

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

April 11, 2018 Meeting

Town Council Chambers - 6:00 PM HDC meeting

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Calise, Lauren Drury and Andrew Barkley (arrived at 6:18 pm).

Absent: Kristen Carron

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner and Andrew Teitz, Legal Counsel.

Ms. Balkcom, Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Balkcom read the procedures into the record as follows: Each person addressing the Commission will state his/her name for the record. Although the Commission does not generally swear in applicants or their representatives, all witnesses are responsible for providing the HDC with true, accurate, and complete information. The applicant or the applicant's representative shall present the request before the Commission along with arguments and material in support of the application. HDC members will then have the opportunity to discuss the proposal and ask questions which are pertinent to the application. All other persons wishing to speak in favor of or against the application will then be asked to do so. All speakers are asked to avoid repetitive comments and confine their comments to those which are relevant to the application at hand. Cross examination by the general public may be allowed only if the Commission feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all of the relevant facts have been heard, the Chair will call for a motion. Once the motion has been made and seconded, the HDC only will discuss the motion followed by the Chair's call for a vote. Only active members of the Commission shall vote. The alternate will sit as an active member with full voting rights only

when a regular member is unable to serve at any meeting. During the discussion among voting members, no further testimony from the floor will be accepted unless specifically requested by a Board member. Every effort will be made to render a decision this evening. The minutes of this meeting will be on file in the Planning Department within 14 days. Certificates of Appropriateness granted this evening will be available in the Planning Department within two (2) days of this hearing. The hearing of any HDC application which has not yet started before 10:30 p.m. will not be heard this evening and a special hearing date will be scheduled. This rule, however, may be waived by a majority vote of the Commission. All decisions of the HDC are final and legally binding under the authority of Article XI of the East Greenwich Zoning Ordinance and Article 45, Section 24.1 of the RIGL. All decisions of this Commission may be appealed to the Zoning Board of Review.

Ms. Balkcom added the HDC considers local standards as well as Federal guidelines when reviewing applications and noted this is a collaborative process between the Board and the applicant. Ms. Balkcom explained the sequence for review of applications and its helpfulness to understand how the process works before the Board hears the applications. She noted each application is reviewed in of itself; the Commissioners receive the applications prior to the actual meeting in order for each Board member to review the content. The Board members identify properties and character defining features and historical and architecturally significant to the district that are taken into consideration. When applicants come before the Board there is a discussion in order to better understand the project at hand and answer questions that arise. The Board determines the standards that apply; hearing applications in this type of forum allows the Board to discuss alternatives, offer suggestions and provide support for the applicant to hopefully have a successful outcome and possibly save money.

Ms. Balkcom introduced the Board members and Staff present and read the application items into the record.

**1. Pamela Unwin-Barkley for John & Andrea O'Connor
93 Prospect Street; Map 74 AP 2 Lot 191
Window Replacement & Minor Modification - Replace 6
windows & Add window to side of structure - FINAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from this application. He arrived to the meeting after this hearing took place.)

Ms. Balkcom stated #4 and 8 apply to this application. Standard 4 states all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own. Standard 8 states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory-made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Ms. Pamela Unwin-Barkley represented the owners, being John and Andrea O'Connor. Ms. Unwin-Barkley requested to install a new double hung window to the second floor bathroom located on the north (right) side of the home. The new window is to be centered between two existing windows but be slightly smaller in size. The window to be added will be an Anderson 400 Series unit with the trim being consistent with the other windows. The petition also includes the replacement of six windows on the second floor (3 located in Bedroom #1 and 3 located in the Master Bathroom). The replacement windows will be the Anderson 400 Series unit and match the existing windows in size and configuration.

Mr. Maxwell asked about the existing windows that need to be replaced. Ms. Unwin-Barkley explained the sashes and jambs are breaking away from the two front windows which will be the daughter's bedroom and the owners are worried about safety and security. She added the windows to be replaced are replacement and not original

windows. As for the windows in the master bathroom, Ms. Unwin-Barkley noted they steam, the windows do not lock, are not original and not worth repairing. In terms of the new opening for a bathroom window, Ms. Unwin-Barkley stated there is currently no window in the bathroom which is dark and unvented and a window will resolve those problems. The new window will have a 2/2 grid configuration in order to match those on either side.

