trace said she thought Option 2 looked like a wall from the pond but had no problem with Option 3 because it was softer and more appealing and the mass was better. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said Option 3 presented a more unified structure.

There was no public comment. Ms. Doering noted that the public submitted written comments, but they were not addressed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote, 7-0 to **continue** the petition to the May 5, 2021 meeting.*

F. Work Session requested by **Ross D. Ellenhorn and Rebecca J. Wolfe, owners**, for property located at **279 Marcy Street, Unit #3**, where permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct recessed deck on 3rd floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 45-3 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to **postpone** the petition to the June 2, 2021 meeting.*

IV. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **Warner House Association, owner**, for property located at **150 Daniel Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the new construction of a once existing 2-story carriage house on the property as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 58 and lies within the Civic, Downtown Overlay and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Project architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant and said the proposed carriage house would be a simple building with stain siding and trim the same color. She reviewed the windows and doors and said the heat pump would have a solid fence enclosure.

Ms. Ruedig asked what the window materials would be. Ms. Whitney said they would be Green Mountain true divided lights with interior storms. Ms. Ruedig said she had no problem with reconstructing the building on site as long as attention was paid to all the details and archaeological issues. Chairman Lombardi asked when the original building was built. Ms. Whitney said she didn't know but that it was demolished in the sixties. She said modern framing would be used and everything on the outside would be natural materials. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested a timber frame and asked what kind of material would be used on the fire-rated side of the building. Ms. Whitney said it was a sheathing product. Mr. Ryan asked about the roof material, and Ms. Whitney said it would mostly be cedar. City Council Representative Trace said the building reminded her of the Moffatt-Ladd warehouse. She said the two attendees overseeing the project were likely Warner House Board members, so she was comfortable with the project.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and approved by unanimous vote, 7-0, to **continue** the work session to the June 5, 2021 meeting.*

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary