



Division of Development Administration and Review

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning
200 Ross Street, Third Floor
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of October 7, 2009
Beginning at 12:30 PM
200 Ross Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<i>Members</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Others</i>
	Katherine Molnar	Jerome Jackson
Noor Ismail		Stanley A Lowe
Sergei Matveiev		Ethan Raup
Joe Serrao		Linda Hansen
		Patricia Washington
Linda McClellan		Eric M. White
		Al DePasquale
		Bob Russ
		Sarah Hoover
		Tobie Nepo
		Deborah Moore Ellsworth
		John Lewis
		Jeff Slusarick
		Evelyn Jones

Old Business

Nominations Report: There are two buildings in the nomination process. Ms. Molnar reported that the Old Stone Tavern was designated by City Council in September, 2009. The Paramount Pictures Film Exchange nomination went to Planning Commission in September, and now is being scheduled for a public hearing at City Council.

New Business

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Molnar regretted that the September 2009 minutes were not yet available, and that the HRC would vote on them in November.

Certificates of Appropriateness: Molnar directed the commissioners to the Certificates of Appropriateness. In regards to the September 2009 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao moved to approve, Ms. Ismail seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship: None

Update on the Manchester Neighborhood Strategic Plan:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the plan, saying that this commission has been discussing and anticipating for the entire year. Since even before some of the current members came to the HRC, the commission has struggled with demolitions. Molnar indicated that MCC has submitted a draft of the plan. She said that her recommendation is for MCC to give a presentation of the report, the HRC to ask questions as they see necessary, and then all members can

go home and read the report thoroughly and on their own time to make comments. The HRC would then collectively provide comments back to MCC.

2. **Ms. Patricia Washington** came to the table to introduce herself as treasure of MCC. She thanked everybody, and then introduced Ethan Raup from PHLF.
3. **Ethan Raup** introduced himself from PHLF. From PHLF's perspective, he wanted to give some context. He said that PHLF was born out of Manchester in the 1960s. They've since been heavily involved in the neighborhood. He said that as a National Register district, public money must be reviewed through the Section 106 process is followed. The intent is that federal money should not be used for massive demolitions, for examples. He said that PHLF has been working with the City on similar issues throughout the years, and they are encouraged by the progress that has been made.
4. **Linda Hansen** spoke to the HRC and asked to walk through the PowerPoint presentation.
 - a. The Strategic Planning Committee is a variety of members from the community, and is a cooperative effort. Chief of Staff Yarone Zober sent a letter to MCC asking the community to come together to make a broader plan. They've been meeting since May to come up with this plan.
 - b. They first wanted to look at the mission statement of MCC and of the HRC. Then they wanted to look to the past to see what the last 53 demolitions in Manchester, that cost the city over \$500,000. MCC partnered with PHLF to define a strategy that draws upon development that is already underway, including:
 - c. There are currently two projects underway in Manchester – the Columbus Square project (American Electric), and the Renaissance project. They wanted to look at these projects, update key recommendations, and then put actionable items in place for next steps. The rate of demolition in the neighborhood is rapidly increasing, and most of that is due to the amount of stimulus money that is available.
 - d. We based this on revitalization principles. She spoke about vacant properties, price appreciation, and high risk loans. She showed graphs describing where the highest market value of property exists. They categorized vacant properties by a variety of criteria. Out of 172 vacant properties, 64 are priority for preservation, 56 should be kept (not a priority), 49 are suitable for demolition.
 - e. Ms. Hansen continued to walk the HRC through the PowerPoint and the plan as distributed to the HRC members.
5. **Mr. Eric White** showed a commercial that was intended to advertise the Great Manchester House Sale. He described the neighborhood's efforts toward marketing the American Electric and Renaissance projects.
6. Ms. Hansen outlined the next steps, including house tours, \$1 house sale, extending the Manchester Historic Restoration program to other properties, capitalize a revolving loan fund, utilize the conservatorship law, and utilize the city's land reserve program. They also want to salvage materials from buildings that are being demolished.
7. **Mr. Jerome Jackson** introduced himself as Associate Director of MCC.
8. **Mr. Stanley Lowe** introduced himself as the new managing Director of MCC. One, Manchester has a new tagline "Manchester, we're proud to call it home." He talked about his connection with Manchester. He said this is personal. He said that if we continue down this road, we will be facing the question about whether to decertify the district. Stanley said he wants to partner with the HRC to find methods to avoid demolition, because demolition should be the last option, not the first. He asked that the HRC continue to look at its mission statement. He said there was a "Part 2" to the MCC Plan, that the HRC does not yet have because it is not finished. It will be done within a week or so, two weeks at the latest. Part 2 lists all of the addresses, all of the estimated rehabilitation costs, etc. The recommendations will be coming in full. Stanley wants all of the HRC members to follow up with comments. He wants to have a meeting with the Mayor's Office.

-
- a. In regards to 1218 N. Franklin: **Mr. Lowe** said that Carnegie Mellon University has agreed to use its TEMPER (?) school to complete one-half million dollars worth of work. Starting in January, CMU is going to be working with MCC to do mapping, real estate evaluation, and a number of other things to support the plan. Lowe said that they sent a report on 1218 N Franklin to the HRC three months ago. It is MCC's belief that the building is sound. But for the dormer, where the rain comes in, there aren't other leaks. They'd like the HRC to review the plan for this specific address. He hopes this will be the last time the HRC comes together to talk about specific addresses.
 - b. Mr. Matveiev asked if the 84 condemned properties had been mapped. He also wanted to see a map of where the demolished properties have occurred. Mr. Lowe replied that at the advice of the Mayor's Office, MCC didn't want to get too far ahead, or too far behind. So they are in the process of doing the mapping now. He said that, on the other hand, if recommendations come back from the HRC and URA, etc., and the maps need to be redone – well, this is costly stuff, and it can't be done on a whim. Mr. Serrao said that the CMU materials have some maps.
 - c. Mr. Matveiev wanted to know what criteria MCC used to evaluate properties. What was the methodology. Lowe said that they used the initial National Register nomination and its ratings (A) (B) and (C). He described what these ratings meant to the National Register nomination in terms of contributing, non-contributing, etc. Rather than go back to the A, B, C ratings, they called those categories Architecturally Significant, Contributing, and Beyond Repair. Mr. Lowe said that within the next two weeks, they would have the data, building by building, that they would send to the HRC.
 - d. Mr. Serrao wanted to know if there was a system of triage to secure the buildings one-by-one? Mr. Lowe said there is. Serrao likes the idea of broader development, but he wanted to know how to address the individual buildings. Mr. Lowe said when we think about these buildings being on condemned lists for years, that's over three administrations worth of time. He said we have to apply the federal regulations to help save these buildings, but we're not even trying right now. Sir, with all due respect, we don't even have a Historic Preservation Plan in place! Isn't there a way we can come together to seek new resources to accomplish our goals? WE are the resources that can accomplish these goals.
 - e. Mr. Lowe said that come January, we should apply for the second round of stimulus money that Obama has available.

Upcoming Demolitions:

- 1230 Buena Vista Street

Adjourn: Mr. Matveiev motioned to adjourn, all members seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages

608 Pressley Street

OWNER: PRIORY HOLDINGS LLC 614 PRESSLEY ST PITTSBURGH, PA 15212	WARD:.....23 rd LOT & BLOCK:.....0009-A-00041 INSPECTOR:.....Mark Sanders	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00 SITE VISITS: 00/00/00 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: PRIORY HOLDINGS LLC 614 PRESSLEY ST PITTSBURGH, PA 15212	COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION:..... ARCH. RATING:.....Typical	
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the project, gave some background on the building that used to be on the site, its demolition, etc. Owned by Priory Holdings, who owns the Priory Hotel.
2. **Mr. Bob Baumbach** introduced himself. He described the proposed building, its uses, and its materials.
3. Mr. Serrao wanted to know if the new building would have a similar footprint as the former building. Mr. Baumbach said that it will have a similar footprint and setback, but not identical. Mr. Matveiev asked about the connection between the proposed building and the existing structure. Mr. Baumbach said they plan to consolidate the parcels, and if it is not to their benefit, then they would install a fire separation and work with BBI, etc.
4. *Inaudible portion of the HRC recording.*
5. Mr. Matveiev called for public comment. Then he called for a motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the new construction with the condition that the final drawings would be presented to the HRC staff for final consideration prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Ismail.....Seconded the motion.

All voted in favor.....**Motion passes.**

610 Lockhart Street

OWNER: DEPASQUALE ALFRED R PO BOX 6666 PITTSBURGH, PA 15212	WARD:.....23 rd LOT & BLOCK:.....0024-N-00301 INSPECTOR:.....Mark Sanders	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00 SITE VISITS: 00/00/00 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: DEPASQUALE ALFRED R PO BOX 6666 PITTSBURGH, PA 15212	COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION:..... ARCH. RATING:.....Typical	
REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application, saying that the new property owner wanted to maximize square footage in the uppermost floors by modifying the roofline.
2. Mr. Baumbach explained the reconstruction and the proposed modification of the roofline. He explained that in order to rehabilitate the structure, in order to justify the investment in the building, Mr. DePasquale would need a bit more square footage. Mr. Baumbach said that of the 100 linear feet of exterior walls, 50 feet have to be replaced 100%, because they are in such poor condition.
3. Mr. Baumbach explained the differences between the two proposed alternatives to the original construction. He showed images of the neighboring buildings, and explained that there is currently a variety of roofs on the street. Molnar showed images of the streetscape.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the modification of the roof into a Mansard, as shown in option 2 of the submitted drawings.

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded the motion.

Mr. Matveiev.....Abstained from voting.

Mr. Serrao, Ms. McClellan, and Ms. Ismail voted in favor. **Motion passes.**

OWNER: DOWNTOWN STREETS PITTSBURGH LP SOUTHPOINTE PLAZA 400 SOUTHPOINTE Blvd. Ste. 400 CANONSBURG, PA 15317	WARD:.....1 st LOT & BLOCK:.....1-D-268 INSPECTOR:.....Ed McAllester COUNCIL DISTRICT:..... ZONING CLASSIFICATION:..... ARCH. RATING:.....Typical	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 00/00/00 SITE VISITS: 00/00/00 CERTIFICATES OF APP.: 00-000
APPLICANT: Sarah Hoover DRS Architects		

REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE.....

Discussion:

- Ms. Molnar introduced the application as a portion of Market Square Place, an application that the HRC approved a number of years ago. It was part of the large rehabilitation of the Murphy building, and surrounding structures. She introduced the sign application for the main entrance to the YMCA on 5th Avenue. Molnar said the reason this application was before the HRC is because the signs do not meet the guidelines. Most notably, the guidelines only permit one projecting sign, where this application is for two projecting banner signs, and one central ID sign.
- Ms. Sarah Hoover**, DRS Architects, representing the YMCA on their exterior signage. Ms. Hoover described the banners and the other signage.
- Mr. Serrao asked about the size of the central “Y” sign. Hoover replied that the sign represents the main tenant of the redevelopment, and it also represents the multi-story building (seven stories). Mr. Serrao said that he thinks this is a large sign for a small building.
- Molnar pointed to the guidelines to reference “appropriate” size of signs in the district. She indicated #9, but Mr. Serrao pointed out #2, #4, #5 and others for “appropriate scale.”
- Mr. Matveiev asked for public comment. Seeing none, he said that he was disappointed with the rendering, because it does not accurately represent the project. He would be more inclined to approve the scale of the rendering than that of the actual sign. The gesture of the sign is too bombastic, and is not appropriate for the character of the historic neighborhood.

MOTION:

Mr. Matveiev.....Moved to approve the perpendicular projecting signs, but not the large central “Y” sign.
Mr. Serrao.....Seconded the motion.
All voted in favor.....**Motion passes.**

- Ms. Molnar asked for a motion regarding the awnings. There was some discussion about the awnings. Ms. Hoover said that the aluminum awning is too contemporary for the YMCA’s image, and she believes that the cloth awning better represents the YMCA and its identity. Mr. Matveiev said that he feels the aluminum awning is more appropriate for the building. Ms. Hoover said that many of the other buildings are using cloth awnings, and this would provide some consistency. Mr. Matveiev said that it is not relevant.

