

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
SANFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**WEST END CONFERENCE ROOM  
7:00 PM, MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2010  
SANFORD MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Al Roethlisberger, David Nestor, Donnie Worley  
Brandon Atkins, Shannon Gurwitch, Ed Page,  
Mike Humphrey

**Commissioners Absent:**

**Staff Present:** Planning Director, Bob Bridwell  
Clerk, Anne Sears

**Government Official Present:** Sam Gaskins City Councilman

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 25, 2010**

Chairman David Nestor called the meeting to order. Clerk Anne Sears called the roll. Chairman Nestor asked for approval of the agenda. Commissioner Humphrey asked to add the policing policy from January 2007 under Old Business. Commissioner Worley moved to approve the agenda as amended. Seconded by Commissioner Humphrey, the motion passed unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF THE PRIOR JUNE 21, 2010 MINUTES AND THE MINUTES  
FOR SEPTEMBER 27, 2010.**

Chairman Nestor asked for approval of the minutes. Chairman Nestor provided samples of two different board meeting minutes: one was from the City Board of Adjustment and the City of Sanford City Council regular meetings. He noted how lengthy the HPC minutes were in comparison. He stated that Attorney Patterson was not at this meeting, but she might have additional recommendations for them at next month's meeting. Chairman Nestor would like to see them shorter and more reasonable. He asked if anyone had any input to send him an e-mail. Commissioner Humphrey pointed out that there were twenty pages for a three hour meeting, in comparison to eleven pages for a thirty minute City Council meeting. Chairman Nestor stated that they needed to respect their time as well.

Commissioner Gurwitch moved to approve the June and September minutes and it was seconded by Commissioner Worley. Commissioner Humphrey had a question about the June meeting and the reason the Commission didn't approve the June minutes was that

Attorney Patterson asked to hold them back. She was not present tonight, and it was Commissioner Humphrey's understanding from a conversation earlier tonight that the minutes had not been amended, and he thought it would be inappropriate to approve them until the minutes were rectified. Commissioner Humphrey asked that the motion be divided to not include the approval of the June minutes.

Commissioner Roethlisberger arrived at 7:15.

Chairman Nestor asked if there was any discussion on his dividing the motion, there was none, and it passed unanimously.

Commissioner Humphrey made a motion to table the June minutes until Attorney Patterson had the opportunity to resolve or clarify any corrections until the subsequent meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Page, the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Gurwitch moved to approve the September minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Worley, the motion passed unanimously.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### ***Review of Application for Certificate of Appropriateness COA-10-66.***

Mr. Bridwell stated that before them was an application made by James Squire, property owner at 221 N. Horner Blvd., who wished to remove the original slate roof and replace it with architectural shingles and replace and repair all rotten sheathing and wood associated with replacing the roof. Citizen Linda Cunliffe was there to represent Mr. Squires. Chairman Nestor stated he had received an e-mail reflecting Mrs. Cunliffe being here tonight.

Linda Cunliffe, Jackie Ledbetter, Bob Bridwell and Carl Anglin were sworn in. Commissioner Roethlisberger had a question about the presentation of this case. Commissioner Roethlisberger commented that they had been instructed by the City Attorney that the general statute now required that if someone was to be represented it needed to be by legal counsel or similarly appointed representative. Linda Cunliffe stated she was employed by the owner, and she had a notarized paper from Mr. Squires allowing her to represent him.

Chairman Nestor asked if anyone had any previous knowledge of the COA 10-66. Commissioner Roethlisberger stated that he didn't have any conflict that would influence his ability to make impartial decisions in the case. He stated the property was listed, and his realtor did show him the property as an interest in the property itself. Commissioner Roethlisberger stated he was on the premises today, and he observed the condition of the

structure. Commissioner Humphrey also shared that he had viewed the property with his wife, a realtor, and another person when it first went on the market two months ago.

Mr. Bridwell summarized the COA 10-66 staff report. Mr. Bridwell indicated that all public notifications required by general statutes had been fulfilled. Mr. Bridwell stated that staff recommendations were included in the staff report; however, staff would not be making recommendations in the future. Mr. Bridwell entered the staff report as Exhibit A.

Mr. Bridwell read that on Monday, October 11, 2010 Code Enforcement and Historic Preservation Staff conducted a site visit to the property. Staff documented a few areas where water damage and mold were evident in the rear in the sun porch area; however, the house appeared to be structurally sound. Mr. Bridwell noted that there were photos available, and he would be glad to answer any questions.

Mrs. Cunliffe, who was representing Mr. Squires, came up and presented the case. Mrs. Cunliffe noted that Mr. Squires wanted to sell the property but didn't want to do anything with the roof himself. She noted a couple of people were interested in the property, but would not consider it if they did not know whether or not they could replace the slate roof, which could be very costly. Mrs. Cunliffe stated Mr. Squires wanted to tell potential buyers that changing the slate roof to an architectural shingle would be acceptable to the Commission.

Mrs. Cunliffe stated that to replace the roof with slate shingles was estimated to be \$57,780.00, which didn't include any other repairs to the house. Mrs. Cunliffe mentioned she had also had an estimate to replace the roof with a dimensional asphalt shingle for \$9,695.00, which did not include repairing the sheathing or anything underneath.

Chairman Nestor asked Mrs. Cunliffe if Mr. Squire was having her apply for a COA with no promise of the work being done. She indicated that Mr. Squires was not going to repair anything unless the house was sold. She stated she could not get a contract on the house without getting an estimate; with the estimate so high, she felt that it was a lot of money to put into something without a guaranteeing of selling it for a reasonable amount. Commissioner Page asked what the difference in price was for slate versus architectural shingles. Mrs. Cunliffe stated she had another slate estimate of \$34,895.00, but that didn't include anything else.

Commissioner Gurwitch said that she didn't think it was appropriate for the Commission to be hearing the case because 1) the applicant was not actually coming before the Commission to indicate they had plans or any intention of going through with the project and 2) if the home was sold, there was no guarantee of the work being done, and the new owner might want to do something different, and the current Commission could not guarantee that the future Commission was going to approve that. Commissioner Roethlisberger agreed. Commissioner Humphrey said the Commission could not approve anything when someone was not here to offer testimony, and it was very clear in their role that they could not do that. Chairman Nestor stated to Mrs. Cunliffe the

concern was the Commission did not want to find themselves in a situation that was binding a future Commission to make that decision. Commissioner Roethlisberger wanted clarification that Mr. Squires just wanted permission to put architectural shingles on the house while he still owned the home but had no intention of actually doing the work. Mrs. Cunliffe stated again that Mr. Squires was not going to put any more money into the home. Commissioner Roethlisberger also mentioned as Commissioner Humphrey pointed out, the Commission could not offer solutions to someone who did not exist in the eyes of this meeting. Mrs. Cunliffe asked the Commission if Mr. Squires needed to come before the Commission and say he was going to replace the roof, before she tried to sell his house.

Commissioner Gurwitch said once the house was sold to the new owners, who actually intended to do the work, could a COA be applied for. Commissioner Gurwitch shared that the Commission was not just there to hear a COA case, but also make recommendations to whoever was applying for a COA. She commented that if a person came before the Commission and said they wanted to do this, but didn't have the means to do it, the Commission could work with those people to try to identify a solution that could work for everybody. Commissioner Gurwitch felt the Commission couldn't approve a COA on work that was not actually going to be done, and she didn't think the Commission could issue a guarantee as to whether or not a future board would approve or deny or alter a COA. Mrs. Cunliffe asked if the Commission would approve it with an offer to purchase. Chairman Nestor said his thoughts were only if the individual that was named in the offer to purchase, would come before them.

Chairman Nestor shared with Mrs. Cunliffe there were a lot of different roofing products out there. He shared that CertainTeed made wonderful products that looked like slate at one-third the cost. Commissioner Gurwitch stated that if there were an alternative that had a slate like appearance, and she had an offer binding contract on the house, then the Commission might be able to approve the project contingent upon the closing on the house with that particular client. Chairman Nestor suggested to Mrs. Cunliffe to bring in a sample product with the color. Commissioner Roethlisberger warned against the Commission advising the applicant on such matters.

Commissioner Humphrey asked Mrs. Cunliffe how bad was the roof. She said she was not a roofer, and she couldn't answer that question, but she did state that she had hired a roofer, and he felt like it could be repaired but at considerable cost. Chairman Nestor said he agreed with Commissioner Humphrey that a recommendation was needed on the floor, and to move on. **Commissioner Gurwitch moved that we not hear this particular application COA-10-66 as it was inappropriate for the Commission to rule on this COA at this time. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Atkins.** Chairman Nestor asked if there was any discussion, and Commissioner Humphrey said he would like to give some reference to why in the minutes.

**Commissioner Gurwitch said for the reason that I previously stated: 1) the applicant was not actually coming before the Commission to indicate they had plans or any intention of going through with the project and 2) if the home was sold, there**

was no guarantee of the work being done, and the new owner might want to do something different, and the current Commission could not guarantee that the future Commission was going to approve that. Chairman Nestor called for a vote dismissing COA-10-66; the motion was approved unanimously. Chairman Nestor thanked the applicant for coming. Commissioner Atkins asked for the record to give the applicant, Mrs. Cunliffe, a copy of the detailed minutes when they were completed.

**Review of Application for Certificate of Appropriateness COA-10-67.**

Chairman Nestor asked to move forward with case COA-10-67 and asked if anyone had made any site visits. Commissioner Humphrey asked to recuse himself, and noted that the property was directly across the street from him. He said there was no financial means in it, just so there was no question. Commissioner Humphrey left the meeting.

Mr. Bridwell stated that before them was an application made by Jackie Ledbetter, property owner at 504 Summitt Drive, who wished to remove the existing roof on her side porch and replace it with a pitched roof, and to remove and replace all rotten wood.

Mr. Bridwell summarized the COA-10-67 staff report. Mr. Bridwell indicated that that all public notifications required by general statutes had been fulfilled. Mr. Bridwell stated that staff recommendations were included in the staff report; however, staff would not be making recommendations in the future. Mr. Bridwell entered the staff report as Exhibit B.

Mr. Bridwell shared that Code Enforcement and Historic Preservation staff conducted numerous site visits to the property. Staff had given the applicant permission to secure the roof to ensure that water would not cause further damage to the structure. The approval of the COA would be an after the fact COA, and was stated as such in the file. At this time, Chairman Nestor noted for the record about the staff report, in the middle of the page 5, where the sentence read “after the Chairman was contacted by staff” about the situation, the Chairman had done a telephone poll with the majority of the HPC to allow the applicant to proceed with the project without a COA to protect the integrity of the property. Chairman Nestor asked the board if they had any questions. There was none.

Mrs. Ledbetter came up and spoke about the case. She stated that she bought her house two years ago, and she wanted her house to be repainted. Mrs. Ledbetter told the HPC that they could see the damage on the flat screen porch in the pictures provided. When she noted that when the contractor came to scrape and repaint the house she asked if it could be fixed and the contractor said yes. She stated that the integrity of the house was still left intact. Chairman Nestor asked her if the photos were current, and it was stated they were before and after pictures.

Commissioner Gurwitch relayed that after talking about it, there was not a lot of difference in the photos.

**FINDING OF FACT:**

**Commissioner Gurwitch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission find as fact that the proposed project COA-10-67 at 504 Summitt Drive had been constructed according to the plans reviewed and was congruous with the character of the district, for the reasons that the height, setback, and placement, materials, architectural detailing, roof shapes, general form and proportions were generally in harmony with the criteria of the design guidelines and the special character of the neighboring properties and the historic district as a whole. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Worley.**

Chairman Nestor asked if there was any other discussion, and Commissioner Roethlisberger disagreed. He stated there had been significant change to the house. Commissioner Roethlisberger stated that the pitch of the roof had been changed. He also commented that the lines with the soffitt on the rest of the house had a Greek Revival appearance with exposed rafter tails. Commissioner Roethlisberger said now when looking at the after photograph it looked like a shed type porch addition. Commissioner Roethlisberger said it didn't look bad, but it was a significant change, not extreme, but not totally in harmony with the rest of the house. He noted it has already been built, and obvious the Commission didn't want to make anyone rebuild it. Chairman Nestor noted that the rafters on the addition looked like they were missing, but Mrs. Ledbetter said they were all there, but a little different shape. Commissioner Gurwitch stated that she did not realize that the project was already completed. Chairman Nestor and Commissioner Gurwitch asked that in the future that staff inform the applicant to stabilize but not complete the entire project, because there was always the possibility of it being denied, based on the concerns that Commissioner Roethlisberger had. Chairman Nestor said that this was a statement that the applicant was given, and he hoped staff would let the applicant know you were preceding with the risk that it wouldn't be approved, when they were told to go ahead and dry it in. Commissioner Gurwitch asked the applicant again was it made clear to Mrs. Ledbetter that if the Commission did not approve the changes she made, she would have to go back and do it over. Mrs. Ledbetter indicated she didn't understand that. Commissioner Atkins shared that there may have been different solutions to pursue. Commissioner Atkins also noted that water was going to find its way in, and it was logical to try to change the pitch of the roof to make it work.

Chairman Nestor asked Code Enforcement, Carl Anglin, if he had a testimony to share. Carl stated when he went over and saw the flat roof with shingles that it was physically impossible to go back like it was. The roof had to be raised; they had to get it stabilized, and lots of rain was forecasted for that week. He said the shingles matched the same as before and he required a drip edge to be put back on.

Commissioner Roethlisberger noted his concern was with contractors and subs that were not aware of the rules, yet they made recommendations to clients that might or might not work. The Commission didn't have a way to hold the contractors accountable. He had no answers, but he suggested an education program, similar to the one the realtors and contractors had done. Commissioner Gurwitch shared that the goal for these projects was

not to continue to let it happen this way again. Commissioner Page called to end the discussion and called for a vote. **The motion passed unanimously.**

**Based upon the previous finding of facts, Commissioner Gurwitch moved that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jackie Ledbetter and approve the proposal as shown in COA-10-67, 504 Summitt Drive. Seconded by Commissioner Page, the motion passed unanimously.**

Mrs. Ledbetter left and Commissioner Humphrey came back to the table. Commissioner Gurwitch asked if staff would provide a form for the homeowner to sign that if they continued with work prior to the COA that the responsibility was with the homeowner if the project was denied. Mr. Carl Anglin said he would have his staff complete the assignment.

Chairman Nestor had concerns there was no architectural drawing, and the final outcome was not what was proposed to him. It was noted that Mrs. Ledbetter had tried to contact Mr. Anglin on Friday, but he was out of the office, so when Mr. Anglin got there on Monday morning, the contractor had already completed the pitch, the decking, and removed the rotted wood. Mr. Anglin told the applicant that she had to replace the rafter tails.

Commissioner Humphrey said he had recused himself for a great reason. He shared that building supervisor, Frankie Hickman, had put a stop work order on the project around 2:00 pm on Thursday afternoon. He pointed out that the porch was not an addition but original construction based on the foundation that was underneath it. Mr. Humphrey shared that Mrs. Ledbetter called him and asked him what she should do and he told her that it was on your contractor and that if he didn't get a building permit, he was responsible. Commissioner Humphrey stated a painting contractor could not get a building permit, so Mrs. Ledbetter had to get a homeowner's permit, taking on the liability herself. Mr. Anglin said that a painting contractor could get a building permit as long as the project was under \$30,000.

Commissioner Humphrey told her at that time that in his opinion she needed a COA, and she needed to contact staff Liz Whitmore. He gave her Liz's phone number, and if she was not available, she could speak with David Montgomery, and he gave her that phone number as well. Mr. Humphrey said Mrs. Ledbetter called her Sunday afternoon, stating it had been four days, and she had not received a phone call back. Mr. Humphrey asked whom did she call and she said both. Mr. Humphrey stated that Mr. Worley had mentioned that staff Whitmore and he were at a seminar on that Thursday and Friday. It was noted that Mrs. Ledbetter had contacted Mayor Cornelia Olive, and that is when Mr. Anglin got brought in on Monday.

Discussion continued on how staff operated, and Mr. Bridwell suggested that this was not appropriate for the meeting. Mr. Bridwell said he would address this after the meeting. Chairman Nestor thanked him for the follow-up.

Commissioner Gurwitch said she had a question as to how long a person had to stop work when a stop work was placed. Mr. Anglin explained that a stop work order was issued because the individual did not obtain a building permit. He shared that if the stop work order was placed on Thursday, and if Mrs. Ledbetter had gone on Friday to get a building permit, probably none of this would have happened. Basically a stop work order was placed because an owner started work without proper permits; but once a permit was issued that stop work order was lifted. Commissioner Gurwitch asked if the work was actually stopped, and Mr. Anglin stated he doubted it, due to the fact it was on a weekend. Chairman Nestor remarked that the homeowner out of desperation was making moves. Commissioner Humphrey mentioned that staff did report work was being done at last month's meeting. Chairman Nestor stated it was listed as a minor work. Commissioner Humphrey said it was a minor work, and it was questioned, not by me, by others. Commissioner Humphrey said the work proposed was not what actually was constructed, and he had concerns that there were far too many of these.

