



Rochester Hills Minutes

1000 Rochester Hills Dr.
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Historic Districts Commission

Chairperson Brian R. Dunphy, Vice Chairperson Paul Miller

*Members: Maria-Teresa L. Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Nicole Franey, Micheal Kilpatrick,
Dr. Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson*

Thursday, February 11, 2010

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

MINUTES of a **REGULAR ROCHESTER HILLS HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION MEETING** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Dunphy called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Paul Miller, Richard Stamps, Brian Dunphy and Jason Thompson

Absent 2 - Micheal Kilpatrick and Nicole Franey

Also Present: Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Dunphy stated for the record that Ms. Franey had provided prior notice she was unable to attend this meeting and was excused.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Dunphy announced a quorum was present.

4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

Chairperson Dunphy read the following Statement of Standards for the record.

"All decisions made by the Historic Districts Commission follow the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, MLHDA Section 399.205, and City Code Section 118-164."

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5A. 2010-0079 Minutes of the January 14, 2010 Regular Meeting

Chairperson Dunphy asked for any comments or corrections to the January 14, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.

A motion was made by Dunphy, seconded by Stamps, that the Minutes be Approved as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Cozzolino, Dziurman, Miller, Stamps, Dunphy and Thompson

Absent 2 - Kilpatrick and Franey

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the January 21, 2010 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMUNICATIONS

1. November 23, 2009 Letter re 3610 S. Livernois

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commissioners had received a copy of the letter discussed at the January meeting regarding the property located at 3610 S. Livernois reminding the property owners about their duty to maintain this historic property, specifically in relation to the historic barn on the site.

(Arrive M. Kilpatrick 7:09 PM)

Present 7 - Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Paul Miller, Richard Stamps, Micheal Kilpatrick, Brian Dunphy and Jason Thompson

Absent 1 - Nicole Franey

2. February 4, 2010 Letter from City Attorney

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commissioners had received a letter from the City Attorney, who had been requested to provide a summary of his views on the limits on the use of e-mail by Commissioners. There has been some concern about this in the past, and he felt strongly that the Commission's business was to be conducted in public and not via e-mail. Attorney Staran provided a good summary about the pro's and con's and the guidelines for sharing information, but not discussing or lobbying other Commissioners in regard to that information.

Dr. Stamps requested clarification that it was okay to talk with one person and maybe lobby them, but more than one got them in trouble.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that Attorney Staran's opinion said specifically that "it is not appropriate for an administrative board member to attempt to lobby or persuade a fellow board member." That meant it did not matter how many people a Commissioner intended to lobby, it is inappropriate no matter how many others are involved.

Dr. Stamps felt it that really tied the Commissioner's hands behind their backs. He clarified that meant the Commissioners could not discuss anything unless it is in a meeting that has been officially called to order.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that was what the Open Meetings Act required.

Mr. Miller did not think that required the Commissioners to give up their constitutional right of free speech. They were Historic District Commissioners at all times, not just when they were sitting at a meeting. The Commissioners are allowed to express their opinion as an individual and a citizen of the United States, as opposed to expressing an opinion as an official Historic Districts Commissioner. He was not aware that administrative boards were held to a higher standard than legislative boards, but the Commissioners needed to be very cautious avoiding a lot of discussion between Commissioners on something that is before them or something that will be coming before them. Other than that, he believed the Commissioners could discuss anything they wanted to discuss.

Chairperson Dunphy agreed, noting he was not saying that the Commissioner's were giving up their constitutional rights, although he was not an attorney and anything in more detail he would want to have Mr. Staran reference specifically. He did not want to make the Commissioners feel they cannot share information with each other because he thought that was appropriate. The point where he thought it crossed the line was in advocating a certain position and specifically asking fellow Commissioners to vote or consider voting in a certain way. Personally, he thought if the Commissioners had additional questions about this, or they felt they needed to dig deeper into the issue, he would be happy to ask the Commission's liaison to have Mr. Staran join the Commissioners to talk about it in more detail and answer the questions.

Mr. Dziurman thought that would be appropriate. Chairperson Dunphy stated he would ask the request be relayed to the Staff Liaison.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was confused about why it was so much more restrictive for an administrative board than a Councilman. That did not make sense to him.

Chairperson Dunphy noted the letter from the attorney stated the law allowed for greater flexibility for the legislative bodies. He would ask that the Attorney attend a meeting and address those issues specifically.

Dr. Stamps thought it was okay if he ran into someone at the restaurant he could say "that building needs some attention; it seems like its demolition by neglect," but he could not say "we really should push for a letter being sent to them". Or they could talk about science of it, but as long as he was not lobbying or persuading, he can talk to his colleagues.

Chairperson Dunphy stated the issue clearly was that the Commission's deliberations are intended to be public. He thought as a general rule the Commissioners needed to be very careful about taking things off-line. It was a matter of law and he thought the Commissioners had an ethical responsibility to conduct business in the open. He would be happy to ask Mr. Staran to attend a

meeting to address any questions the Commissioners might have and explore any issues or nuances there might be.

Mr. Kilpatrick thought part of the distinction is that administrative was a quasi-judicial capacity versus a legislative capacity. Since the Commissioners made decisions with respect to Certificates of Appropriateness, and residents came to them for relief, that was where the distinction lies and what Attorney Staran conveyed, which is why the Commissioners did not have as much latitude. That way "the deal is not already done" before a resident came before them, where the Commissioners had advocated a position one way or the other.

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other announcements or communications. No other announcements or communications were presented.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any public comments. He advised the audience members in attendance that if they wished to speak on any non-Agenda or Agenda items, they should complete a speaker's card and turn it in to the recording secretary. He reminded the speakers they had a maximum of three minutes to speak.

Alice Benbow, 1582 Northumberland Drive, stated she had not planned to speak about the Attorney's letter, but wanted to make a statement to Mr. Staran. She wished he would remind the City Council members of the Open Meetings Act as well. If one looked back at the statistically significant voting record of the City Council Members, it was blatantly obvious that things are not done in the open. That was not only her opinion, but other people's opinion as well. She stated if she was a Commissioner, she would be absolutely offended that Mr. Staran told them what they had to watch and what they had to do as she did not know of any Commissioner who would ever violate the Open Meetings Act, noting she wanted that on the record.

Ms. Benbow stated she wanted to speak about the blight ordinance. She thought Mr. Staran should remind people in the historic district that they needed to maintain their property and the City did have a blight ordinance. That would be a better use of Mr. Staran's attorney abilities.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated she was concerned about the status of the Dunn/O'Neill Pottery property. She believed the Commission had asked for a resolution to send this to the attorney for court action to stop that property from having any further deterioration. It looks like it's on its last legs. She would like the Commission to send another resolution to the attorney. This body has the authority to ask the attorney to go to court on a matter and have the issue taken care of versus having it get stopped at the Mayor's office. She also had a concern with 1585 S. Rochester Road, which was before the Study Committee this evening.

There seemed to be some talk about things going on with that property, and whether they had asked for a delisting or not, she would like to see this board ask the City Attorney to take action on that property. It is definitely a demolition by neglect case. She would like some attention be paid to the property on Adams Road, that was part of the Lorna Stone PUD. What is the status of that house - is it mothballed, secured, or demolition by neglect. She felt there was. Part of this body's obligation is to help protect designated districts and it was very sad what's going on, especially in large development-owned properties. They have the one that's coming up on Livernois as well on that ten-acre parcel. As a quick aside, she thought it would be worth the taxpayer's dollars to have Attorney Staran attend one of the meetings so everyone is perfectly comfortable with the explanation about the Open Meetings Act and the use of electronic devices. It was a very tough issue and a fine line to walk and it's really important for the public to feel that everything is being conducted in a very open manner.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8A. 2010-0021 2010 Earl Borden Award

- Discussion / Nomination of Recipient(s)

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commissioners had received some information in their packet about the 2010 Earl Borden Award. He noted a request for public comment had been made for this Agenda item.

