

City of Keene
New Hampshire

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 18, 2015

4:30 PM

2nd Floor Committee Room

Members Present:

Hanspeter Weber, Chair
Dan Bartlett, Vice-Chair
James Duffy, Councilor
Anita Carroll-Weldon
Jan Brehm
Joslin Kimball Frank

Staff Present:

Tara Kessler, Planner
Nancy Vincent, Library Director
Rhett Lamb, Planning Director

Others Present:

Members Not Present:

David Bergeron, Alternate

3:45 PM Site Visit: In advance of the meeting, Commission members conducted site visits to review the site conditions of the properties located at 17 Center Street, 47 Mechanic Street, and 88-90 Main Street. Commission members present included Chair Hanspeter Weber, Vice Chair Dan Bartlett, Councilor James Duffy, Anita Carroll-Weldon, Jan Brehm, and Joslin Kimball Frank. Staff present was Tara Germond.

1) Call to Order and Roll Call-

Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM. Roll call was conducted.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – October 21, 2015

Ms. Kimball Frank made a motion to adopt the minutes of October 21, 2015 with the following changes/corrections: on Page 5, fifth paragraph, fourth sentence change “MGM” to “NGM.” Councilor Duffy seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

3) Keene Public Library Renovation Project Update-

Jeff Hoover, of Tappé Architects gave a slide presentation of the proposed designs for the Keene Public Library renovation project. He noted that the plan elevations displayed exhibit changes made since the first presentation to the Commission earlier this year. Mr. Hoover discussed the following areas:

- Replacement of mechanical systems and bringing the Library up to Code in terms of access and egress
- Stair addition on the west side of the Heberton Hall building
- Restoration and re-glazing of the windows
- The proposed connection between the Library and Heberton Hall
- Development of the activated front yard and the sloped walkway
- Material selection of the connector (the choice of granite or brick is not yet determined)
- Hedges, a cast iron fence, or a combination of both along West Street
- The courtyard on the north-facing side of the buildings, the design for which is still under development

At the conclusion of Mr. Hoover’s presentation Chair Weber asked how the Commission should proceed. Ms. Kessler noted this is the second or third presentation to the Commission and suggested that this may

be the Commission's last opportunity to provide input, and share any feedback before the plans move forward.

Ms. Kimball Frank referred to the earlier presentation and asked if there had been more glass in the connector. Mr. Hoover noted that the earlier designs did have more glass. He explained one of the things they are trying to achieve is not only a sense of transparency but a sense of enclosure as well.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon commented that the solution for the stair tower on the west side of the building is excellent, and the solution for the front of the building is brilliant. Continuing Ms. Carroll-Weldon noted her concern with the very contemporary aspect of the connector. Ms. Carroll-Weldon explained that because these buildings are ranked as primary resources, she feels the Commission should be cautious about setting a precedent of allowing more contemporary designs for additions on older buildings. She suggested this be something for further discussion by the Commission.

Councilor Duffy noted that he had similar thoughts as Ms. Carroll-Weldon. He stated that he feels the plans are outstanding and flow well with the neighboring NGM building. Councilor Duffy referred to the west side of Heberton Hall and asked if they considered making the arched windows openings, which are filled in with brick, windows again. Mr. Hoover pointed out that the area in question is located behind the stage and there would no opportunity for a view. Mr. Bartlett referred to the same area and said he thought there were egress stairs in the back. Mr. Hoover displayed the floorplan noting that the stairs will go behind the stage. They propose to add louvers where the brick currently fills in the arched window opening. The space behind these louvers will be used to locate building's mechanical equipment. Differing from Ms. Carroll-Weldon, Mr. Bartlett noted he favors a little more contemporary architecture to complement our historic fabric. Mr. Bartlett continued his comments, noting that the design represents part of a logical evolution without setting a negative precedent. In discussing the materiality of the existing buildings, Mr. Hoover reiterated the brick on each building is of a different color. Mr. Bartlett also commented that he liked the approach of utilizing the granite in the connector. Mr. Hoover noted material selections are not yet determined. Councilor Duffy commented that he likes brick, and thinks a terra cotta brick would be nice for the connector. He added that he does not think the design of the connector diminishes the character of what is already present onsite. Councilor Duffy said that he can understand both perspective and that he feels our view of historic preservation progresses as time passes.

