

City of Keene
New Hampshire

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 20, 2026

4:30 PM

**2nd Floor Conference Room,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Sofia Cunha-Vasconcelos, Chair
Hope Benik, Vice Chair
Louise Zerba
Councilor Edward Haas
Russell Fleming, Alternate (Voting)

Staff Present:

Evan Clements, Planner / Zoning Administrator

Members Not Present:

Anthony Ferrantello
David Bergeron, Alternate
Peter Poanessa, Alternate

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM. Roll call was conducted. Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked Mr. Fleming to be a voting member in Mr. Ferrantello's absence.

2. Minutes: April 15, 2026 Regular Meeting

Ms. Zerba made a motion to approve the April 15, 2026 meeting minutes. Councilor Haas seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4 to 0. Mr. Fleming abstained due to not being present.

3. Public Hearing

A) HDC-26-01 – Major Project Application: Applicant: St. James Episcopal Church; Owner: Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of NH; Proposed installation of a 54-panel rooftop solar energy system at 44 West St. (TMP #575-034-000). Waivers from sec. 22.6.3.C.2 for slate roof replacement with metal and sec. 22.6.3.C.4 for chimney removal are requested. Property is ranked as a Primary Resource in the DT-C District.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos introduced the application and asked for advice from staff on the completeness of the application.

Mr. Clements stated that no exemptions from the submittal requirements were requested. He continued that however, before this meeting, staff felt that they were lacking some information

that is required from the regulations pertaining to quotes and documentation showing economic hardship related to the removal of the slate roof as well as the requirement to include alternative materials that the regulations request, versus the proposed materials of the roof. Since the writing of the staff report, the applicant has presented the HDC with additional information, including some information that the regulations did require.

Mr. Clements continued that it is the HDC's decision as to whether they feel the application is complete. One option would be to accept the application as complete, let the applicant state their case, and hear from staff, and then if they still feel like they need more time to review the materials, they could continue the application until next month. If they feel satisfied with the content of the application, they can render a decision tonight. That is the HDC's prerogative. Another option is for the HDC to not accept the application as complete and the hearing would stop here, and the applicant would need to re-notice for next month and that would give the HDC more time to look at the additional information that was presented at the beginning of the meeting. Staff's recommendation on completeness is more about whether the HDC feels that they have time to evaluate the new material that has been presented to them. He quickly looked through what the applicant submitted, and there appeared to be some quotes and information that the initial submittal lacked.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if that refers to the addendum regarding the economic hardship issue that was provided to all the HDC members just a moment ago. Mr. Clements replied yes.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if it is correct that staff's recommendation on completeness is that it depends on whether the HDC feels they have had time to review the information provided. Mr. Clements replied that he is inclined to recommend accepting the application as complete, and then if they need more time to process the additional information, at least the application has been accepted as complete, and if the HDC feels like they need to continue the application, the applicant will not need to re-notice. It would also give the applicant an opportunity to speak today.

Ms. Zerba made a motion to accept the application as complete. Councilor Haas seconded the motion.

Councilor Haas stated that even though the HDC members have not had the opportunity to examine the new information in detail, they had it qualitatively at prior meetings and from understandings from the applicant. He continued that if staff advises that the detail supports what they have had qualitatively before, he is happy to second the motion.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked by "prior meetings," Councilor Haas means the site visit they just had. Councilor Haas replied yes, and what was in the agenda packet. Ms. Zerba stated that during the site visit, all questions were answered very well. She continued that she felt that the concerns she had were answered to her satisfaction. Mr. Fleming stated that this is not the first time this matter has come before the HDC.

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked to hear from the applicant.

Peter Hansel of 61 Bradford Rd. stated that he has been selected as the spokesperson and has been a member of the St. James Church since the 1970s. He continued that he has some background in historic preservation. He was on the board of the Foundation for Preservation of Historic Keene for many years. His company, Filtrine Manufacturing, moved into the Cheshire Mills in Harrisville in the 1970s, and he became very used to working in an old building and the charm and challenges that that presents. Some of that applies to the site they are talking about today. He has been involved with a 200-year-old farm on Hurricane Rd., owned by Filtrine Manufacturing, which also has some challenges with an old barn. His own house was built in the 1860s. Thus, he has a lot of experience with old buildings.

Mr. Hansel thanked the HDC for the work they do to protect the historic nature of the community. He continued that they are blessed to have a historic Main St. and many historic buildings around town. Too many cities around the country have not taken the steps that Keene has taken to try and protect those. Thus, he congratulates the HDC members for volunteering to do this.

Mr. Hansel continued that he has been involved with resource conservation, both in terms of land and energy, and has served on the Energy and Climate Committee for years. That has also influenced his ability to work with the property committee at St. James Church to try and get a solar array installed and approved by the HDC. This project for solar on St. James started about 12 years ago when they first looked at it. They contacted several solar array companies. The first thing they said was, "*Very nice site, but we will not install solar on that slate.*" A lot has happened in those 12 years, but they are still fighting that issue, and the question of whether they can install solar on the slate.

Mr. Hansel continued that he praises the City of Keene for its position on energy use and the renewable energy goals the City Council set to try and move the community away from fossil fuels toward 100% renewable energy by 2030 for electricity and by 2050 for transportation and heating. That is a tall order. And they are not talking about just City buildings; they are talking about the whole community trying to rally around that goal. That is one of the things that inspires him about the St. James project. If they can do this on a church in the middle of Keene, he hopes others see it and follow suit. Keene has become designated as a Solar Smart City, which means they have taken steps to encourage solar in the community, making the pathways to that more easily achievable by residents, businesses, and organizations like St. James. He applauds the City. The City's website says the City wants Keene to be in the solar business, and they are making it solar-ready.

Mr. Hansel continued that regarding why St. James Church thinks the HDC should approve its application, the packet they originally provided covered most of what they wanted to state in terms of meeting the criteria for the requested waivers, but through consultation with Mr. Clements, they realized they needed to get into more detail on the economic hardship issue. Thus, the packet he provided today delves into that in more detail. St. James is, as is true of most churches these days, in economic trouble. They have declining numbers of people coming into church, which reduces the finances for maintaining the buildings. St. James is looking for all

ways to cut costs and improve their sustainability. For example, they removed some of the fossil fuel heating and changed that to heat pumps, about a year ago, in accordance with St. James's desires to maintain a sustainable future. One of the problems with that is it uses more electricity. They want to try and reduce that need by installing solar panels to take up that increase.

Mr. Hansel continued that the addendum they gave to the HDC covers some of the costs they have incurred in trying to maintain the slate roof over the years. The fourth page is a letter from Jancewicz and Son, the company that has been maintaining the slate roof for many years. They looked at St. James's needs and evaluated what they felt was the best solution, which is to remove the slate and install solar on top of a raised seam metal roof. St. James also contacted several solar installers to see if they could work with St. James on this project. They had three bids and others did not bid because they would not consider a solar installation on a slate roof. St. James chose ReVision Energy, which has a good reputation in Keene and has done a lot of work with the City as well as other residential and commercial installations around the city. He has personal experience with ReVision Energy through his business. Filtrine Manufacturing has a large solar array on its roof, installed by that company. St. James got a good analysis from them as to whether they could provide solar for the roof with the arrangement they have. They got advice from both Jancewicz and Son and ReVision Energy about the problem with the chimney, which led them to believe they should remove the chimney so the roof is wide open for a solar array. If they did not do that, the solar array would be an odd shape to go around the chimney, and that conflicts with some of the City's standards for solar arrays.

Mr. Hansel continued that over the years, St. James has spent thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands of dollars maintaining the roof. In 2014, they had to replace all the slate on part of the sanctuary, for \$160,000. That had to do a capital campaign for that. Every year, they run into expenses when the slate falls off. As they were walking back from today's site visit, they found a piece of slate on the ground that fell today. That is not an unusual occurrence. This one fell on the grass and was not a danger, but they have recently put in a garden there, so if someone had been gardening when it fell, it could have been a problem. The slate on the south side of the building that they are proposing for solar is on a public way, with a sidewalk where people walk and park their cars. Slate falling on that is an accident waiting to happen. The church has been trying to eliminate that liability, and this provides a perfect opportunity to do that. He does not know if the HDC calls that an economic hardship, but he would hate to be on the receiving end of a lawsuit if someone got hurt by that falling slate.

Mr. Hansel continued that every time slate needs to be replaced, they have to have someone like Jancewicz and Son come in with a crane to get up on the roof to do the replacement. The roof is 125 years old. The fasteners that attach the slates are copper, which degrades with time. As more years go by, the incidents of slate falling off will only get worse. That is a liability that the Diocese is not pleased about. The agenda packet includes a letter from the Diocese, Bengé Ambrogi, Manager of Special Projects, stating "their" (the Episcopal Diocese of New Hampshire's) perspective on this project and the need to go forward with it. They are the building's owner. St. James Church is the tenant. He mentioned the economic hardship from that perspective, but he cannot overemphasize the economic hardship of a potential claim if someone got hurt by a falling slate.

Mr. Hansel continued that St. James Church has looked at many types of materials for the roof. Standing seam metal is the best from the point of view of installing solar panels. Stepping back and looking at the broader picture of what they are trying to accomplish, humans are changing the climate in ways that threaten the future of not only humans in Keene, but all creatures around the world. Future generations should be able to look back at Keene and be proud of what they have preserved, and proud of the actions people took to make sure the environment is worth living in. He would be glad to address any additional concerns the HDC has about the economic hardship. He thinks St. James Church has given the HDC a lot to digest, but they have talked about it in person, and representatives from the two contractors St. James Church is working with are here to answer questions.

Reverend Elsa Worth, Rector of St. James Church, stated that she thinks they are coming to the HDC with something that is good for St. James Church, good for the City, and good for the earth. She continued that no one loves the historic building of St. James more than the people of St. James. It was built in 1896, and their faith community has prayed in it, cared for it, and stewarded it for almost 164 years. Their ministry in and around Keene was established in 1858, and their community, therefore, is almost 170 years old, making their faith community even more historic than the building. They are talking today about the historic preservation of their congregation, not just about the preservation of the building. St. James Church, as is true of most churches, receives no financial help from outside of itself for its yearly budget. People tend to assume churches are supported by some outside body, like a diocese or some sort of larger church body or denomination, but St. James Church is completely funded by its members and always has been. In 2026, St. James Church has 80 pledging members, which means 80 individuals or couples, who completely pay for every bit of the ministry, the staff and benefits, and the big, old building. If the HDC is worried about economic hardship, they can see it right there. The congregation is engaged with some significant sacrifice-giving to give the church what it needs and keep it vibrant and sound. Churches these days are experiencing decreasing membership, especially in the northeast, which is the least religious section of the country. Congregations of all denominations are generally older than they have previously been. Some congregations are on the edge of being able to keep going as an organization at all. If a few larger pledgers die or move away, or there is a big maintenance problem, and suddenly you cannot afford staff anymore, or clergy, or the building, things can all too easily go the way of their Methodist neighbors.

Rev. Worth continued that St. James Church is here to be as proactive in being as sustainable as possible for as long as possible in their church. In the light of current realities of churches, St. James Church is not just continuing to do the same things they have always done in hopes that everything will work out. They can see that they need to be proactive in reducing their carbon footprint, for the earth and for their bottom line. They also need to make some big, proactive, not-always-easy changes. They sold the Jonathan Daniels Building, which was sad, but they could not sustain it. They also sold the rectory on Church St., which was old and needed maintenance they could not sustain, and they bought a smaller rectory about a mile out of town that is easier to pay for and maintain. It would possibly keep the Church attractive to potential part-time priests if they have to reduce to part-time clergy in the future to have housing.

Rev. Worth stated that the solar array, as the application told the HDC, will not only result in significant savings during the projected life of the panels, but could generate income into the future. The solar array, along with the mini splits, is an integral part of St. James Church's financial sustainability plan. The HDC can see that the team has done a thorough, respectable job of due diligence, in time to meet the deadline of July 1st that allows them to apply for some federal rebates on this project. That is just a few weeks away, and they need to move forward with the HDC's waiver in order to meet that window.

Rev. Worth stated that the HDC has said St. James Church might not have enough evidence on economic hardship, but she can say, as the rector of the church, that even when a repair of a few slates costs thousands of dollars, it is an issue for their lean congregation. The potential cost of repairing the slate underneath solar panels, which has been not recommended by the professional, would require them to remove the slate, remove the solar panels and the supports, and find the leak. Putting solar on a 125-year-old roof would not be the most prudent choice. They have been told that the standing seam roof is the gold standard of solar installation. This piece of roof is about an eighth of St. James Church's roof, leaving 7/8ths of the beautiful slate on three other sides, completely intact. This tiny part of the roof would be mostly covered by solar, and they would not really see what was underneath it anyway. As the rector of St. James, she can tell them that they are already stretched financially, but nonetheless, they are proactively planning ahead, stewarding the church as they have done for almost 170 years, for the benefit of future congregants and the Keene community. After researching all the many solar options, they know they have presented to the HDC the most prudent and viable way to install solar on the roof so that it will remain safe and maintenance-free for 40 or more years. She urges the HDC to please look at the big picture that includes the health of the earth, Keene's community that benefits from St. James's ministry, Keene's stated energy goals, the facts presented about roofing and substrates and solar, and the faithful and vibrant ministry of St. James, one of the most historic, active, compassionate, and generous congregations in the city, whose work and mission in this community is something the city really needs, especially now. They need the HDC's approval to continue to steward both their ministry and their large historic building.

Mr. Hansel stated that standing seam metal roofs are not unusual in Keene. He continued that several historic buildings have it, such as the Colony Mill on West St., the Center of Keene on Emerald St., and Ted's Shoes on Main St. He would be happy to answer any of the HDC's questions or refer them to any of the experts who are here tonight.

Councilor Haas stated that they talked about colorations and the different options for the standing seam roof. He continued that the panels will be black, but that is related to the non-reflective nature of the solar panels. The underlying roof can be multiple colors. He asked if St. James Church had considered other colors.

Mr. Hansel replied that they considered a variety of colors. He continued that the Monadnock Conservancy building on Ashuelot St. has a burgundy-colored roof, which he thinks is beautiful, but that is not appropriate for St. James. They tried to come up with a color that would blend in with the architecture of the building and with the existing standing seam roof on the back side of that part of the building. There are different patinas in some of the copper that is in the main part of the church, such as on the steeple, and it would be difficult to try and match all of those

different ones. Thus, they debated whether they want metal to match the panels, or metal to complement the architecture. They decided, at this point, to try and complement the architecture. They have not committed to anything, however, so they are still open to input.

Ms. Zerba asked if they have any pictures of the differences between the two. Mr. Hansel replied yes, in the original packet. He referenced the color selection chart they have been looking at. He continued that they have been focusing on the dark bronze or medium bronze selections.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that she sees in the supporting materials that it is not suggested to install an array on the existing slate roof. She asked if the condition of the roof is such that it needs to be demolished. Mr. Hansel replied no, it can last, but lasting and needing repairs is another question. He continued that as he said, slates fall off daily or almost daily. At least, regularly. He asked Hunter Grillone to speak.

Hunter Grillone of Jancewicz and Son stated that regarding the conversation he would be having with someone asking that question, it would be answered differently if they were not considering solar. He continued that Jancewicz and Son have been maintaining the roof at a proven high cost. It is expensive to have the proper lift to be safe and maintain this roof over the course of time. If they were not putting solar on, his concern would be the slate randomly falling. Regarding the slate that fell in the past 24 hours, there was no snow or ice dislodging it; it just randomly fell.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if that is unusual for a slate roof of this age. Mr. Grillone replied that it is typical.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if it is correct that the roof is 127 years old. Mr. Grillone replied about 125 years old. Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that there is great concern that if the slates fall, there will be economic hardship, damage, and the potential for physical injury to someone. She asked if there has been any such economic damage, or physical damage to a person, in the past 125 years. Mr. Grillone replied that he cannot speak to personal injury or personal property damage. Mr. Hansel replied that he cannot speak to that, either. He continued that fortunately, St. James has not experienced it during his tenure there. Rev. Worth stated that as far as she knows, St. James has not experienced it in a way that they can document, but she can tell them that many times, there has been a slate in a place where a car or person could have been. It happens regularly.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if the roof is in good condition, fundamentally. Rev. Worth replied yes, it is well maintained by the stewardship of St. James, but it is an old roof, and maybe too told to survive being flawless under the panels for the life of the panels.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if the chimney is in such a state that it needs to be demolished. Mr. Grillone replied that as a building professional, he takes the thought process of demolition seriously. He continued that it does not matter whether it was built two years ago or 200 years ago. The sustainability does not happen when contractors want to come in because it is not quite done the way they would do it or the way it is done today. He does not expect a chimney that is not original to that section of building, but certainly older than he is, to be built and constructed to today's standards. The perspective he is bound to is that of the National Roofing Contractors'

Association (NRCA), which gives the proper details for flashing a roof around a masonry protrusion or any other protrusion. He would be responsible for the integrity of reflashing the chimney to the new roof. He must also prudently examine the chimney above the roofline. They do not want cracking or failing bricks or mortar above the flashing of the roof to come into the building and be perceived as a roof leak. A chimney evaluation followed. His document noted some brick deficiencies. Some of the bricks are failing and falling apart. The mortar is no longer sound. The chimney needs to be cleaned, resealed, and repointed. If it were to remain, his recommendation, based on his root cause analysis or needs-based site evaluation was that they were investigating to put solar on, and considering the chimney was not original to that section of the building and is need of significant repair without any real benefit to the church, as it is no longer in use, they recommend it being taken down while the roof is being done, not after, to allow for one less protrusion in the roof and to allow a greater size solar array to be placed on the structure.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that she hears that it is not original to the building. She asked if he can say how old the chimney is. Mr. Grillone replied that he personally cannot. Mr. Hansel replied that they did some research and found that the chimney was built several years after the original building was built. Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if “several years” means not decades. Mr. Hansel replied that he does not believe it was decades.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that it says it is “not recommended,” but her question is whether the vendor has the capability or has ever done a solar panel installation on a slate roof.

Dave Webb of Merrimack stated that he is a Keene State College (KSC) alumni and works for ReVision Energy. He continued that it is an employee-owned company and has been in business since 2003, operating in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. ReVision Energy does not suggest installing on existing slate roofs, and they are not willing to do it, for a handful of reasons. It is a maintenance concern. They do not suggest installing solar on a roof with a life expectancy that does not align with the life expectancy of the solar.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if ReVision Energy has ever installed a solar panel array on a slate roof. Mr. Webb replied that to his understanding, ReVision Energy has never installed solar on an existing slate roof, but on a newly-installed slate roof, yes.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that regarding economic hardship, she feels like there is a lot of data missing. She continued that the HDC has regulations around when slate can be removed. As far as she knows, there is nothing that says a slate roof cannot be replaced with another slate roof, so she would have appreciated some data on what the cost would have been to replace the slate roof and install solar on that. To her, it would have been a valuable data point to describe the economic hardship. She is hearing a lot about the church’s financial hardship, and she might have missed it, but she would have valued understanding what the church’s budget is and how the costs impact their bottom line. She hears that churches are economically challenged, but she would have appreciated some actual budgetary numbers to understand what the impact of maintaining the roof is to the church, and what the costs would mean for them against that budget.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos continued that she also does not see numbers on what the solar panels will save the church. She believes in green energy, loves the amount of solar that is going in, and is behind the City's mission, but she does not see any numbers regarding what cost the solar installation would save the church. She sees how many watts it will generate, but does not see what the church's consumption is. Maybe it was in the application and she missed it.

Mr. Webb stated that in the new packet of information the HDC received, the financial overview is the third to last page. He continued that a load summary is included. The current electric load within the facility versus what it will look like when they install solar is on the second to last page. It is a 54-panel system, and it is about 24 kw. That size array with that perfect exposure will produce a little over 31,000 kilowatt hours per year. All of the savings numbers are based off the 12-month utility rate averages. Installing solar will save the congregation about \$4,500 annually, while also qualifying for \$1,000 in renewable energy credits. Thus, it will save about \$5,500 per year. The second to last page shows the current usage, looking back on the last 12 months. The facility uses around 25,500 kilowatt hours per year. The solar will produce a little over 31,000, so the current system is producing about 125% of what the facility uses. You do not only get charged for kilowatt hour consumption; that is just the volumetric charge of your electric bill, which is about 60% of what you pay monthly. That surplus will turn into an on-bill dollar credit. Thus, even though it will produce 125% of what the facility uses, it does not mean the church's bill will be zero, and it does not mean that solar will be a money-maker for them. They will still have a financial burden, and during the winter when the solar is not producing as much, they will still have a utility bill. They will rack up a credit during the warmer months when the solar is producing more than what the facility uses, but they will quickly use those credits during the cooler months.

Mr. Fleming stated that the City's rules say, "*Character-defining chimneys shall not be removed unless determined to be a safety hazard,*" but during the site visit, he saw that the church is primarily made of stone and the chimney is made of brick. He asked if there are other substantial parts of the church made of brick, such that it could be considered "character-defining." Mr. Hansel replied not that he is aware of. Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if there is one more brick chimney on the building. Mr. Hansel replied that the chimney for the existing boiler, which serves the primary part of the church, does have a brick chimney.

Mike Metell of 19 Salisbury Rd. stated that there used to be two chimneys, and one was removed. He continued that there used to be one in the entryway in the front of the church. In old photographs, you can see it if you look carefully. The Keene Sentinel informed the Solar Project Team about a lot of things. The fireplace Rev. Worth talked about was a gift from a parishioner. They had the welcoming in November 1899, and there is doubt about whether it was installed. They installed a steam system to heat the whole new building and parts of the church. It is likely that the project manager of that time had to look at his punch list, and the article said that he was busy and concerned and had about 70 items he needed to complete before winter. Thus, he suspects that the fireplace that was gifted might have been installed after the fact. Mr. Webb was looking for ways to hide conduit. They looked at the support. It had a lot of brick, and a lot of brick missing. His point is, yes, there was another chimney. It was taken down well before the HDC came into business.

Mr. Fleming stated that he has another question for the roofer. He continued that when he sees new slate roofs, they seem to be artificial slate. He asked if anyone puts in new slate roofs anymore with actual slate. Mr. Grillone replied that they do a handful a year, typically when at architect specification only. Mr. Fleming asked what types of buildings those are, when the architect says to only use slate. Mr. Grillone replied they are typically high-end, high net wealth, individual homes.

Mr. Hansel stated that the Monadnock Conservancy building he mentioned, on Ashuelot St., does not have a slate roof, but it has slate walls. Mr. Fleming asked if it is real slate. Mr. Hansel replied yes.

Councilor Haas stated that it seems like there could have been two projects here, a roof replacement project that might have stood on its own, at least meeting economic hardship matters, separate from the solar installation. He continued that they are talking a lot about the roof and maintaining the roof, but that might have justified itself on its own. Slate roofs are beautiful but difficult.

Mr. Clements stated that he will go through the staff report and talk about the waiver criteria and information in the application. He continued that the project building, the St. James Episcopal Church, is located at 44 West St. on the corner of St. James St. and West St. The building is located about 350 feet from Central Square. The church was originally constructed around 1863 by Shepherd Woodcock and designed by architect Charles E. Parker. The first service was held in 1864. Prior to its construction, there was no permanent Episcopalian congregation in Keene, only occasional, visiting clergymen who provided services to residents. In 1899, the parish house was constructed on the south side of the church and designed to match the existing style of the original building. It was later converted into an office and reception area, which is his understanding of how it is currently being used. The building was designed in the gothic revival style with stone façade, pointed arch windows and doors, vaulted gable roof line with slate roof tiles, and a prominent bell tower. The granite façade is broken up with stained glass windows. In 2000, a significant investment was made in the church to upgrade it for ADA accessibility compliance. In 2001, a columbarium was added to the west side of the property to house the ashes of parishioners, and a garden with wrought iron fences was installed to enclose that area.

Mr. Clements continued that as the applicant stated, the purpose of this application is technically to install a rooftop solar energy system, consisting of 54 photovoltaic solar panels. All conduit is proposed to be routed internally, along with the inverter and a 100-amp disconnect. A second 100-amp disconnect is proposed along the western exterior of the building adjacent to an existing heat pump array with some expanded screening. Originally, this application was noticed very specifically with two waivers in mind. Technically, there are three waivers. Staff created a revised motion sheet that HDC members have been given, to refer to Section 22.6.3.C, which incorporates the removal of the slate roof; the use of a standing seam metal roof, as opposed to an alternative that is articulated in the regulation; and the removal of the chimney. Fundamentally, the request that was noticed to the public is accurate. It was just a matter of a section notation. Per Table 22-3 in the Land Development Code (LDC), this work is classified as a Major Project, which is why they are all here today.

