

HISTORIC AREA COMMISSION
New Castle Town Hall
2nd and Delaware Streets
September 20, 2018

Present: Laura Fontana, Chairperson
David Baldini
Marty Wright
Lynn Briggs
Jean Norvell

Also Present: Leila Hamroun, Architectural Consultant
Jeff Bergstrom, City Building Inspector

Ms. Fontana convened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Roll call followed and a quorum was declared.

Approval of Minutes

A Motion was made to approve the Minutes of the August 9, 2018, Meeting as presented. The Motion was seconded and approved.

Ms. Fontana made a point of order regarding public comment that everyone who has comments should come forward to sign in with name and address first, then approach the microphone and state their name before speaking. She added that if anyone has an issue that has been raised by a previous speaker, the Commission asked that the speaker refrain from presenting a duplication of comments.

Ms. Fontana reminded the Assembly that the purview and duties of the Historic Area Commission is materials, design, size, scope, etc.

NEW APPLICATIONS

207 East 2nd Street – Mike Dooling

An Application was submitted by Mr. Dooling to install a new white vinyl triple unit non-operating picture window with casement windows on each end of the center picture window on rear of his home. The exterior wood trim around new window to be painted by homeowner.

Ms. Fontana asked Mr. Dooling to explain the window. Mr. Dooling stated that currently there are two casement windows on the house, and that within the same setting, he wanted to add a picture window between the casement windows and narrow the casement windows slightly. He noted that the casement windows are wood. He added that Newport Windows would do the work.

Ms. Hamroun advised that the home is a contributing home to the National Historic District, but is not a key building. She added that the Guidelines state that vinyl windows are not

appropriate for that area because the windows are visible to the public right-of-way. Mr. Dooling noted that vinyl windows have been installed on homes on The Strand, and Ms. Hamroun advised that the fact that vinyl windows were installed on The Strand would not make them appropriate unless the building had been built initially with vinyl windows, as may have been the case 1980's or 1990's. Mr. Dooling confirmed that he would not be able to install vinyl windows, and thanked the Commission.

After discussion, it was noted that as a Tier 1, the request should be rejected.

A Motion to disapprove the Application to install vinyl windows was made, seconded and approved.

OLD BUSINESS

37 West 3rd Street - Tax Parcel 21-015.30-194, also known as the "Bowling Alley Parcel" – Trustees of the New Castle Common

Andrew P. Taylor, Esquire and Mr. Andrew Hayes, Sr. Engineer of ForeSite Engineering, came forward for the Trustees.

Mr. Roger Clark, West 4th Street, came forward to express his concern about the procedure of the Application. He noted that the Application had been denied at a previous HAC meeting and he had not heard that the Application was tabled for 60 days for a vote; therefore, this item should not be on the Agenda of the present meeting. Ms. Fontana stated that procedural objections are not in the purview or guidelines of HAC and cannot come forward at the meeting. Mr. Clark asked in which meeting procedural objections could be discussed, and Ms. Fontana advised they could be discussed at Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Taylor introduced himself as the attorney for the Trustees of the New Castle Common appearing under §230-52. He noted that he was present to continue the dialogue with HAC and seek approval of the Application, presenting refinements that were made to the older Application pursuant to recommendations made in a June 19, 2018, letter to the Trustees of the New Castle Common. *(copy attached to Application)*

Mr. Hayes, Sr. Engineer of ForeSite Engineering, noted that some updates to drainage had been made with respect to the project, and began his slide presentation of the proposed parking lot. He stated that in terms of drainage, there is a separate project that was done to install a larger pipe with outfall into the river, and noted that the new project would install new catch basins and larger pipes so water coming from 4th street and above is directed into the new outfall pipe to the river. The City advised Mr. Hayes that construction of the new pipe will be complete at the end of September 2019, and Mr. Bergstrom confirmed that construction will commence Monday, September 24. Mr. Hayes explained that storm water runoff will be collected in a bio-retention area on the site that has an engineered soil profile in it with an active biological component of fungi and bacteria that breaks down pollutants into harmless constituents and renders them into plant tissue. He noted that during the growing season, the area will be planted with flowering shrubs and perennial plant species.

He added that a low point on the property that does not drain well will be grading to provide positive drainage into the drainage system, which will eliminate ponding.

Mr. Hayes added that the storm water performance design has gone through a technical review by the New Castle Conservation District engineers and they had no technical comments on the design plans that would alter it in any substantive way. The design provides 200% of the treatment level required by the Regulations. Mr. Hayes reiterated that it is a plant-based living system, and explained that system is desirable because: (1) If there is a problem you will see standing water; (2) The systems are proven long-term and are highly resilient and very effective; and (3) When a basic rainfall event happens, the water collected will travel through the practice in nine hours and the area becomes dry again. He added that the 100 year event is able to drain inside 12 hours. The facility has a significant capacity, being able to treat about 36,100 gallons of water in a storm.

Mr. Hayes recapped some of the issues on the original Application as: (1) fencing on the property line; (2) retaining wall on the property line; and (3) concerns over screening and materials. The Design Revision to the Plan subsequently presented removed about 1,100 square feet of pavement which enabled the elimination of the retaining wall and fence, and the addition of a landscaping border. He added that concrete was proposed for the handicapped accessible spaces.

The Plan submitted for discussion at the present meeting removes the blacktop from the center portion of the parking lot and replaces it with concrete. It reduces one type of material within the application so it will be granite, brick, concrete. It retains the reinforced turf area, which is recommended for overflow parking, but not as a primary surface for parking.

Mr. Hayes presented some photographic examples of concrete driveways in the City and the ADA ramp at the wharf and described the vegetative plantings around the site. He explained that the parking lot consists of 39 standard parking spaces and three turf overflow parking spaces, and restated that the fence and retaining wall are eliminated and that the blacktop surface is replaced with concrete.

Mr. Wright asked what is different from the design that was rejected, and Mr. Hayes explained that the new design reduces the number of surface material types and eliminates blacktop. Mr. Wright asked what material is under the brick, and Mr. Hayes advised he would have to work with the City during the construction phase as to what they find to be an acceptable foundation for the brick. He noted there are a number of methods to provide a foundation for the brick, including a prepared engineered stone profile, a reinforced slab, and a bituminous concrete surface. Mr. Wright noted that the previous Application used concrete as a reinforcing material under the brick, and Mr. Hayes explained concrete is frequently used under brick for reinforcing, particularly in areas of heavier loading, such as the entrance; but added it could be a bituminous concrete as well. Mr. Wright noted that in any case the material is impermeable, and Mr. Hayes concurred. Mr. Hayes further explained that because there is a building lot down-slope from the proposed site which in

the future might include a basement or crawl space, it was good engineering practice not to introduce storm water in a significant manner into the ground upslope from a structure, and therefore, no type of infiltration is being used and storm water is being diverted to the bio-retention field.

Ms. Fontana asked Mr. Hayes to review the parking lot lighting, and Mr. Hayes advised it uses standards consistent with those on Delaware Street and they are working with the Designer used by the City regarding the metal shielding on the lights that will direct the throw of the light to project it into the parking lot and not behind the parking lot. After discussion with Ms. Hamroun, the light intensity was found to be acceptable. Ms. Fontana asked how many lights were proposed, and Mr. Hayes advised there would be approximately 8 lights, but needed to review the Plan for the exact number. He added that there is an Engineering Plan that includes light levels. Ms. Fontana asked about the height of the shrubs along the M & T border, and Mr. Hayes advised they were a low hedge approximately table-top height in order to provide proper line of sight by pedestrians and vehicles.

Ms. Fontana asked what the finish on the concrete would be and Mr. Hayes advised it was similar to the brick pattern, but they would work with Ms. Hamroun during the construction phase of the project. Mr. Hayes added that they would discuss wearing traits of brick with regard to significant traffic and maintaining an acceptable long-term surface with Ms. Hamroun.

Ms. Briggs asked where the bollards would be placed and Mr. Hayes advised there would be bollards at the light standards to protect them from vehicle contact, and a bollard at the reinforced turf area for maintenance access into the park itself to separate those two uses so maintenance vehicles will not drive up on the concrete. Ms. Briggs asked about the fence along 3rd Street, and Mr. Hayes advised that along 3rd Street there are brick columns with an iron fence between the columns that is reminiscent of the fence at the wharf.

Mr. Hayes added that with regard to materials, they will have a conversation with Ms. Hamroun about the striping, and they believe they will be able to do it in a contrasting brick pattern rather than having painted striping.

There being no other questions or comments from the Commissioners, Ms. Fontana opened the meeting to public comment. She reiterated that HAC is only reviewing materials, design, scope, and size, and comments should be made only in regard to those issues. She added that no comments would be recognized from the floor, and that if anyone wants to make a comment, they need to sign in with name and address and speak their name clearly into the microphone before commenting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dale McDine – New Castle

Mr. McDine, Branch Manager of M & T Bank, introduced himself. He noted that he felt the small business voice is under-heard and under-represented at the public meetings and he

understood why because he felt a lot of animosity in the room and commenting in the Assembly during Mr. Hayes' presentation. He recognized that it is a heated topic. He stated that some small business owners asked him to speak and show their support of the parking lot, they want it, and they need it, and the parking lot should have been put in years ago. He added that some small business owners are hesitant to speak out in support of the parking lot in a public forum for fear of retribution against their businesses. He also noted that speaking as the Branch Manager for M & T Bank, he felt the parking lot is needed in the City. He noted that people can't get into the town or the bank because there is no place to park. He noted that comments from the Assembly behind him were completely inappropriate.

In response to disruptive comments from the Assembly, Ms. Fontana reiterated that no comments should be made from the Assembly, and that anyone who wishes to be heard should come up to the microphone.

Mr. McDine stated that he understood many people do not support the parking lot, but the business owners he represented do, and he noted he had spoken to many residents who, he felt, also support the parking lot, who want it and think it is beautiful. Mr. McDine commended the Commission and the Designers. He also noted that in reading and hearing about the objections against the building of the pier, now that the pier is completed even people who originally objected to it, love it. He concluded that the business owners in New Castle he represented support it and think it will be beautiful. He added that there can be disagreement about the parking lot, but that he felt some of the disagreement came across as being intimidating.

Ms. Fontana noted there was a piece of business that needed to be conducted before Public Comment could continue. She asked Mr. Bergstrom if the proper notification for the meeting was posted on the property, and Mr. Bergstrom advised that it was.

Glen Rill – 60 West 4th Street

Mr. Rill asked if the location of the entrance/exit to the parking lot was being addressed. He noted that there were safety concerns about the exit of the parking lot and there had been a request to have the exit moved further down the street to discourage traffic exiting onto Foundry Alley, which is too small for increased traffic. Mr. Hayes advised that the entrance is at the current location for the stop sign on West 3rd Street, and is opposite Foundry Alley. There was discussion with the City in terms of the location of the entrance/exit, and the City was in agreement with the location. Mr. Rill noted that the exit is the concern and they did not want exiting vehicles to go across to Foundry Alley. Mr. Hayes explained that the location of the entrance and concerns expressed about relocating the entrance and shifting it further down West 3rd Street, moving it along the frontage, were discussed with Mr. Bergstrom in terms of what that might mean, and everyone was in agreement that this was the appropriate location for the entrance and exit.

Mr. Rill asked if there was no concern for public safety, and noted that in essence, the City has ruled that it's OK for increased volume on Foundry Alley.

In response to disruptive comments from the Assembly, Ms. Fontana reiterated that there should be no comments from the floor.

Ms. Jean-Marie Camac came forward for comments.

Mr. Rill continued his comment and stated that his question was never answered and asked again about safety. Mr. Hayes noted that the concept of safety within the design is absolutely considered very carefully, and the design includes provisions for accessibility, for safe vehicle movement, and for safe pedestrian movement, and within discussions with the City and their review of the Plan, safety concerns was considered. Mr. Rill noted that his question was not about movement within the parking lot, but was about cars exiting the parking lot and the location of the exit and stated that they could not be sent down Foundry Alley. Mr. Hayes noted the City is in agreement that the entrance location and traffic movement in terms of the flow of traffic is consistent with traffic engineering principles and provides a safe means of entry and exit.

Jeanne-Marie Camac – 23 West 3rd Street

Ms. Camac read a letter from Dr. Jennifer Swartz:

To the Members of the Historic Area Commission,

I apologize for not being able to be here in person this evening, but I do want to make a statement. I live at 28 W. 3rd St, on the corner of 3rd and Foundry. I have been here for nine months and have made some first-hand observations:

- 1) The majority of the people traveling on W. 3rd St. do not stop at the stop sign at the intersection of Foundry, where the entrance of the proposed parking lot is to be.
- 2) It is a very common occurrence for people to drive down Foundry the wrong way.
- 3) Foundry is used as a pedestrian walkway for children and people walking dogs to get to the park, and it is barely wide enough for one vehicle and one person to pass. With increased traffic, someone will be injured.

Foundry St. is an alleyway. It is not a roadway that can handle regular traffic, and having the parking lot entrance/exit at the intersection is only asking for trouble. I ask you to reconsider this proposal.

Respectfully,
Jennifer L. Swartz

Ms. Camac provided a copy of Dr. Swartz's letter for the record.

John DiMonde – Box 72, New Castle

Mr. DiMonde noted that he would not talk about protocol and that protocol would come up at a different venue. He stated that the Commission is charged with preserving the Historic Area, and he has not heard how the parking lot will affect the Historic Area or if it is appropriate to be in the Historic Area. Paramount to what is needed is how it will affect the people where the parking lot is located, and the decision should be based on who it affects in town first, not who it affects outside New Castle. He added that the people who live there will be affected negatively, and that housing values will probably be destroyed. Mr. DiMonde expressed his concern that because it is an open parking lot without fencing, residents will have people entering and exiting late at night and will be able to see and hear them, and will not know what may be going on in the parking lot. He stated that all they are concerned about is the appearance of the parking lot, and added that it doesn't look good to the people who live on that block, or the next block or the block in back of it.

He commented on the fact that businesses need to rely on their products in order to succeed, and to put out 2-3 blocks of the Historic Area to put in a parking lot for the benefit of those businesses is not right. He stated that HAC is not doing its charge if they allow the parking lot to be built in the middle of the Historic Area.

Roderick Gillespie – 24 West 4th Street

Mr. Gillespie was surprised that the current meeting occurred since the Application was rejected at the April 18, 2018, HAC meeting. He noted that the HAC has duties under the City Code, and he noted at least three duties:

- (1) the general design, arrangement, texture, material, and color of the building site or structure or pertinent fixtures in question; (2) the relation of such features to similar features and buildings in the immediate surroundings; (3) the position of such building, structure or site in relation to the street or public way and to other buildings, structures and sites.

Mr. Gillespie stated that he felt the parking lot fails as a concept and deserves a “no” vote. He added that the safety consideration is affecting 3rd Street adversely. He noted that the parking lot has 12' lanes which is a design standard; however, the lot will receive and discharge vehicles onto 3rd Street, which has 9' wide parallel parking spaces, leaving only 8' 11" as a travel-way. He noted that if the parking lot design had 8' 11" or 9' wide lanes, there would be side-swiping and accidents. He added that the public is being asked to bear a greater traffic load and increased hazard to their parked vehicles on a sub-standard city street. He also noted that traffic can exit onto Foundry Alley, which is very narrow; and the intersection of Foundry Alley and Shaw Alley has poor visibility.

He stated that by moving the Application to HAC, the Planning Commission has only stated that the parking lot can be built on 3rd Street, not whether it should be built on 3rd Street, and HAC determines whether it should be built at that location. He added that he felt HAC has a special mission to ensure architectural harmony and what should be integrated into

an historical residential neighborhood. He also noted that he was astounded at the size of the parking lot and stated it is overwhelming. He added that the majority of buildings on 3rd Street are residential, and he felt that to put a large parking lot in the middle will be hard on the residents. He added that he felt HAC had a compelling duty to reject the Application at the proposed location.

Mr. Gillespie also noted that he had been told by one resident that a real estate agent reported to her that the parking lot will lower residential property values.

In conclusion, Mr. Gillespie asked that HAC reject the Application and send it back to Planning.

Betsy McNamara – 22 West 3rd Street

Ms. McNamara posed a question as to whether the business owners represented by Mr. McDire would choose to own a home across from a parking lot. She added that she just put her house on the market because she feels like she is being driven out, and was advised by her real estate agent to expect a 5-10% devaluation because of the parking lot. She added that none of the City Council, HAC or Planning Commission members are directly impacted by the parking lot and that the City should have a referendum to ask the residents how they feel about the parking lot. She also noted that when she purchased her home, they checked the Comprehensive Plan, the HAC regulations, the City Council regulations, and Trustees, and they all stated there would be no parking lots in the Historic Area. She added that a parking lot was not appropriate and asked that the Commission think about the people who are directly impacted by the parking lot.

Jamie Stewart – 208 Delaware Street #2

Ms. Stewart advised that her apartment overlooks the proposed parking lot location, and that she is excited about the proposed parking lot. She noted that the project has been well designed and landscaped and is in favor of the project.

Karen Whalen – 17 West 3rd Street

Ms. Whalen began discussing the process of the Application and inferred collusion on the part of the City Council, Planning Commission and Trustees. Ms. Fontana repeatedly asked Ms. Whalen to move on to her comments on the design, materials and streetscape.

Ms. Whalen asked if the Application was a Revised Application with a different technical scope from the Application that went through Planning. Ms. Fontana explained the meeting was a design discussion, and when the Application is presented to HAC it is for design. Ms. Whalen asked if the design had gone through Planning, and Ms. Fontana explained that Planning has different objectives from HAC. She added that after review by HAC, should the Application move on to the Board of Adjustment, it will go back to Planning. Ms. Whalen stated that was not the process as detailed in §510 and argued that HAC was reviewing a different plan than the one presented to Planning. Mr. Baldini explained that a drawing package was presented to Planning that met the requirements to move forward with recommendations. From that process, the Application came forward to HAC with the

Historic Area Commission Minutes
September 20, 2018

recommendations included in the package. He stated it was not a revised Plan, but a Plan that was told to be modified to move forward. The Plan was modified as was presented in the Application to HAC at the current meeting. Ms. Whalen asked if it was the same Plan that Planning approved and noted that she did not remember anything about concrete. Mr. Baldini restated Ms. Whalen's question and reiterated that the Application came from Planning with revisions for the recommendations that Planning asked for. It then came to HAC relative to the Application with those recommendations incorporated. It is not a revision, but a Plan in process, in motion going forward. He added that it is compliant with the Code, not §510, but §28.1. Ms. Whalen asked if §510 was irrelevant and Mr. Baldini stated that was correct. Ms. Whalen stated she didn't think the Commissioners understood the Code and noted that City Council made a statement on July 31st about the process not being followed. Ms. Fontana asked if Ms. Whalen had any questions in regard to the Application.

Ms. Whalen asked how, after discussion under Ordinance 509 and Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer systems (MS4) the Application is compliant under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Program (NPDES). She had numerous other questions regarding the drainage system and storm water, including whether storm water had been studied, if permits were obtained, and if storm water would backflow into the river if the bio-retention drainage field floods. Ms. Whalen asked how this would stop the drainage and trash that visitors will undoubtedly leave in the parking lot and how it was covered under the NPDES program. Mr. Hayes advised that the delegated agency that reviews the sediment and storm water applications for the City of New Castle is the New Castle Conservation District (NCCD). They administer applications as a delegated agency from the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) and DNREC holds the permit with the EPA. He also advised that NCCD has reviewed the storm water design, report and computations, and they agreed that the facility provides approximately 200% of the required treatment and far exceeds the treatment requirements for the site. It has a plant-based treatment system that is shown to be one of the preferred and most effective treatment methods for water quality runoff. Ms. Whalen asked if the storm water agreement and review was available for public review and noted she thought there had to be a public hearing. Mr. Hayes advised that she NCCD would have copies of the application and although he had not filed a FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) through them, he thought it would be a conventional FOIA process. Ms. Whalen asked if that portion of the project was finalized and she should be able to go to NCCD to find it, and Mr. Hayes said yes.

Ms. Whalen asked if the bio-retention field was going to use bacteria for decomposition, and Mr. Hayes explained that it has an engineered soil profile that has constituents in it that promote absorption of certain chemicals, and that it has bacteria and fungi within the biota that exists within it and within the plant roots that help fix nutrients and help them to be taken up by the plants themselves. He added that the bacteria also help with the sequestration and breakdown of hydrocarbons. Ms. Whalen supposed there would be off-gassing and noted the products of decomposition usually include some types of gasses, particularly in a microbial decomposition process. She asked if it would have an odor that

Historic Area Commission Minutes
September 20, 2018

is conspicuous to the nearby area, and Mr. Hayes stated no, it would look, feel and smell like a mulched planting bed.

Ms. Whalen asked if any consideration had been made of the heat load created from sun reflecting on the concrete and how it might impact the neighborhood and direct neighbors, and Mr. Hayes advised that the materials and particularly the concrete is as reflective a surface as you will get in terms of heat island impact, and in terms of the heat impact of the parking lot they did not look at atmospheric contribution of the convective heat coming off the parking lot. Ms. Whalen asked that the Record show heat impact was not considered.

Ms. Whalen noted that asphalt was rejected as an appropriate material in the Historic District and asked what criteria HAC used determined how to evaluate a material, in this case concrete. She added that if that question could not be answered, the appropriateness of concrete should be tabled to review the technical pros and cons of concrete. Ms. Fontana advised that concrete has already been approved by HAC in the Historic District for other uses, specifically driveways. Ms. Whalen noted that concrete in the Historic District has not been used at the level proposed for the parking lot and Ms. Fontana reiterated that concrete has been approved for use in the Historic District.

Ms. Hamroun noted that there have been a number of questions regarding materials and the review, and suggested that she answer all materials questions after public comments have concluded, and Ms. Fontana agreed. Ms. Hamroun recommended that she answer all materials questions after all comments are heard. Ms. Whalen stated that she personally felt the use of such a mass of concrete would not be compatible with a residential neighborhood and no one will be running to buy houses next to a parking lot.

Ms. Whalen stated that if a large slab of concrete breaks the entire area has to be replaced and she asked about repair and maintenance of the parking lot. She expressed her concern with proper installation. She also questioned if the cost of concrete had been considered and incorporated into the budget, and Ms. Fontana advised that cost is not a question for HAC. Ms. Whalen noted that the area has a significant amount of fill, and asked if the concrete in the parking lot would have the potential of settling and cracking. Ms. Whalen noted that she felt a vote on concrete without a great comprehensive understanding of concrete could reasonably be approved.

Ms. Whalen once again began a commentary on her belief that the town is putting the merchants over the residents, and Ms. Fontana asked if Ms. Whalen's comments had anything to do with the specific Application regarding materials.

In response to disruptive comments from the Assembly Ms. Fontana called for order and asked if Ms. Whalen's final comments had anything to do specific to this Application from materials. Observation from Mr. Baldini: *Mr. Baldini noted that the Police Officer present at the meeting entered the room and repeatedly asked Ms. Whalen to settle down.*

Ms. Whalen refused to leave the microphone and stated to the merchants and officials “you work where we live; we don’t live where you work, and we’re not a project.”

Ms. Fontana asked if there were any other comments from the floor. Ms. Fontana advised that a resident was coming back to the microphone for additional comment.

Jamie Stewart – 208 Delaware Street #2

Ms. Stewart returned to the microphone and noted that the speed limit on 3rd Street is 15 mph, and there is no signage indicating the speed limit. She noted that signage should be installed on 3rd Street and Foundry Alley indicating the speed limit and perhaps exiting vehicles will not be inclined to travel down Foundry.

Jim Workman – 21 West 3rd Street

Mr. Workman addressed some of the materials and design. He noted that 3rd Street is very narrow, and asked if the parking lot would have a separate entrance and exit, or if there was one entry that acts as both the entrance and the exit. Mr. Hayes stated the location was the entrance and the exit. Mr. Workman asked if it was one lane or two lanes, and Mr. Hayes advised it was two lanes. Mr. Workman asked if vehicles entering the parking lot will pass in front of the exit lane and if traffic flow in the parking lot would go counter-clockwise or clockwise. He added that there had never been discussion about traffic flow. He expressed his concern of the logistics of traffic flow on 3rd Street, asking how vehicles exiting the bank parking lot will deal with vehicles entering the proposed parking lot and traffic that may go down Foundry Alley and vehicles exiting the proposed parking lot. He added that it is a very small space and it did not seem traffic flow had been considered. Mr. Workman also noted that his personal vehicles have all sustained damage while parked on 3rd Street. He expressed his concerns with safety, noise, and trash that may accumulate in the parking lot. He also noted that after the repairs that were done in the park, the area appears swampier than in the past and he is not convinced the bio-retention field will work and is concerned that it may make the water flow worse. He asked if the City was trying to create a commerce district down 3rd Street where residents will no longer wish to live leaving no residential spaces or only rental spaces on the top floors. Ms. Fontana asked Mr. Workman if he had any other questions regarding design or materials. Mr. Workman asked if HAC was going to act in the interest of the residents of the neighborhood they are charged to preserve or just destroy another neighborhood in New Castle. He added that he would like an answer to his concerns on traffic flow.

Ms. Fontana asked if there were any other comments.

Dr. Joanne Viola – 1 The Strand

Dr. Viola stated she has had significant experience with parking and visitors and it has impacted her life. She noted her support of the project and commended Mr. Hayes for his diligence and perseverance, and in honestly answering questions. She noted that change is very scary and difficult, and this has happened in the past with the Police Station. She added that most of the issues have to do with “we don’t need it.” She stated that the City needs a place for visitors to park. She added that the number of visitors to New Castle is increasing, and will probably increase more. She concluded by stating she believes the

design of the proposed parking lot is fine, and she understands change is scary when it impacts people where they live, but she feels the project should move forward.

Gail Levinson – 318 South Street

Ms. Levinson expressed her concern with traffic on 3rd Street and recounted a situation she witnessed when a concrete truck came down 3rd Street that created chaos on the street. She also asked what kind of receptacles will be put in the parking lot that, if not historically appropriate, are ecologically reasonable because the parking lot will inevitably have trash. Ms. Levinson noted that she walks in her neighborhood frequently and at various hours, and sees things in the parking lot at the bottom of South Street across from the Progressive Club. She stated that she picks up trash that accumulates in that parking lot, and she asked who will monitor the proposed parking lot and what the hours the parking lot will be open. She also noted that HAC voted down the Application it was because it was an impermeable surface, and stated that there will be consequences of using concrete. She added that Delaware is losing one acre a day of marsh land, and that 100 year storms are a misnomer and actually happen more frequently. She stated her opinion that the proposed parking lot is in the wrong place, and she felt the businesses that may benefit from the parking lot are small and will probably not bring many visitors to the City at any one time. She added that her vehicle has been side-swiped while parked on the street.

Ken Oppenheimer – 36 East 5th Street

Mr. Oppenheimer noted that he lived through HAC in 2001 and 2007, and saw arbitrary and capricious actions and was grateful when written Guidelines were prepared. He expressed his opinion that the proposed parking lot design and materials are appropriate and correct, and added that if it meets the requirements in the Guidelines, any action other than approval is arbitrary and capricious. He noted that the current meeting was to consider design and material, and if it meets the requirements it needs to be approved. He added that he lives next to a parking lot.

Tom Tritelli – 20 Peninsula Court, Bear, DE

Mr. Tritelli stated that he grew up in New Castle on 9th Street and had made a comment at a previous meeting that he felt what the people who live in the immediate area of the proposed parking lot have to say should carry more weight than what others have to say, and he came forward to express that again. He asked that the Commission include in their criteria not just how many trees there are, the materials and technical aspects, but also the will of the people that live in that area, and he asked that they base their decision on that.

Andrew Camac – 23 West 3rd Street

Mr. Camac expressed his concern for the children and the meeting was being held in the fall when children are not visiting the park and their parents can't attend meetings to stand up for their children and their park. Ms. Fontana clarified that the proposed parking lot was being built on private property and not parkland. Mr. Camac noted that it was an extension of the park. Ms. Fontana explained there were lots that individuals could purchase and have the ability to make improvements, and the location was not on park land.

Ms. Fontana asked for order and reiterated that there should be no comments from the Assembly.

Mr. Camac asked how anything is more attractive than historically green grass. He asked how often concrete breaks up and who is responsible for the maintenance. Ms. Fontana advised that she could not speak for the owners of the property, but that the maintenance would be the responsibility of the property owners. Mr. Hayes added that it is a privately owned and privately maintained parking lot. Mr. Camac asked who owns the property and Mr. Hayes advised it was owned by the Trustees of the New Castle Common. Ms. Fontana added the address of the property is 27 West 3rd Street and it is owned by the Trustees of the New Castle Common. Mr. Camac noted that it is not only a parking lot being proposed, but a drainage field which could be a breeding ground for mosquitoes. He reiterated that his concern is for the children, and his residence is the closest to the proposed drainage field. Mr. Hayes stated that the bio-retention area has always been in the design and is a facility that accepts water and drains within 10-12 hours. It is a dry mulch bed and does not keep standing water. The drainage design and grading alleviates standing water that currently sits at the site. Mr. Camac asked how well the field drains litter and asked who will be responsible for the litter that drains out of the parking lot into the drainage field. He clarified that the only change was from asphalt to concrete, and Ms. Fontana stated that was correct. Mr. Camac asked if there was a full plan for the material under the brick, and Mr. Hayes noted that the foundational elements for the brick section would be done during the development of the construction drawings, and would be reviewed and overseen by the City Code Official and Engineer. The owners are responsible for maintenance of the property.

Dorsey Fiske – 26 East 3rd Street

Ms. Fiske stated that she came speaking not as a Trustee but as a citizen and resident of the town, and wanted to clarify that the property is owned by the Trust of the New Castle Common and managed by the Trustees for the use and benefit of the residents of the town. She added that it is not owned by the Trustees. She also noted that M & T Bank does have a parking lot and was surprised that he was so insistent on having the proposed parking lot. She said that Mr. Hayes has done a very handsome design, which, speaking for herself, would be better suited in another location.

Marianne Caven – 49 West 3rd Street

Ms. Caven noted that with regard to the entrance/exit at the intersection, she stated that in addition to the bank parking lot, 3rd Street, and Foundry Alley, the proposed parking lot adds another entrance and exit. She clarified that they were adjacent to one another, and Ms. Fontana stated there was one opening to the two lanes. Ms. Caven noted that vehicles entering the parking lot would cross in front of vehicles exiting the lot, and Mr. Hayes noted that the traffic flow in the parking lot follows the American standards for traveling on the right side of the road. Ms. Caven noted that because there is a stop sign there, the vehicles exiting would stop traffic, and the exit on the eastern edge of the lot will feed traffic onto Foundry Alley. She added that an earlier comment was that it was designed to do that, and that the Alley could barely handle two cars; however the alley cannot handle two cars and

it causes an extreme, dangerous situation. She asked how pedestrians are being accommodated with the plan and whether there is a pedestrian walkway on the east side. She asked if there was a pedestrian walkway between the bank driveway and the parking lot, and Mr. Hayes said yes. Mr. Hayes advised the sidewalk along West 3rd Street is going to be widened to approximately 8' wide from its current condition, and within the parking lot, pedestrians will walk on the parking lot surface and at the end of the parking lot there is an ADA compliant concrete walkway that will connect to the park on future pedestrian improvements. He added there is a provision at the northeast corner for a future connection to the private parking lot adjacent. Ms. Caven clarified her understanding that there was no provision for pedestrians, cyclists or strollers, and to enter and get to the park from the parking lot everyone will be directed to walk through the parking lot in the car lanes. Mr. Hayes noted that the entrance to the parking lot is not proposed to be a pedestrian entrance to the park. Ms. Caven expressed her concern that access to the park is being closed off by the parking lot; that there are concrete car lanes for vehicles, but no place for people to access the park. She also noted that, although the design is good, it is not appropriate for the area because it will affect not only the residents on 3rd Street but everyone in the Historic District, and potentially visitors as well. She added that crime in parking lots is escalating, and stated that she has been informed by people in the insurance business that 15-20% of insurance claims are the result of accidents in parking lots. She also stated that the police will tell you crime in parking lots is increasing and that most arrests due to problems incidental to restaurants and bars happen in the parking lots. She also noted that visitors find between 150-300 spaces, and that does not count some of the blocks in the Historic District. She feels the location of the proposed parking lot is inappropriate and she has great concerns that people who now use the area will not be able to use it safely.

Jim Workman – 21 West 3rd Street

Mr. Workman returned with further comments. He noted that Mr. Hayes stated there is an ADA compliant walkway into the park, and there had been discussion about the elevation going up West 3rd Street toward Delaware Street. He asked if the elevation going from the proposed parking lot into the bank parking lot was ADA compliant as well. He added that his understanding was that the angle going up 3rd Street and the obstacles on 3rd Street would make it ADA non-compliant, but it exists as it does since it was called Prince Street. He asked if this is for the benefit of the future merchants of New Castle City have they considered the fact that the parking lot is in a non-ADA-compliant position in terms of people perambulating from the parking lot up to Delaware Street where future businesses will most likely be located. He added that one of the issues was that the grade was too steep to be compliant on West 3rd Street. Mr. Hayes explained that during review of the construction drawings, the ADA compliance would be part of the criteria for the City's Code Official Engineer to approve the project so the proposed improvement on the property and along the property's frontage would be ADA compliant and the project would not be approved by the City until it met those requirements. Mr. Workman commented that even if the entrance of the parking lot is ADA compliant would visitors be able to travel up 3rd Street to the future businesses of New Castle since it is non-ADA-compliant, or would they only able to access the park via the ADA compliant walkway.

John DiMonde – Box 72, New Castle

Mr. DiMonde returned with further comments. He asked if, since the Applicants were given another opportunity to present the Application, would the opposition (*meaning the public*) be given another opportunity next month. Ms. Fontana advised that if the Application moves through the process, the public will get another opportunity when it goes to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. DiMonde stated that the Application should have gone back to Planning and that Ms. Fontana would be held responsible at the next Council meeting. Specifically he said “You (*meaning Ms. Fontana*) are gonna be responsible at the next Council Meeting. I guarantee it.” Observation from Mr. Baldini: *Mr. Baldini noted that the Police Officer present at the meeting entered the room and asked Councilman John DiMonde to settle down. He also recalled that Mr. DiMonde commented to Laura Fontana “I’ll get you”, or something of that nature, and gave a derogatory wave good bye to Leila Hamroun.*

Janet Wurtzel – 54 West 3rd Street

Ms. Wurtzel noted that Ms. Fontana had indicated the address of the property is 27 West 3rd Street, Parcel #2101530194, and Ms. Fontana confirmed that was the correct parcel number. Ms. Wurtzel stated that according to the Recorder of Deeds, the City of New Castle owns that parcel and it is exempt residential. Mr. Taylor explained that the property is owned by the Trustees of New Castle County Commons and advised it was purchased in four different transactions, two deeds from 1961 and two deeds from 1962. He added that to clear up any confusion, he filed a Confirmatory Deed with the Recorder of Deeds Office detailing the history. Ms. Wurtzel asked if a title search was run and asked why the Recorder of Deeds showed the property being owned by the City of New Castle. Mr. Taylor explained that was an error by the Tax Department, and that was why the Confirmatory Deed was filed in Instrument #201809200048167. Ms. Wurtzel asked if the Trustees paid taxes on the property, and Mr. Taylor advised he could not speak to that question. Ms. Wurtzel recapped her understanding that the City of New Castle doesn’t own the property, the Trustees own the property, the Recorder of Deeds has the wrong information, and Mr. Taylor has not corrected it. Mr. Taylor stated that he did correct the error and advised that Instrument #301809200048167 will cause the Tax Department to correct it on the Parcel View System. Ms. Wurtzel asked if the Trust would pay the back taxes on the property, and Mr. Taylor advised that was not part of the hearing.

Ken Oppenheimer – 36 East 5th Street

Mr. Oppenheimer returned with additional comments. He explained that he was required to use a wheelchair last summer and was able to navigate the town from the pier to 5th Street. He did not know if it was ADA compliant, but advised that it could be done.

Jeanne-Marie Camac – 23 West 3rd Street

Ms. Camac returned with additional comments. Ms. Camac stated that it is physically impossible to get a wheelchair up the sidewalk on West 3rd Street. She added there is insufficient space between her steps and the tree, there are plantings that are cut out of the sidewalk and on the other side of the street the bricks are nearly impossible to walk on.

She added there is an elderly woman in town who uses a wheelchair and must be pushed up the middle of 3rd Street and she feels the Commission should look at that. She added that ADA compliance should go all the way up to Delaware Street.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Fontana closed Public Comment and asked Ms. Hamroun to address the materials issues that were raised by the Assembly.

Ms. Hamroun stated that she made a list of the public comments and that she sorted them according to what is under the purview of the issues being considered by the HAC, or if they can be considered.

She explained that the protocol that was agreed upon in the new guidelines update is that any applicant can come with an Application for review. It can be approved, it can be approved with conditions, or it can be rejected. If it is rejected, the applicant can appeal it within 20 days to the Board of Adjustments or the applicant can revise the Application and restart the process.

An outburst from the Assembly interrupted Ms. Hamroun and Ms. Fontana called for order.

Ms. Hamroun continued and advised that she would not address the broader parameters that can be raised in another venue, or the process of the special exemption. She added that she represents her position as the architect member of HAC speaking to the internal functionality of the HAC review process not legal counsel, and she noted this because the question had been raised of whether the Application before the Board is new or revised. She added that when HAC gets an Application that is a revision to a previous Application it is normal to focus on the revisions and how that moves the conversation forward. There can then be a determination of whether the Application is approved, approved with conditions, or still rejected. She explained that when the new Application with revisions came to HAC the only change, and thus the focus of the review was the use of concrete in lieu of macadam paving.

She detailed the categories noted of public comments noted in terms of the Application:

- Materials / appropriateness of concrete
- Traffic engineering concerns
- Safety
- Turn radius
- Risk to other vehicles
- Pedestrian interface
- Repair and maintenance of concrete over time
- Security
- Upkeep
- ADA compliance

Issues that she will put aside as being out of the purview of HAC:

- Trash
- Upkeep
- Security
- Costs

She noted the consensus within HAC, the HARC and the general public during the guidelines update process, that cost be taken off the table in terms of one of the parameters to be taken into consideration when reviewing an application..

Ms. Hamroun explained her role for Tier 1 Applications and noted it is the same process when there are open meetings when more involved Applications are involved.

ADA Compliance – It is under HAC purview to look at ADA compliance. On a project-by-project basis, part of the review that Mr. Bergstrom and HAC would do is to determine if it meets the criteria of ADA compliance. The purview of HAC is not to review if areas beyond the project scope such as all of the streetscape is ADA compliant. It is not an unreasonable consideration; however the HAC purview is limited to the area within the scope of the Application. She noted the parameters include ramps, accessibility, heights of steps, and width of doors, etc..

Safety, Security and Turn Radius – Safety, security and turn radius are about a Traffic Engineering Study. When a project comes for concept review, HAC will do the detailed review of features under its purview. The Building Code Official will review the various engineering disciplines and make sure everything is designed appropriately. When an Application moves forward the Engineer will ensure construction documents and permits comply with all the code requirements in terms of engineering, which here would include radius, impact of the parking on adjacent circulation, as well as major and minor circulation flow.

Repair and Maintenance – Repair and maintenance is the responsibility of the property owner. The durability of the concrete is a question of engineered design, execution, and maintenance.

Materials – Ms. Hamroun explained repair and maintenance issues apply to all projects. She noted that you can tell when maintenance has been done appropriately by the owner. When it comes to concrete, the durability is a question of design, execution and maintenance and she cannot speak to those issues.

The only change to the Application is the concrete. Ms. Hamroun advised that her position has not changed and that she stated at the last meeting her recommendation to HAC is the Guidelines talk about minimizing the use of macadam because it is not appropriate adjacent to adjoining buildings and therefore, a separating barrier is required.

Ms. Hamroun stated that the fact that it has gone from macadam to concrete is not a transformational experience. She noted that the fact that it can be brushed concrete and that it looks more like other concrete areas in the City is a plus. She added that she believes fundamentally the proposed design remains a compromise that would comply with the Guidelines because: (1) there is a separation between the historic properties and the concrete with the brick, (2) there are articulations of materials that are seen in other

areas of the City, (3) there are elements to try to conceal the pragmatic use of the area, and (4) an attempt is being made to deal with the imperviousness of the area.

With regard to the concrete, Ms. Hamroun noted it is her opinion that it is a compromise solution that can fit within the spirit of the Guidelines. In terms of the long-term duration for preservation philosophy, it is all done on a flat surface, there is vegetation, and it is fully reversible should at some point another use or building be constructed in that area. The concrete modification does not make her recommendation more supportive, but the overall design takes a number of elements and tries to accommodate something that fits within the broader parameters of New Castle that is, ultimately, from a preservation philosophy reversible should somebody choose to do something appropriate at another time.

Ms. Hamroun stated she would focus her commentary on points that are relevant to what her position is in terms of the advice that she had been entrusted to give to HAC. She asked the Assembly to let her know if she missed any of the concerns that were raised.

Roderick Gillespie – 24 West 4th Street

Mr. Gillespie stated the safety and scale of the massive parking lot will hurt the neighborhood and drive down property values, and asked if those were the points Ms. Hamroun meant. Ms. Hamroun noted that from her perspective what started out as a giant asphalt parking lot turned into an area where there is vegetative borders, brick borders and, and from a public perception, is more a combination of streetscape sidewalk and macadam or concrete. She added that from that perspective it is something she feels minimizes the large slab in the middle to a much smaller scale. She also noted that working with the brick using contrasting colors instead of paint will reduce the perception. Ms. Hamroun added that the safety issues are not in her purview.

Tom Tritelli – 20 Peninsula Court, Bear, DE

Mr. Tritelli returned to make additional comments. He wanted to clarify his understanding that the scope of the Commission is to decide on the appearance of the project and not the functionality, environmental effects, or accessibility. Ms. Hamroun noted that part of it is appearance and a large part of the Guidelines were developed because of the criteria of what is visible from the public right-of-way. From that perspective it is about appearance, fabric and materials. She added that HAC can look at ADA only within the project itself, and the fact that the sidewalk on either side of the property limits is not ADA accessible is not within her purview, and would be apart of the overall code review. In terms of the functionality and environment, she noted that they encourage the use of bio-swales and the use of pervious materials. She added that the plan is a compromise because there is not as much pervious material. Mr. Tritelli noted that the appearance is basically what you are going by, and that the other issues are a small part. Ms. Hamroun stated appearance, ADA and permeability are as important a part, noting in terms of ADA within the parking lot is there, the sustainability, the bi-swale, are all there. She added that is why the plan is a compromise rather than a perfect solution. Mr. Tritelli asked if the will of the people was in the equation from the purview of HAC. Ms. Hamroun noted that when the whole review of the Guidelines was done, it was based on gathering extensive public input. Although she

has incredible respectful of the Assembly and from a professional perspective she cannot get into an emotional or personal place; her function is to offer her best professional opinion to HAC.

In response to unrecognized comments, Ms. Fontana once again called for order.