Sue Thomasson, 999 E. Tienken Road, wanted to suggest that the Commission consider Michelle Akers-Berg for the 2010 Earl Borden Award for preservation leadership. She stated Ms. Akers-Berg was the archival specialist for the Rochester Hills Museum for the past eight years, and worked tirelessly to preserve and protect the archives, artifacts, buildings, and furnishings, all of which belonged to this Community, not just to the Museum. She also worked to inform people of the history of the Community. She explained Ms. Akers-Berg was no longer an employee and she thought this would be a nice way to thank her for her years of preservation work.

Chairperson Dunphy stated under the Commission's process for the awards, they could make the nominations and vote on them at this meeting or at the March meeting. He did not see a reason to delay to March unless they were totally bereft of nominees they could feel comfortable with. He opened the discussion to consider nominations.

Mr. Dziurman thought the Tienken Road organization had done an outstanding job over the task they took upon themselves, specifically their efforts related to the Stoney Creek Village. He thought they should be recognized for that effort, as they had been very beneficial in saving the most important historic district in our Community.

Mr. Dunphy asked if the Commission had identified to whom the award would be presented.

Mr. Dziurman stated there were two prime people, Dave and Joe, but he thought it should go to the whole group.

Mr. Miller believed they had structured leadership and assumed the award would be presented to the acting chairperson or president.

Dr. Stamps agreed the award be given to the group. He thought there was some organization although he was not sure of the names but there was a Dave and somebody else. He noted a former Historic Districts Commissioner was also closely involved. He thought they could be contacted and asked about their leadership.

Chairperson Dunphy stated he was not in favor of the nomination and would not support it. He was not sure he was convinced that the group's role in this process was appropriate and merited this kind of recognition.

Dr. Stamps thought the reason he leaned towards giving them recognition was because of the way they rallied the members of the Historic District; pulled them together; held meetings, and generated an interest in historic preservation that the Commission had not seen in a long time. They tried to work through all the appropriate channels and he thought they accomplished something. Had they not stepped forward, he did not think the Commission would have been able to come up with the solution that was arrived at. He was in favor of it, although he liked Ms. Thomasson's suggestion of Ms. Akers-Berg at the Museum as she was a very deserving person also. Ms. Akers-Berg did her work for eight years or so, and the Committee only did theirs for two years, but he thought the Committee did a lot that was key and important.

Mr. Miller stated he was in favor of the nomination, noting it was the only nomination made. The most outstanding reason for supporting it was this was first time that the Road Commission had ever been before the Commission. He did not believe it would have happened if the Friends of Tienken Road and the Village residents had not insisted the way they did in the face of some pretty strong opposition in terms of the "authorities". He thought it was significant because of the size of the contiguous district and its historical importance. In terms of the original meaning of the award, this group seemed to fall to the head of the list.

Mr. Thompson had some difficulty with this nomination and shared some of the Chair's concerns. He noted in years past, Mr. Dziurman had always reminded the Commission it was not always necessary or prudent to give this award if there was not someone deserving. He could not support the nomination.

Chairperson Dunphy took issue with the assessment that it was that group's involvement that got the Commission the outcome they did and that the Commission would not have been able to approach it from the Commission without the urging of the Tienken Road group. He took strong exception to that statement, and was part of his reservation about the nomination.

Mr. Dziurman stated the selection criterion was very clear: "recognize individuals or groups who have made outstanding efforts to support historic preservation in our community". They certainly have done that, and they made headlines throughout the whole City and probably the whole region for many, many months about the importance of preservation. To him, the preservation award can be presented to individuals and organizations for outstanding historic preservation efforts in the greater Rochester Hills community and even efforts outside the City Limits would be considered. He did not know of anybody that had had that much publicity, held public meetings, been on television, and things like that talking about preservation. He was against nominating Ms. Akers-Berg because she was an employee doing a good job, and that was great, she should be doing a good job, but he did not think they should get an award from the Commission for doing a good job. He looked at these awards as people who give their time and effort and did not get paid for doing it. He thought that was where the Commission should be going with this. These people put in almost full time during this effort and he supported it, which is why he made the nomination.