Mr. Clements continued that Section 22.5.5.A says, “*Renewable systems shall be installed in a location and manner on the building or lot that is the least visible and obtrusive, in such a way that causes the least impact to the historic integrity and character of the historic building, structure, site, or district, while maintaining efficient operation of the system.*” As explained in the project narrative, and as looked at by staff, this is a very challenging standard for the applicant to meet. The regulations articulate six choices for where a rooftop system should be placed, going from most desirable to least desirable. The list is as follows:

- “1. *The rear or side of the property not facing a public right-of-way.*
2. *On an accessory building or structure such as a shed, garage, or barn in a location that is least visible from the public right-of-way.*
3. *On newer additions to the principal structure in a location that is least visible from the public right-of-way.*
4. *On the flat roof of the principal structure setback in the least visible location.*
5. *On a secondary façade or roof not facing the public right-of-way of the principal structure.*
6. *On facades or roofs facing the public right-of-way.*”

Mr. Clements stated that he suggests the HDC acknowledge the unique location and orientation of the property. The proposed southern façade, while highly visible from Gilbo Ave., is a secondary façade, compared to the primary façade of the church on West St. The proposed location of the array is not visible from West St. The applicant has gone to lengths to diminish the visual impact of the array, through their color choices with the proposed roof. Thus, staff believes the standard related to placement has been met, due to the lot’s unique characteristics.

Mr. Clements continued that standard F of Section 22.5.5 says, “*A solar array grid should be regular in shape and joined, and multi-roof solutions should be avoided.*” As the applicant explained, the proposal to eliminate the chimney would allow them to adhere to this regulation. It would get a nice, uniform panel orientation that would be conducive to power generation and reduce the visual impact. Staff believes this standard has been met. The proposed system is designed to be removed, in a way that is not damaging to the historic building. The use of the standing seam roof with a flush mount rail racking system and special S-5 clamps, for which specification sheets are in the agenda packet, are designed specifically for the metal roof system to reduce the amount of potential damage that removing the system would be for the roof. Staff believes that standard has been met, assuming the metal roof. Regarding color, the standard is, “*In order to minimize visual impacts, the color of equipment and assemblies associated with the system shall either be muted or match nearby materials and colors, and solar panels shall have an anti-reflective coating.*” His understanding is that the FAA requires that solar panels not be reflective. The whole point of the panels is to absorb light, not reflect it, so it is standard practice in the industry for panels to not generate an amount of glare that would be described as a nuisance. Staff believes this standard has been met. The proposed system is flush mount with a little bit of gap to the roof, and is on the same plane of the roof, as required by the regulations, so that standard is met. Standard G is, “*All supplementary equipment and supply lines associated with the renewable energy system shall be placed in inconspicuous locations and/or concealed from view with architectural elements.*” The church and everyone here tonight have been great to work with, with the running supply lines for the mini splits that they installed about a year ago, by utilizing existing architectural features or venting existing penetrations so that new

penetrations did not need to be created. The lines were masked where possible and screening was installed for the condensers. Staff believes that the care and practice to do so for any required exterior lines will continue to be followed. Thus, they believe that standard has been met.

Mr. Clements stated that lastly, he will say that as Councilor Haas said, this application kind of feels like two applications in one, because it is predicated on such a significant change to the historic resource. He continued that he would say that if the proposed roof surface was an existing standing seam or architectural asphalt shingles, this would be a very well put-together application that appears to meet the solar energy regulations of the HDC. Unfortunately, the request to remove the slate makes it far more complicated. The church came before the HDC in January 2024 for advice and comment on this idea. At the time, the church was saying it was impossible to install solar on slate. Some vendors in Europe have more practice installing on slate, but in the US, there were no vendors who did this in a way that would be viable or that they would want the work to be done. In the supplemental information provided today, the applicant notes that of the three vendors for the solar install, one did say they could install it on the slate roof, although they have never done it before.

Mr. Clements continued that the challenge this evening is that the regulations are very clear. He will give a hypothetical example. Say there is a single-family home in the Historic District with a slate roof that has deteriorated to the point where it needs to be fundamentally repaired or replaced. The owner is not economically equipped to replace that slate roof. The regulations talk about requiring a roofing contractor, highly experienced in slate work, to provide an analysis of the condition of the existing slate, the percentage of the slate that is beyond repair, amount of slate that is salvageable, the cost of using new slate where replacement is warranted, re-using existing slate, including relocation of non-visible portions of the roof to the visible portions of the roof that need replacement. It also requires other estimates for other roofing materials. The regulation then goes on to discuss the materials that should be used if they are talking about replacing a failed slate roof with other materials. It could be either replacement slate, slate that is salvaged, synthetic slate, or asphalt shingles that are similar in color and appearance to the original slate roof that is being replaced. Metal is not one of those materials. That is what necessitates St. James Church's waiver from the material choice. The question that they are seeking waivers from is both the removal of the character-defining roof and then also the replacement with the material that while best suited for the intent of this project, is not necessarily aligned with the strict interpretation of the regulation.

Mr. Clements continued that he belabors all of that because that is why waivers exist. The waiver criteria are as follows:

- “1. Strict application of these regulations would result in a particular and exceptional difficulty or undue hardship under the owner of the affected property, and*
- 2. An alternative design or materials meet the design objectives stated in the Historic District Regulations of this LDC equally well or better than would strict compliance with these regulations are, and*
- 3. The waiver may be granted without substantial detriment to the intent of the historic regulations and the public good.”*

Mr. Clements continued that it is the HDC's responsibility to weigh the strict regulations and the intent and the proposal to determine whether the waivers are justified and meet the criteria. The purpose of the Historic District Regulations is *"to recognize, preserve, enhance, and perpetuate buildings, structures, and sites within the City of Keene's Downtown Historic District having historic, architectural, cultural, or design significance."*

Mr. Clements continued that lastly, regarding the motion, the HDC members should not use the motion language from the staff report, and should instead use the modified draft motion. It more properly articulates the waiver requests being sought. Staff is not recommending any conditions of approval. A building permit will be required for the roof work and the solar system installation.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked Mr. Clements to review what the criteria are for the demolition of a chimney. Mr. Clements replied that it says, *"A character-defining chimneys shall not be removed unless determined to be a safety hazard by the Building and Health Official or their designee and repair constitutes an economic hardship."*

Mr. Fleming stated that Mr. Clements described the building as gothic revival style. He asked if the chimney would also be described as such. Mr. Clements replied that he does not know. He continued that he characterizes the building as gothic revival because that is what the architectural inventory of this property described it as. Mr. Fleming stated that in his opinion, the chimney is not noticeable to the building's style. He continued that people more likely notice the bell tower and other aspects of the building. The chimney is not as noticeable as, say, the chimney on the Colony Mill building. Mr. Clements stated that he agrees. He continued that the regulation says that *"character-defining chimneys"* shall not be removed. If the HDC makes a determination that this chimney is not character-defining to the resource, then the standard does not necessarily apply. Staff will not make that call. Staff recommended that the applicant request that waiver, to let the HDC decide whether the chimney was character-defining, and if so, whether its removal meets the waiver criteria to be removed.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked for public comment, either for or against the application.

Mike Metell of 19 Salisbury Rd. stated that he has experience with property management and engineering. He continued that he used to work for Vermont Yankee, so he is very familiar with codes and standards. He reviewed the staff report, and looked at the LDC regulations. Regarding Section 22.6.3.C.2, he agrees with Mr. Clements about 95%. It is very strict and onerous and would push them to economic hardship. However, he wants to point to the first sentence: *"Slate shall be retained whenever economically feasible."* That is a different standard. The definition of *"economic hardship"* is in a different section of the Code, but *"economic feasibility"* is not. What you prove on *"economic feasibility"* is looking into the future and asking, is this going to give me a problem? Is this viable? Should I invest money in it? That is the standard. When you take that with the other 95%, it does not make sense in that standard, but he thinks it is very important, because when he drafted the first part of the application and then Edie collected all of the supplemental information that staff had requested, that standard is all swapped around. It is not an *"economic hardship,"* it is an *"economic feasibility."* They must look into the future instead of the past. For example, say a tree falls on a slate roof of a house. The homeowner has to

figure out what to do and how to pay a contractor to fix it. The contractor tells him an asphalt roof would be about \$45,000, or a slate roof would be about \$100,000. The homeowner cannot afford the slate, so he applies to the HDC for a waiver from this standard, because that is a true economic hardship. The HDC would have no problem with that. However, St. James Church is looking ahead. They do not want to get into trouble, or leave a situation for the patrons in the future to have to fix leaks or address slates falling on them. In today's packet of supplemental information, they have a summary of that. It is important, and he encourages the HDC to look at it. It is an economic feasibility argument because it is based totally on risk. From his reading of the Code, that is what they need to do.

Mr. Clements stated that to clarify for the HDC, this part of the meeting is for members of the public who are not directly associated with the application to give their thoughts.

Sean Burke of Walpole stated that he is the President of the Keene Sentinel at 60 West St. He continued that as a neighbor, he wants to wish the church the best of luck in this endeavor. He thinks it is good and worthwhile work. His question is about accessibility. The Keene Sentinel shares St. James St. with the church, and has an active loading dock. Customers, vendors, and employees use the street daily. He is concerned about any impediments to the Keene Sentinel's deliveries, which happen every day, or accessibility of their stakeholders.

Mr. Webb stated that from a solar perspective, this is a rather quick installation. He continued that the roof work will be done before ReVision Energy shows up, and for the solar installation they will be able to stage most of their equipment on the solar side of the building. They can stay off of St. James St., except for the work of putting the exterior disconnect there, on the side where there is screening, where the air source heat pump is. There is ample space for ReVision Energy to do that work without impeding the roadway at all. Just below the roof surface, they will flag off the area so that pedestrians cannot walk below during the installation. The solar installation should take about a week.

Mr. Grillone stated that regarding the roof portion of the work, Jancewicz and Son would come in and set up OSHA-compliant scaffolding. He continued that they would have a lift there. They would occupy the sidewalk space immediately below the roof plane where they are requesting solar. He believes there are two City-designated parking spaces on the same side of the building. He anticipates that in addition to the building permit, Jancewicz and Son would request a permit to work within the right-of-way for what they would have to do there. He anticipates they would be on site and occupying the space for their scope of work for about one week.

Mr. Fleming asked if that means the roofing work will obstruct part of St. James St. for a week, or not at all. Mr. Grillone replied that they would not be obstructing St. James St. He continued that they would be accessing from Lamson St.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if there was anything further from the public. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing and asked the HDC to discuss the application.

Ms. Zerba stated that she thinks the St. James presenters more than adequately gave the HDC reasons for economic hardship, and she thinks they validated those reasons very well. She

continued that she agrees with staff comments about the standards being met. She knows the chimney is deemed to be removed because they are not using it and it is potentially in disrepair and bricks could fall periodically. Since it is on a secondary view and not the main façade of the church, she thinks its removal will make the solar installation better. It would be cleaner and have a better appearance. She supports the chimney removal, and she supports the solar panel installation on the standing seam metal roof, knowing they are non-reflective and will be as unobtrusive as possible so they will not draw the eye to that roof line.

Mr. Fleming stated that the staff report said that when these rules were developed, the HDC was thinking of a single-family home with a slate roof and a piece of property. He continued that the fact that this comes down to a sidewalk adds a dimension to it from a safety and liability standpoint that is an economic hardship in and of itself. If people from St. James came in today and said they had a lawsuit last year from someone seeking, say, \$3 million from St. James and it could happen again, the HDC would acknowledge that it is an economic hardship to have 125-year-old fasteners holding up the slate tiles above the sidewalk. He does not think they need to wait for that to happen. He thinks everyone can envision something like that happening, and it would be horrible for the church. He does not think the chimney is character-defining, and he thinks there is a hardship issue. It is an exceptional difficulty the church is faced with. He would be in favor of the draft motions staff gave them.

