

MOTION: Commissioner Pruden moved to take HAWP 2017-013 off the table. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Muckle. The Motion was approved by acclamation and without objection

(8-0).

Mr. Gross presented the HAWP and Staff Recommendations. Staff divided the application into six items.

1. Construction of a 23x22 detached carport between the main house and the smokehouse. The carport is illustrated in power point and drawings in HPC packet. It is proposed to be of post-in-ground construction with a gravel floor and eight posts, open to existing gravel driveway, facing east.
2. Replacement of two existing board-and-batten doors in the brick-and-frame addition to the house. Staff has a condition in the staff recommendations related to the design of the doors.
3. Enlargement of a door opening in the brick-and-frame addition. Staff has been unable to establish an exact construction date for this section of the structure connecting the house and summer kitchen.
4. Replacement of light fixtures at the south elevation entrance. The proposed fixtures could be serviced by gas or electric lights.
5. Install star-shaped pattress/anchor plates to halt chimney movement. Proposed installation is on both ends of the house. Proposed plates are approximately 8 inches by 8 inches.
6. Repair and replacement of windows and storm windows. The repaired windows would use in-kind materials. The proposed storm windows are Burch brand aluminum storm windows.

Mr. Gross noted that the applicant withdrew items from the originally submitted application including the repair of damaged shutters, repainting of the entire house, construction of a covered walkway connecting the house to the proposed carport, and a new door opening on the west elevation of the brick-and-frame addition. Some of these items may appear on a future application.

Mr. Gross concluded that staff found that the proposed carport would not impede the view from the main house and would be compatible with the property's historic context. The archaeological impact of the carport would be limited to the excavation of the eight post holes. Mr. Gross stated that the replacement of the two exterior doors on the north elevation is appropriate given their current condition; however, the proposed enlarged door opening on north elevation would substantially alter a character-defining feature and cause irreversible damage to the historic fabric. Mr. Gross stated that the new lighting fixtures would have limited visual impact and that gas light was not compatible with the historic context. Mr. Gross indicated staff's approval of the anchor plates as necessary to halt chimney movement, and that the proposed window repair would make use of appropriate materials and methods and ensure the retention of historic fabric.

Mr. Gross stated that staff recommended denial of Item 3 (proposed enlargement of door opening). The alteration would be inconsistent with or detrimental to the Subtitle, and an unnecessary loss of

historic material. Mr. Gross stated the staff's recommended approval of items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 as meeting *Subtitle 29-111 (B)*;

(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource;

(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archaeological, architectural, or cultural features of the historic resource and is in harmony with the purpose and intent of this Subtitle;

(4) The proposal is necessary in order to remedy unsafe conditions or health hazards;

and *Secretary of Interior standards for Rehabilitation*

(1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(3) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The conditions of staff approval include:

1. The presence of the staff archaeologist for the excavation of the carport post holes;
2. Specifications for the replacement board and batten doors be provided,
3. That the anchor plates will be painted to match exterior walls.

Commissioner Callahan asked staff if the smaller door is a unique feature of the house and Mr. Gross confirmed that it was. Commissioner Callahan asked if there was any historical reason that the door is smaller. Mr. Gross answered that the size of the door related to the use of the interior space.

Commissioner Callahan asked if there were other examples of this two door scenario, to which Mr. Gross pointed out that the doors lead into unconnected interior spaces.

Commissioner Campbell asks about the replacement of aluminum windows and whether it was an issue for staff, as it may change the appearance of the house. Staff responded that the replacement is reversible.

Campbell asks whether current storm windows had been approved at some earlier time. Mr. Gross responded that the installation may have predated designation of Fairview as a historic site.

Commissioner Davidson brought up patress plates; asking whether they are suggested as a definite fix to the chimney settlement or an experimental solution. Mr. Gross read from the structural engineer's report, and suggested that the applicant may have additional information about previous attempts to fix the problem.

Nakita Reed, architect with Encore Sustainable Design, followed Mr. Gross with a presentation on behalf of the owners. Ms. Reed provides historic and physical context with pictures in a presentation. Ms. Reed stated that the applicants are in agreement with staff recommendations, except for the proposed door enlargement. Ms. Reed suggested that there is no reason for the door to be its particular height. Enlarging the door opening would improve health and safety conditions. Ms. Reed introduced NPS recommendations to Alterations/Additions to Historic buildings, suggesting that flexibility in interpreting standards is allowable for the ultimate protection of historic resources. The door enlargement would allow current owners to fully utilize space and thus be better stewards of the property. Ms. Reed concluded that the door enlargement would meet all of the criteria of *Subtitle 29-111*.

(A) The Commission shall instruct the Director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to it, that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inconsistent with, or inappropriate or detrimental to, the preservation, enhancement, or ultimate protection of the historic resource and purposes of this Subtitle.

(B) The Commission shall instruct the Director to issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformance with the purposes and requirements of this Subtitle, if it finds that:

- (1) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archaeological, architectural, or cultural features of the historic resource and is in harmony with the purpose and intent of this Subtitle;
- (2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural, or cultural features of the historic resource and is in harmony with the purpose and intent of this Subtitle;
- (3) The proposal will enhance or aid in the protection, preservation, and public or private utilization of the historic resource in a manner compatible with its historical archaeological, architectural, or cultural value;
- (4) The proposal is necessary in order to remedy unsafe conditions or health hazards;
- (5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship;
- (6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic resource with the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by issuance of the permit.

(C) In the case of any application for work within an environmental setting of a Historic Site, or on property located within a Historic District, the Commission shall be lenient in its judgement of applications for structures of little historical or design significance or for new construction. This shall mean that the Commission will authorize issuance of such permit, with any necessary conditions, if authorization of such permit would not impair the character of the Historic Site or Historic District.

(D) Nothing in this Subtitle shall be construed to limit new construction, alteration, or repairs to any particular period or architectural style.

Commissioner Scott requested to see the floorplan which Ms. Reed provided showing the staircase immediately inside of the door in question. Commissioner Davidson asked Ms. Reed whether the applicants had considered creating an interior door connecting the historic summer kitchen to the rest of the building. Ms. Reed confirmed that it is planned but would not be possible for several years.

Commissioner Muckle asked how applicants currently enter the building. Ms. Reed answered that there are three other doors used to access the house in addition to the one in question, and Commissioner Muckle asked for confirmation that the other three doors are of standard height, which Ms. Reed confirmed, stating that it was the closest door to the proposed carport. Commissioner Scott stated that it was a question of convenience. Commissioner Campbell asks a clarifying question about the head height in the staircase inside the door in question. Ms. Reed stated that it was a double height space about 10 feet. Staff went to look for interior drawings of the staircase.

Meanwhile Commissioner Callahan asked why the door is smaller, about the Bus Parking sign above the door in question, and Fairview's exterior color. Ms. Reed answered that she didn't see any particular reason for the specific height of the six-foot-high doorway, that the bus parking sign was assumedly for tours, and it was uncertain when the house color last changed.

Vice Chair Scott asks why the applicant stated that the door height is a code issue. Ms. Reed clarified that code requires only one standard height door, but that it this was a safety issue. Vice Chair Scott asked what the owners are currently doing to enter and exit the house. Ms. Reed stated that the door in question was the only door that can be unlocked from outside. Mr. Days, the property owner, explained about the box locks on the current doors. Vice Chair Scott asked whether it wouldn't be a simpler procedure to repair the locks than to adjust a lintel, and stated that it was not a compelling argument. Ms. Reed stated that the locks will have to be adjusted either way, and that the request concerns safety regarding entry to the building through the planned main entrance. Vice Chair Scott asked if they were going to leave the locks as they stand. Mr. Days said that they will be repaired, and that the desire is to enter the house through the nearest door to the proposed carport. Vice Chair Scott asked what the functions of the rooms on the first floor are. Ms. Reed responded by showing the locations of the parlor, kitchen, dining room, and mud room. Ms. Reed explained that the desire is to enter the mudroom without walking into the main hall. Vice Chair Scott asked to see the location of the proposed carport in relation to the entrances. The door in question is closest to the proposed carport. The front hall entrance would be an additional 22 feet from the proposed carport. Mr. Days pointed out that the other three standard height entrances have exterior stairs, while the door in question is at ground level and enters into a stairway that provides interior steps.

Commissioner Davidson stated that she is not persuaded by all of the applicant's arguments but is persuaded by the fact that is not the most character-defining feature of the house, but is concerned by the fact that their proposal may only be a temporary solution. Ms. Reed explained that the summer kitchen would be used as a home office, so that the owners would still prefer to enter through the mudroom than walk through the home office.

Mr. Days pointed out that over the winter the other exterior entry door steps became icy and that the door in question was the safest entry point despite the lower height, because none of the other entrances were covered. Commissioner Davidson stated that the commission wants to strike a balance between being careful not to alter a historic property for future generations in an unnecessary way, and to respect the owner's current conditions, needs, and ability to care and maintain the house. Ms. Reed pointed out that Commissioner Callahan suggested that there was no historic reason the owners made the door shorter. Commissioner Davidson interjected that regardless of why, the doorway still constitutes historic fabric. Chairman Thompson clarified that whether we know the reason or not, the Bowie family put in the door, making it historically unique.

Commissioner Muckle asked what the taller door enters into. Ms. Reed answered that it was the historic detached kitchen, which never had appliances and that currently it has a large fireplace which had been for cooking. It will become a future office. An interior wall separates it from the rest of the building. Commissioner Muckle stated that the only reason she had heard for changing the door is convenience.

Ms. Reed argued that creating an interior door will destroy more historic fabric. Ms. Reed asked how the weighing of the Environmental Setting is brought into the commission's deliberation. Mr. Gross provided clarification about the Environmental Setting. Commissioner Scott asked for a picture of the full elevation. Ms. Reed provided relevant pictures.

Chairman Thompson asked staff to respond. Mr. Gross responded to Ms. Reed's conclusion. Mr. Gross stated that staff appreciated the thoughtful language Ms. Reed used in addressing the criteria of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Subtitle 29-111*. In referring back to the criteria used by Ms. Reed, Mr. Gross pointed out that the National Park Service language Ms. Reed used earlier refers to guidelines that accompany the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*, not the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* themselves.

Mr. Gross addresses *Subtitle 29-111(A)* criteria.

(A) The Commission shall instruct the Director to deny a permit if it finds, based on the evidence and information presented to it, that the alteration for which the permit is sought would be inconsistent with, or inappropriate or detrimental to, the preservation, enhancement, or ultimate protection of the historic resource and purposes of this Subtitle.

HPC has purview over all of elevations and is not limited to primary facades. The smaller door represents a character defining feature that speaks to historic space and use.

(B) The Commission shall instruct the Director to issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformance with the purposes and requirements of this Subtitle, if it finds that:

(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of the historic resource;

Staff argued that the alteration is substantial because it impacts what makes the feature distinctive.

(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural, or cultural features of the historic resource and is in harmony with the purpose and intent of this Subtitle;

Staff argued that the dimensions of the door, for whatever reason they are, are the way they are for a reason. While the reasons may not be known now, they could be discovered in the future by a future owner or researcher. Staff would be reluctant to recommend approval for an alteration that would reduce the property's historical legibility.

(3) The proposal will enhance or aid in the protection, preservation, and public or private utilization of the historic resource in a manner compatible with its historical archaeological, architectural, or cultural value;

Staff respectfully submitted that existence of the smaller doorway does not impede the applicants use of the property, and that any enhancement in the utilization of this doorway resulting from approval would be minimal.

(4) The proposal is necessary in order to remedy unsafe conditions or health hazards;

Staff argued the door does not provide the only means of ingress and egress from the house or even that particular area of the house. The proposed mudroom does have another doorway.