Ms. Brehm commented that she feels the way the designs bring all the various elements together is commendable. She noted that she likes the idea of incorporating the granite or brick in the connector piece. Ms. Brehm asked if there would be room for a bike rack somewhere. Mr. Hoover replied in the affirmative. Mr. Hoover verified for Ms. Brehm that the existing entrance to the Library will remain the same. Ms. Brehm also commented that the landscaping and curved walkway will enhance the beauty of the buildings. She likes the idea of shrubbery and a fence to separate the space from West Street. Ms. Brehm said well done, and that it looks great.

Chair Weber commented that this is an exciting opportunity for the Library to have a new face, and that he loves the orientation towards West Street. Chair Weber noted that he leans more towards the contemporary side and feels that Mr. Hoover and other involved with the design process will make good choices with respect to material selection.

Referring to the connector, Councilor Duffy asked if there was a reason for the upper section being arched. Mr. Hoover replied that they arched it for better daylighting. He added that they did try a straighter line in other design concepts, and that it was determined the arch has no functional difference. He noted that they selected this form because they thought it resonated with the evolution of development.

Ms. Kimball Frank commented that she loves the plans; however, she feels the rectangular windows on the connector are somewhat harsh and resemble a storefront. Mr. Hoover agreed, noting that he understood what Ms. Kimball Frank was observing and suggested that he would modulate the design.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon commented that these newer elevations tie in better with the buildings that are present onsite than the earlier ones presented. She also agreed with Ms. Kimball Frank's comments regarding the rectangular aspect of the windows in the connector.

There being no further discussion Chair Weber thanked Mr. Hoover for his presentation.

4) Public Hearings

a) **COA-2015-08 - 47 Mechanic Street** - Applicant and owner, Beauregard Family Revocable Trust, is proposing to remove a two-car garage at 47 Mechanic Street and to pave the existing hard-pack surface parking area. This building is ranked as a Primary Resource. (Tax Map Parcel #003-05-006)

Chair Weber read the public hearing notice and asked for staff's recommendation on completeness. Ms. Kessler recommended that the Commission find the application to be complete.

Ms. Brehm moved to accept application COA-2015-08 as complete. Councilor Duffy seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Chair Weber opened the public hearing invited the applicant to come forward.

Jim Phippard, of Brickstone Land Use Consultants, addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Phippard suggested that much of the information regarding this proposal has already been shared with the Commission. He commented that the staff report provides a thorough description of the proposed project and that a site-visit was conducted by the Commission members before the meeting. Mr. Phippard reported that the two-car garage proposed for removal is not a contributing historic feature of this property. Mr. Phippard also noted that the applicant is requesting to remove the handicap ramp on the east side of the main building on the site. Continuing, he noted that the only change to the site plans that are placed in front of the Commission is related to the back entry to the ground floor apartment. The applicant would like to leave that landing to the back steps, which would result in a change to the proposed location of the trash containers. The trash containers would remain in the same area; however, they would project 4- to 5-feet out from the building rather than 8-feet as drawn on the plan.

Mr. Phippard addressed the proposal to pave the existing gravel parking area including the area where the garage is to be removed. This project will provide a total of 18 parking spaces for the building occupants and other tenants. Mr. Phippard also noted the addition of a privet hedge on the southeast corner of the property, behind the existing fencing to provide visual screening on Mechanic Street.

Chair Weber asked the Commission to share any questions or comments.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon referred to the site plan and asked what the six circles indicate. Mr. Phippard noted that these circles are the existing trees on the other side of the fence. Ms. Carroll-Weldon asked whether the ground surface underneath the existing ramp would be covered in grass after the ramp is removed.

Chair Weber asked Mr. Phippard his thoughts on the difference between hardpack surface and asphalt and on the use of permeable pavement. Mr. Phippard commented that they have done several parking lots using permeable concrete for the parking surface. Continuing, Mr. Phippard noted that hardpack is considered to be a paved surface as there is limited infiltration. Mr. Phippard also noted that permeable surfaces do require maintenance over time. Mr. Phippard noted that he has witnessed greater success with constructing infiltration systems below the parking lot surface, which is the system proposed for this project. This system will reduce the amount of runoff leaving the property and entering the City drainage

system. Mr. Phippard verified for Chair Weber that the property currently has no drainage system on site. Ms. Kimball Frank asked if there was a substantial price difference between hardpack and permeable concrete. Mr. Phippard noted that there was a considerable difference and explained how the manufacturer has to have a different setup, which makes it too costly for a smaller project like this one. He noted that permeable concrete is about three times the expense of standard asphalt.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon commented that the HDC is trying to discourage property owners from paving large areas for parking. However, she understands what the owner is trying to accomplish at this site and feels that overall it is a good solution.