Councilor Haas stated that he has four points. One, if the applicant was presenting the HDC with a request for solar on a new slate roof they were installing, from what he heard from the staff report, that would flow through easily, as it does not face the main way and meets all the other requirements in Section 22.5.5 for solar installation. He continued that that should stand on its own. The replacement of the roof is almost a subset of that. The roof will be covered by a solar installation that the HDC would approve anyway, thus, the roof is somewhat irrelevant here, other than to facilitate the solar installation. Two, the chimney is unused. An unused chimney will not be maintained and will further deteriorate, which presents a hazard to nearby vehicles and people passing by. Slate comes down in little pieces, but chimneys come down all at once. Three, in the supplemental information received today, he sees a payback period of about 11 years before the solar installation really starts contributing to the church, not only offsetting their costs immediately, but then in the future, helping the church maintain itself in the community. Four, as Mr. Fleming referenced how the LDC is currently worded, there might be some motivation here for some changes to the LDC to help better address situations like this. He will support the waiver.

Ms. Benik stated that she agrees with the other HDC members who have spoken. She continued that the chimney is not character-defining, nor a visually impactful part of the church, and she does not think removing it is an issue. The roof itself seems problematic, whether they continue to maintain the current slate roof, and it is not replaceable with new slate. That is not an option for the church, financially. The solar would pay off in the long term. She is also on board with accepting these motions.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that she is trying to separate her disappointment with the work that was done in preparation for this application from the work that is actually being done and the value of that work. She continued that as an attorney, process is an important part of what she

does, and it is an important part of what the HDC does. Everyone is supposed to go through the same process; that is why they have the rules. From her perspective, the economic hardship argument amounted to “just trust us.” She did not see numbers that she would have wanted to see to convince her. It is not that she does not believe the economic hardship is there – the point is they need to provide the evidence.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos continued that if this had been done in pieces, things would be going very differently. She agrees that if the solar was going on a new roof, this would be approved without a doubt. However, she does not like that they are circumventing the process for making a determination on the roof. If this was just about the roof, the HDC would need to see a report about what was salvageable and what was not. There are steps that would need to be gone through. She does not see any of that in the application, and there is no conversation about material options. They are just skipping to the final step. She likes the chimney. She hears that other HDC members disagree that it is part of the original appearance and fitting, which is fine.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos continued that it feels like the HDC is making a lot of concessions, without having gone through the full process. She personally does not like that. As she said, everyone is supposed to go through the same process, and it feels like there are three different things going on and the process for all three things was not followed. She also hears mitigation offered by HDC members, which she does not know the HDC has necessarily offered to other applicants, which concerns her. She is trying to separate her concerns about process from the importance of the application’s goals and what the waivers will achieve. She will thus allow further discussion and think some more.

Councilor Haas stated that he respects what Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos says. He continued that he tries to respect process, and he respects Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos’s comments on the need to follow a process, as someone could come with a similar application next month and the HDC could reject it for not having sufficient hardship justification. He asked if the applicant is required to meet all five points in order to be granted a waiver, or if the HDC can waive any of the points that go into granting a waiver.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked Mr. Clements to advise on that. Mr. Clements stated that the HDC needs to find that all three waiver criteria have been met to grant a waiver.

Councilor Haas replied that the HDC needs to use its judgement in that. He continued that certainly, there could have been more substantiation of the finances, as the HDC might require of someone else, but they have to use their judgement as to how well a group might be able to provide that justification. This is a tough one, looking at whether a very strict process is applicable to every applicant that comes before the HDC.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked for further comment. Hearing none, she asked for a motion.

Ms. Zerba made a motion for the Historic District Commission to grant a waiver from Section 22.6.3.C of the Land Development Code to permit the removal of the chimney on the south roof and the removal of the slate roof on the parish house portion of the St. James Church, to be

replaced with a standard seam metal roof, with the condition that the roof be non-reflective as discussed.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if it is correct that Ms. Zerba's motion is the first paragraph of the draft motion with the condition that the roof be non-reflective. Ms. Zerba replied yes, a non-reflective material. Mr. Clements stated that she can add that as a condition for the motion to approve the application, but the waiver motion is self-contained. Ms. Zerba replied that she will withdraw the condition.

Councilor Haas seconded the motion.

Councilor Haas stated that he has a question about the second paragraph that is suggested. Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos replied that the second paragraph is a free-standing motion. She continued that there is an order of operations here. Mr. Clements replied yes, they need two votes – a vote on the waiver, and then a vote on the application.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked for discussion on the motion. Hearing none, she called for a vote. The motion passed on a vote of 5-0.

Mr. Fleming made a motion to approve HDC-26-1 to allow for the installation of a 54-panel rooftop solar energy system on the property located at 44 West Street as presented in the application and supporting materials received on April 13, 2026 and revised on May 7, 2026 with no conditions.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked for discussion. Mr. Clements asked if Ms. Zerba wanted to add the condition of the roof being non-reflective. Ms. Zerba replied yes.

Ms. Zerba made a motion to amend the motion, to add the condition of the roof being non-reflective. Mr. Fleming seconded the amendment.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked for discussion on the amendment.

Mr. Fleming stated that he wants to make sure it is correct. He continued that he knows the solar panels are non-reflective, but he is not sure if the metal roof is also proposed to be non-reflective.

Mr. Grillone replied yes, there are two options for coatings. He continued that one would be a high gloss, and with the color of the proposed palette, the other would be what the manufacturer says is a low gloss. For clarity, the finishes are solar reflective. He thinks what the HDC is looking for is the low gloss coating, with the least amount of sun reflective where you look at it and it is not a high gloss sheen. Ms. Zerba asked if "low gloss" would be better wording than "non-reflective." Mr. Grillone replied yes, that would be helpful.

Mr. Clements asked if Mr. Fleming would be amenable to amending his motion with that condition. Mr. Fleming replied with the low gloss condition, yes.

Mr. Fleming made a motion to approve HDC-26-01 to allow for the installation of a 54-panel rooftop solar energy system on the property located at 44 West Street, as presented in the application and supporting materials received on April 13, 2026 and revised on May 7, 2026, with the condition that the finish on the standing seam metal roof be low gloss. Ms. Benik seconded the motion.

With Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos's permission to address the HDC, Mr. Grillone asked if the HDC would like to specifically dictate the color, or if the two proposed colors acceptable so the church could make that determination. Mr. Fleming replied that he was going to raise that issue after the HDC voted on the motion. Mr. Clements stated that the application has the dark bronze as the proposed color for the roof. He asked if any HDC members are not comfortable with that.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos proposed they vote on the motion regarding the low gloss and the approval of the entire process, and then they will get to the paint color in a moment. She asked if that works. Mr. Clements replied that it would be hard to do that once they have already approved the application. He continued that the application proposes dark bronze. If the HDC is comfortable with that color, they can just vote on the motion as is. If they want to condition a different color, they will need to ask Mr. Fleming to amend his motion again.

Councilor Haas stated that the dark bronze is in the application, so that is what they would be voting on today. He continued that they would need to reject the application if they wish to change the color, or condition the motion upon making it a different color that the HDC would specify at this moment. He asked if they could amend the application on the fly to remove reference to any color.

Mr. Fleming stated that he could make an amendment to say "low gloss dark bronze" instead of just "low gloss." He asked if that would be acceptable.

Councilor Haas stated that the entire roof needs to be covered with solar panels, which are essentially black, so the only color that would be seen is in the three-foot edge of the roof. He continued that he wonders if that could match the wall and look better, because the rest of it will be irrelevant, since it will be all black from the solar panels. It would be more pleasing to the eye to have a gray come up to a black.

Mr. Webb stated that he has a quick correction – they will be three feet down from the ridge, and three feet in from both roof rakes, and then three feet from the drip edge. He continued that the dark bronze would be more like a "picture frame" versus just dark brown exposed at the bottom. Due to the roof's steep nature, you will be able to see the three-foot gap between the ridge and the start of the solar panels.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if that changes anyone's opinion. She continued that the HDC has the opportunity to approve the project with a low gloss finish in the dark bronze, or redesign the motion in its entirety. She asked how important this is to the HDC members. Mr. Fleming replied that part of the presentation was St. James's desire to match the overall coloration of the church as opposed to just the solar panels. He continued that he thinks a great deal of thought has already gone into this.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if the HDC was ready to vote on the motion presented by Mr. Fleming and seconded by Ms. Benik.

The motion passed on a vote of 5-0.

4. Staff Updates – OpenGov

Mr. Clements stated that there is a new file designation. He continued that the applications used to be referred to as a COA, Certificate of Appropriateness, with a dash with the year and then a sequential number. He continued that the City has recently gone live with a new, comprehensive, online permitting system called OpenGov. It is for land use permits, building permits, fire permits, and operational permits. For example, one of the things the applicant talked about was the encumbrance on St. James St. The Public Works Department issues right-of-way encumbrance permits for something like use of a cherry picker in a parking space downtown to repair façade or put up scaffolding. That will all be done through an online portal now. The HDC will notice the file name change from COA to HDC. Administrative HDC applications will also be HDC, the year, then the sequential number. Thus, the HDC members might see gaps in that sequential number. They will have a new application next month, which came in as 26-2, but if they get some administrative approvals, the next one the HDC sees might be something like 26-6 or 26-7.

Mr. Clements continued that another thing to be aware of is that the output for what is submitted through that portal will look different in the agenda packet than what the HDC members are used to with that paper form. The information the City will be collecting is fundamentally the same; it will just look a little different. Thirdly, staff asks the HDC to please bear with them as they get used to this new system. There might be an evolution of what the HDC members see submitted to them in the agenda packet, because staff are still trying to come up with a way in OpenGov to extract the relevant information, in a way that is easy to consume visually. In the short term as they go through this transition, he encourages them to utilize the Staff Report, which is always a summary of what is going on.

Mr. Clements stated that the City received two bids for the Downtown Infrastructure Project. and was moving forward with one of the bids. He continued that a contract is being worked out. It came in about \$2 million less than the previous round, from a vendor that the City has used in the past. It is still about \$2 million more than what was budgeted. He has immense respect for the Public Works Director's work to bridge the funding gap. The decision is not final and it will be acted on at tomorrow's City Council meeting.

Ms. Zerba stated that the Heritage Commission is looking at some of the tweaks that might have been made to reduce that amount, and hoping that some of the historical features that were in before are not totally eliminated. Councilor Haas replied that he encourages anyone who was concerned about different pieces of it being taken out to review the line item list that has been circulated. He continued that the Public Works Director put that together, with the costs included. He is not sure how to find it, however. Mr. Clements replied that he is not sure if it is on the City's website. Councilor Haas stated that it is in the agenda packet at least. He continued

that he knows several of the items on this four-page list will come under discussion at the Council meeting tomorrow.

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos asked if Mr. Clements can send the HDC members a link to the line item list that Councilor Haas referenced. Mr. Clements replied that the City website has tomorrow's Council agenda packet, which includes the Downtown Infrastructure Project Financing Plan Report, and more. He continued that he will go through it and find the list the HDC is looking for, and email them the link.

Mr. Clements stated that the Heritage Commission and the HDC had a joint meeting last week, and both bodies will need to approve the meeting minutes from that. He continued that those draft minutes are not ready yet, so the HDC can act on them in June.

5. New Business

Councilor Haas asked if there is any report from Mr. Ferrantello's meeting at KSC, or if anyone attended that. He continued that he lost track of that. Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos replied that she is not aware of that meeting having been held. Mr. Clements replied that he thinks they had a scheduling conflict and he is not sure if they pinned down a date.

Ms. Benik stated that she is not quite finished with her video task for the HDC, but she should be finished by the next time they meet. Mr. Clements asked if she wants that on the agenda for next month. Ms. Benik replied yes.

6. Upcoming Dates of Interest:

A) Next HDC Meeting: June 17, 2026 – 4:30 PM

B) HDC Site Visit: June 17, 2026 – 3:30 PM (to be confirmed)

Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos stated that the HDC meets again on June 17 at 4:30 PM. She continued that Mr. Clements will keep them posted about whether there will be a site visit. She asked if Mr. Clements can tell them anything about the application.

Mr. Clements replied yes, it has been submitted, so that is public record. He continued that the HDC cannot talk about it now, but it is an application for a mural on the Colonial Theater.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Cunha-Vasconcelos adjourned the meeting at 6:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Evan J. Clements, Planner / Zoning Administrator