(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship;

Staff respectfully submitted that the existence of the smaller doorway does not deprive the property owner of reasonable use, nor impose an undue hardship.

(6) In balancing the interests of the public in preserving the historic resource with the use and benefit of the alternative proposal, the general public welfare is better served by issuance of the permit.

It is true that the property is privately owned; however, the subtitle states that one of its purposes is to preserve historic sites for education, and welfare and continued utilization of the public and is not limited to specific owners or current generation.

(C) In the case of any application for work within an environmental setting of a Historic Site, or on property located within a Historic District, the Commission shall be lenient in its judgement of applications for structures of little historical or design significance or for new construction. This shall mean that the Commission will authorize issuance of such permit, with any necessary conditions, if authorization of such permit would not impair the character of the Historic Site or Historic District.

The Subtitle does extend protection to all exterior features within the environmental setting.

(D) Nothing in this Subtitle shall be construed to limit new construction, alteration, or repairs to any particular period or architectural style.

Staff has not recommended denial because of its period or style, but because it is a character-defining feature of the historic site.

Chairman Thompson asked for the official definition of "character defining" Ms. Reed provides the Association for Preservation Technology (APT) as:

“Character defining features are visual and physical features that give a building its identity and distinctive character, they may include overall building shape, materials, craftsmanship, decorative details, interior spaces, features and aspects of the site and environment.”

Commissioner Callahan stated that the character of the house is made up of many character-defining features. He stated that if the door was originally eight inches taller it would still be significant, and asked why the Commission was so focused on the door instead of the usability of the house and its ability to bring us into the future. Chairman Thompson stated that Commissioner Callahan was engaging in fuzzy logic by asking how much of the house can be altered while still maintaining its character. Commissioner Callahan explained that using the language of the Subtitle, the alteration in his opinion does not constitute an inconsistent, inappropriate or detrimental change to the building.

Vice Chair Campbell asked about the size and thickness of the brick arch above the smaller doorway. Discussion clarified that the interior brick arch is a single brick length on the interior, supported by a wood lintel on the exterior. Vice Chair Campbell asked for clarification that the door enlargement would shift the entire arch, which Ms. Reed confirmed. Commissioner Pruden suggested that the height of the door is more than an inconvenience, based on her personal experience with a tall husband. Vice Chair Campbell pointed out that 18 inches of material will need to be removed to enlarge the door opening by eight inches on the outside. The process of creating an interior door into the kitchen would be a similar process. Ms. Reed responded that it would be removing less square footage of historic material.

Chairman Thompson asked for Ms. Reed’s conclusion. Ms. Reed concluded that this door was never meant to be a distinctive architectural feature, and the applicants are not proposing to alter the ornamentation, architectural style or detail of the door, just raise the height. The modification will be in keeping with the character of the rest of the building. Chairman Thompson commended the applicant for their thorough application, and staff for their prepared response.

MOTION: Commissioner Callahan made a motion to approve HAWP 2017-013 Items 1,2,3,4,5, and 6 based on *Subtitle 29-111* Criteria 1,2, and 4 and *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards* Criteria 1,2,3,5,6, and 10. With conditions that the staff archeologist monitor the excavation of the post holes for the carport, the applicant shall submit specifications for the replacement doors, and the anchor patress plates and hardware are painted to match the exterior of the building. Commissioner Pruden seconded the motion.