There being no further questions Chair Weber asked for staff comments. Ms. Kessler outlined the Historic District Commission Regulations relevant standards in relation to the proposed application.

Regarding Section XV.E.b) 1) of the HDC Regulations (*“Demolition, or partial demolition, of a building and or structure categorized as a Primary or Contributing Resource, including secondary buildings and structures located on the same property as a Primary or Contributing Resource, shall be prohibited unless...demolition is limited to a secondary or a free-standing structure on the same property that has not been cited on the survey form as a significant resource or character-defining feature”*), Ms. Kessler noted that the garage is not cited on the historic survey form for this property and is not considered to be a character-defining feature.

Regarding Section XV.A.4.b) 4) of the HDC Regulations (*“New onsite parking, if required, shall be unobtrusive, with appropriate screening and landscaping, and shall preserve any character-defining features of the site. Grading shall not dramatically alter the topography of the site or increase water runoff onto adjoining properties”*), Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant proposes to partially screen the parking area with privet hedge adjacent to the existing granite posts and metal fence on the southeast corner of the lot along Mechanic Street. She also noted that there is an existing solid fence along the rear property line. This fence continues on the west side of the lot, where it meets the building. The property is screened on the east side by the Keene Community Kitchen building. A small paved pad for the storage of three trash totes will be added near the rear entry to the ell on the east side of the building. This area will be screened by a four-foot high solid wood fence that will be painted to match the color of the rear ell.

Regarding Section XV.A.4.b)6) of the HDC Regulations (*“For new construction, and on sites with residences or converted residences, every effort shall be made to locate parking behind the building(s). Parking shall be located to the rear of the backline of the building or the backline of the main block of the building, as applicable.”*), Ms. Kessler noted that the existing parking area currently extends beyond the frontline of the building. She added that the Applicant proposes to pave over this existing surface and they are not proposing to extend the parking area beyond the frontline of the building any further.

There being no public comments or further questions from the Commission/public Chair Weber closed the public hearing for deliberation.

Mr. Bartlett indicated the project meets all the criteria of the HDC regulations and he will support it. Chair Weber commented that he agrees with Mr. Bartlett’s comments and is also in support of the project.

Councilor Duffy motioned to approve COA-2015-08 for the removal of the two-car garage and paving of the existing parking area at 47 Mechanic Street as shown on the Site Plan, “47 Mechanic Street Parking,” dated October 22, 2015, and submitted to the Planning Department on November 3, 2015 by the Beauregard Family Trust. Ms. Brehm seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

b) COA-2015-09 - 17 Center Street - Applicant and owner, MGJ Realty LLC, is proposing to remove a garage and unfinished storage space at 17 Center Street and is requesting a waiver from Section

XV.B.3.b) 4) of the Historic District Commission Regulations to reside the exterior of the building with vinyl siding. This building is ranked as a Contributing Resource. (Tax Map Parcel #001-03-008)

Chair Weber read the public hearing notice and asked for staff's recommendation on completeness. Ms. Kessler recommended that the Commission find the application to be complete.

Councilor Duffy moved to accept application COA-2015-09 as complete. Mr. Bartlett seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Chair Weber opened the public hearing inviting the applicant to come forward.

John Tasoulas, of 36 South Lincoln Street, noted that his family purchased the property at 27 Center Street in January of this year, and that they would like to receive approval for the modifications proposed in the application. Mr. Tasoulas reported that both the garage and storage area proposed for demolition are unfinished spaces and were built at a much later date than the primary structure on the site. He does not consider either structure to be historically significant and noted that the garage is sided with wood clapboard and the storage area has asbestos siding. He proposes to lay gravel in the area of the existing building footprints after they are demolished and to extend the existing gravel driveway. Mr. Tasoulas also commented that the garage proposed for demolition is barely visible from the public street. He cited the adjacent Monadnock United Way building as an example of what the property will look like after demolition of the garage and storage area.