Ms. Cozzolino supported what Mr. Dziurman just indicated. She did not think Ms. Akers-Berg is the right person since she was an employee, and she did support the Tienken group receiving the award.

Mr. Miller said that never before had the County Road Commission, or the City, come before the Historic Districts Commission in regard to any road construction. In fact, with his limited knowledge, he could think of times where they not only did not, but planned on demolishing a historically significant house that was actually the home of Mr. Borden. It was only through the results of some individuals pushing for a review and decision to be made that the Prairie House was even saved. The Tienken Road Group made extremely intensive efforts to involve not only the Commission, but the County and State groups resulting in a positive outcome for the Village. He thought it was important. He referred to the stone shelter which was National Register eligible. He commented the Commission represents the City, telling folks that come before them with a designated house or in the contiguous district, what they can and cannot do, and yet the City has a National Register eligible building in one of its public parks that does not fall within the purview of the Commission. He hoped that "we could all get on the same train car headed in the same direction". He thought the award going to the Friends of Tienken Road group might actually help put us in that car.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated he would be more comfortable if the Commissioners could name the individuals that were involved. He acknowledged there were some individuals that seemed to have been more active and involved, and if the Commission had a list of them and their efforts, he would feel more comfortable with that. The reason he said that was because he was happy with what they did, but he thought that group in and of itself had some negative connotations. He thought if there were some individuals beyond "Joe and Dave", and not to slight anyone, but an indication of what they did, he might be more comfortable with the nomination.

Mr. Dziurman stated it was their steering committee. He did not want to tell the names because he did not remember everyone. He thought that was probably more appropriate.

Dr. Stamps thought it was appropriate to come up with the names of the steering committee and the Commission could recognize the group and invite the steering committee. He stated there was somebody from the schools, the land, and the historic neighborhood. He thought if the Commission looked back over the past year and took the guideline that said "recognizes individuals who have made outstanding efforts to support historic preservation in our community," this really exemplified the thrust and the spirit of that more than anything else that happened in the last year. He also thought there was a value if the Commission came out and said they appreciated a group of citizens who got together and accomplished something. He thought they were very deserving and could not think of anything in the last year that could hold a candle to it and he still supported it.

Mr. Miller agreed. He noted whether the Commission was talking about a greenspace millage effort or historic preservation, without community involvement and support, it was either a very hard uphill struggle or impossible. He thought it was worthy of notice when there is a community group involved in issues; however, he also understand that there probably were some individuals who really did provide the large bulk of the footwork; the letter writing, and showing up at City Council. He suggested if it would make a difference that somebody could contact that group. He did know that Dave Tripp and Joe and others were significantly involved, not only in doing the homework and the phone calls, but in hosting the community meetings and putting those together. Perhaps instead of the group, or along with the group, it might be better to recognize certain individuals who were key or crucial to that effort. He was comfortable going with the decision of the Commission on how it wants to move on this. He agreed that if there was no one that rises to level, then it's probably best that the award not be given.

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commission needed to figure out if they wanted to vote on the nomination as is, or if they wanted to take this up at the next meeting

where they could have names they could put on the nomination. He recalled the Commission did have names on the greenspace award, noting that Pam Wallace and Andy Krupp were the awardees on behalf of the group. He stated the Commission had precedent there for approaching it on that basis if the individuals can be identified.

Mr. Miller stated he was involved with the Greenspace Yes! and the "Save our Open Space" groups from the very beginning and knew the key individuals that were involved. There were others that felt slighted because their names were not mentioned. It was hard to avoid offending anyone and he was not sure the Commission should try to. He thought even though there were key individuals in this, they operated under the aegis of Friends of Tienken Road and he was comfortable giving the award to the group. He would also be comfortable voting the award to the group with the key individuals to be discovered and named since there was time before the invitations were printed and sent out and the award plaque ordered.

Mr. Miller believed a simple phone call could take care of that. Either one of the Commissioners could call or the Staff Liaison could find out for them. He suggested rather than making the presentation in conjunction with the City Council, perhaps the Commission could come up with a more public venue to present this award, giving it greater recognition Community-wise. He had noticed when the award is given at the City Council meeting very few people were there because of the award.

Mr. Dziurman stated when the award first started, the Commission used to give the award at the Museum. He happened to be the Chair at that time and gave the award out, and they had a pretty good crowd there. He thought the advantage over time was the television exposure and was why it was moved to a City Council meeting. He noted that was quite an exposure that would be lost. The other way was an interesting way to present the award and they used to have a pretty good crowd, including people from the historical society and the Village, and obviously relatives attended. It was moved to City Council because of television.

Mr. Dziurman stated that since he made the nomination, he supported what was said about the names. He thought they should follow what they did with greenspace and that was the way to handle it. As for the names, he thought the Commission could figure that out and did not have to make that part of the motion.

Dr. Stamps suggested one phone call to former Commissioner, Melissa Luginski, because she knew. She lived in the same household as one of them and was next door neighbors with all the rest of them. The recording secretary could ask for a list of the executive committee or the key people, and that could be brought back to the Commission next month.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the Recording Secretary would be okay with making

the call or whether a member of the Commission should handle that. The Recording Secretary noted she was not sure she had current contact information for Ms. Luginski, although her e-mail address may not have changed.

Dr. Stamps stated he would support a motion for the nomination.

Chairperson Dunphy stated procedurally the Commission had a nomination that was supported and had held discussion, and asked if there was any additional discussion. No additional discussion was held regarding the nomination.

Chairperson Dunphy called for a voice vote on the nomination of **The Friends of Tienken Road** as the recipient of the **2010 Earl Borden Preservation Leadership Award**. The Commission voted in favor of the nomination, with nay votes from Mr. Dunphy and Mr. Thompson. He noted for the record that the nomination carried.

A motion was made by Dziurman, seconded by Stamps, that this matter be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 5 - Cozzolino, Dziurman, Miller, Stamps and Kilpatrick

Nay 2 - Dunphy and Thompson

Absent 1 - Franey

RESOLVED that **The Friends of Tienken Road** are nominated as the recipient of the **2010 Earl Borden Preservation Leadership Award**.

2010-0110 Bloomer Park Stone Shelter (HDSC 10-001)
Bloomer Park No. 2 Picnic Shelter

Mr. Dziurman referred to the comments about Bloomer Park, and stated he totally agreed that there was no reason it should not be part of the historic districts. He wanted to make a motion that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission ask the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Study Committee to look into and see if it would be appropriate to nominate it as a resource in the local register. That would include both the stone shelter and picnic shelter No. 2.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the request would be made directly to the Study Committee or to City Council to direct the Study Committee to conduct the study.

Mr. Dziurman believed anyone in the City could ask the Study Committee to do that and it did not have to go through City Council.

Mr. Thompson stated the previous Ordinance permitted anyone to make the request, but the revised Ordinance stated anyone could make the request of City Council but Council had to direct the Study Committee to conduct the study. He stated the Committee could discuss that at the next meeting.

Mr. Miller suggested the motion be revised to ask City Council to direct it to the Study Committee if that was more appropriate.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the motion maker was agreeable to changing his motion. Mr. Dziurman stated that would be fine. Dr. Stamps stated he would second the motion. Mr. Dziurman clarified the motion requested a study of the Bloomer Park Stone Shelter and the No. 2 Picnic Shelter together.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there was any discussion on the motion. Upon hearing none, he called for a voice vote.

A motion was made by Dziurman, seconded by Stamps, that this matter be Accepted. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Cozzolino, Dziurman, Miller, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dunphy and Thompson

Absent 1 - Franey

RESOLVED that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission requests that the Rochester Hills City Council request the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Study Committee to conduct a study on the Stone Shelter at Bloomer Park and also on the No. 2 Picnic Shelter at Bloomer Park to determine if it would be appropriate to nominate those structures as resources in the local register.

2010-0021 2010 Earl Borden Award

- Discussion / Nomination of Recipient(s)

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any other nominations the Commission wanted to consider for the 2010 Earl Borden Award.

Dr. Stamps asked if there were any structures or rehabilitation activities, noting he could not think of any.

Mr. Miller mentioned the Heritage Festival that was held in the Community, although not within the City Limit. He stated it had been held in the Downtown Rochester Municipal Park, but the location would be changing this year, and there had been some talk that Bloomer Park or Rochester College might become future locations. He suggested the festival could be a possible location for the award presentation, although he realized television reached a large audience and may not be surpassed. He hoped the festival could become more of a regional event, and certainly tied in with both educating and raising awareness of the City's historic heritage and the historic districts, structures and individuals within the Community.

Chairperson Dunphy stated he knew there had been discussion about where that venue would be and who would be responsible for it, and there had been some discussion about another group continuing to hold an event at the Rochester City Park. He thought this had a way to go before it was settled, and cautioned the

Commission to be careful not jump in support of one group or another until they knew where the process was likely to wind up. He thought anything that helped support awareness of the local history was a plus.

This matter was Discussed

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other business.

Mr. Dziurman mentioned the public comment received at the Study Committee meeting in favor of preservation was gratifying and he appreciated it.

Dr. Stamps stated the Oakland County Historical Commission was also meeting this evening. That group is recognizing the fact that next year will be the sesquicentennial of the beginning of the Civil War. They would be discussing the types of things that communities can do to remember, respect and learn from the Civil War experience, such as speaker's groups, re-enactors groups, exhibits in local museums that would rotate around the County, picnics, parades, publications of Civil War soldier's letters, art gallery shows of Civil War photography, and song and dance from the Civil War period, Civil War cemetery walks learning about the individuals buried in cemeteries across Oakland County, and how it was a watershed event in our country's history. The theme of the County-wide event would be "thank God for Michigan". The idea was to encourage cities, townships, historical societies and other groups to take advantage of this opportunity to educate, learn, and share so they will not have been lost in vain. He encouraged the Commissioners to become involved in remembering that watershed event in our history.

Mr. Miller stated the latest publication he received from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) included a request for information in regards to awards, which specifically mentioned historic landscapes. He realized that had not been much of a focus locally, but thought the Commission could begin to take historic landscape renovation or preservation into account. There were still small pieces of the original landscape that survived, but he did not believe they were likely to survive unless they got more attention. He thought that would fall under the Commission's purview since it is historic landscape and is included in some of the Ordinances.

Dr. Stamps asked if there were any in the City.

Mr. Miller stated there were a few small pieces here and there on hillsides or along the railroad tracks, but it would take some further investigation. There are traces of both the tall grass prairie as well as oak barrens, although most of the vernal ponds have been lost. He believed 1800s landscape still survived around some of the existing old farms.

Mr. Dziurman thought that was a great idea. He knew the Museum at one time had talked to a historic landscaper although he did not know if anything was done at the Museum. He referred to Meadowbrook, because of the garden club and their fantastic gardens, but he did not know if they were historic. He did not know if any of the gardens featured in the garden tours were historic, but it was something the Commission should look into.

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other business, noting the next meeting was scheduled for March 11, 2010. No other business was presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Dunphy adjourned the meeting at 8:12 PM.

Brian Dunphy, Chairperson
City of Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Commission

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

(Approved as _____ at the _____, 2010 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting)

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT