

City of Keene
New Hampshire

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 19, 2021

4:30 PM

Remote Meeting via Zoom

Members Present:

Andrew Weglinski, Chair
Russ Fleming, Vice Chair
Hope Benik
Hans Porschitz
Councilor Workman
Tia Hockett, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Planner

Members Not Present:

Sam Temple
Peter Poanessa, Alternate
Dave Bergeron, Alternate

Chair Weglinski read a prepared statement explaining how the Emergency Order #12, pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04 issued by the Governor of New Hampshire, waives certain provisions of RSA 91-A (which regulates the operation of public body meetings) during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.

1) **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chair Weglinski called the meeting to order at 4:31 PM. Roll Call was taken.

Chair Weglinski invited Tia Hockett to act as a voting member for the meeting. Ms. Hockett accepted.

2) **Minutes of April 21, 2021**

Russ Fleming made a motion to accept the minutes of April 21, 2021 as presented. Hope Benik seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3) **Public Hearings:**

COA-2021-02 - 17-23 Mechanic St – Lead Paint Abatement - Applicant and owner Greenwald 2 LLC proposes to install vinyl siding over the existing wood siding and trim on the buildings located at 17-23 Mechanic St (TMP# 554-082-000). A waiver is requested from Sec. XV.B.3.b.4 of the HDC Regulations to allow the use of vinyl siding. The property is ranked as a Contributing Resource and is located in the Central Business District.

Chair Weglinski read the applicant's request and asked for staff recommendation on completeness of the application.

Mari Brunner reported that the Applicant had requested exemptions from providing a site plan and building elevations, as no changes are proposed to the site and the only changes to the building include a change in the exterior materials. She went on to state that in place of elevations, the applicant had submitted photographs of the building facades to show existing conditions. Staff recommended that the Commission grant the requested exemptions and accept the application as "complete."

Hans Porschitz made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Fleming seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Weglinski opened the public hearing and invited the applicant and owner Mitch Greenwald of Greenwald 2 LLC to present on his application.

Mr. Greenwald stated that he and his son purchased the aforementioned buildings in 2010, noting that they were in very poor condition on both the interior and exterior, and had experienced a lot of damage. He and his son managed to turn the buildings around by renovating almost all apartments and doing significant re-painting. He went on to state that when they originally purchased the buildings they were flaking red paint, which may have been a missed indication that there was an issue.

Mr. Greenwald reported that in early April they were informed that a small child who lives in one of the apartments had tested positive for lead, which triggered a process that brought in a state investigator and a risk assessor. He went on to state that they relocated the resident and the child had since recovered; however, they are now faced with lead remediation and an estimated cost of \$7,500 to replace a windowsill and two doors in the aforementioned apartment. Additionally, the risk assessor noticed that on the exterior of the building, under multiple layers of latex paint, there was lead paint. Mr. Greenwald stated he was given a number of options which included:

1. Removing and replacing all the siding, expensive disposal of materials and repainting, estimated at \$400,000
2. Repair, scrape, paint and encapsulate all surfaces, estimated at \$200,000
3. Cover all surfaces with vinyl siding and sheet metal, estimated at \$100,000

Mr. Greenwald reported that there is no state or federal money available unless they go into all apartments and they are all lead remediated, which would mean all tenants would be displaced. Given all that information and after weighing all the options, he stated the chosen solution is to install vinyl siding for both buildings. Mr. Greenwald reported that he found a contractor that is lead certified to do the work, which is an additional cost as well.

He went on to explain that they selected a similar color to the wood siding already on the building and stated the new siding would cover the present wood siding that is worn out

and cracked. He added that the more damaged areas may require the wood to be removed, and in that case, plywood would be added and vinyl siding placed over top.

Mr. Greenwald noted that from a distance you won't be able to tell a difference other than the fact that the buildings will look significantly better, thus improving the neighborhood. He referred to pictures of surrounding neighborhood buildings that he had taken, most of which have vinyl siding, which he stated gave him confidence that the building would fit in with what's already there. Mr. Greenwald then shared several pictures of the buildings he owns from multiple angles, and pointed out the two architectural wood trim features that would be removed, encapsulated, and put back to preserve the history. He pointed out that with the poor condition of the wood, encapsulating it wouldn't improve it like vinyl would. He again assured the commission that, when finished, the building will not look different. Lastly, he showed the proposed products they would use and price estimates for each option.