Mr. Maxwell commented that all of the changes as outlined in the application are appropriate to the building.

With no further comments Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.
Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Pamela Unwin-Barkley, representing homeowners John and Andrea O'Connor.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 93 Prospect Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is c. 1900 late Victorian.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 93 Prospect Street for a new window on the north side of the house and window replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standards #4 and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 - 0. (Balkcom, Calise, Drury, McGeorge and Maxwell all voted in favor).

- 2. Pamela Unwin-Barkley for William & Nancy Wray
71 Church Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 261
Minor Modification, New Construction - Add exterior staircase,
Replace one rear window with door - FINAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from this application. He arrived to the meeting after this hearing took place.)

(Mr. Maxwell recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #4 applies to this application. It notes all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own.

Ms. Unwin-Barkley represented the application for William and Nancy Wray, the property owners. She disclosed that she has done prior work for the homeowners, being she designed the existing carport.

Ms. Balkcom recollected a prior conversation regarding possibly adding a staircase to the rear of the home. Ms. Unwin-Barkley noted the rear staircase has always been a “possibility” project which the homeowners would now like to complete. She pointed out the rear door will have access to the third floor apartment. She commented the header of the two rear windows is 7’-5” from the floor which is the reason why a transom was added in order to create a better connection. Additionally all materials to be used will match the existing and the new rear door will match the existing mudroom door.

Mr. McGeorge recalled how dilapidated the subject property was when he moved to town and how much it has improved since then. He commented the owners have done an amazing job restoring the house. Considering the project is to the rear of the building, the head is continuous with the transom, and all the materials will be consistent with the standards, Mr. McGeorge did not have any objections to the application, thought it was an appropriate alteration and would not affect the structure in any way.

Ms. Drury and Ms. Calise also noted the project was very appropriate.

With no further comments Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Pamela Unwin-Barkley, representing homeowners William and Nancy Wray.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 71 Church Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is c. 1885 late Victorian.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 71 Church Street for a new rear staircase and conversion of a rear window to a door. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 4 - 0. (Balkcom, Calise, Drury, and McGeorge all voted in favor).

Mr. Barkley arrived to the meeting at 6:18 pm.

3. Paul & Judith Cullinane
13 Prospect Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 201
Window Replacement - Replace 5 windows - FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #8 applies to this application. It states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory-made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. James Spinale of Renewal by Anderson represented the application for owners Paul and Judith Cullinane. Ms. Balkcom noted the application requests to replace five windows but questioned if ultimately all the windows will be replaced. Mr. Spinale said yes. If all the windows are to be replaced Ms. Balkcom suggested granting “blanket” approval therefore the homeowner will not have to return to the HDC as the approval stays with the house.

Ms. Balkcom recalled a previous approval back in November 2015 at this property where replacement windows were used. Mr. Spinale asserted the windows used in 2015 were Anderson 400 series but the request now is to use the Renewal by Anderson fibrex windows.

Mr. Maxwell queried whether the new windows will match the existing configuration. Mr. Spinale confirmed the configuration will be the same 2/1 true divided lite (consisting of an interior and exterior grid with a spacer bar between the glass). Mr. Maxwell asked about the condition of the windows. Mr. Spinale stated the 5 windows requested to be replaced were identified as the most problematic, meaning there is severe sill rot and general deterioration.

With no further questions or comments from the Commission, Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Paul and Judith Cullinane.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 13 Prospect Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1900 late Victorian building.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 13 Prospect Street for blanket Renewal by Anderson window replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

**4. Renewal by Anderson (Mike Bedard) for Robert & Stephanie Adam
81 Greene Street; Map 75 AP 2 Lot 207
Window Replacement - Replace 23 windows - FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #8 applies to this application. It states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory-made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Robert Adam, homeowner, presented the application. He explained the windows are 90 years old and are in need of replacement. Mr. Adam noted he researched several brands of windows and found the Renewal by Anderson had the appearance he desired along with ease for cleaning. Additionally 23 of a total of 24 windows will be replaced all at once which will match the existing in size, configuration, etc.

Mr. Maxwell commented that given the historic value is low on the state survey he finds the change is appropriate to the house. Additionally the proposed window is a good product and has no objections to the submission. As he has noted several times in the past, Mr. McGeorge asserted the prevalence of storm windows hiding original windows diminishes the historic quality of a true-divided light window.

With no further questions or comments from the Commission, Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Drury made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Mike Bedard of Renewal by Anderson for property owners Robert and Stephanie Adam.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 81 Greene Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c. 1928 early Twentieth century/Colonial Revival.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Drury to approve the application at 81 Greene Street for blanket Renewal by Anderson window replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

**5. Brad Horsfield
17 Bridge Street; Map 75, Plat 3, Lot 168
Extension of Previous Approval; Deck Construction - FINAL
(Continued from March meeting)**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #4 is applicable to this application. It states all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own.

Mr. Brad Horsfield, owner of the property, represented the application. Ms. Balkcom said the submitted drawings look good and noted at this

point the Commission is reviewing the finishing and rail specifications for the deck. When questioned if trex decking is to be used by a Commission member, Mr. Maxwell confirmed that the deck has already been built with the trex product.

Based on the history of this project, the state of the house, and the deck location, Mr. McGeorge indicated he had no objections to the submission.

Mr. Barkley questioned if the deck materials will match those of the front deck. Mr. Horsfield said yes. Ms. Balkcom appreciated the Applicant submitting everything that was asked by the Commission.

Mr. Horsfield commented he will be returning to municipal court to review the issued violation; the judge will need to know a timetable for project completion. Atty. Teitz suggested a 60 day timeframe. Mr. McGeorge recommended a 90 day time table considering every builder he has recently dealt with has scheduled jobs into 2019 and the Applicant has shown a good faith effort in fixing the problem.

With no further questions or comments from the Commission, Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Brad Horsfield.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 17 Bridge Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c. 1865 early Victorian building.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 17 Bridge Street for deck completion. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

Additionally, the Commission recommends a 90 day timeframe for project completion.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

**6. Andrew Stone for owners Michael Sherer & Tiffany Mabee
16 Somerset Street; Map 75, Plat 3, Lot 7
Replacement of Front Door - FINAL
(Continued from March meeting)**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #4 is applicable to this application. It states all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own.

Mr. Andrew (Chad) Stone represented the application.

Atty. Teitz informed the Commission that this situation was before Municipal Court; Mr. Stone was in the process of selling the property therefore \$3500.00 was deposited with the Registry of Court to cover the cost if the door violation were to be abated which allowed Mr. Stone to proceed with the closing. Mr. Stone disagreed in that the money was not to cover the cost of the door.

Atty. Teitz insisted the money was to insure the door violation was abated based on an estimated cost of \$2,500.00 for a door and an extra \$1,000.00 was added to make sure it was covered. Atty. Teitz asserted that he had worked with Mr. Maxwell to find an appropriate door; the last he heard the suggested Captiva door was too expensive. Since then Mr. Maxwell has obtained additional information as a question arose about the high cost as it might have been due to it being mahogany. Considering the door is to be painted Atty. Teitz noted the door did not have to be mahogany.

Mr. Stone indicated he had submitted a replacement door last month but was unable to attend the March HDC meeting. The feedback he

received was that the replacement door was described as “too horizontal.” He acknowledged the assistance from Mr. Maxwell and thanked him for the help. Mr. Stone informed the Commission that he received a quote for the suggested door, being \$3,300.00 and it was to be a mahogany. He questioned the Horner Millworks representative if using a different species of wood would reduce the cost (such as using fir which is the wood type for the existing door) but was informed using a fir door would make it more expensive. He commented a \$3,300.00 door plus installation would cost over \$4,000.00; costing twice the amount for the Simpson door he installed and felt that it was unreasonable.

Mr. Maxwell disclosed that just prior to the start of the meeting he received updated pricing from his Horner Millworks representative for the Captive #8345 door model being \$2,300.00 for the mahogany door hung in a jamb. Mr. Stone commented that the \$2,300.00 quote was more acceptable than his quote for \$3,300.00. Mr. Maxwell was unsure of the price differential but noted the backup material is how he obtained the pricing and the suggested door is the closest comparable door to the original. Atty. Teitz confirmed the Captive door is not an identical replica of what was there but is very close in appearance.

