

NEW HAVEN HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Wednesday, October 13, 2021, Regular Meeting, 7:00 PM

Location: Web-based meeting via Zoom

**Commissioner Trina Learned calls to order the public hearing at 7:00.**

**In attendance:** William Long (Deputy Director of Zoning), Maya Vardi (City Plan, Staff to the Historic District Commission, Planner II), Aicha Woods (City Plan, Executive Director), John Ward (Special Counsel to Economic Development Administrator), Trina Learned (Commissioner and Chair), Susan Godshall (Commissioner), Dylan Christopher (Commissioner), Doug Royalty (Commissioner), Karen Jenkins (Commissioner), Elizabeth Holt (New Haven Preservation Trust)

**1. Commissioner Learned reviews New Haven's Zoom meeting HDC policies and procedures and the point of New Haven's Local Historic Districts and the Historic District Commission.**

**2. New Public Hearing**

**2.1 21-02-CA 342 Greene Street (MBLU:208-0560-00400), Wooster Square Local Historic District. Owner: Jon Vercellone, Agent: Dan Baughman. Seeking approval for removal of existing wood porch and construction of new masonry covered porch.**

*Dan Baughman, 3 Danbury Place, Branford, CT*

Mr. Baughman describes the proposed work to demolish the existing front porch that has been in disrepair for years and replace it with another porch. The current porch is 32” wide. He proposes to reconstruct the porch with a natural stone finish (brownstone to blend with the brick foundation) and aged copper color metal roof. The fiberglass columns would have Roman capitals and bases, chosen to mimic the New Haven courthouse columns. There would also be cedar plantation shutters with operable louvres and S-style hinges. Cedar clapboard siding will be used for repairs around the new roof area. He shows an elevation drawing to show that the porch will be turned so it will not

end at the city sidewalk. The short sidewalk made of concrete would be replaced with red brick pavers. The proposed railing is black painted aluminum, but they have an alternate wood railing if the Commission prefers. The proposed spindles are ¾” and spaced no more than 4” apart and the wooden design would be the same. The top of the railing has a spherical motif, and the total height of the railing is 36” high. Commissioner Learned asks for questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Godshall asks about the column shaft being round but the capitol and base being square. Mr. Baughman confirms. Commissioner Godshall asks if there are examples of that in the neighborhood because it is unusual. Mr. Baughman answers that he does not think so.

Commissioner Christopher asks if there is gutter proposed. Mr. Baughman answers that it will be a copper gutter to match the roof.

Commissioner Royalty asks about the diameter of the columns. Mr. Baughman says they are 12” in diameter and are hollow fiberglass with a painted finish. Commissioner Royalty asks for further explanation of the design creation. Mr. Baughman says he designed it to scale down the mass of house by making the porch larger. Commissioner Royalty asks if there is historical evidence for the design. Mr. Baughman replies that nothing is on file for historical evidence. Commissioner Royalty had looked up the building and found its construction date as 1880. He thinks that most of the architectural features have been lost. Mr. Baughman says the distinctive 6-7” crown molding along the roof line still exists. Commissioner Royalty also asks if he has consulted with the New Haven Preservation Trust or other consultants. Mr. Baughman says they have consulted with one.

Commissioner Jenkins asks if the owner is the same owner that appeared over two years ago. Mr. Baughman replies that it is the same owner. She continues that she is glad to see the property come back before the Commission because she feels the Commission did not give a final answer to the owner last time. She thinks the design enhances the building.

Commissioner Godshall asks if Mr. Baughman chose not to put shutters by the gable windows or are they typically not included. Mr. Baughman says they are typically not included because if shutters were added, it would interfere with the roof.

Commissioner Learned closes this portion of the hearing and opens it up for public comment.

***Elizabeth Holt, New Haven Preservation Trust, 922 State Street, New Haven***

Ms. Holt clarifies that she helped Ms. Vardi with the application and spoke to Mr. Baughman last week. She does not think fiberglass columns, or design based on the courthouse are appropriate. She thinks a simpler design and wood railing would be more appropriate. She also thinks there are inconsistencies with the application, like the elevation drawing not being what the final design would be. No further comments from the public. Commissioner Learned closes this portion of the hearing and asks for Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Jenkins asks why Ms. Holt thinks the materials are inappropriate and why the design matters for the columns. Ms. Holt replies that fiberglass is not an appropriate material for historic buildings and the column design does not represent what would have been there in the past. Commissioner Learned explains that according to the Secretary of the Interior Standards, one cannot create a false history so unless there is evidence to the contrary, there is no reason to expect the porch would have had grand columns and railings because it is a vernacular house. Furthermore, fiberglass was not a building material used in 1880. By scaling it down to the vernacular, with a simpler capitol and wood railing (with 2" spacing), it would be consistent with the neighborhood. She adds that she sees the practicality of changing orientation and size as well as using brick like the foundation of the building on the base.