Chair Weber asked Mr. Tasoulas to address the waiver for vinyl siding. Mr. Tasoulas provided a sample of the colored vinyl siding being proposed. Mr. Tasoulas noted that the existing asbestos siding, which Commission members would have observed during the site visit, was probably installed in the 1950s or 1960s. Mr. Tasoulas commented it is a financial hardship to remove the asbestos siding. Continuing, he commented that the east and west facing sides of the building have limited architectural features. He noted that he does not plan to alter the bay windows and entryway and porch at the front of the building nor does he plan to alter the side porches. He will be painting these features white. Mr. Tasoulas reported that both buildings on either side of the property are sided with vinyl material. He suggested that the addition of the vinyl siding will bring this building back to a clapboarded appearance. He addressed the material sample provided and noted that the trim will be painted white.

Chair Weber asked Mr. Tasoulas if he had a sense of the financial impact of removing the asbestos siding. Mr. Tasoulas indicated that it would cost tens of thousands of dollars. He noted that the contractor has secured permission to remove the asbestos from the 15x15 storage area that is proposed for demolition and has received a demolition permit.

Chair Weber asked for questions or comments from the Commission.

Ms. Kimball Frank asked if Mr. Tasoulas had obtained an actual estimate for removing the asbestos. Mr. Tasoulas replied in the negative to which Ms. Kimball Frank commented that it would be preferred to have a cost-estimate when determining a financial hardship. Mr. Tasoulas commented that he wished he had gotten an estimate for the asbestos removal.

Mr. Bartlett asked Mr. Tasoulas why he would be replacing the fascia with the same type of metal material used on the Monadnock United Way building rather than preserving the wood. Mr. Tasoulas indicated he would like to do the eaves at this time to reduce the need for future maintenance.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon noted her appreciation for leaving the bay windows, entry, and side porch intact. She expressed her concern with using vinyl siding over a wooden building because it makes it more difficult to determine whether there is any rot. Mr. Tasoulas noted that the building is high off the ground and that rot is generally seen more in buildings that are lower to the ground. He is not worried about the vinyl siding being a detriment to the property.

Chair Weber agreed with Mr. Bartlett's comments regarding the fascia and eaves. He suggested that these areas would not be much more for the applicant to paint when doing maintenance. Chair Weber noted that he is not concerned with the soffit as it is less apparent. Ms. Kimball Frank was also in agreement with Chair Weber.

There being no further questions Chair Weber asked for staff comments. Ms. Kessler outlined the relevant standards of the HDC Regulations as follows:

Ms. Kessler addressed that the applicant submitted a waiver request to Section XV.B.3.b) 4) (*"Vinyl and aluminum siding are prohibited."*). The reasons provided by the applicant for this waiver are listed below:

- A. "For MGJ Realty to adhere to these strict regulations would inflict undue hardship. The financial hardship to remove the asbestos siding and restore building siding to an approved surface would be prohibitive financially. MGJ Realty can safely and cost effectively encapsulate the asbestos siding with vinyl."
- B. "The vinyl siding material will equally meet the historic district regulations because the building will be returned to its original siding - clapboard appearance. "
- C. "The waiver would not have substantial detriment to neither the regulations nor the historic district ordinances and would be in the public good. To change from the asbestos siding to restoration of vinyl clapboard exterior will benefit the public good. The two direct abutters, the Monadnock United Way and the MGJ building are both vinyl-sided. Adding vinyl siding to 17 Center Street will not be contrary to other buildings at the location."

Regarding Section XV.B.3.b) 1) (*"Character-defining architectural trim shall be retained and repaired when technically and economically feasible. If the trim is sufficiently deteriorated that replacement is warranted...If substitute material is used, it shall convey the same visual appearance as the historic trim."*), Ms. Kessler noted that character-defining features including the bay window, entrance, and side porch will be retained.

Regarding Section XV.B.1.a) 3) (*"The removal of historic materials or alteration of features that characterize a building or structure shall be avoided"*), Ms. Kessler noted that although the applicant does not propose to remove the cement siding, they do propose to cover this siding with vinyl material. She noted that applying vinyl siding over the existing siding has the potential to cause problems with the ability of the structure to breathe and release moisture. However, the exterior siding material of the historic structures on either side of the property at 23 Center Street and the Barker Block row houses at 7-11 Center Street, is currently vinyl.

Mr. Tasoulas indicated that he feels that his proposal to leave the bay window and entranceway wood was a compromise he made to better comply with the HDC Regulations. He feels that changing the material of the fascia and eaves from wood to aluminum or vinyl is important to him with respect to long-term maintenance of the building.

Chair Weber asked for public comments, there being none he closed the public hearing.

Councilor Duffy commented that almost all of the buildings on this block are covered in a vinyl material, even the new County Courthouse. He noted that for this reason, he has no issue with covering the existing asbestos shingles. Councilor Duffy also has no issues with the demolition of the barn and the storage space. However, he is not yet certain of his opinion regarding the change of fascia material.

Mr. Bartlett observed that the Commission is in a position to approve vinyl quite often and he suggested that the Commission might want to discuss its presence in the HDC Regulations. He noted no objections to the vinyl siding in this particular case. Mr. Bartlett also agrees with the applicant's decision to leave the wood trim on the bay window and porch.

Ms. Kimball Frank commented that the building's appearance will be improved with this proposal and has no issues with the demolition. She feels that the wood features (fascia, windows, and porches) are part of the defining features and would like to see them painted versus replaced with a vinyl or metal material. Ms. Kessler asked for clarification regarding the east/west facing windows, which will be replaced with aluminum. Ms. Kimball Frank expressed no concerns with this aspect of the proposal.

Ms. Brehm noted her appreciation for some of the character-defining details being painted, and has no objections to the demolition.

Chair Weber commented that he thinks this proposal will be improvement; however, he would prefer to see the existing wood fascia remain. Chair Weber has no objections to the demolition, and supports the project.

Referring to the vinyl, Councilor Duffy suggested that no precedents would be set if the Commission were to approve the project given the surrounding neighborhood. He agreed this is something the Commission should revisit in the regulations; being mindful this is not something the Commission wants to encourage.

Mr. Bartlett moved to approve COA-2015-09 for the:

1. removal of the barn and unfinished storage space; and,
2. waiver to re-side the building exterior with vinyl siding and aluminum trim at 17 Center Street as described in the application and shown on the plans "Barn Demolition and House Renovation" and "Building Elevations 17 Center Street Keene, NH" submitted to the Planning Department on November 6, 2015 and November 9, 2015, respectively, by MGJ Realty LLC.

Councilor Duffy seconded the motion which carried on a vote of 5:1 (Ms. Carroll-Weldon voted in opposition).

c) COA-2013-07 Modification 1 - 88-90 Main Street - King's Garden / Amicci's Pizza

Applicant, Blanc and Bailey Construction Inc., on behalf of owner, George and Eleni Xanthopoulos Living Trust, is proposing to repaint the brick parapet wall of the building at 88-90 Main Street. This building is ranked as a Contributing Resource. (Tax Map Parcel #023-04-001).

Chair Weber read the public hearing notice and asked for staff's recommendation on completeness. Ms. Kessler recommended the Commission find the application to be complete. Ms. Kessler distributed the staff report to Commission members.

Councilor Duffy moved to accept the application COA-2013-07 Modification 1 as complete. Ms. Brehm seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Chair Weber opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward.

Kevin Douglass, of Blanc and Bailey Construction at 18 Depot Street, Charlestown, NH, was present to represent the applicant. Mr. Douglass commented that Commission members observed the condition of the brick parapet wall, for which repointing is being proposed, during the earlier site visit. He continued that the current condition of the parapet wall is visually unpleasant and a hazard to the public due to loose bricks. The intent of this proposal is to remove the damaged and eroded mortar within the wall and replace it with mortar as close to the composition and color of the existing mortar as possible.

Mr. Douglass confirmed for Chair Weber that this work would include the parapet wall on the Main Street side of the building and the return on Cypress Street. Mr. Douglass noted that the bricks are in fairly good condition, but the mortar has eroded deep within the brick at some points.

Chair Weber asked for questions or comments from the Commission.

Ms. Carroll-Weldon commented on the importance of doing the proposed work and of how helpful the site visit was. She commended the Mr. Douglass for doing a good job in matching the mortar.