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the awning, as submitted.
Ms. Ismail.....Seconded the motion.
Mr. Matveiev.....voted in opposition
Mr. Serrao, Ms. McClellan, and Ms. Ismail voted in favor. **Motion passes.**

240 5th Avenue – YMCA Building

*Pittsburgh HRC – 7 October 2009 Minutes
Market Square Historic District*

OWNER:	WARD:.....1st	APPLICATION RECEIVED:	
McDonald's USA, LLC	LOT & BLOCK:.....1-C-224	SITE VISITS:	07/16/09
APPLICANT:	INSPECTOR:.....Ed McALISTER	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:	00/00/00
McIlvried, DiDiano & Mox, LLC	COUNCIL DISTRICT:.....		88-028
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:.....		93-072
	ARCH. RATING:.....		95-018
			05-106

REGISTER: LISTED ELIGIBLE

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application, saying that the Historic Review Commission had approved this proposal last month, but the applicant is asking for an amendment.
2. **Mr. Mark Mox and Susanne Neal** introduced themselves. They asked the HRC for a number of modifications to the prior approval, including:
 - a. They wanted the LED sign to change fore frequently than once per day, to make the cost of installation more feasible.
 - b. They wanted round flag signs instead of square. The square footage would be slightly larger.
 - c. The awnings they are now proposing are “cloth,” nylon and acrylic mesh that McDonald’s feels could easily be cleaned.
 - d. They asked that the arched “Ms” of the signage be increased in size slightly.
3. There were some general questions about zoning regulations in regards to signage. Ms. Ismail said that no matter what the HRC decides, all of the signage and application materials would need to meet the requirements of the current zoning code.
4. Mr. Matveiev asked for public comment. There was none.
5. Mr. Matveiev asked staff why she would recommend denial of the LED sign changing frequently. Molnar replied that the sign would now be considered a “flashing or intermittent” light sign, which is not approvable under our guidelines. Matveiev said he looks at this building within its context, and he thinks the new signage fits. Matveiev asked Molnar what precedent we would be setting if we approved the flashing sign. Molnar said that the sign guidelines are weak. She also said that justifying this sign because the building is “non contributing” is a slippery slope, because there are a lot of non contributing buildings in the district.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve larger, round, projecting signs, the new “M’s”, and the timing of the LED billboard to conform with the zoning requirements for such signs. Cloth awnings were approved at the last HRC meeting, and thus do not need further approval.

Mr. Matveiv.....Seconded the motion.

Ms. Ismail.....Abstained from voting.

Ms. McClellan.....Abstained from voting.

Mr. Serrao and Mr. Matveiev voted in favor of the motion. **Motion passes.**

1827 – 1831 East Carson Street

East Carson Street Historic District

OWNERS: Mr. John Lewis and Mr. Edward Lewis
1831 East Carson Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15203

WARD: 17th
BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER: 012-E-336
BUILDING INSPECTOR: Mr. Bob Molyneaux
ZONING CLASSIFICATION: LNC
HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RATING: Vacant Lot

DESCRIPTION: 1827 E Carson was the site of a two-and-a-half story Second Empire Style building dating from the 1880s. The building had a brick façade and a first-floor storefront with turned wooden corner posts. It had three segmental-arch-topped windows with decorative hoods in the second floor and two gabled dormers in the mansard roof. This building collapsed and was removed in June, 2001.

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar introduced the application. She gave some of the background history of the project, and said that the HRC had approved a prior design earlier this year, but that modifications were being proposed.
2. **Jeff Slusarick** came to the table to describe the application. He said they are now proposing to eliminate the two story atrium space, and modify the stairwell. They are now interested in developing the deck space on the second floor. The atrium takes up valuable deck space, so they would now like to see it gone.
3. **Mr Bob Russ**, East Carson Local Review Committee, said that he doesn't think the new design is necessarily much worse than what the commission already approved. He said that there could be an opportunity for a trellis, or for some type of visual massing that wouldn't prohibit the use and programming of the space.
4. Mr. Matveiev argued that the design is too far departed from the original design for him to be comfortable approving.
5. Mr. Serrao said that the façade as shown just doesn't work. It would be important to keep the street-line. However, the HRC already gave an approval for the old building, so that's why he would be opposed to denying the application.
6. Mr. Matveiev said that without the vestibule, the space looks like it has a missing tooth, and that the buildings now don't "step down".

MOTION:

Mr. Matveiev.....Moved to deny the application
Ms. McClellan.....Seconded the motion.
Ms. Ismail.....Abstained from voting
Mr. Serrao.....Voted in opposition to the motion
.....**Motion failed.**

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to approve the design as presented on the condition that the atrium stays. This includes the west wall, removal of stairs, signage with size requirements. It does not include the removal of the atrium / vestibule.
Ms. Ismail.....Seconded the motion.
All vote in favor.....**Motion Passes.**

CONTINUED: Update on plans for abating condemnation notice: under consideration for demolition

Discussion:

1. Ms. Molnar directed the HRC to the timeline in the back of the packet, describing all of our past efforts in regards to 1218 N Franklin Street. She said that at the September HRC meeting, the HRC asked MCC to provide the following: A document that formalizes an agreement allowing MCC to do the work on this property. It would include an itemized work list, signed by the owner, a timeline for when the work would commence, and an estimated date of completion.
2. Mr. Stanley Lowe addressed the HRC by asking if the HRC had a “Mitigation Preservation Policy.” He said that we have spent an enormous amount of time discussing individual properties, and he wants to know – what our policy is describing how the City saves buildings like this.
3. Over the last 5 years, 53 buildings at a cost of \$515,000 have been demolished in Manchester. Today, we’re having a discussion about how the *community* can spend \$15-20,000 to save a building, when it is clearly eligible to use existing funds, that the City uses to demolish buildings, to salvage the building. Do we have a policy that allows the City to use these funds for rehabilitation instead of demolition? Ms. Molnar replied that the HRC does not. Ms. Ismail began to respond saying “the Department of City Planning does not have...” when Stanley interrupted saying, “Well, then it is my clear understanding then, that the City of Pittsburgh has a Policy, which in effect goes against the HRC’s mission, which is absolute demolition.” In other words, we are living in a policy that says the HRC’s mission is to protect historic neighborhoods, but at the same time, if someone wants to save a building, there is not a partnership with the City in which the City clearly has funds to save buildings, but just used for demolition.
4. Ms. Ismail said that the City is currently pursuing a Cultural Heritage Plan that will outline our policies.
5. Lowe said that until the City has a policy, particularly as it relates to Manchester, we do not think it should be the burden of the community to spend its own dollars to save these buildings. Especially when it is a federal guideline, a federal statute, that allows the City to use money it spends on demolitions to save the buildings instead. And you have no policy in place to do that.
6. If the committee *chooses* to demolish this building, as based in Manchester, we would move for a City Council hearing to look at all demolitions that have taken place on the North Side in the last five years. We would furthermore request a cost of all the demolitions that have taken place on the North Side in the past five years, against the policy of saving any of those buildings, in the last five years.
7. My statement to you is, “We request that the City of Pittsburgh, through the HRC and the Planning Department, establish a mitigation policy, so you can tell us, and everyone, how we should go about using the City’s policies, to save buildings in National Register Historic Districts.
8. Ms. Ismail said that this was a surprising “turn around” because during our walk through with MCC in the neighborhood, it was the City’s understanding that MCC would work with URA to come up with a plan for preservation / conservation, and that was the directive we had been given by the administration.
9. Mr. Lowe said that was correct, but on June 8, 2009, the City received a document, the same one in front of the HRC today, about 1218 N Franklin. He said the only time the City and MCC have a dialogue is when he [Lowe] gets up in front of the HRC microphone. I am asking a very basic question. If we are having a discussion about the exterior use of buildings, and the HRC has a mission to protect buildings, I would suggest to you, particularly on the north side, as we look at neighborhoods, especially where massive demolition has already occurred, in the face of not having a mitigation policy that says “we recognize that there are some architectural jewels that we are here to protect,” and we won’t demolish.
10. I’m simply asking you what the policy is so we can follow it. WE SENT YOU THIS OVER FOUR MONTHS AGO, and there has been no response. So today, given the fact that you’ve spent over a half-million dollars to demolish buildings in Manchester, I would like to know if you could spend \$17,000 to save a building when you know you have the law on your side to do so.
11. Mr. Matveiev said that BBI doesn’t have anything that allows them to do that, at this point. But that’s a more global discussion, and what we’re talking about is 1218 N Franklin Street. He knows there are things that could be done better, but what Mr. Lowe is proposing for this rust belt city, we have to work smart with the limited funds that we have. What we have right now is a