Paul Hannum – 18 East 4th Street

Mr. Hannum noted that his understanding is that HAC is charged with the responsibility of advising the other bureaucratic bodies as to the appropriateness of whatever is brought to the Commission for the Historic Area. He noted that a previous comment was made that the parking lot could be dug up and replaced with something more appropriate, and he asked if that meant the Commission does not consider the parking lot to be appropriate. Ms. Hamroun clarified that her comment was regarding reversibility, and that she said they could remove it and replaced it with another building. Mr. Hannum noted that her comment was “more appropriate” and asked if that is an indication that she does not consider the parking lot appropriate. Ms. Hamroun stated that was not her opinion; however some people might consider another structure to be more appropriate. Mr. Hannum asked if the Commission agreed the parking lot is an appropriate use for the property within the Historic District, and Ms. Hamroun stated that from her perspective it is a compromise that is appropriate because it is a reversible compromise should something be put there at a later date.

Glen Rill – 60 West 4th Street

Mr. Rill returned with additional comments. Mr. Rill confirmed that ADA compliance is being considered, and added that a question regarding pedestrian egress from the parking lot was brought up in a previous comment. He noted that from the parking lot pedestrians can either go out into the park or exit the parking lot to the sidewalk. He asked if the traffic flow area of the parking lot is considered a sidewalk because that is the only way pedestrians can exit the parking lot to the sidewalk on 3rd Street. Mr Rill also noted one of the first slides Mr. Hayes put up was a gridline showing the slope of how the water will drain off, and that is a side slope. The parking lot is on the side of a hill, and pedestrians will be required to walk on the side of a hill, and the initial grade maps had more than 3 degree and up to 4 degree. He added that the requirements for normal sidewalk approval are up to 5% up and down but on a side slope it is no more than 2 or 3. He stated that the side slope does not pass any requirements. Mr. Rill advised that at a previous meeting he heard Mr. Hayes say “I could fix that slope”, and asked if the slope is going to be fixed. Ms. Hamroun noted that from an architectural perspective, any plan has to be signed off as a suitable engineered design and it will not pass for construction unless it meets all the criteria of a professional design for the surface. Ms. Hamroun added that if the Engineer of the design mentions fixing the slope it is his responsibility to ensure all issues are taken care of so when the document is put forth for permitting, everything meets the Code and it is approved by the Building Code Official. Mr. Hayes stated that the preliminary construction drawings provided to the City will go through a review process with the City and their Engineer for Code compliance and ADA compliance. If there are portions of the plan that need to be revised to comply with ADA cross slopes and longitudinal slopes, those

revisions would be required prior to the City issuing approval. As the grades are developed and refined for the project, any areas that need revision will be revised.

Marianne Caven – 49 West 3rd Street

Ms. Caven returned to offer additional comments. Ms. Caven advised that she is convinced there are no accommodations made for pedestrians, cyclists, strollers, etc., and she stated there are too many parking spaces. She noted that the West 3rd Street parking lot is the first parking lot they will approach on the way to the park. She added that she is concerned there is no pavement or sidewalk for pedestrians and that there is very little space to accommodate people with cars pulling in and out. She noted that visitors bring bicycles, strollers, coolers, and there is a lot of activity and she feels the design will not accommodate them.

Karen Whalen – 17 West 3rd Street

Ms. Whalen returned to offer additional comments. Ms. Whalen noted that no one is talking about the compatibility of the parking lot when it is full of cars and the Historic District. She compared the HAC to a homeowners association and noted that many HOAs restrict the number of vehicles allowed in front of their homes. She commented on the potential misuse and abuse to the parking lot from visitors and stated that is not compatible to the area.

She added that she felt it was inappropriate for Ms. Norvell to vote and that she should recuse herself on the issue due to conflict of interest since her family members own Penn's Place. Ms. Norvell asked to comment and asked Ms. Whalen to come forward again. She challenged Ms. Whalen's singling her out by her assertion that she should recuse herself. She stated that the lie had been said once before by another member of the Assembly. She added that the lie that she sent out a letter stating she wanted the parking lot behind the business that doesn't belong to her, was spread to other people. She declared again that it is a lie.

Dorsey Fiske – 26 East 3rd Street

Ms. Fiske returned to offer additional comments. Ms. Fiske noted that she did not feel Ms. Norvell understood a conflict of interest, and she read the definition:

“Recognizing the need of avoidance of even the appearance of impropriety this prohibition of self-dealing and conflict of interest shall apply where the benefit would accrue to any family member. Family member includes spouse, children, stepchildren, parents, step parents, brothers, sisters, grandparents, in-laws and any person living in the same household.”

Ms. Norvell stated that she does not live in the same household and has nothing to do with that business.

In response to argumentative comment, Ms. Fontana called for order.

Ms. Whalen added that she had passed out the 2016 real estate ad for Penn's Place.

In response to out of order commentary, Ms. Fontana called for order.

Ms. Fontana closed the floor for public comments.

Mr. Taylor thanked the Commission for their consideration of the Application for 27 West 3rd Street, known as the Bowling Alley Parking Lot and for their review under §230-28.1. He added the Applicants feel what has been submitted has addressed the Commission's recommendations from the two prior meetings under §230-52, and asked for the Commission's approval so the Application can move forward to the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Fontana asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Commission.

Mr. Wright stated that he did not think his concerns had been addressed regarding permeability of the surface, and although it may have mentioned only the underlayment of the brick before, now the decision of the underlayment of the brick is up to someone else and it still could be concrete, which is an impervious material and so is the concrete surface. Although it may be a compromise to the Guidelines, he stated he is opposed to runoff and that he wants the water on the surface to permeate into the soil. Mr. Baldini asked if the technology for the runoff into the bio-retention field is not acceptable to him, and Mr. Wright stated that it was not acceptable and that he did not want to see runoff at all.

Ms. Fontana asked if there were any other comments from the Commission. There being no further comments, Ms. Fontana asked for a Motion.

Mr. Baldini made a Motion that the Application as presented with the concrete material changes be approved and as such move forward to the Board of Adjustments according to Zoning Code 230-28.1H. Ms. Norvell seconded the Motion.

A vote was taken:

- Mr. Wright – No
- Ms. Briggs – No
- Ms. Fontana – Yes
- Mr. Baldini – Yes
- Ms. Norvell – Yes

The Motion was passed.

Ms. Fontana stated that many of the concerns brought up that the Historic Area Commission was unable to answer can be answered in further meetings, just not by HAC.

Historic Area Commission Minutes
September 20, 2018

A Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 p.m. was made, seconded and unanimously carried

Kathy Weirich
Stenographer