Councilor Duffy agreed with Ms. Carroll-Weldon, adding that this project is something the community can be proud of and exemplifies what the HDC is trying to accomplish.

Chair Weber asked about the cornices. Mr. Douglass explained they are pre-cast concrete panels that rest on top of a steel support beam that runs horizontally and that they are backed by brick. He noted that they will not be altered during this project.

Ms. Kimball Frank asked if this will complete the renovation at this site. Mr. Douglass replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Bartlett asked why there was no soldier course included above the window openings. He noted that he recognizes this is not part of the request. Mr. Douglass agreed he did miss this. Mr. Douglass explained the approach for these openings due to their non-historic nature.

There being no further questions Chair Weber asked for staff comments. Ms. Kessler outlined the relevant standards of the HDC Regulations as follows:

Regarding Section XV.B.2 b) 6) (*“Repointing shall be undertaken only to address deteriorated masonry or in areas where moisture infiltration is a problem. The amount of wall area to be repointed shall be limited to the affected area. The new mortar joints shall match the original as closely as possible in terms of profile, width, and mortar composition. The new mortar shall match the color of the mortar used when the building was built; or it shall match aged or weathered mortar color, whichever is more appropriate. The color of all mortar shall come from the aggregate and not the binder. Upon completion of the repointing, all remaining mortar and residual film shall be cleaned from the façade of the building”*), Ms. Kessler noted that only the damaged/eroded mortar at the location of the parapet wall facing Main Street will be replaced. The new mortar will match to the existing as closely as possible in terms of color, profile, width, and composition. The applicant notes that none of the bricks in this location will be replaced. The applicant will be providing a sample of the mortar prior to the work being started.

Regarding Section XV.B.2 b) 1) (*“Character-defining architectural trim shall be retained and repaired when technically and economically feasible...”*), Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant will be doing a limited amount of work to the capstones but will not be replacing them. The applicant will not be replacing the “1930” placard or the stepped cornice or any other character-defining architectural features.

Chair Weber asked for public comments, there being none he closed the public hearing for deliberation.

Ms. Kimball Frank moved to approve COA-2013-07 Modification 1 for the repointing of brick on the parapet wall and repairs to the limestone capstones as described in the application dated and received by the Planning Department on November 10 2015 by Blanc and Baily Construction Inc.

Councilor Duffy seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Kessler stated that Mr. Douglass and the staff at Blanc and Bailey have been great to work with and have been very cooperative and willing to work with staff in meeting the intent of the HDC design standards.

5) Other Business

a) HDC Ordinance Review Subcommittee Update

Ms. Kessler reported that the Subcommittee met last on Friday, November 13, 2015. The Subcommittee will continue discussion on the draft Ordinance at its next meeting on December 10, 2015. She noted the Subcommittee's decision to remove the threshold for new construction Staff had recommended that only new construction greater than 3,000 square feet in total gross floor area would require a COA. The Subcommittee is still exploring the thresholds for accessory structures and new additions.

b) Other

Ms. Kimball Frank recommended adding language to the HDC Regulations that requires applicants to provide documentation of cost estimates when presenting a claim of financial hardship. Ms. Kessler addressed this comment, suggesting that an existing place of reference would be under roof criteria (i.e. replacing a slate roof), where there requirement for a written estimate. Discussion continued with Councilor Duffy noting that the HDC can only look at what it costs, not the applicant's ability to pay. Mr. Bartlett agreed with what is being discussed; however, he has a concerns with the notion that a Board should ignore the financial abilities of an applicant. Ms. Brehm also agreed getting a quote was a good idea.

c. Membership Roster

Ms. Kessler reported the Commission will need to review its membership roster. Ms. Brehm's term will be ending this year, and there is currently one vacancy. Councilor Duffy will not be serving as a Council representative after the end of the year. However, he did express an interest in serving on the Commission as a citizen member. Nominations/recommendations should be submitted to the Mayor's office. Ms. Kimball Frank asked about the needed qualifications. Ms. Kessler advised she would send out Chapter II on membership for review.

6) Next Meeting - December 16, 2015

7) Adjournment - Chair Weber adjourned the meeting at 6:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Mary Lou Sheats-Hall, Minute-taker
November 19, 2015

Edited by,
Tara Germond, Planner
December 4, 2015