Chairman Thompson calls for final discussion. Commissioner Callahan stated that he understood the door is unique but that he felt the Commission should focus on the entirety of the house, and the use of the building that makes it viable. Commissioner Callahan felt that the change to the door is not an alteration inconsistent with preservation of the historic resource. Commissioner Davidson agreed with Commissioner Callahan, stating that while she is hesitant about removing historic fabric and going against a correct and well-argued staff report, the modification is an acceptable trade-off. Commissioner Campbell expressed his concern that the decision would set a precedent. Commissioner Callahan responded that he did not think it would set a precedent and felt that the HPC addresses each case separately. Chairman Thompson expressed his delight in having a applicant willing to be a steward of Governor Oden Bowie’s house. Chairman Thompson expressed his concerned about the slippery slope argument, which might slowly carve up the character of the property a little at a time. At the same time, he stated that he understood the “convenience” aspect of the argument, but that all aspects contributed to the character of the Bowie family, who were there from the early 1800s until recently. Vice Chair Scott expressed his concern about at what point does the HPC take exception. The point of the Commission is to preserve. He said he understands the need for balance but ultimately the owners should have understood the responsibility when they purchased the property. Vice Chair Scott said he took a tiny bit of solace that the change is reversible. Commissioner Davidson stated that the Commission should weigh each individual case on its merits and expressed concern that people do not want to deal with preservation because it is too rigid. Commissioner Muckle agreed with staff. The door

is just one aspect of the project, and that convenience is not a strong enough argument.

Chairman Thompson called for a roll-call vote. The motion failed 4-3-1 (Commissioners Campbell, Muckle, Schneider, and Vice Chair Scott voted against the motion, Commissioners Callahan, Davidson, and Pruden voted to pass the motion, and Chairman Thompson voted present). Chairman Thompson entertained a new motion.

MOTION: Commission Schneider made a motion to deny HAWP 2017-013 Item 3 in accordance with *Subtitle 29-111(A)* and recommend the approval of HAWP 2017 Items 1,2,4,5, and 6 meeting *Subtitle 29-111(B)* Criteria 1,2, and 4 and *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* 1,2,3,5,6 and 10 with the following conditions: the staff archeologist monitor the excavation of the post holes for the carport, the applicant provide specifications for the replacement doors providing for a straight rather than arched top rail, and the anchor/pattress plates to be painted to match the exterior of the building. Commissioner Muckle seconded the motion and Chairman Thompson called for a roll call vote. The motion passed 5-2-1 (Commissioners Campbell, Scott, Schneider, Muckle, and Davidson voted to pass the motion, Commissioners Callahan and Pruden voted to deny the motion and Chairman Thompson voted present).

Chairman Thompson noted that the HPC wanted to encourage the applicant, and work with the applicant in the future to make Fairview livable. Mr. Farrar clarified that the applicants have 30 days to file an appeal the decision.

2. HAWP 2017-018: Warren House (68-004-02)

Mr. Gross presented the staff report on HAWP 2017-018 for the Warren House, a Victorian house in Riverdale Park destroyed by fire. The permit is for demolition and new construction. The applicant's insurance company and structural engineer agreed that the fire constitutes a total loss and that rehabilitation is impossible. The applicant proposed a new two-and-a-half-story house on the site. The garage, drive and sidewalk remain. The proposed house will be of a similar design of the destroyed house, with an addition on the west side. The proposed house will include features similar to the historic house, including lapped wood siding, oriel window, and wraparound porch. Staff concluded that demolition was unavoidable and that the proposal was reasonable. Staff recommended approval, based on *Subtitle 29-111* Criteria (B):

(4) The proposal is necessary in order to remedy unsafe conditions or health hazards;

(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship;

and *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* criteria:

(1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristic of the building and its site and environment.

With the condition that the applicant submits roof material specifications from among the four proposed options.

Mr. Michael Herman, the applicant, presented the application stating that he lost everything in the fire and stated that unfortunately the county lost a historic site. Mr. Herman, who is the former Mayor of Riverdale Park, stated that Oliver Street is a quintessential historic street in Riverdale Park. Mr. Herman introduced the idea of an experimental roofing material. A slate roof would be prohibitively expensive. The applicant expressed his desire to have Tesla photovoltaic shingles. Mr. Philip Njowusi, the project architect, presented the proposed materials: TESLA Textured Glass, Slate Glass by TESLA, Timberline HD Birchwood, and Aledora Synthetic Slate. Slate Glass is the preferred material. Timberline or Synthetic Slate

is the second option. Mr. Herman explained that an addition was already planned prior to the fire. The idea to put a bedroom on the first floor was related to end-of-life care or aging-in-place opportunity. The proposed house is in keeping with the neighborhood, even incorporating plans for the addition. The applicant stated his desire that approval of HAWP 2017-018 give flexibility in terms of roofing material.

