

DAVID BRILEY
MAYOR



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION (MHZC) MINUTES October 17, 2018

Commissioners Present: Chair Menie Bell, Vice Chair Cyril Stewart, LaDonna Boyd, Kaitlyn Jones, Elizabeth Mayhall, Ben Mosley, Brian Tibbs

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Melissa Sajid, Jenny Warren, Robin Zeigler (historic zoning administrator), Susan Jones and Jennifer Moreno (metro legal counsel)

Applicants: Steve Meisner, Mitch Hodge, Blake Rutland, Kevin Caine

Councilmembers: None

Public: Sonya Link

Chairman Bell called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Chairman Bell read information about the amount of time people have to speak, the process of the consent agenda and the process for appeals.

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Zeigler informed the Commission that 2020 10th Avenue South has been withdrawn and 409 Broadway has made a request for deferral--no date certain.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the revised agenda. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

None present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. September 19, 2018

Ms. Zeigler pointed out a typo on page 4, on the paragraph just before the motion towards the end of the page. There should be a period after "addition" and no "con."

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to accept the revised minutes. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Staff member, Sean Alexander read the items for the consent agenda and there were no requests to remove items from consent.

b. 1703 FORREST AVE

Application: New construction—Addition (Revision to a Previously Approved Plan)
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid, melissa.sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: 2018038828

c. 1112 CHAPEL AVE

Application: New Construction—Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018062932

d. 104 BOWLING AVE

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Sean Alexander, sean.alexander@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018063434

Motion:

**Commissioner Stewart moved to approved all items on consent with their applicable conditions.
Commissioner Boyd seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

V. OVERLAY RECOMMENDATIONS & DESIGN GUIDELINE ADOPTIONS

None

VI. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEMS

The items below were deferred at a previous MHZC meeting at the request of the applicant.

e. 2020 10th AVE S

Application: Demolition
Council District: 17
Overlay: Waverly-Belmont Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid, melissa.sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018039146

Withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

VII. PRELIMINARY & FINAL SP REVIEW

None.

VIII. VIOLATIONS & COURT ACTIONS

f. 422 BROADWAY

Application: Signage
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018062925

Staff member, Melissa Baldock presented the case for new signage at 422 Broadway. 422 Broadway is better known as Tootsies. The applicant is proposing a sign for the alley elevation. The sign's size, materials, and illumination all meet the design guidelines.

The signage is proposed to be installed below the window sills of the top floor, which meets the design guidelines. However, the design guidelines state that signage should not obscure architectural features, and the proposed sign is to be mounted on a window casing. Staff recommends approval based on the fact that the windows are not historic and they are located on the rear of the building. In addition, any other non-window locations would put the signage in inappropriate or unsafe locations.

Staff recommends approval of the signage, finding that it meets the design guidelines for signage in the Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay with the exception of the placement. Staff recommends approval of the proposed placement since the windows the sign will cover are not historic and are located on the rear of the building. In addition, staff recommends approval because all other non-window locations would not meet the design guidelines for placement.

Steve Meisner, legal representative for the applicant, provided the legal background regarding the case.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve. Commissioner Boyd seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

g. 409 BROADWAY

Application: Rehabilitation—Building Illumination
Council District: 19
Overlay: Broadway Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Robin Zeigler, robin.zeigler@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018063415

Applicant requested deferral-no date certain.

IX. MHZC ACTIONS

h. 1910 19TH AVE S

Application: New Construction—Outbuilding (Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit)
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Sajid, melissa.sajid@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018062947

Staff member, Melissa Sajid presented the case for an addition to an outbuilding including a request to convert it to a DADU. The house located at 1910 19th Ave S is a one-and-a-half story home that was built circa 1928 and contributes to the character of the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

The plan includes a rooftop addition and the addition of a covered stoop on the right side façade. The site plan includes an outline of an addition to the footprint of the existing outbuilding, but that is not proposed with this application; therefore staff recommends obtaining a site plan that accurately portrays just what is being requested.

The applicant also proposes to add living area above the garage, and the plan labels the proposed addition as dormers; however, because what is labeled as a dormer does not just project out from the roof but extends above the existing roof, staff reviewed the proposal as a new cross-gable roof form for the existing outbuilding.

With the proposed rooftop addition, the overall height will be taller than that of the existing house, which exceeds the maximum allowed by the design guidelines, and the eave height also will exceed the maximum allowed by the design guidelines. Staff recommends that the overall height of the addition be reduced so that it does not exceed twenty feet (20'), which is the height of the historic house as measured from grade and that the eave height not exceed ten feet (10').

Also, the left side elevation of the existing house shows a rear addition that is taller than the existing house. No plans for such an addition have been submitted, so staff has not reviewed an addition to the existing house.

The proposed roof top addition also does not meet the design guidelines for roof form as it creates an asymmetrical cross-gable that is not typical in the district and therefore does not meet Section II.B.i.1. There are alternatives available for additions where the roof form would meet the design guidelines. One would be to add true dormers to the existing roof form that meet all the design guidelines. Another option would be to create a symmetrical cross gable with a continuous eave, rather than two different eave heights. Staff recommends that the roof form be revised so that it is appropriate for the district.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The overall height of the DADU shall not exceed the height of the house and the eave height shall not exceed ten feet (10') from grade;
2. The roof form shall be appropriate for the district; and
3. Staff approve the final selections of the cladding, roofing, trim, windows, door, porch roof, porch floor, porch posts, and porch base prior to purchase and installation.

With these conditions, staff finds that the application meets the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines II.B.1. for New Construction.

Ms. Sajid confirmed, for Commissioner Mosley, that the existing outbuilding is not historic.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, explained the reason for the proposal and the existing additions. He noted that the owner was available if the Commission had questions. The proposal will add approximately three hundred-fifty (350) square feet to get living space on the second level. The two foot (2') recess for the dormer doesn't work for the small footprint of the building. He showed how big the building could be if they maxed out the footprint, which is not what they want to do. The existing eaves are nine feet (9') high and he feels the roof form is compatible with the house. A cross-gable form will not provide the needed head-room and will require removal of the full roof, which is not what the applicant wants to do.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Tibbs asked about the asymmetrical roof form, and Mr. Hodge explained that it was to keep the addition as low as possible but also provide the needed headroom. Commissioner Tibbs said that the proposed roof form would be contradictory to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Stewart asked if there is precedent for approving a taller ridge height based on what might happen in the future. Ms. Sajid said there is not. Commissioner Mosley asked what could be built if this were a brand new building. Ms. Sajid explained that they could have a one thousand (1,000) square foot footprint where they only have approximately six hundred-fifty (650) square feet at the moment, but that a larger footprint would change the setback requirement. Commissioner Stewart said the architect has done an admirable job working within the parameters but the difficulty with this is that it will violate several design guidelines, one being that it does appear to be two stories, which is contrary to the design guidelines.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve with the following conditions:

1. **The overall height of the DADU shall not exceed the height of the house and the eave height shall not exceed ten feet (10') from grade;**
2. **The roof form shall be appropriate for the district; and**

3. Staff approve the final selections of the cladding, roofing, trim, windows, door, porch roof, porch floor, porch posts, and porch base prior to purchase and installation; finding that with these conditions, the application meets the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay design guidelines II.B.1. for New Construction. Commissioner Tibbs seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

i. 1406 5TH AVE N

Application: New Construction—Addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov
PermitID#: T2018062966

Melissa Baldock presented the case for 1406 5th Avenue north, beginning with the information that public comment was provided to the Commissioners, prior to the meeting. According to the Germantown Historic District National Register nomination, 1406 Fifth Avenue North was constructed circa 1850 and is a “one-story brick raised cottage with a daylight basement.” However, the structure could date back as early as the 1830s, making it one of the earliest houses in Germantown. The applicant is proposing a rear addition and a front porch addition. The applicant is proposing a rear addition that is eight feet, four inches (8’4”) taller than the historic house. The Historic Zoning Commission approved this same addition in 2015 and 2016, under the old design guidelines, but the addition was never constructed.

The site plan shows a DADU. The DADU was originally approved in 2016, and in February 2018, MHZC re-issued the permit, finding that the DADU met the new Germantown Design guidelines and the DADU ordinance.

The existing partial width front porch was constructed in 2008 and is therefore not historic. The 1897 Sanborn map depicts the house as having a small stoop or porch toward the right side of the front façade, similar to the 2008 front porch. However, the 1914 Sanborn map shows the house as having a full-width front porch. A photograph of the house from 1970 shows a full-width front porch; this is likely the same porch that appears on the 1914 Sanborn, although there may have been changes. The applicant proposes to construct a full-width front porch, with a footprint matching that of the porch shown on the 1914 Sanborn map. Although the house did not originally have a full-width porch, it did have one added that remained long enough to have historical significance of its own. For this reason, staff finds that reconstruction of a full-width porch to be appropriate.

The roof of the porch will be hipped, tying into the front of the house at the bottom of the front eave line. The porch floor height will match that of the existing front porch. The porch will have five square columns along the front edge. The roof form and column configuration are similar to the porch depicted on the circa 1970 photograph. Staff finds that because the porch depicted in the circa 1970 photograph may not be the exact original design, that a similar configuration is appropriate. The differences are minimal including hipped roof rather than shed and slightly different pier configuration but still with an open basement level. The porch will have a depth of five feet (5’). Typically, the design guidelines call for porches to be a minimum of six feet (6’) deep. However, in this case, the previous full width porch was just five feet (5’) deep, so a new five foot (5’) deep porch is appropriate. Staff finds that the proposed new front porch meets Section V.B. of the design guidelines.

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing addition at the rear of the house. This part of the structure does appear on an 1897 map, and is shown as a frame element form distinct from the masonry portion of the house. The existing addition is clad in siding and has a separate roof form from the brick house as well. It is located more than forty feet (40’) from the front of the house on the right side and about fifty feet (50’) from the front on the left side. It is at most minimally visible from the street. Staff finds that the existing addition does not contribute to the historic character of the historic house at 1406 5th Avenue North and to the Germantown Historic Zoning Overlay as a whole. Staff finds that its demolition meets Section VII.B.2. for appropriate demolition and does not meet Section VII.B.1. for inappropriate demolition.

The Commission approved the rear addition that is eight feet, four inches (8’4”) taller than the historic house in 2015. (Staff recommended a condition that the addition not be more than five feet (5’) taller than the historic building.) That permit has since expired. In October 2017, the Historic Zoning Commission adopted revised

design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay. Staff re-examined the proposed project under these new guidelines.

The applicant is proposing a rear addition that is eight feet, four inches (8'4") taller than the historic house. The addition is inset two feet (2') on both sides, which is appropriate. It will increase the footprint of the existing structure by approximately six hundred-fifty (650) square feet, after the non-contributing additions are demolished.

Examining the proposed addition under the current Germantown design guidelines, staff finds that its insets, width, depth, and footprint meet the design guidelines. The height of the addition, however, does not meet the current design guidelines. The previous Germantown design guidelines did not discuss situations when additions could go taller than the historic house; they did not provide a maximum additional height or parameters for when taller additions would be appropriate. Many of the other Metro Historic Zoning Commission design guidelines for residential neighborhood conservation and historic preservation zoning overlays state, in italicized print, that an addition may extend up to four feet (4') taller than the historic house at a distance forty feet (40') back from the front of the house. In the 2015 staff recommendation, staff recommended that because the addition was more than fifty feet (50') back from the front of the house, the addition should be limited to being five feet (5') taller than the historic house. However, the Commission approved the addition to be eight feet, four inches (8'4") taller because of the slope of the lot.

The current design guidelines now state, in italicized print, that "*when a taller addition is the only option,*" additions can be up to four feet (4') taller than the historic house at a point forty feet (40') back from the front of the house. Staff finds that an addition that is taller than the historic house could be appropriate for this lot because of the slope of the site.

The site is steeply sloped upwards towards the back of the lot; there is a difference of about ten feet (10') from the front of the lot to the rear (Figure 7). The lot's ground is rock, making it difficult and expensive to dig and level the slope. However, staff is not supportive of the proposed height of the addition which is a two-story addition on a one-story house. Since the current design guidelines specifically limit the height of additions to be no more than four feet (4') taller than the historic house, staff recommends that the addition be reduced in height by four feet, four inches (4'4") in order to meet the current design guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed rear addition's height is out of scale with this one-story with a raised basement house, and that reducing the addition's height to be no taller than four feet (4') taller than the historic house would make the addition more compatible with the historic house.

The applicant is proposing the addition to be all siding without any masonry. The design guidelines state that "All facades shall be at least 80% brick. A greater percentage of accent materials may be used on facades that are not visible from a public right-of-way." The applicant is proposing an addition that is entirely clad in siding, making the left/north façade fifty-two percent (52%) brick and the right/south façade forty-seven percent (47%) brick. The rear façade is almost entirely siding, with only the two feet (2') of brick walls at the back of the historic house being brick.

Staff finds that in this case, having an addition that contains no brick is appropriate because historically, the historic house had substantial amounts of non-brick facades. Both the 1897 and the 1957 Sanborn maps show that the entire back of the house was frame and not brick and that about two-thirds of the right/south façade was an enclosed wood porch (Figures 8 & 9). Parts of that wood porch section are now brick. Since historically, appendages and additions to this historic house were frame and not brick, staff finds that the proposed lap siding material to be appropriate for the addition. Staff finds that the percentage of brick on the side and rear façade to be in keeping with the historic character of 1406 5th Avenue North.

Staff recommends approval of the addition with the following conditions:

1. The addition be no taller than four feet (4') taller than the historic house;
2. Staff approve a brick sample and roof shingle sample;
3. Staff approve the location of the HVAC unit and all utilities; and
4. Staff approve all permanent landscape features, included but not limited to fences, pathways, pavers, parking pads, pools, etc.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed demolition and additions meet Sections II, III, V, VII of the design guidelines for the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Mosley asked if the addition was lowered four feet (4') would that result in a roof form that is inappropriate. Ms. Baldock said that it is not likely that a second level on the one-story building would be possible with the requested loss of four feet (4') in height.

Blake Rutland, representative for the architect, stated that the project has not changed since their submission several years ago. They are comfortable with all of the conditions with the exception of lowering the height of the addition. The additional height is sixty feet (60') back, rather than just the forty feet (40') requested by the design guidelines and so will not be visible. He claimed that second level would not be possible without the additional height.

Sonya Link, neighborhood representative, said that the neighborhood association supports the staff recommendation. She explained that the neighborhood worked hard to revise the design guidelines because the previous version was allowing for inappropriate changes in the neighborhood. She agreed that it will not be visible from 5th Avenue North but pointed out that the proposed addition would be highly visible from Taylor Street. She argued that all public facades should be considered, not just the street the project faces.

Commissioner Jones said the project is between large homes but the home it is attached to is a small one-story home; therefore a two-story addition is inappropriate.

Commissioner Mosley said that since the current guidelines give clear direction it would be hard to support the proposed height.

The applicant requested a deferral.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to accept deferral request. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

j. 1321 A STRATFORD AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 07

Overlay: Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Sajid, melissa.sajid@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2018063108

Staff member, Melissa Sajid, presented the case to construct a new single-family residence at 1321 A Stratford Ave. The lot is currently vacant. The house that stood on the lot previously was non-contributing as it was constructed circa 2013 and has since burned down.

The plan meets the design guidelines for height, scale, setbacks and rhythm of spacing, materials, roof shape, and orientation. As proposed, the infill is oriented to Stratford Ave with parking from the existing shared driveway.

Staff recommends that a walkway connecting the front porch of the infill to the public street be included on the site plan.

The structure is one and one-half stories and will have a maximum height of twenty-six feet (26') as measured from grade at the front. The overall height and scale of the infill is compatible with historic houses on this block of Stratford Ave. Here are the front and rear elevations.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill with following conditions:

1. The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The front setback should be consistent with the buildings to either side, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. Staff approve the final details of the roof color, siding reveal, windows, doors, trim, porch floors and steps, porch railings, porch posts, and walkway materials; and,
4. The site plan shall include a sidewalk connecting the front porch of the infill to the public street.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III of the Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, said he was available for questions and he agreed with all of the conditions of the recommendation.

Commissioner Stewart asked about the inspiration of the column, which Mr. Hodge said was a modern interpretation of a battered column.

Motion:

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve with the following conditions:

1. **The finished floor height shall be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
2. **The front setback should be consistent with the buildings to either side, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
3. **Staff approve the final details of the roof color, siding reveal, windows, doors, trim, porch floors and steps, porch railings, porch posts, and walkway materials; and,**
4. **The site plan shall include a sidewalk connecting the front porch of the infill to the public street; finding that with these conditions. the project meets Section III of the *Inglewood Place Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Commissioner Stewart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

k. 1623 SUMNER AVE

Application: New Construction—Infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: Melissa Baldock, melissa.baldock@nashville.gov

PermitID#: T2018062918

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented the case for new construction at 1623 Sumner Avenue. 1623 Sumner is a circa 1948 house that does not contribute to the historic character of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. In October 2018, MHZC staff issued an administrative preservation permit to demolish the structure and the outbuilding on the site. This application is to construct duplex infill development.

Because the house to the right, 820 Setliff Avenue, faces Setliff Avenue and not Sumner Avenue, staff recommends that the front setback for 1623 Sumner line up with the front setback of the historic house at 1621 Sumner. The setback for 1621 Sumner is not shown on the site plan, and staff recommends that it be included.

The proposed infill is one-and-a-half stories in height with a ridge height of twenty-three feet, nine inches (23'9") above the foundation. The foundation is drawn on the plans as being approximately two feet (2'); staff recommends inspection of the foundation height and finished floor height to ensure compatibility with the historic context. Staff finds that the proposed height of the infill meets the historic context, where historic houses are one to one-and-a-half stories and range in height from eighteen to twenty-four feet (18'-24').

The infill will be thirty-one feet, three inches (31'3") wide at the front, and will expand to thirty-six feet (36') wide approximately fifteen feet (15') behind the front porch. Staff finds that this meets the historic context where

houses range in width from twenty-eight feet (28') to thirty-four feet (34') at the front. The expanded width is pushed further back, helping to keep the scale of the infill appropriate to the context.

Staff recommends inclusion of a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion on all paired window openings. Staff further recommends that the siding have a maximum reveal of five inches (5") and that the front doors be at least half glass. On the side facades, staff finds that more window openings are required to meet the design guidelines and the historic context. Specifically, in the gable field, either the window should be centered, or another window should be added to mirror the existing windows. Additional windows are required on the ground floor, behind the side door, and in the dormers. In addition, all paired windows should have a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion in between them.

Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
2. The infill's front setback line up with the front setback of the house at 1621 Sumner Avenue, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;
3. The infill's siding be smooth with a maximum reveal of five inches (5");
4. The front doors be at least half glass, and staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;
5. Staff approve shingle and metal roofing color and textures;
6. The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;
7. One or two walkways be added from the street to the front porch;
8. All paired window openings have a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion in between them; and
9. Additional windows be added on the side facades, specifically in the gable fields, on the ground floor behind the side entries, and in the side façade dormers.

With these conditions, staff finds that the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Commissioner Mosley noted that the elevations don't match the site plan. Kevin Caine, applicant, explained why the drawings do not appear to match and the roof of the porch will wrap around. He said that he agree with the recommendation's conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Stewart explained that one-third (1/3) glass was appropriate, despite the guidelines requirement of one-half (1/2) glass since the house was not a Victorian style.

Motion:

Commissioner Stewart moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

1. **The finished floor height be consistent with the finished floor heights of the adjacent historic houses, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
2. **The infill's front setback line up with the front setback of the house at 1621 Sumner Avenue, to be verified by MHZC staff in the field;**
3. **The infill's siding be smooth with a maximum reveal of five inches (5");**
4. **The front doors be at least one-third glass, and staff approve all windows and doors prior to purchase and installation;**
5. **Staff approve shingle and metal roofing color and textures;**
6. **The HVAC be located behind the house or on either side, beyond the mid-point of the house;**
7. **One or two walkways be added from the street to the front porch;**
8. **All paired window openings have a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion in between them; and**
9. **Additional windows be added on the side facades, specifically in the gable fields, on the ground floor behind the side entries, and in the side façade dormers;**

finding that with these conditions the proposed infill meets Section II.B. of the Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

I. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS & UPDATES

Ms. Zeigler had several updates for the Commission:

- Reminder that all Commissioners need to complete training before the end of the year.
- New meeting date for November, which will be 11/19 and moves the deadline date up to 11/2, at noon.
- Old House Fair will be March 2nd

m. ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS ISSUED FOR PRIOR MONTH

The meeting adjourned at 3:01pm