Chair Weglinski invited the commission to ask questions.

Mr. Fleming asked if the risk assessor was someone from the state agency and if he went into other units. Mr. Greenwald replied that the state sent out an investigator and then a small group of risk assessors went in and did a detailed analysis. He added that all they were interested in was the one apartment where the child was living and they did not go into any of the other apartments. That one apartment has been flagged and cannot be rented until it has been totally remediated. He also mentioned that the other buildings do not have children.

Chair Weglinski asked, with regards to the vinyl siding option, how the windows and trim would be handled and if they plan to extend the window trim out to avoid it sitting behind the new siding. Mr. Greenwald requested that his contractor speak to the question. Todd Russel, owner of Connecticut River Valley Abatement and Contracting, stated that the existing clapboards on the building are flush with the window trim on the outside, so they will take white coil stock and form it around the window trim, and it will appear exactly as it does currently.

Chair Weglinski asked the gauge of the coil stock. Mr. Russel replied that he believed they will be using 0.024 and they will custom bend each piece and form it to the existing trim. He added that the architectural features will be removed, de-leaded in his shop, repainted with correct paint and then placed back on the building. Mr. Russel reiterated that the building will look the same when the work is done.

Mr. Porschitz asked if they had plans to add additional insulation, noting that the recess of the trim may be less pronounced if they do. Mr. Russel stated the building will be wrapped in Tyvek and taped off, which is part of the sealing process to encapsulate the wood, and no insulation will be added.

Councilor Workman joined at 4:57 pm.

There being no further questions, Chair Weglinski invited staff comments.

Ms. Brunner stated the applicant had done a thorough job of reviewing the request and went on to cover the highlights. She said the 23 Mechanic Street building is original to the site and was a single-family home that was later converted for use as multi-family. The 17-19 Mechanic Street building was originally located elsewhere in Keene, and later on moved to its present location. The buildings most likely provided housing for the families of factory workers in Keene. Ms. Brunner mentioned that both buildings are fairly old and built in the late 1800's or early 1900's, and both have lead paint on the exterior. She went on to state that because the request includes adding vinyl siding, which is generally prohibited in the historic district, it required review by the HDC as well as the issuance of a waiver.

Ms. Brunner reported the applicable regulations include Section XV.B.1 – Building Rehabilitation: Primary and Contributing Resources. The standard states that the removal of historic materials or alteration of features that characterize a building or structure shall be avoided. Deteriorated historic features significant to the building or structure shall be repaired, rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary due to extreme deterioration, the new feature shall match the historic in size, design, texture, color and, where possible, materials. The new feature shall maintain the same visual appearance as the historic feature.

She went on to state that the applicant was proposing to cover all exterior materials and features of the building, including exposed clapboard siding, window sills, casing, and trim, and all other exterior trim with either vinyl siding, vinyl trim, white aluminum coil stock, or encapsulating paint in order to comply with a state-mandated lead abatement process. She felt that, overall, the applicant had made an effort to match the reveal of the siding and preserve its historical features. She mentioned that cut sheets are included in the packet for the proposed materials, including vinyl siding and the coil stock.

Ms. Brunner stated the other applicable standard is section XV.B.3 – Building Rehabilitation: Primary and Contributing Resources. She stated these standards relate to wood (siding and architectural trim), and more specifically to character-defining architectural trim which shall be retained and repaired when technically and economically feasible. If the trim is sufficiently deteriorated replacement is warranted, and the new trim shall match the original in size, scale, placement, detailing, and ideally material. If substitute material is used, it shall convey the same visual appearance as the historic trim.

She noted that the only two pieces of trim that were proposed to be preserved were the wood trim features located on the porches of the buildings. She reiterated that those features would be taken down and encapsulated with paint and preserved, while the rest of the trim would be covered with aluminum coil stock. Additionally, the last standard states that vinyl and aluminum siding are prohibited. Ms. Brunner noted this is where the applicant was requesting a waiver. She referred to the applicant's submission in the packet, noting his waiver request, a quote to show the cost for the proposed treatment,

and a letter from his contractor that shows the two other possible treatments and costs to compare.

Chair Weglinski opened public comment.

There being no questions or comments, Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing and began HDC deliberations.

Chair Weglinski stated it was clear that the owner had made attempts to maintain the existing siding as best as possible and it seems to be a forced remediation. With material prices escalated he understood the hardship with trying to replace the siding with wood as it originally exists. He expressed that he had no issue with the vinyl but did have an issue with the coil stock, which at 0.019 is the thinnest gauge you can get and wouldn't allow the same detail that you see now on the building. It is also prone to oil canning. He wondered if there was any way they could avoid the coil stock and use another material. Chair Weglinski added that he was appreciative that the architectural wood elements would be removed, de-leaded and reapplied.

Mr. Porschitz agreed with the Chair's concern about the coil stock and wondered as well if there was a way to mitigate that situation.

Chair Weglinski asked for additional questions or discussion. He reopened the public hearing so the applicant could answer their questions.

Mr. Greenwald thanked them for pointing out the concern with regards to the coil stock and suggested his contractor answer. Mr. Russel stated the coil stock with vinyl siding on homes is the industry standard and mentioned they had done it on historic homes in the past. He went on to state that the only detail they would cover up would be if there were piano key type trim on the top of the building. He mentioned that they could purchase heavier gauge metal for the coil stock but it would take away from the design. Mr. Russel noted that, if done right, the metal does lay flat. He then stated that if they were to encase with wood or composite wood, the cost and labor charge would be substantially more than the cost of the aluminum.

Mr. Greenwald reported that during board deliberations he and Mr. Russel had revised the window treatment to meet concerns of the commission. Mr. Russel explained that they could add another block of wood to overlay the existing trim, which would give it more design and a raised appearance, so the vinyl would be butting up to the window. He noted that the changes would enhance what the building is now and Mr. Greenwald stated the process will make a better product in the end.

Discussion ensued about the gauge of the coil stock with Chair Weglinski leaning towards 0.024 as a better product if trying to maintain as much of the original character of the property as possible.

Mr. Fleming stated he was in favor of the wood for the trim and wondered if they could compromise and change coil stock thickness around higher traffic areas such as doors, but not so much on windows and higher areas that not everyone will see.

Mr. Russel and Mr. Greenwald agreed and noted that they could make those changes happen.

There being no additional questions, Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing and opened board deliberations.

Mr. Porschitz liked the compromise of having the window trim doubled up and a 0.024 gauge for the high traffic areas, and felt that would be an acceptable compromise to support a vinyl finish.

Discussion ensued about where to use the thicker coil stock gauge and what would trigger a 0.024 versus a 0.019. There was general agreement on pronounced window reveal.

Mr. Fleming made a motion to grant a waiver from Section XV.B.3.b.4 of the HDC Regulations to allow the use of vinyl siding and approve COA-2021-02 for the installation of vinyl siding over the existing wood siding and trim on the buildings located at 17-23 Mechanic Street (TMP# 554-082-000), all as presented in the application and supporting materials submitted to the Community Development Department on April 28, 2021 with the following conditions:

1. The reveal of the windows will be increased using ¾” wood backing.
2. A higher-gauge, 0.024 aluminum coil stock will be used on entrances and any features that are 10” width or greater.

Furthermore, that they are doing this on the basis of the need for lead abatement of the exterior paint as well as the economic hardship of alternatives, and under the recognition that the property is at the extreme edge of the Historic District.

Mr. Porschitz seconded the extended motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Greenwald stated his interaction with the HDC was very positive and thanked them for their input.

COA-2014-06, Modification #2 – 166 West St – Mixed-Use Building Design Changes - Applicant DB Architects LLC, on behalf of owner Flyboy Realty LLC, proposes to modify the design of the mixed-use building on the property located at 166 Washington Street (TMP# 576-002-000). A waiver is requested from Sec XV.D.2.b.5 of the HDC Regulations to allow the use of vinyl siding on new construction. This property is not ranked and is located in the Central Business Limited District.

Chair Weglinski read the applicant's request and asked for staff recommendation on completeness of the application.

Ms. Brunner stated staff recommended that the commission accept the application as complete.