MOTION: Commissioner Pruden made a motion to approve HAWP 2017-018 as meeting Subtitle 111(B) number 4 and 5 and *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* 1. Motion seconded by Vice Chair Scott. The motion was approved by acclamation and without objection (8-0-1, Chairman Thompson voted "present").

D. Commission-Staff Items

- 1. Staff Sign-off Report** - Dr. Krause asked if there were any questions from the HPC on the Staff Sign-off report included in the packet. There were none.
- 2. Referrals Report** - Dr. Krause asked if there were any questions from the HPC on the Referrals Report included in the packet. There were none.
- 3. Correspondence Report** - Dr. Krause asked if there were any HPC questions about the Correspondence Report.

Commissioner Davidson asked about the Trileaf project potentially effecting Historic Greenbelt. Staff responded that it was involved the installation of cell tower utilities.

4. Other/New Business –

Dr. Krause distributed an article about the Whole Foods' Ice House to the Commissioners.

1. Welsh House (68-010-01)

Dr. Krause stated that staff had become aware of unpermitted work at the Welsh House, a Historic Site within the Hyattsville National Register District. DPIE issued a Stop Work Order for the removal of the rear porch. Several other violations exist on the site including the shed and window replacement. An incomplete application was submitted and staff is working with the property owners. Mr. Berger stated that it will appear on a future agenda as a compliance issue.

2. Ammendale Institute Site/St. Joseph's Chapel (60-004)

Staff was alerted to graffiti at the chapel and cemetery. During staff's site visit, unpermitted grading and paving of the Ammendale Institute site was noticed. DPIE was contacted and visited the site May 12 and issued a stop work order and a building violation notice. Staff is currently following up with the property owners.

3. Marlow Hunt Casket Shop (85A-033-14)

The owner and engineer appeared before the HPC about 1 ½ years ago. There are still compliance issues, and staff is still waiting on a completed HAWP. Staff is working with applicants to iron out compliance issues through the HAWP application process.

Mr. Berger presented a draft of a Tax Credit legislation amendment that would extend the amortization period of the county historic preservation tax credit from five to twenty years. Mr. Berger stated that it is within the HPC's purview to provide the council with an opinion. Chairman Thompson asked exactly

what tax liability is tied to the credit. Mr. Berger clarified that the credit is applied to the Real Property Tax Assessment only. Commissioner Pruden asked if there was a hearing scheduled for this. Mr. Berger answered not yet. Commissioner Davidson asked if there was an anticipated downside. Mr. Berger said that he did not foresee any anticipated objection and stated that it would not constitute a significant change to the county's tax revenues. Commissioner Pruden asked if a fiscal note has been provided. Mr. Berger said that he would find out.

Dr. Krause told the HPC about the Modern Materials Symposium on June 10th and that any commissioners interested in attending would be paid for by CLG grant funds.

Commissioner Pruden expressed appreciation for the real estate flyer generated by staff and stated a need to more easily identify historic resources on the market. Chairman Thompson stated that he has been in conversation with staff about designating or removing historic resources. Commissioner Muckle asked how staff and commissioners are being alerted when a property is put on the market. Mr. Gross described staff's current approach using public listings like Zillow and Redfin. Mr. Berger suggested that the Real Estate Association give real estate listings to the Historic Preservation Section for review. Mr. Berger stated that staff would pursue improving how Historic Resources are identified on PG Atlas.

6. Site Tour: Compton Bassett, June 3, 9:30-10:30am.

4. Meeting with Calvert County HPC (CLG Training Module)

5. Historic Preservation Reception: May 25, 6:00-8:30pm-Darnalls Chance

MOTION: Commissioner Pruden made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Commissioner Schneider; the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m. The next HPC meeting will be held on June 20, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Tyler Anthony Smith
Principal Planning Technician
Historic Preservation Section