### **Old Business:**

- 1) Mr. Bridwell passed out copies of prior COA 08-10 (406 W. Chisholm Street). Chairman Nestor stated this was the COA that was approved at 406 W Chisholm with the sleeping porch on the back side of the house. Chairman Nestor had mentioned to Carl Anglin that an architectural drawing would have been nice, as opposed to the drawings they received from the homeowner in the prior COA. Commissioner Humphrey noted that the project was approved by a previous Commission and indicated then that the addition could not be built according to the drawing, yet the Commission went ahead and approved that project. Chairman Nestor said they couldn't turn around and say the Commission was going to disapprove it now.

Chairman Nestor said he had looked at the addition. He said he thought it was adequate and it performed the function in which it was intended, but he questioned some of the architectural detailing on the project. Some members asked why this was on the agenda. Commissioner Roethlisberger stated that it was probably the result of his recent inquiry on the monthly spreadsheet for a renewal. Chairman Nestor said there was nothing they could act on at this point and time. Commissioner Humphrey had two points; 1) the addition was not built as approved, particularly the roofline, and 2) the criteria in the original COA issued was that it was going to be heated space but it was not. Commissioners Atkins asked why they were looking at this right now, other than looking at this as an example. Members discussed what they needed as far as future drawings for approval. Chairman Nestor asked Mr. Anglin if building inspections would have passed that particular drawing enabling them to get a building permit, and Mr. Anglin noted more than likely they would be able to do that. Mr. Bridwell stated that building inspections saw numerous sketches, by owners and non-license contractors, and they do not have to be drawn by an engineer. Commissioner Atkins mentioned he would like to see dimensions, so you wouldn't have to argue the point. Discussion continued about drawings, and it was the consensus of the board that a more detailed drawing were needed when plans were submitted.

- 2) Chairman Nestor asked Commissioner Humphrey to proceed with policing policy. Commissioner Humphrey stated he would like to discuss reinstating the policing policy, which was effective in January 2006 and 2007, like when Carl and David did the policing. Commissioner Humphrey explained that Carl Anglin was to do a weekly check with staff David Montgomery at that time, because Mr. Anglin was not familiar with the historic guidelines. Mr. Anglin stated that at the present Staff Whitmore was policing two days a week, one of those days with him.

Commissioner Gurwitch asked if there was a specific requirement in the historic district that a realtor notify and show proof of having notified a potential buyer in the historic districts. Chairman Nestor said yes, it was similar to having covenants in a sub-division, where realtors are required to inform potential buyers of anything that would exist that would interfere with what they want to do with their property. Chairman Nestor suggested that when Carl Anglin rides through the historic district, and he sees a for sale sign with a phone number on it, it would be great to give the realtor a call and let them know that the property was in the historic district.

On another subject, Commissioner Gurwitch noted some of the information that was shared after the Commission approved the second COA was information the Commission should have had prior to the decision, such as how the whole thing transpired, were they informed, and questions regarding the stop work, and Mr. Humphrey's comments on the case. Commissioner Humphrey said I thought it was unreasonable for me to do that. Councilman Gaskins shared that both members were correct, that that discussion belonged in the motion while the motion was on the floor but after the motion had been voted on, it shouldn't have been discussed at all. Councilman Gaskins shared that on the City Council they are restricted on being able to recuse themselves. Mr. Gaskins said he felt like it didn't apply for the HPC board, but he felt that Mr. Humphrey should have been sworn in at testimony for that information. Mr. Gaskins also shared that with City Council you need to be familiar or financially involved before you can recuse yourself. He stated just because you have a personal relation as a friend doesn't count. Commissioner Gurwitch said she felt we should have had that information, and Mr. Gaskins said this was why Attorney Patterson's presence was needed at tonight's meeting. Mr. Gaskins stated that he felt like Commissioner Humphrey followed the correct procedure by recusing himself, and if it was part of your decision making it really should have been during the motion, and then it was over and done. Chairman Nestor said to Mr. Gaskins that our discussion that we had after the fact was more directed at staff. Commissioner Gurwitch said they needed to know as a commission that if this should happen again, that if a person has that much information that could impact the decision of the board, then do we, even if that person said maybe they had a conflict of interest and shouldn't take part in making this decision, then that person could be sworn in and share what information they had. Chairman Nestor stated he would ask Attorney Patterson if a Commission member could step off, and recuse himself, and then turn right around and be sworn in and testify. Commissioner Humphrey stated we had done it in the past.

- 3) Chairman Nestor said he was going to table the review of the Rosemount McIver Historic Park Guidelines and asked to go on to New Business. Commissioner Roethlisberger shared that they needed to make progress, due to the fact that they had worked on it for a number of years for preparation and delivery of the product. He asked that if not at this meeting but at a future meeting we come up with a solution of how they were going to address that either by a committee or such.

**Commissioner Humphrey made a motion to send the Guidelines to a committee and have members outside of the committee review the guidelines, make any suggestions or directions of expectations to that committee before they started. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gurwitch.**

Chairman Nestor asked for any discussion. Chairman Nestor discussed the option of having a separate meeting just for the guidelines, and expressed that the only way they had been able to get through the Rules and Procedures was due to the lack of cases for COAs at prior meetings in the past. Chairman Nestor asked Commissioner Humphrey to let him know what it is going to take to establish a committee, and we can talk afterwards and figure it out.

Commissioner Atkins asked for clarification who was going to put together the committee. Chairman Nestor said he would speak to City Attorney Susan Patterson and staff. Chairman Nestor called for a vote. There were six in favor of the motion and Commissioner Page opposed.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- Mr. Bridwell summarized the minor work COAs for the month of October (sheet attached) Board members had questions on COA 10-69 at 126 S. Moore St., the Kimbrell's Furniture Building where the windows were falling out. It was questioned why it was approved as a minor work. Commissioner Roethlisberger checked the guidelines of replace original windows with wood, and Commissioner Humphrey read part of the guidelines that might influence the project as well. Chairman Nestor asked Mr. Bridwell to ask staff Liz Whitmore to verify the address of the actually building that the work was being done. Mr. Bridwell he would do so and he would continue to follow up with the board. Commissioner Roethlisberger shared that the matrix was basically designed to empower staff to take care of certain classifications of COAs. He shared that personally he didn't believe that yanking out windows and holes and replacing them should be a minor work – that this was a major architectural feature, and Commissioner Gurwitch was in agreement. Mr. Bridwell said he would be glad to bring everything to the board. Several opinions regarding minor works and major works were expressed among board members. Chairman Nestor did state that by looking at the matrix there was no doubt that it was listed as a minor work. Commissioner Roethlisberger opined that when windows are involved to advise the Commission. Mr. Bridwell said he felt ~~tt~~-staff's decision was adequate.~~equite.~~

Commissioner Humphrey asked Mr. Bridwell if he was aware of the project going on at 206 Gulf St. At this time, Mr. Anglin was asked to share comments. He stated they were removing piers underneath the house, replacing those, adding two piers, and also a beam under the porch. Mr. Anglin also stated that they are not anticipating replacing the steps, and they do have a permit to do the work. Owners are Debra and Michael Fincher.

Chairman Nestor called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Gurwitch made a motion to adjourn, and seconded by Commissioner Page.

Commissioner Roethlisberger stated he had good news to share. He stated that the white duplex behind his house @ 216 & 218 N. Gulf that has been vacant for a year and a half is being renovated. He said in the past all sort of activity have been going on there. Commissioner Roethlisberger said the owner plans to turn it over into a single family dwelling, and plans to sell it.

Commissioner Gurwitch commented on the house that is diagonally across the street from her on Hawkins Avenue, that doesn't look habitual at all, but she has notice residents going and coming and asked Carl Anglin if he was aware of it. Mr. Anglin noted he has been working on that house for a long time.

Commissioner Roethlisberger also shared that a white duplex at 313 A & B Green Street, owned by Jeff Cashion, was also a focus point of crime, but he was doing renovations to turn it into a single family home as well. The structure had practically been gutted as well, and would make a great impact to the community.

Mr. Anglin informed the board that the COA that the board had previously approved at last month's meeting had interest by a local church to do the work. Mr. Anglin said the church had even agreed to build the stairs from the door, but that of course a COA would be attained before commencing work. Everyone gave praise.

**Chairman Nestor again, called for adjournment. Commissioner Gurwitch moved; and it was seconded by Commissioner Atkins.** The meeting adjourned at 9:05.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
David Nestor- Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Anne Sears, Clerk