1218 N Franklin Street

larger pot of money, because of stimulus money (which could go away next year). As far as neighborhoods with a large number of condemned buildings, we would have to define which buildings to save and which not to save. Since MCC has done all of the leg-work to determine how much it would cost to mediate the problems at 1218, they have an understanding of cost for this address only. Matveiv thinks a more realistic number for multiple properties would be at least three times that amount, due to architect costs, engineer, etc. We'd be in the business of construction management – but we don't have those resources readily available to us. When you have 1600 or 1700 condemned properties on the books currently, and constantly getting more and more every day, it is hard to understand how we would do that on a day to day basis. We get allocated money for BBI's mission, which is Public Safety. Maybe there is another avenue for directing this money, such as the URA, for directing money toward this purpose. But to suggest that this is the HRC's responsibility, or BBI's responsibility, well, I'm not sure that's correct.

12. Mr. Lowe said that was not the question he was trying to ask. I'm asking the exploratory question. We all have the responsibility to explore other opportunities. The facts cannot be denied. In the last five years – 53 buildings and a half million dollars has been spent to demolish buildings. Demolition has occurred. We know, City aside, that when federal funds are allocated to the City of Pittsburgh, the city has a certain responsibility for the use of those funds. It is CLEAR that you can not use federal funds to demolish structures in a National Register Historic District without certain standards being met. It is CLEAR that in Manchester that has not been the case. It is also clear that we have the responsibility to explore... If we continue to say "demolition," then when do we say, "how do we save"? I'm asking the question!
13. Matveiev: I know you are asking the question, and the point was right on as far as going to the URA to figure out a solution.
14. Lowe: We have gone to the URA, and they told us there was \$450,000 of Stabilization money sitting on the table – which we have an upcoming meeting to think through, hopefully in part for mitigation in Manchester. The meeting is on October 20th. In the meantime, let's not demolish the building.
15. Matveiev asked Molnar to repeat the items HRC had requested. She read that the HRC wanted a document that formalizes an agreement allowing MCC to do the work on this property... Matveiev asked Lowe if he had that. Lowe replied that the property owner will not give permission unless we know that we can in fact save the building. The original owner is dead, and the relatives will not allow us to mitigate this because they think if they do, they will incur additional liability.
16. Matveiev: So, you don't have the property owner's permission to do any work?
17. Lowe: No, and furthermore, I'm requesting that YOU do it, or the URA do it.
18. Matveiev: Well, BBI's funding is already earmarked for demolition. So if you find another source of funding...
19. Lowe: Not "you," but "WE." That's what I've been trying to say all day.
20. Molnar said that she knows that reprogramming CDBG monies toward historic preservation is something that *can* happen, but is not something that the HRC or that BBI has the directive or the ability to do themselves.
21. There was general discussion on how to reprogram these dollars.
22. Mr. Matveiev called for a motion:

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao.....Moved to table for one more month.

Ms. McClellan.....Seconded the motion.

Mr. Matveiev.....Opposed the motion

Ms. Ismail.....Voted in favor

.....**Motion passes.**

1218 N Franklin Street

*7 October 2009 – Historic Review Commission Minutes
Manchester Historic District*