Mr. Porschitz made a motion to accept the application as complete with the change that it's 166 West Street, not Washington Street. Mr. Fleming seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Weglinski invited Dan Bartlett of DB Architects LLC to present on his application. Mr. Bartlett was present on behalf of the owner, Flyboy Realty LLC.

Mr. Bartlett, of 185 Winchester Street, stated the project had been approved by the commission last fall and now requires some minor tweaks. An approximate location of the proposed new mixed-use building on Gilbo Avenue was shown and Mr. Bartlett stated that the subdivision and site plan had been previously approved by the Planning Board, noting that his particular site plan was not changing. He next showed the elevations that the commission approved last fall, including a waiver for the use of vinyl siding on the upper level. Mr. Bartlett reported that the main issue was a change in configuration of the roof which will now be a straight gable at both ends, as opposed to a hipped roof.

Mr. Bartlett went on to explain that the project had been under a fairly comprehensive design process since last August and construction designs started last winter. The owner has a major tenant of the building who, in the interim between schematic design and construction drawings, decided to flip the floor plan. This posed the issue of the elevator placement which ended up having to stay on the North end of the building instead of being flipped like the rest of the plan. Ultimately, the roof design had to change because of clearance for the elevator, which wouldn't fit under the hipped roof.

Mr. Bartlett mentioned that the owner wants the building to maintain symmetry so the North and South ends are the same. He then showed a side by side comparison of the previously approved design and the modified design, again pointing out that the hipped roof was eliminated and in its place would be a straight gable roof. He explained that the gable roof ends cannot have shingles so it requires vinyl siding, and thus the reason for requesting a waiver from the commission. He mentioned that the siding would match the color of the already approved vinyl siding, but it would be a board and batten style in a vertical orientation. Additionally, the windows shifted several inches and the door placement, due to the elevator, but the general design intent changed very minimally. Mr. Bartlett stated part of waiver request is based on cost and maintenance, and hoped since the job had already been approved for vinyl siding that the same criteria would apply for the roof vinyl siding.

Chair Weglinski opened questions for the commission.

Mr. Porschitz asked if the proportions of the upper triangle on the gable end had decreased in size from the triangle on the previously approved design. Mr. Bartlett replied that the size had decreased because the roof pitch had become slightly steeper in the new design due to the elevator, which requires a certain amount of head room above for emergency exits. He added that the reconfiguration of the roof took away the triangle so he added it back in to emulate the previous design, but couldn't get it to be exactly the same because the triangle was previously a function of the hipped roof configuration.

Tia Hockett and Russ Fleming left the meeting at 6:00pm. Quorum was still met with 4 board members present.

Chair Weglinski asked for questions from the board. There being none, he asked staff to present on the application.

Ms. Brunner stated in October 2020, the HDC approved a request to renovate the former Friendly's Building located at 166 West Street and construct a two story, 12,300-sf mixed-use building on the south end of the site facing Gilbo Avenue. Following the HDC's review of this request, the Planning Board approved a site plan application for this same project on October 26, 2020. In addition, the Planning Board approved a subdivision in March 2021 which separated the parcel into two lots. The southern portion of the site where the new mixed-use building will be built is now located on a separate lot from the former Friendly's building. She noted that they are referring to it as the 166 West Street building because it will not have an address until the foundation is put in.

She went on to state the current request is to modify the design of the roof from a 'hipped gable' to a full gable to allow for the installation of an elevator shaft at the north end of the building, move the main entrance on the east façade of the building further to the south, move the entrance and one upper story window on the north façade of the building further to the east, and enlarge the entry canopy on the north building facade. In addition, the applicant proposes to install vinyl siding in a "vertical board-and-batten" pattern on the gabled walls of the roof. A waiver is requested from Section XV.D.2.b.5 of the HDC Regulations to allow the use of vinyl siding on new construction.

Mrs. Brunner stated that the relevant standards of the HDC regulations include section XV.D.2 – Construction of new buildings or structures. This regulation states that the shape, scale and fenestration of new buildings or structures shall respect the established historic architectural character of the surrounding area. Ms. Brunner reported that the changes the applicant proposed were relatively minor with the location change of the main entrance on the east façade of the building resulting in the entrance being slightly off-center with respect to the windows on the first and second stories of the building. Additionally, shifting the entrance on the north façade of the building further to the east would shift the location of one of the center windows on the second floor further to the east, and enlarge the entrance canopy in order to keep the canopy centered with respect to the roof gable. Ms. Brunner noted that changes to the fenestration on the east and north building facades were reported by the Applicant as being necessary in order to comply with building code requirements and other design constraints.

She then reported that the second standard relevant to the application included section XV.D.2 – Construction of new buildings or structures, sub-sections b-4 & b-5. This standard states that the exterior cladding shall be of materials that are common in the district. Acceptable materials include brick, stone, terra cotta, wood and metal. Wood shingles, wooden clapboards, concrete clapboards and brick are also acceptable types of siding. Additionally, materials commonly referred to as “vinyl siding” are inappropriate contemporary materials and are therefore prohibited for use on new construction in the Historic District.”

Ms. Brunner stated that as part of the original approval of the building, the HDC approved the use of red GlenGery brick for the siding material on the first floor of the mixed-use building, a 7-foot tall band of horizontal vinyl siding for the second story in a “sandstone” color, and dark gray architectural shingles for the hipped gable roof. In order to permit the use of vinyl siding in new construction, the HDC granted a waiver at that time.

She went on to state that the current request is to change the overall design of the roof from a hipped gable to a full gable in order to accommodate an elevator shaft at the north end of the building. Vertical board-and-batten style vinyl siding is proposed for the exterior cladding of the gable walls in a matching sandstone color. At its peak, the gable wall would be about 34 feet tall on the south elevation and 33 feet tall on the north elevation. Ms. Brunner noted it was a fairly large increase in vinyl siding and that staff felt the original design was more in line with the goal of the Historic District, and therefore would encourage the board to ask the applicant if any thought had been given to adding fenestration or ornamentation to the gable wall to add more visual interest and break up the massing of the façade.

Ms. Brunner went on to state that a waiver had been requested from Section XV.D.2.b.5 of the HDC Regulations to allow the use of additional vinyl siding on the gable walls of the mixed-use building. She noted that the Applicant’s waiver request was included in the packet. For supporting materials the applicant submitted a cost comparison that was prepared in October 2020 by the contractor to show the difference in cost between vinyl siding (\$26,174), pre-finished cement board (\$52,000), and cedar clapboards (\$78,114).

There being no questions for staff, Chair Weglinski opened public comment.

Chair Weglinski stated the commission isn’t looking to critique design but asked about the design going from a recessed gable with a hip or shed roof to a full gable roof, and if there was a reason for choosing that design over going to a hip from the eave to the previous point of the recessed gable front.

Mr. Bartlett stated the elevator is smack up against the North wall of the building so any kind of hip that starts that low wouldn’t work with the design. He added that he tried everything he could to get away from a full elevator but it ended up being essential.

Additionally, bringing the gable close to the street would contribute to requirements of space between the building and the sidewalk.

Chair Weglinski asked if a tower or roof penetration would be needed for the elevator. Mr. Bartlett replied that the change in the roof configuration was the only way to do it attractively and would accommodate all elevator requirements. He noted that he had worked through many options with the elevator people and no tower will be added.

Mr. Bartlett encouraged the commission to walk around the Historic District and look at 2 story gable buildings, mentioning that there are a lot of plain gables. He felt the plain gables are an understated sense of New England and that the several different materials on the proposed building, 3 on the gable and 2 on the eave ends, were a bit busy.

Chair Weglinski asked if the North and South upper space is attic or cathedral behind the gable. Mr. Bartlett stated there's an 8ft ceiling on the second floor and on top of that are standard roof trusses.

Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing and began board deliberations.

Discussion ensued about the triangle size. Mr. Porschitz wondered if there was a different way to break up the vinyl siding so the upper triangle could increase and bring it closer to the original that was previously proposed. Chair Weglinski hesitated to comment on design feeling that it was outside of the commission's role, but added that he did not agree with applying fake historical elements on a new building to mimic old historical elements. Ms. Brunner stated that the building is in an area where they want to see the look and feel of downtown extended, so that's where the staff's reserve comes from. She also added that the Planning Board wouldn't be reviewing the design of the building because it's in the Historic District, so it is within the commission's role to comment on and review the design of the building.

Chair Weglinski asked staff to clarify their concerns and propose any recommendations. Ms. Brunner stated that she had consulted with the Community Development director and referred to an established standard that the Planning Board uses, which is to make sure that they are breaking up the massing and scale of large or blank facades, especially those facing the streets. She offered no recommendation for solutions.

Chair Weglinski reopened the public hearing. He asked the applicant if there was mechanical equipment and where it was located. Mr. Bartlett replied that there is equipment located in the basement and the exterior equipment is limited to condensing units on the West side of the building, which are totally concealed.

Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing and opened board deliberations.

Chair Weglinski understood staff's concern but hesitated to persuade the applicant to add design elements to a brand new building based on the standards they adhere to.

Mr. Porschitz asked if staff would see a difference with regards to the façade if the lower edge of the upper triangle was moved to be closer to where it was in the previous design. He noted that would reduce vertical blank space and cover more of the louvre above it. He added that he was not in favor of adding design elements, only adjusting the ratio with the triangle.

Chair Weglinski reopened public comment and asked the applicant if he had suggestions on adjusting the triangle closer to its original appearance to break up the facade, without changing the actual gable end itself. Mr. Bartlett stated he could do a 6 ft band of vertical siding so the horizontal and vertical sidings would be about the same height, and the triangle would be about the same size as the original version. He added that he could also introduce another pattern or material in the triangle area that is grid-like, although it would be a lot going on.

Mr. Bartlett stated that he had been on the HDC and cares deeply about what Keene looks like, and does his very best to make his buildings look as good as he can. He mentioned that there had been many agencies designing with him, which is healthy, but also difficult to take on ideas just because everyone likes them. Mr. Bartlett added that he's having to conform to a regulation that none of the other buildings on the blocks had to conform too, and noted that the building is in the middle of two huge bank parking lots.

Chair Weglinski stated that he would adhere to the standards and felt they were being met, and reported that he was not comfortable critiquing the building design.

Mr. Porschitz clarified that he did not feel more design elements had to be added, he only requested that the triangle size be adjusted to become closer to its previous size.

Discussion ensued about ways in which the triangle could be brought back closer to what it was previously. Mr. Bartlett felt confident that he could use a change of material and texture with regards to the siding to accommodate that request and create a look that lowers the line of the louver and enlarges the triangle. He stated that he would get a revised drawing to the commission.

Chair Weglinski felt the approval needed to go back to the HDC since they were asking him to deviate from what he presented. Mr. Bartlett stated they had just received approval for foundation and would begin digging within days. He noted that it would be disruptive and costly to have delays in the progress of work and respectfully requested they trust him to do his job and do something that's fitting and appropriate based on the discussions they'd had. Mr. Porschitz supported that approach.

Chair Weglinski closed the public hearing and opened board deliberations.

Mr. Porschitz stated the architect seemed to understand their concerns and felt comfortable that he would appropriately address them.

Chair Weglinski made a motion to grant a waiver from Section XV.D.2.b.5 of the HDC Regulations to allow the use of vinyl siding on new construction and approve COA-2014-06 Modification #2 for alterations to the design of the mixed-use building, all as presented in the building elevations identified as “166 West Street / Gilbo Ave Building Elevations” prepared by DB Architects at a scale of 3/16 inch = 1 foot, dated October 16, 2020 and last revised on April 8, 2021, with the following condition:

1. Submittal of a revised elevation for the south and north building façades that shows the design of the gable wall.

Councilor Workman seconded the motion.

Chair Weglinski expressed concerned about leaving it up to staff to make the final decision and also noted liability on the commission for approving something that won't be reviewed or approved once the revised design is submitted. Mr. Porschitz reiterated that he felt confident that the architect and staff could achieve an acceptable outcome, based on the discussions had during the meeting.

The motion passed unanimously.

4) Staff Updates

Ms. Brunner stated City Council voting would take place the following night on the Land Development Code, which will include the amendments the commission voted on last month.

5) New Business

There was no new business.

6) Upcoming Dates of Interest

- a. **Next HDC Meeting: June 16, 2021**
- b. **HDC Site Visit: June 16, 2021 (To be confirmed)**

Chair Weglinski stated the HDC site visit is tentatively set for 4pm. Ms. Brunner stated there were no current applications for the next meeting..

7) Adjourn

Chair Weglinski thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 7:13 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Nicole Cullinane, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Planner