Mr. Maxwell recalled hearing a quote was provided to Mr. Stone for \$5,000.00 and questioned how that price was obtained. Mr. Stone clarified that when he requested a quote from Horner Millworks he was told it would take a couple of weeks to obtain; when he asked for a ballpark estimate the Horner Millwork rep said it would cost about \$4,500.00. Mr. Maxwell shared his printed quote with Mr. Stone and commented that Horner makes Captiva doors. Mr. McGeorge pointed out the door Mr. Maxwell found is appropriate and it does not matter if it comes from Captiva, Horner or any other company as long as it looks like the door Mr. Maxwell recommended. Mr. Maxwell opined that Horner provided him with the most cost effective door they offered and it seems to be in the price range Mr. Stone was going to spend.

Considering the updated quote was obtained within the last hour Mr. McGeorge questioned if it was worth continuing the matter in order for Mr. Stone to appropriately respond. Atty. Teitz stated Mr. Stone has to

appear before Municipal Court the following day and noted if the Commission is comfortable with the suggested door it is really up to Mr. Stone to install the door in the existing jamb or get a whole new jamb. He advised the Commission to suggest a time period by which the door needs to be installed. The Commission suggested 90 days as a time period due to contractor demand and their busy schedules.

Mr. Stone still felt as though the quotes were expensive for a front door. He asked what was wrong with the first door he submitted. (Atty. Teitz circulated the submitted door spec sheet.) Ms. Drury noted the glass to wood ratio was not the same as the original door.

Mr. Stone queried what the Commission meant by being "too horizontal." Mr. Maxwell explained the main difference is a 3 vs 4 panel door and the door submitted by Mr. Stone did not include a panel on the top part of the door which makes the proportion very different; he added that it does not seem like a big deal but other doors in the neighborhood all look like the recommended Captiva door and not the door Mr. Stone submitted. Ms. Drury added that Mr. Stone's door is very modern looking. Mr. Maxwell said the bottom line is Mr. Stone's submitted door does not match the original door.

Atty. Teitz reiterated that the Commission is not asking for a custom rebuild of the original door which would cost much more. Mr. Stone did not want to leave the new homeowners with something they were not expecting; currently they have a brand new door that seals perfectly and still feels as though the Captiva door costs too much. If he could find another option that does not cost as much (but looks like the Captiva door) Mr. Stone commented that he would prefer to take that route.

Ms. Drury questioned legal counsel if the Commission had to approve a door this evening. Mr. Stone interjected by saying not necessarily as the proposed door is more than he wants to spend noting he has already spent a lot of money on the front door. He requested the opportunity to find another option, being a refurbished door that may only cost \$1,000.00.

Atty. Teitz asked what work Mr. Stone has done in the last two months. Mr. Stone replied that he submitted a door last month and was unable to attend the meeting so he was not sure what else the Commission wants from him.

Atty. Teitz questioned where the new homeowners are and if they have a say in this situation. Mr. Stone said they may be sitting on their couch; he did not know where they were. Atty. Teitz asked if they have a say in what is being presented. Mr. Stone commented they are happy with him dealing with this. Atty. Teitz asked if they are happy with whatever you get for them. Mr. Stone said yes and he has been communicating with them.

Ms. Drury questioned if Mr. Stone did not want the Commission to make a decision. Mr. Stone noted that between now and the next meeting he hoped to find a door that essentially matches the original door and could be refurbished as that is the only other option than buying the Captiva door from Horner Millworks. If there is a possibility a door can be located that is in reasonable condition and can be refurbished he would like to look into that option. Mr. Stone questioned if he had to wait to the next meeting to have that conversation or whether there can be dialogue in the meantime.

Atty. Teitz confirmed the Commission could appoint referees but the issue goes back a couple of years. Mr. Stone opined that he is fully aware of the history and he was more than happy to go before the judge. Atty. Teitz reminded Mr. Stone there were conversations six months ago about finding a replacement door. Mr. Stone said he did not want to replace the door but his hand has been forced to make it happen and now has put up the escrow to make it happen which is what he is in the process of doing. Atty. Teitz felt that Mr. Stone's time was up.

Mr. Stone was of the opinion he and the Commission can sit here and have this conversation; we can go in front of the municipal judge tomorrow or he can try to work with the Commission and try to get something done between now and then. Ms. Calise asserted the

Commission has been trying to work with Mr. Stone for quite some time and have only got the run around.

Mr. Stone recapped that his interpretation of the guidelines was that he was under the impression his door qualified as a replacement-in-kind. Ms. Calise affirmed Mr. Stone should have come to the Commission first.

Ms. Drury pointed out that the reason Mr. Stone is before the Commission is due to him being wrong all along because he ripped out a door that should never have been removed and he did not consult with anyone. Mr. Stone felt that was a point of debate. Ms. Drury asserted that Mr. Stone is in the wrong because he did not remediate the way he was supposed to; he repeatedly blew off the Commission; he went before the court and now he is back to the HDC again. She asked what part of this is none of Mr. Stone's fault.

Mr. Stone responded that he was of the opinion the replacement door was replacement in kind based upon the information that was available to him.

When asked about the Commission's options, Atty. Teitz noted the Commission has two options - the HDC can either approve the Captiva door leaving it up to Mr. Stone to do what he wants regarding installation or the Commission can continue the matter. Given the amount of effort Mr. Maxwell made by finding the Captiva door Atty. Teitz recommended approving the Captive door and then he can proceed to municipal court. As for a recommendation to the court, Atty. Teitz affirmed that the Captiva door is the door that should be installed and Mr. Stone should be given a period of time to have it installed; if not then a daily fine should be imposed.

Mr. Stone questioned if there is still a possibility to have a referee for a refurbished door since he did not submit the Captiva door as a submission request. He reiterated he received two different quotes for the same door within a day, one being \$1,000.00 less than he received and he is essentially coming before the Commission without formally having a door. Atty. Teitz questioned whether Mr. Stone wanted the

Commission to deny the door that was submitted in March (being the "too horizontal" door). He emphasized the Commission has tried to help find a door and recommended the HDC approve the Captiva door.

Atty. Teitz also mentioned he can inform the judge that Mr. Stone did not want the approval of the door. He repeated that the Commission members have taken their time to assist Mr. Stone with finding an appropriate door and he does not want to install it.

Mr. Stone tried to clarify that was not his point. Atty. Teitz stated that he will be prepared to point out the whole history of just how long it has been and may suggest to the judge a \$50 fine per day be imposed going back to 2016.

Mr. Stone noted that all he is trying to do is find another solution and save \$3,000.00 because that is the amount of money that has been spent on the existing door. Again, Atty. Teitz noted the Commission has been trying to help Mr. Stone resolve the issue and allow him the ability to move on. He indicated the HDC should approve the Captiva door, if Mr. Stone does not want to move forward with it that is solely up to him but if Mr. Stone changes his mind then at least an approved door is available to him.

Ms. Drury asked legal counsel if the Commission can approve a door that Mr. Stone has not agreed to. Atty. Teitz noted the Commission has spent the last 25 minutes discussing the matter; he understood the Applicant did not formally submit the Captiva door but he believes the HDC can approve it. He informed the Commission that they cannot make Mr. Stone put it in but has the ability to approve the door; he compared it like to being an advisory opinion.

Mr. Stone questioned if he were to install a door that is the exact as the original door would it require HDC approval. Atty. Teitz said yes because the original door is no longer there; legally the door no longer exists and due to res judicata, decisions have already been made as it has been before the Commission several times it is now too late to simply get an exact door to install. Atty. Teitz confirmed if Mr. Stone

were to find another door he will have to return to the HDC to get approval from the Commission.

Atty. Teitz recommended the Commission approve the Captiva door, Model #8345 as provided by Mr. Maxwell and it be installed within 120 days with the finding that the Captiva door, although not a match for the original door, is a close enough match to doors that are very common in the district and similar to the original door that was removed, as seen in old photographs - therefore the Captiva door is appropriate to both the property and the district. Motion to approve as explained by Atty. Teitz. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Mr. Maxwell noted that the Captiva door is a basis for design that matches the same characteristics as the original door; if Mr. Stone prefers to install a true replacement a new formal application will be required.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

Historic District Commission Business

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the March 14, 2018 meeting.

Approval of minutes was continued to the following meeting.

2. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioners mentioned a new fence had been installed at the corner of Dedford Street and Peirce Street.

Ms. Balkcom noted her term is up in August and new members will need to be appointed as well as determining a new chair for the Commission.

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Drury. Seconded by Mr. McGeorge. Adjourn at 7:20p.m.

For additional information, please contact the Planning Department.
Respectfully submitted by:

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner