

Minutes for the April 7, 2004 Historic District Commission Meeting

**Regular Meeting
Historic District Commission
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
City Council Chambers**

SITE WALK: Saturday, April 3, 2004 @ 9:30 a.m. at 195 Hanover Street

PLEASE NOTE: Because of the length of Agenda, the Agenda has been split as follows: Old Business A) and B), Public Hearings #1 through #11 and Work Session A) will be heard at the April 7, 2004 meeting and **Work Sessions B) through G) will be heard the following Wednesday, April 14, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.**

7:00 p.m.

April 7, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman, John Rice; Vice-Chairman, David Adams; John Golomb; Ellen Fineberg; Rick Becksted; Planning Board Representative, Paige Roberts; City Council Representative, Joanne Grasso; and, alternates Richard Katz and

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Amendment to previous approval given on November 5, 2003 for the application of Ocean National Bank, owner, and JSA Architects, applicant, located at 325 State Street that the brick and mortar sample be approved for the building as requested by the Historic District Commission. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 001, 006 and 007 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

Mr. Wallinga from JSA Architects and representing the owner, stated that the site for the electronic transformer has been chosen and three additional bushes are being proposed for screening of the electric transformer that will be placed under the ground in the back corner of the building on Porter Street. All electrical wiring will be placed under ground. The brick being used will be Morin A-Gorham Smooth brick and Morin B-Brown Smooth brick; the mortar will be quick Crete/Solomon 32X.

Commission members Vice-Chairman Adams and Mr. Golomb visited the site and felt the brick and mortar sample shown at the site was a "top drawer" presentation and using the Morin A-Gorham Smooth brick and the Morin B-Brown Smooth brick and the mortar color will be "Quick Crete/Solomon 32X. The Commission members also approved the site for the electric transformer and added that since the transformer will be placed underground and the proposed screening will help create a block should not present any problems for the area.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as submitted; however, should the transformer be larger than the specifications presented at the meeting, the applicant will return to the Historic District Commission for further approval; Mr. Becksted seconded and the motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....
B) **Amendment to previous approval given on March 5, 2003 for the application of Tyroch Realty, owner, and DeStefano Architects, applicant,** on property located on 480 State Street for approval of the brick and mortar sample at the site as requested by the Historic District Commission. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 014 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he had visited the site to review the brick and mortar sample and added that that the proposed Morin Red Water Struck brick and the mortar that is being proposed will be a white SGS60H and will fit in with the area of other brick buildings. This will enhance the community.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve amendment for the brick and mortar presentation; Ms. Grasso seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....
C) **Amendment to previous approval given on November 5, 2003 for the application of Christiana D’Adamo, owner and Chester P. Keefe, II, Architect,** for property located at 54 Bridge Street to allow the approved Marvin windows to be upgraded with sill detail as discussed at that meeting as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 053 and 054 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

The motion was made to accept the request of Chester P. Keefe, II, and the Architect for the project, to table the application to the May 5, 2004 meeting and was seconded. The motion passed unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....
Both Ms. Fineberg and Mr. Becksted stepped down from the following application since they were not in attendance for the work session. Alternates, Mr. Katz and Ms. Dika sat in.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1) **Petition for Scott Osgood, owner, for property** located at 133 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (placement of new Anderson windows . Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 015 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Scott Osgood, the owner of the property, stated he application is to discuss balancing out the window fenestration on the carriage house that was discussed at the last work session using the Anderson windows with true divided lights.

The Commission members discussed the work session with Ms. Fineberg and Mr. Becksted who were not present for the work session and they indicated that they were satisfied with the outcome.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented; Mr. Dika seconded and all approved with a 7 – 0 vote.



2) Petition for Allen Kaufman, owner, and Anne Whitney, Architect, for property located at 50 South School Street. Unit #4 to allow an amendment to an application previously approved on August 6, 2003 to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace three existing skylights with smaller Velux units and add two casement windows to dormer addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 060 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Anne Whitney, the Architect for the project, stated that Mr. Kaufman had been approved in August of 2003 to add skylights on Unit #4. We are proposing to remove the three approved 39” skylights and replace with three smaller 27” skylights. We are also proposing to place a couple of small casement windows on side façade as well.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve as presented; Ms. Roberts seconded.

Ms. Fineberg stated she had no problem with the small casement windows on the side of the structure. The windows are high up on the structure and feels it will not make a difference in the dormer.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he agreed with Ms. Fineberg comments; however, he was not in favor of the mass of the roof and dormers.

The motion to approved passed with a 6 – 1 vote with Vice-Chairman Adams voting in the negative.



Let the record reflect that Mr. Golomb stepped down and alternate, Mr. Katz sat in.

3) Petition for Christos Papoutsy, owner, for property located at 33 Bow Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install a fire escape to be used as a second means of egress to meet insurance company requirements) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 048 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Whitney stated that the insurance company is requiring a second means of egress from this unit on Bow Street. She presented a photograph showing a fire escape unit with an iron railing that will be used on the stairs.

At this time, the Commission members discussed the design of the fire escape and the railing.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he understand that a second means of egress is required; however, he feels the application could have been better handled to make the railing seamless.

Ms. Whitney stated she did not see a problem with the decorative railing.

There was discussion between Ms. Whitney and the Commission members regarding the railing.

Chairman Rice asked Ms. Whitney if she would return later on during the meeting and prepare a drawing showing the proposed changes? Ms. Whitney replied that she would do that.

Vice-Chairman Adams withdrew his motion and made a motion to table the application between public hearing #4 and #5 to allow the applicant time to submit a drawing. The motion passed unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.



Ms. Grasso stepped down from this application and alternate, Mr. Katz sat in.

4) Petition for Portsmouth Housing Authority, owner, and, Rick Goduti, Architect for property located at 5 Junkins Avenue (1895 Building/Old Cottage Hospital) wherein permission is requested to allow an amendment to original approval given on October 2, 2002 for screening of an HVAC unit and electrical equipment on the northwest façade at the corner of the building; and add infill door panels that were withdrawn from a previous application as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 001 and lies within the and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICATION

Mr. Rick Goduti, the architect for the project, stated they needed approval for the HVAC unit that is being proposed. The HVAC unit sits below grade and will not be seen. The space for the unit will be landscaped and we are proposing a wall 3-1/2' to 4-1/2' tall around the unit and will also be landscaped.

Mr. Goduti, then discussed the infill panels adding that three wood infill panels are being proposed and has been approved by the State.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked about the noise level of the proposed AC units? Mr. Goduti stated that the noise will be minimal since the HVAC unit will below grade level and will not be seen from anyplace in the vicinity. Utilities will be placed underground.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to accept the application as submitted; Mr. Becksted seconded.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he has been rehabilitating buildings for quite a long time and feels he likes the idea of infilling the door openings with brick and will therefore, not support the application.

The motion to approve passed with a 6 – 1 vote with Vice-Chairman Adams voting in the negative.



5) Petition for National Block Building, LLC, owner, and Mark A. McNabb, Applicant, for property located at 48 Congress Street (corner of Congress and Fleet Streets) wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing mechanical building located on the side of structure; and remove the two existing entryways on the Congress Street façade and replace with new wood-frame storefronts, glazing to match existing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is show on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 040 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Mark McNabb, the owner of the building, stated that on the West façade of the existing building annex there is an existing mechanical building that we are proposing to remove. He added that he was not sure when it was added to the building; however, it is not part of the original masonry. The addition is extremely ugly and we would like to demolish it. We are proposing to install a new windows and doors. Screening will be installed to obscure the condenser on the front façade of the building. The center door is attractive and the two doors on either side just don't cut it. The center door will remain and we will replicate everything and all the profiles will match exactly. The building was built approximately in 1878.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated the aluminum grills above the door will match the color of the existing door. Mr. McNabb replied that was correct. Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the aluminum grills above the side will match the same color of the front door Mr. McNabb replied that was also correct and added everything will be replicated. Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the new sashes on the side of the building will match existing? Mr. McNabb replied that was correct and added everything will be replicated.

Chairman Rice stated there was no cut sheet on the condenser in our packets and would prefer to see one. Mr. McNabb presented a manufacturer's cut sheet of the condenser to the Commission members to review.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as submitted; Mr. Golomb seconded.

Ms. Fineberg stated what really bothered her was the placement of a window on the side façade and urged the applicant to change that window to match the windows on the front.

Mr. McNabb replied that this would not be a problem and would be happy to have this window match the other windows.

The motion to approved passed with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....
6) Petition for Tony and Tania Marino, owners, for property located at 678 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace front porch and side porch railings; replace porch columns, balusters and brackets; and, replace front door on farmers porch with a wood door with side lights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 030 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Tony Marino, the owner of the property, stated he wanted to improve the appearance of the house and what he is proposing will better match the period of the house. He will replace the steps and the railing. The change on the farmer’s porch will be increased to a 6 x 6 x 6’. The columns will be small; the railings on the front porch will be replaced and we will install the original wood shutters on the house.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented; Ms. Fineberg seconded; and Mr. Becksted third.

Ms. Grasso asked if the proposed front porch posts were in character with the neighborhood?. Vice Chairman Adams replied that it is very much appropriate and added that the applicant is on the right track. All approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....
7) Petition for Paul and Gordon Sorli, owners, and DeStefano Architects, applicant, for property located at 64 Market Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add two bay windows on the front façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 035 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. DeStefano, the Architect for the project, stated this change has come about because of the change in exterior materials. She added that previously, we were looking for a vinyl; however, at this point the client has agreed to use wood with a copper roof giving it a more traditional look. Ms. DeStefano added that the only thing they would be doing is changing the materials.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the underside will be divided panels. Ms. DeStefano replied it will be solid. Vice-Chairman stated on page 6 of the plans presented show a small sill projection and wondered if it could be larger. Ms. DeStefano replied that this could be accomplished using a dimension of 1-3/4" x 1-3/4".

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application with the stipulation to include a rapsill with a reveal of 1-3/4" x 1-3/4" be added; Mr. Becksted seconded. Vice-Chairman Adams stated most of the windows in the historic district area are wood and they are not utility windows. This being made out of painted wood is acceptable and added it would be wrong if the windows were all made out of metal; therefore, this is appreciated.

The motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.



Let the record reflect that Chairman Rice recused himself from the following application.

Let the record reflect that the Commission will consider this one application; however, they will make two separate Decisions for each application.

8) Petition for 449 Court Street, LLC, and, DeStefano Architects, applicant, for property located at 58 State Street wherein permission is requested to demolish the existing one-story back addition; construct a 582 s.f. three-story addition to the rear of building with retail on the first floor and residential on the second and third floors. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lots 012 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Julie McDonald of DeStefano Architects, stated that they had completed two successful work sessions for the project with the Commission. She then proceeded to review the sheets of the packet with the Commission members. There is proposed to be a three-story addition on the State Street elevation; the pitch of the roof has been lowered on the Court Street façade and will match the pitch of the roof on State Street; the existing single sash will be made smaller for double hung windows. The rear elevation is similar to what the Commission members have viewed previously as well as the east elevation. No changes from last presentation on Court Street. The railing detail was shown on Page 10 of the packets. Clapboards will be aligned with the top and bottom of the windows and the reveal of the clapboard will be smaller at the bottom rather on the top. Page 11 showed the entry detail on Court Street as well as the garage detail. Page 12 shows the window detail.

Attorney Bernard Pelech, representing the applicant, stated this project has two separate applications and added that he was impressed how the applicant has worked with the abutters

concerns. The application has met all the criteria required in 10-1004 and maintains the character of the area. The proposal will not detract from the character of the neighborhood and will enhance the neighborhood as well as the addition to 58 State Street. Both applications #8 and #9 do in fact foster and enhance the character of the area and will also be within the scale of the surrounding structures. The pitch of the proposed roof is consistent with properties on State Street and added that the applicant has completed the project tastefully and is compatible with the area.

Attorney Pelech stated the applicant has worked with the Historic District Commission and asked that a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved.

Attorney Charles Griffin, representing a direct abutter M.J. Blanchette who has an existing deck that overlooks 449 Court Street. He added that this plan is more appropriate than the previous plan. He presented photographs showing Ms. Blanchette's deck and how the addition would have a serious affect on her property.

Mr. Vern Gardner agreed that the open decks on the proposed building would have a serious affect on Ms. Blanchette's property. Foot note #16 in the Ordinance indicates that the burden is on the applicant and added this project will not conserve Ms. Blanchette's property. This proposed building will not preserve the special character of the area. This proposal does not meet the required criteria of Article X of the Zoning Ordinance. To take a one-story structure and replace it with a massive three-story structure is not within the character of the Ordinance. Mr. Gardner commended the applicant for saving the large old trees.

Ms. Dika stated that she is not at all convinced that the property values will be affected; however, it is true the deck will not be as private; however, she does not feel this project will cause any diminution in Ms. Blanchette's property values.

Ms. M.J. Blanchette, the owner of the property, stated the tree issue has been dealt with; however, the project will create a loss of light on her deck as well as loss of privacy. It is nice to have inner City property and added that she has spent a load of money on this property and now my privacy is being taken away. Ms. Blanchette stated it was not her intention to throw a wet blanket on the project; however, it does throw an adverse encroachment on her property.

Ms. Julie McDonald, the Architect for the project, stated that the 58 State Street elevation has windows that face south and there are no windows facing Ms. Blanchette's deck. Privacy is something that we thought about in the design of the project. Attorney Pelech and Mr. Gardner's report do require some scrutiny. The trees that have been discussed are on the Karabeles property; however, if the trees do not survive the construction, we will replace the trees.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted stated for the purposes of discussion, he made a motion to approve the application; Ms. Roberts seconded for the 58 State Street project. Mr. Becksted stated nobody likes to take an abutter's view away, but we are talking about redevelopment of property and expect that no one will be looking at the abutter's deck because that would be rather naive. He could not see that a severe impact would be created to Ms. Blanchette's property. The Commission must vote on these two properties. Ms. Roberts stated the applicant must move

forward. There are two pieces of property both in the CBD and in addition the building as proposed would be an improvement in the neighborhood and surrounding properties.

Ms. Fineberg stated she was still thinking about the application and added the entire rear elevation of this building is lost and is concerned about this. The addition is overwhelming.

Mr. Katz stated this is always a difficult decision where abutters will suffer some kind of loss. The applicant has tried to address concerns of the abutters.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated we have seen other happy endings of applications such as this. This application will help with the economic value of other buildings.

The motion to approve passed with a 5 – 2 vote with Ms. Fineberg and Ms. Grasso voting in the negative.



9) Petition for 449 Court Street, LLC, and DeStefano Architects, applicant, for property located at 449 Court Street wherein permission is requested to demolish the one-story garage and construct a 1,197 s.f. three-story residential building with parking on the first floor and residential units on the second and third floors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 006 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve as presented; Ms. Grasso seconded. Mr. Becksted stated he had nothing further to add than what was stated at the previous application.

Ms. Fineberg stated she feels the application will restore the residential appearance of the area and will be a turning point for that end of the street.

Mr. Golumb stated he liked the idea of using wood shutters being screwed to the building.

Ms. McDonald stated the shutters will give the effect that there is a window in place. The idea is that it is supposed to look like a window casing and sill. The shutters will be inside the frame. We are talking about windows without the sash; however, they will resemble windows.

Vice-Chairman Adams requested that the applicant submit a drawing to the Planning Department reflecting these shutters and added he will support the motion.

The motion to approve with the stipulation passed with a 7 – 0 vote.



10) Petition for Sugar Shack Rental Proper, owner, and Lee Whitney, applicant, for property located at 10 Commercial Alley wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (remove rusted air conditioner unit on side wall and replace with window that existed previously to improve the exterior façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 010 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Lee Whitney, the applicant for the project, stated that it was brought to his attention during an electrical inspection that an air conditioning unit was placed in a former window opening. This proposal is to remove the air conditioning unit and replace with a window that existed previously in this location.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented; Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.



11) Petition for Esther Kennedy, owner, for property located at 41 Pickering Avenue wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing barn (replace existing siding with wood shake siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 025 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Esther Kennedy, the owner of the property, presented photographs of the dilapidated barn siding to the Commission members and added she would like to use wood shake siding.

Vice-Chairman Adams inquired if any windows or trim on the barn would be replaced? Ms. Kennedy replied no that she was not anticipating to do that. Vice-Chairman Adams inquired if the intention of the project was to have the coursing line up with the top and bottoms of the windows? Ms. Kennedy replied she would do her best to achieve that.

Ms. Dika asked about the age of the barn. Ms. Kennedy stated that originally the barn was a bait shake; however, she did not know the actual age except that it has been there for quite a long time.

Mr. Glen Normandeau, a direct abutter, asked that the application be looked upon favorably and added it his findings that the barn has been there since 1900.

Mr. John Grossman, also an abutter stated that Ms. Kennedy does great work and feels that the barn will improve the aesthetics of the neighborhood greatly.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Grasso made a motion to approve the application; both Vice-Chairman Adams and Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.



III. WORK SESSION

A) Work Session requested by DeStefano Architects for property owned by Parade Mall and located at 195 Hanover Street (corner of High Street and Hanover Street). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 001 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. (construct an 116,000 s.f. mixed use building for hotel, residential and retail uses.)

- Ms. DeStefano, the Architect for the project, presented a site plan showing where additional tree buffers would be placed;
- Tree landscaping will be added to screen the Hotel from The Hill;
- The loading area has been re-worked to show the accent corners;
- Vehicles will be forced out onto High Street eliminating the top parking level;
- Residential and retail area will on the first floor;
- A different type roof will be used that will relate to The Hill structures;
- Different color red bricks will be used to give a little more depth to the structure;
- The Hill buildings will not be blocked by the Hotel;
- The penthouse will remain and is not going away;
- Break down the length of the façade by recessing it in a little bit to allow the structure to give variety;
- Asphalt gray shingles will be used and clapboards will be used to separate the hotel from the residential areas;
- Fire wall will be brick and Ms. DeStefano asked the Commission for their comments;
- Chairman Rice stated he felt there was more work to be done on the rear façade since the rear is just as important as the front of the building;
- Chairman Rice asked if any Commission members were having a problem with the use of the clapboard as opposed to using some other rock type material;
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated he was not crazy about the clapboards and the windows that are being proposed are very large;
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated he feels the windows on the residential use will need to be operable;
- Mr. Golumb stated there should be more detail on the rear of the façade;
- Chairman Rice stated he did not want the rear of the building to look institutional;
- An abutter located at 62 Deer Street stated he was unsure of the traffic lanes into the project and out of the project because it will not allow two cars to pass each other easily. The way it is planned now, one car will have to wait until the other car has passed by;
- Mr. Almeida, an abutter located at 103 High Street inquired about the signage;
- Ms. DeStefano replied signage will be on two locations on the building; one at the corner of the hotel and the other will be a marquee and of course there will be signage for the retail uses. The proposed lighting will be addressed at Site Review;
- Mr. John Grossman stated he visited the Portland, Maine hotel and added that this building as it is built does not belong in Portsmouth;
- Mr. Katz stated there are concerns with the materials and is not crazy about the clapboards. Something should be done with the rear of the hotel. It is very large and very plain;
- Ms. Fineberg stated her concerns were with the materials and the roof line in the rear section;
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated there are issues that he is not overwhelmed about;

- Chairman Rice stated the Commission has worked very hard and wants to see the best possible hotel in appearance at this location. There are issues regarding the clapboards and the banding;
- Ms. Grasso stated she was also concerned about the rear of the building and does not want to see the plans rushed;
- Ms. Roberts stated she echoes the same concerns as other members of the Commission on the rear façade about being so plain as well as the roof line.
- Ms. Dika stated she appreciated the fact that the applicant has worked so hard on this application and how far it has come. The rear façade does need extra work;
- Ms. DeStefano stated she feels another Work Session would be in order for the reconvened meeting on April 14, 2004 and then on to a Public Hearing at the May 5, 2004 meeting.
- The Commission members all agreed.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Long
Secretary

/jml