Commissioner Royalty also comments that the reason fiberglass is not appropriate is because in a historic district the Commission needs to follow the Standards which call for using natural materials that were historically used. In terms of design, he adds that the proposed design is far preferable to what is there but perhaps there is more compatible design for the district and a c.1880 house. The house represents a common building type for the 19<sup>th</sup> century as a front gable single family house, deriving from a time when land values changed so people shifted their side gabled houses 90 degrees to fit on narrow lots. By 1880 it was the end of Italianate period so likely it had those details. He thinks the design should be approached with a lot of documentation (which is probably not possible in this case) or look at other examples from period, type and/or massing. He adds that the courthouse is not comparable and suggests looking at the New Haven Preservation Trust publication called “Gable Fronted Single-Family Houses” which shows these houses in various styles. He reiterates rethinking the design in context of the property and district.

Commissioner Jenkins reminds the Commission that there were not next steps advised previously, so the house has continued in current condition. Commissioner Learned clarifies that the current application had revisions with City Plan, but they were not submitted to the Commission. She adds that the renovation being suggested has a certain beauty but would not qualify for historic tax credits because it is creating something new rather than something more original. She thinks with some refinements it would get approved.

***Charles Murphy, 42 Academy Street, New Haven***

Mr. Murphy agrees that something needs to be done and thinks the Commission is nitpicking. He thinks the design is something that would improve the house and allow it to last and to make it more difficult to do so frustrates those who live around it.

Commissioner Learned repeats that the Commission wants to make it simpler. She reminds everyone of her first statement at the beginning about the requirements of the Commission.

Commissioner Godshall reminds the Commission of their approved new construction at 109 Olive Street with a wraparound porch that has slim columns and simple round capitols. She suggests it as an example for design.

Commission Royalty adds that he is not interested in making anything more difficult but would like to see a design that is appropriate for the historic district. He says that it would not be more complicated to use wood rather than fiberglass or a simple column rather than a more complex.

Ms. Holt adds for clarification that fiberglass was not suggested but it was put into the application anyways.

Commissioner Jenkins asks if it would cost more for the owner to do these changes. Mr. Baughman says yes. Commissioner Learned repeats the purpose of the Commission and adhering to Standards. She thinks that what is suggested by the Commissioners is less expensive to construct than the design proposed.

Commissioner Royalty agrees and as a Certified Local Government, the Commission is obligated to follow the Standards which historically does not approve synthetic materials.

**Commissioner Godshall moves to continue the application to the November meeting.**

**Commissioner Royalty seconds the motion.**

**Commissioners Learned, Royalty, Godshall, Christopher in favor; Commissioner Jenkins opposed at 7:56.**

**2.2 2.2 21-03-CA 44-48 East Grand Avenue (MBLU: 098-1013-00101-84), 671-679**

**Quinnipiac Avenue (MBLU: 098 1013 00110), 683-687 Quinnipiac Avenue (MBLU:**

**098 1013 00108), 691-695 Quinnipiac Avenue (MBLU: 098 1013 00104)**

**(Condominium), Quinnipiac River Local Historic. Owner: Phoenix Landing**

**Condominium Association, Agent: Eric Murray. Seeking approval for the**

**replacement of siding, corner, fascia and soffit boards, window trims, garage doors, gutters and porches.**

Ms. Vardi makes a correction that this item should have been numbered 21-05-CA.

*Eric Murray, 677 Quinnipiac Avenue, New Haven*

Mr. Murray explains the application for four buildings at the corner of Quinnipiac and East Grand Avenue which make up the condominium association. It was built in 1989 at the edge of the historic district on the river side. As a 16-unit, owner occupied association, the residents are trying hard to fix deferred maintenance. Eight years ago, they sought to get the buildings painted and have since dealt with foreclosures and other issues that delayed them until now to be able to apply for a loan to complete the work. The application is for standard maintenance and dealing with rot that needs remediation. He proposes replacing rotted corner trim, fascia, soffit board, window trims, and garage doors with identical Azek trim rather than wood to lessen the need for maintenance. He shows a photo of Harbor Landing Condominium Association as an example of using Azek trim. He also proposes changing the gutters in place to 6" seamless aluminum gutters. For elements of porches that have some rot they will change out parts with pressure treated lumber and will be replacing cedar clapboard siding with like. He explains that any place where the trim is in good condition, it will stay and the windowsills will be replaced with pressure treated yellow pine. Mr. Murray shows photographs of elevations, damage, previous replacement, and describes where proposed treatment would occur on a significant portion of the window trim. Furthermore, he shows photos with representations of where gutters would be replaced. He is proposing 6" x 6" x 8' pressure treated lumber with an Azek wrap for non-load bearing porch columns. The lattice and stair treads would be repaired with pressure treated yellow pine as well. He asks about the dentil trim at the top of the porch and proposes to make the design more uniform across all porches but would like guidance from the Commission. He adds that midway through rebuilding the porch, he realized the proper way to proceed was to go through the Commission so that work has stopped. He offers to show more of

the like for like repairs but Commissioner Learned says it is not necessary for the Commission.

Commissioner Learned asks about consulting with the New Haven Preservation Trust. Mr. Murray replies that they have not. Ms. Holt clarifies that she did visit the site.

Commissioner Learned clarifies that the Commission is not ruling on repairs that are like for like. Also, she says that Harbor Landing Condominiums are not in the City Point Historic District. Mr. Murray replies that he only shared them as examples of Azek trim. She adds that the air conditioner units in the photos would have needed to be presented to the Commission and Mr. Murray says that those units were there before his time.

Commissioner Learned asks about which sides are in the right of way, which is in the Commission's purview. Mr. Murray clarifies that the garage doors are behind the building and shows the aerial which shows the sides that are visible from the road.

Commissioner Learned asks if they will be making all columns uniform. Mr. Murray proposes making them simpler by keeping everything square.

Commissioner Learned summarizes that the proposed work is changing the columns for uniformity, removing dentils on one of the roofs, and the use of Azek. She adds that Azek is not natural, and it will warp, does not behave like wood, and is not an approved material in a local historic district. Mr. Murray asks about the gutters needing approval but Commissioner Learned thinks that gutters are not permanent alteration so for her they do not have the same requirement. She asks the Commissioners for questions.

Commissioner Godshall commends Mr. Murray for the diligence put into the application. She asks about the differences in the building and why there is an effort to unify them. Mr. Murray replies that he feels some of the details are confused and would like to keep the buildings cohesive since they are a community. Commissioner Godshall is not sure uniformity is appropriate. Mr. Murray says the Building 4 columns are in good condition so leaving those as is would be fine. Commissioner Godshall asks him to think about the

diverse character of the buildings as an asset. Mr. Murray replies that the columns are the only thing they are looking to change in terms of unification.

Commissioner Royalty agrees with Commissioner Godshall's point because those differences in details were made on purpose by the architect. The details of Building 4 references a Greek Revival style and those buildings that have spindles reflect a later 19<sup>th</sup> century building. He says if it is possible to repair some features, that should be done. If it were not for change in materials to Azek, the work would largely be like for like. Mr. Murray agrees. Commissioner Royalty adds that Azek is plastic and is not stable over time or repairable in the same way wood is. Mr. Murray references quotes from contractors, and everyone recommended Azek for financial and maintenance considerations.

Commissioner Learned clarifies where the Azek trim would be placed. Mr. Murray says it will only be where there is rot. Commissioner Learned replies that it will not match the wood trim. Commissioner Godshall clarifies that the windows would be either wood or Azek, not a mix. Mr. Murray confirms they would not abut. Commissioner Learned asks about what happens over time if the wood rots and Mr. Murray says the wood would be changed to Azek. Commissioner Learned closes the question portion and asks for public comment.

Ms. Holt comments that her observation is that the buildings are already quite uniform, built by same developer, but she is not taking a stance on uniform columns. Also, she thinks in in this case a synthetic material should be considered given that buildings were constructed outside period of significance summarizing that a 1989 building should be treated differently than an 1889 building. No more comments from public.

Commissioner Learned says her concern is a mixture of the wood and Azek. She adds that the greatest amount of wear is on the sill, and its counterintuitive to have the sill remain wood. She perceives an individuality of each building's details, but the columns



are not in proportion so changing to all square would make more sense in regards to massing.

Commissioner Royalty comments that Azek does come closer to mimicking wood. However, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would not consider Azek as an appropriate material. He mentions the Mary Moody house which was denied use of Azek by SHPO. Also, if there is financial consideration, the Commission could consider that in their determination but reiterates that properly maintained wood is as durable and more fixable than Azek.

Commissioner Godshall says that the Moody house situation is not comparable to this application and that the indication of avoiding problematic abutting materials shows the diligence of the applicant. She agrees with Ms. Holt in not applying the Standards to a 1989 house. Commissioner Learned reminds the Commission that these buildings are prominent in the Quinnipiac River district. Mr. Murray address their financial issues as treasurer of the board, which are a concern. They want to use materials that can be power washed and Azek would ultimately help protect the building envelope. Commissioner Learned says to not power wash the clapboard exterior.

**Commissioner Godshall moves to approve the application as submitted.**

**Commissioner Learned seconds the motion.**

**Commissioners Godshall, Christopher and Jenkins approve; Commissioner Royalty abstains; Commissioner Learned opposed at 8:56.**

**2.3 2.3 21-04-CA 660 Quinnipiac Avenue (MBLU: 098-1001-00910), Quinnipiac River Local Historic. Owner: Carla Zaratian, Agent: Anthony Costello. Seeking approval for replacement of 12 windows with vinyl replacement windows, and replacement of 3 doors with fiber glass doors.**

*Carla Zaratian, 660 Quinnipiac Avenue, New Haven*

*Anthony Costello, 60 Commerce Drive, Trumbull*

Mr. Costello seeks approval to replace 12 windows and 3 doors in the Turnbridge Crossing Complex (1987) for energy efficiency purposes. The windows and doors have never been replaced. They propose replacing like for like in style and configuration. He shows drawings and specifications of the proposed vinyl windows. The current windows are double hung and wooden. He shows examples from the complex and across the street of other vinyl windows. He explains that the proposed Inspira Window mimic a wood window, but the first-generation PVC will not fade. He says the capping on the outside will be aluminum and vinyl. He then explains the proposal for three doors (front, back, and patio) which are currently wood but will be replaced with wood grain fiberglass, also for energy efficiency. Commissioner Learned asks who will install the windows. Mr. Costello says it would be his company. Commissioner Learned also asks about the current and proposed configuration of the doors. Mr. Costello shows the renderings of the proposed doors which will be in the same configuration.

Commissioner Learned states that the vinyl windows in his photos were not approved by the Commission and are all in violation. She asks for Commissioner questions. There are none. She asks for public comment. No comments. She asks for Commissioner discussion.

Commissioner Learned says while the condominiums may be more recent construction, they were carefully designed to be in the historic district. Commissioner Royalty adds that vinyl is not an appropriate material in a historic district. He asks if the applicant has considered replacing with wood. Ms. Zaratzian replies she did research with other contractors and wood was not suggested as an energy efficient material. Commissioner Learned explains that efficiency is in the glazing of the window and not the surround. Commissioner Godshall reminds the Commission of a recent application that was referred to New Haven Preservation Trust for consultation. That applicant is getting exterior storms rather than replacing and there are firms that can do that work without affecting the wood. Commissioner Royalty adds that interior storms also influence thermal efficiency. Commissioner Godshall asks if the applicant would be willing to withdraw her application to consider the proposed material usage for the doors and windows. Commissioner Learned adds that the Commission has never approved vinyl

windows in any historic district. She asks if the owner and agent would like to come back with new application or if the Commission should vote. Ms. Zaratzian asks the Commission to vote.

**Commissioner Jenkins makes a motion to approve as submitted.**

**Commissioner Learned seconds.**

**Commissioner Jenkins in favor; Commissioners Learned, Royalty, Godshall, Christopher opposed at 9:16.**

### **3. Discussion**

#### **3.1 52 Howard Avenue- Roof replacement completed without approval.**

Commissioner Learned explains that no building permit was issued for the work to replace the roof.

##### ***Warren and Raquel Seacord, 52 Howard Avenue, City Point, New Haven***

Mr. Seacord explains that they hired a roofer to replace the roof with a wood blend, as many houses around them have cedar shingle roofs, and that the roofing company was supposed to get permits. Mrs. Seacord adds that there was a leak that needed to be fixed and reiterated the company said they would get the permits and were familiar with the area. She says the letter they received from the City was addressed to Bestway Siding & Roofing Company and they were copied as owners. Commissioner Learned clarifies that they were asked to come because the work was done without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness and then a building permit.

##### ***Luis Aguayza, Bestway Siding & Roofing (no address given)***

Mr. Aguayza explains that he pulled the permit online and then paid. Then, they did the work and asked for final inspection. At that time, the Building Department informed them it was in a historic district. Commissioner Learned asks him to confirm he has a valid building permit. Mr. Aguayza reads the confirmation email from the permit submission and accepted payment of \$668.58. Commissioner Learned asks for clarification and staff input. Ms. Vaya confirms that Mr, Aquayza did receive a confirmation of the permit submission but not that it was approved. The permit has since been denied. She believes the misunderstanding is that the submission and payment was

processed but not that the permit was approved. Commissioner Learned says she believes that both the applicant and contractor's intent was good because they thought the permit application and payment were approved. She adds that staff have looked at the work and it is reasonable and keeping with the district, but the work should have gone through the Commission first. Mr. Long adds that the purpose of including them on the agenda was to show the owner and roofer the process for permits. Mr. Ward adds that the Building Department should put on the confirmation that it is not a permit.

### **3.2 90 Day Demolition Delay: 200 Columbus Ave- St. Martin de Porres Academy.**

Ms. Vardi provides updates to this item since the July meeting. The demolition application met all requirements, and the delay ends on November 11, 2021. Commissioner Learned asks if Commissioners would like to make comments. Commissioner Godshall comments that the New Haven Preservation Trust, Preservation Connecticut, and SHPO have cooperatively and vigorously worked with St. Martin de Porres Academy to find alternatives for two years. Measures were taken beyond what is often the case to save, in particular, the convent on Columbus Avenue, but feels it will come to unhappy end by demolition. Commissioner Learned asks staff to confirm the buildings to be demolished. Ms. Vardi shows the three structures to be demolished in an aerial view. Commissioner Learned says for past demolition delays the Commission has asked the applicant organization for replacement plans. Commissioner Godshall replies that the academy has plans for playing fields at the rear and improved parking where the convent is. She adds that SHPO, for various reasons, is not going to pursue legal action. Commissioner Royalty thanks the preservation community for their efforts as he feels it is a devastating loss. He thinks that despite the efforts of a small group of people, there was not enough understanding among the public to save important buildings as they were not beyond repair or adaptable. Commissioner Godshall adds that awareness of the situation amongst the preservation community came late as the applicant for site review is not required to show historic status of buildings involved. Commissioner Learned addresses the other factors involved in this case beyond protecting built environment like social or financial benefits which adds to the complexity of the situation. She asks if the Commission would like to write a letter to take a stance.

Commissioner Jenkins asks a question about the lack of public awareness that Commissioner Royalty raised, and he replies that he was making a general comment about the state of preservation ethic in New Haven. Commissioner Jenkins then asks what the Commission does to provide education to the community to address that problem. Commissioner Learned replies that she thinks that is an excellent point. She also addresses members of the public are on the call but as a point of procedure this is not a public comment discussion. Commissioner Jenkins reads into the record from the chat: “There are other things that may be more important to the community, we are looking more to our future than preserving history.” Commissioner Godshall suggests not to proceed with objection. Commissioner Royalty agrees. Commissioner Learned concludes that the issue is closed.

### **3.3 Update- Commissioner attendance in meetings.**

Ms. Vardi reached out to the mayor and legislative services and got the response that there is no specific requirement for Commissioner attendance in meetings. For poor attendance, it would come up in questions at a public hearing when it is time for reappointment. Commissioner Jenkins clarifies that Commissioners can miss meetings, but it only is an issue when they get reappointed. She also asks if each Commission can set its own standards. Mr. Long replies it is on staff’s radar to look into.

### **3.4 198 River Street Demolition**

Commissioner Royalty wanted to add the demolition to the agenda to explore the process that led to the shocking demolition. He also asks what can be done to mitigate the problem of such a loss to the industrial heritage. Ms. Woods says it came down to the building department’s assessment that the structures were unsafe, especially after additional damage from Hurricane Ida, so they issued an emergency demolition order. She adds that City Plan put out stabilization RFP in September. Commissioner Godshall asks who the Building Department issued the permit to and if staff saw it, as there is difference of legal opinion as to if the city can condemn its own buildings. Mr. Ward says if the Building Official deems a building unsafe, it is his obligation to order it demolished. Commissioner Learned clarifies the obligation is to eliminate the danger, which could mean stabilization does that. Commissioner Godshall brings up the gate

house at Brewery Square and the City giving the owner seven days to remediate or demolish. She believes in this case that official notice is missing. Ms. Vardi shared the permit application but will investigate finding the order to demolish. Commissioner Royalty asks if City Plan was involved and if the mayor signs off on it. Ms. Woods says City Plan was not involved in the demolition and Mr. Ward says the mayor does not need to sign off. Commissioner Christopher asks which department that would have needed to maintain the building. Commissioner Godshall says there was a lease holder who was urging the department to take the building down. Commissioner Royalty says he is not clear what led to requiring the demolition while simultaneously pursuing stabilization with SHPO. Ms. Woods replies that she does not have an answer. Commissioner Royalty asks for thoughts to keep this from happening again to other buildings in similar conditions. Ms. Woods responds that part of the challenge was funding turned down by FEMA which put them in a difficult position for the stabilization. Commissioner Godshall suggests contacting SHPO to talk about mitigation for emergency demolitions.

### **3.5 Proposed Text Amendment to Section 64(d)(1)- Site Plan Review**

Commissioner Godshall introduces this item as an outcome of the August discussion regarding St. Martin de Porres. She explains that among 32 submittal requirements in a site plan review application section of the zoning ordinance, none of the requirements ask the applicant to identify historic buildings. She reminds the Commission of the decision to maybe review someone else's proposal for a text change. She adds that a letter was submitted by Elizabeth Holt (New Haven Preservation Trust) and she hopes the Commission would review and support it. Mr. Long responds that he did research and concludes that aesthetics are not permitted during site plan review. He came up with a way for staff to conduct review but needs time to make a memo. Ms. Woods added it was also discussed with Counsel to add language to review criteria with designation, but no conclusions were reached. Commissioner Godshall says the letter written by Ms. Holt references the Connecticut General Statutes that allow zoning regulations to protect historic factors. She does not believe it is about aesthetics, just identification. Ms. Woods says the item has been submitted to Board of Alders for a notification about the historic listing of a property. It will be discussed at City Plan Commission (possibly October 20<sup>th</sup>)

and Legislative Committee (early November) for public comment, all likely to happen before the next HDC meeting. Commissioner Godshall asks the Commission to support it, like the New Haven Preservation Trust board did. Commissioner Learned says the consensus is to write a letter of support, and she will work with Ms. Vardi on that, as it has been thoroughly researched and written by New Haven Preservation Trust.

### **3.6 2022 Annual meeting schedule review.**

Commissioner Learned calls this schedule to everyone's attention for review and will call for a vote at the next meeting.

## **4. Minutes**

### **4.1 Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes- 7/29/2021**

Commissioner Learned would like the following edits: add page numbers, p. 4: under administrative action "enough of a change to warrant an application" take away "enough of a"; p. 5: change to "she asks if a member of the public would like to comment"

**Commissioner Royalty moves to approve the minutes as amended.  
Commissions Godshall seconds.  
All in favor at 10:16.**

### **4.2 Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes- 8/11/2021**

Commissioner Godshall edits: item 3, Item 3 motion- change to "are no changes"; substitute "prior" for "proposed", take out "in design"; on last page Green Street needs an "e"; Commissioner Learned edits: 4<sup>th</sup> line "mistreatment" taken out.

**Commissioner Godshall moves to approve the minutes as amended.  
Commissioner Royalty seconds.  
All in favor 10:20.**

## **5. New Business**

Commissioner Learned announces George Knight's resignation from the Commission and expects discussion at the November meeting for a proposal for vice chair. She asks if there is other new business. Commissioner Royalty thanks City Plan staff on hard work to try and save the River Street properties.

**Commissioner Godshall moves to adjourn.  
Commissioner Royalty seconds.  
All in favor 10:22.**

Respectfully submitted by Jordan Sorensen, recorder.