

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MEETING NOTICE**

**January 8, 2018 at 5:00pm  
Town Hall Committee Meeting Room  
100 Ann Edwards Lane  
Floor 3, Room 3300**

\*\*\*\*\*

*NOTE: Items in [blue](#) are hyperlinks (some file sizes are large and may take a minute to load).*

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Joe Keenan, Chair; Leigh Rowe, Vice Chair; Scott Hirshorn, Heather Wilson and Susan Dickson

**STAFF PRESENT:** Eric Pohlman, Senior Planner; Joe Juan; Plan Reviewer

Mr. Keenan called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m., and reviewed the meeting procedures with the public.

**I. Approval of Minutes - [December 11, 2017](#)**

*Ms. Dickson moved for approval; seconded by Ms. Wilson. All present voted in favor.*

**II. Public Comment & General Correspondence**

**[None]**

**III. BUSINESS**

**STAFF REPORT**

*Ms. Wilson made a motion for consent on items #1, 202 Bank Street; #2, 327 Bennett Street; #3, 135 Toomer Lane, Option B; and #5, 314 Hibben Street.*

Mr. Martschink asked if there could be discussion regarding his property, item #3, 135 Toomer Lane.

*Ms. Wilson amended her motion for consent to items #1, 202 Bank Street; #2, 327 Bennett Street; and #5, 314 Hibben Street; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.*

1. [202 Bank Street](#) – (Survey 6110) TMS 532-05-00-225 – Final Review for Alterations to Approved Plans [**Consent approval**]
2. [327 Bennett Street](#) – (**HISTORIC 6127**) TMS 5320100027 – Final Review for Installation of ADA Ramp [**Consent approval**]
3. [135 Toomer Lane](#) –TMS 517-15-00-064 – Final Review for Alterations to Approved Plans

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Losse Knight**, architect, reviewed the original approved site plan where they had one spot footing at the newel post for the stairs. He stated that functionally, aligning the door in option A, makes for a more favorable furniture configuration on the back porch. He stated that they have established this rhythm of having equal bays with the three columns coming across the rear. He said that there are not too many views to the back of the house, so their preference would be to obtain more usability inside the porch floor plan, given that it is not highly visible.

Mr. Keenan asked if their preference is Option A over Option B.

Ms. Wilson asked if there has been discussion with the Town's arborist, Eddie Bernard.

Mr. Knight stated that they have been attempting to communicate with Mr. Bernard; however, originally they were approved with having the one spot pier which is more of a fencepost without rebar and a small amount of concrete. He said that if Mr. Bernard advises that he is unable to approve Option A, he said that given the structure of the remaining posts to support this and the fact that it hangs on the band

board of the porch itself, it could potentially be floated and not encroach into the tree area at all from a structural standpoint, if necessary.

Ms. Dickson stated that her only concern is the tree and would like to ensure that the tree is not going to be harmed. She said there were so many beautiful trees on that lane and many have been lost to development.

Mr. Knight stated that the nice feature of this landing, is it is an open air where rain and breezes are able to come through. He said that the owners wish to maintain and protect the tree and would not propose this if it were going to be detrimental to the tree.

Mr. Keenan stated that he does not see an issue and agrees with Ms. Dickson on ensuring the tree is protected; however, it is out of the purview of the Commission. He said that he does not have an issue with either option A or B.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he would defer to Mr. Bernard; however, if Mr. Bernard is agreeable, he would not have an issue. He said that he would like to see some type of clarification from Mr. Bernard.

*Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve Option A at 135 Toomer Lane, as submitted, and have Mr. Bernard make the determination on the tree; seconded by Ms. Dickson. All present voted in favor.*

Mr. Martschink asked if he could revert to Option B, if Mr. Eddie Bernard made the decision not to approve Option A, in order not to come back before the Commission.

Mr. Pohlman responded in the affirmative and stated that the property owner would need to re-apply and request approval for Option B. He said that the property owner may only build what is approved by the Commission.

Ms. Rowe asked if another motion may be made to approve both options.

Mr. Pohlman said that he would not recommend it.

Mr. Martschink asked if the column spacing could be approved in order for them to finish the porch.

Ms. Wilson stated that this is part of both Option A and B and they can finish the porch and come back before the Commission for the stair.

*Ms. Wilson amended her motion to approve these items independently; Option A, porch column spacing, stair alignment and shutters at 135 Toomer Lane; Ms. Dickson amended her second. All present voted in favor.*

4. [625 Royall Avenue](#) – (Survey 5993) TMS 532-09-00-084 – Conceptual Comment for Demolition and New Construction.

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Phil Clarke, Clarke Design**, stated that last month, the main objection was doing a drive under and bringing the grade up in order to ensure the ground floor was not too wet. He said as it was compared to the house next, it was too massive. He said the main comment was to bring the height down as much as possible, still being above flood. He said that he has accomplished this. He said that they have brought the grade up out of flood and raised it slightly around the front and let it drain off and took away the drive under element and the ADU, and detached a garage in the back. He said there are dormers, in order to use the upper floor as storage or a small room; however, it will not be a finished room. He said that it is a similar architectural style, as most of the comments last month were favorable with the style, brackets and the simple coastal farmhouse look. He said by losing the ground floor space which counted towards the BAR, he was able to increase the rear porch slightly and the right side elevation which will be seen across the pond also looks nice. He said the pool is shown for location only and not planned on at this time.

Ms. Rowe stated that when you look at the garage it makes a significant difference, because it sets back. She believes it looks great.

Ms. Dickson asked about the square footage.

Mr. Clarke stated that the BAR (building area ratio), is 4,975 which is heated space plus porches. He said that the actual heated space is 3,586. He said the porch in the rear is large and has a nice porch on the front as well.

Ms. Wilson said that the style is more classic and is appropriate in the historic district. She said that on the side elevations, the gables are not complete. She said she would like to see Mr. Clarke follow through with what has been done on the front, on the side elevations, especially the left side which is exposed. She said that the gable on the exposed side needs to have as much integrity as the front of the house, where there are clean forms and the corners are expressed. She said on the right side, the gable could be expressed so that there is a true primary mass to the house, making it stronger. She said that it is misleading on the front elevation, because with the garage, it makes it look wider than it really is. She said she appreciates forgoing the drive under. She said that she really likes the back elevation, because the forms and gables are knitted together in a more fluid manner than the front. She said she is not sure if the front porch wraps around and ties into that piece (mud room).

Mr. Clarke said that he has considered taking the mud room and sliding it forward and letting the porch wrap around.

Ms. Wilson said that this is what she is referring to. She said since Mr. Clarke has to submit the garage separately, perhaps take it out of the house so it does not show so wide. She said that it is a great improvement.

Mr. Keenan said that he also likes the rear elevation, primarily because of the porch. He said that his comments last month were to enlarge the porch slightly.

Mr. Pohlman stated that just prior to final approval, demolition will need to be approved. He stated that the structure cannot be demolished until a final COA has been issued.

*Ms. Wilson moved to propose the demolition at 625 Royall Avenue based on the structure not being eligible for renovation to current code and compliance; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.*

5. [314 Hibben Street](#) – (HISTORIC 6214) TMS 517-15-00-012 – Final Review for Reroofing of Historic Structure. [**Consent approval**]
6. [200 Queen Street](#) – (Survey 6091) TMS 532-05-00-025 – Conceptual Review for New Additions

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Kenneth and Patricia Spicer**, potential homeowners, said that his architect is not present at this time. He read a letter that his architect sent to the Commission.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that for a harbor front home, some of the design details do not mimic some of the historic homes seen in the Old Village harbor front. He said that he is not referring to the new construction, but the general detailed themes of windows, rooflines and porches, which could be better honed to mimic some of the historic homes on the water front.

Ms. Rowe stated that the proposed additions do not fit the feel of the harbor front.

Ms. Dickson stated that she would like to see it simplified.

Mr. Spicer said that the lot size is a constraint and their attempt was to mimic the existing house that is there. He said the floor plan for the first floor will remain unchanged; however, the second floor is where the change takes place. He said that the main reason is because they feel strongly about their grandchildren and their carbon footprint. He said they both drive electric cars and would like to have solar panels. He said that he learned from Town staff that the Commission is not enthusiastic about solar panes and tried to make the roof solar panel compatible. He said that there is no slope on it, it is flat. He said that he has done a great deal of research on other sites in Hilton Head, Kiawah and Isle of Palms, where they have flat solar panels, which are

not as efficient. He said they put dormers up to break-up the roofline, but are still faced with trying to hide the solar panels.

Ms. Wilson asked if it is a hard rule not to allow solar panels.

Mr. Pohlman stated that in the guidelines under Roofs, #7: *If solar panels are desired on a building, they should be placed on a rear elevation or in a valley area of the roof that is not visible from the public right of way.*

Mr. Spicer stated that this property has 2 ½ views from the public right of way, depending on how wide the Commission considers public right of way on the harbor and Queen Street. He said that there is no rear elevation that is out of the public right of way for this property.

Mr. Keenan stated that the solar panels are in the middle of the house on the flat section of the roof, so they will not be visible. He said there have not been too many applications for solar panels in the past several years. He said that he echoes Mr. Hirshorn's comments, as the whole application is difficult to understand and is not certain if this is due to the fact that there is an existing home there already. He said that typically the architects that come before the Commission display both existing elevations and a proposed elevations, which is very helpful. He said that it is difficult for him to decipher what is there and what is being proposed, and has some concern with the additional height, but primarily, it is the harbor view.

Mr. Spicer said that the harbor is approximately 800 feet from the front of the lawn.

Ms. Wilson said that it is important for the Commission to see existing and proposed elevations on the same page, which helps to evaluate the impact on the neighborhood. She said this is difficult, because the neighbor on the right is a large tall house, but Queen Street is not a large street with very small houses. She said what is being proposed is too tall for Queen Street, when you consider the

streetscape. She said that there are nine foot flat ceilings with a lot of attic space so more could be done with the existing rooflines, utilizing dormers or vaulting some of the space. She said that the height needs to come down. She said that she appreciates the discussion of a front door; however, it is not really a front that is addressing the street. She said that the elevation that faces Queen Street needs to be considered for neighborhood capability. She said that this is the tallest elevation of all the elevations, because that ridge is raised the highest. She said it needs to be stepped down towards Queen Street. She said on many of the old homes, the front is the harbor. She said that the front door and front porches are all harbor-side, so they could put a garden entry onto the front porch on the harbor. She said that she would not go to the expense of a grand entrance. She suggested spending additional time studying the elevation along Queen Street. She said where you see the gable that brings the eave down and looks low on Queen Street although it rises up higher in the middle. She said the overall flow of the current house is better than what is being proposed in terms of how it relates to its neighbors in scale. She added that the homes on Queen Street are not big, but there is a very large house on either side so the Commission is sympathetic to this, but are also concerned with existing streetscapes and neighbors and who is being impacted. She stated that this is where the existing versus proposed is very important, so that the Commission is able to understand what the impact is. She stated that she would rather see a solar panel than a house get 10 feet taller.

Mr. Spicer said that it would be easier for them, because the southern exposure is where the solar panels are more efficient.

Mr. Pohlman said that this is a guideline, so it is at the Commission's discretion whether they would like to provide some leniency. He said when discussing with the property owners prior to coming before the Commission, that they must attempt to abide by the guidelines first and then request any leniency.

Ms. Wilson stated that on the other pitches she would rather see a solar panel.

Mr. Spicer stated that they researched the solar singles, which are not commercially available and there is some concern as to how soon they will be available.

Ms. Wilson stated that she understands why the flat roof helps the solar panels, but this is causing a host of other issues with the large flat roof in terms of drainage.

Mr. Spicer said that the builders have mentioned TPO roof (Thermoplastic Polyolefin) and have guaranteed 25 years.

Ms. Wilson said that she would not encourage this, not just technically, but aesthetically, as it is not what is typically seen in combination with pitches. She said if a modern askew were being presented, this would be one thing; however, she would ask to have the architect re-study the roof forms. She said that personally, she would be open to seeing solar panels from the side and rear.

Mr. Spicer asked if this would be on Queen Street and the harbor-side.

Ms. Dickson said that if the front of the house is declared to be the harbor-side, then why not put solar panels on the rear of the home.

Mr. Spicer stated that unfortunately, the panels must be south and west in order for the panels to be effective.

Ms. Wilson said that the second gable that is back, would face that direction and panels that tilt up could be installed, which would not be seen from the water, but would be above the primary ridge.

Mr. Spicer said that the efficiencies of solar panels is 18% to 21% and for their needs, they would need 36 to 38 panels which are approximately four feet by six feet.

Ms. Wilson suggested geothermal which works great when heating and cooling the home.

Mr. Spicer said that they had geothermal on Sullivan's Island and because of the mineral content in the pipes, it was a disaster. He said it was not just the pipes coming into the house, but the ones in the ground which must be dug up every three to five years.

Ms. Dickson stated that she has had geothermal in her home for twelve years and has not had a single issue.

Mr. Spicer asked if it was from a well and if he would be allowed to put in a well.

Ms. Dickson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Keenan responded in the affirmative. He said that he believes the solar panels will be an issue if that many are going to be required. He said he would advise against the TPO roof, as the Commission would likely not consider this as it is a commercial application.

Mr. Spicer stated that they would be completely covered by the panels in this design.

Mr. Keenan stated that he believes the potential property owners have some good feedback for their conceptual application.

Ms. Rowe stated that she would likely not support the solar panels if they were to be seen on the harbor side.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that there would have to be a way for the panels not to be seen in the right of way.

7. [115 Friend Street](#) – (Survey 6090) TMS 532-05-00-069 – Conceptual Review for Demolition and New Construction

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Alan Smith**, 4124 Richmond Street, Arlington VA. He stated that the house is now under contract, and he will be moving to the area. He stated that he is an architect still practicing in Virginia only and is not registered in South Carolina; however, hopes to do work in South Carolina. He met with staff and put together a conceptual plan. He

learned a great deal about trees and porches and the zoning requirements and what is allowed if requested. He said the current house is oriented on Friend Street and five feet off of Royall Street at the upper left corner and not in compliance. He said it is a non-historic structure and has serious mold and structural issues. He said that he does not see this as a candidate for renovation. He said he chose to design a one and a half story cottage home, which honors what is currently on Friend Street. He said that for aging in place, he wanted a bedroom on the first floor and did not want a big two-story. He mentioned that he loves the idea of a detached garage and the house currently has a detached shed and no garage. He reviewed the current survey mentioning that along Royall Street there is a significant amount of pervious concrete apron which continues into the side or backyard. He said the back corner where the porch is along Royall Street is five feet off of the lot line currently. He said there is a retaining wall behind the house due to flooding. He said to the right of the shed, the grade is three foot higher than it is in the front. He said that there has been some concern by the neighbors regarding runoff and in his proposal, he is reviewing ways not to have runoff from his property. He said the shed in the back is approximately 4 feet off the back lot line. He said there are also trees on the property that are critical. He said that there are two trees that are not on his property and fall under SCDOT. He has engaged an arborist to look at all the trees on and off-site and the two trees that are not on his property, but very close, are a hazard according to the arborist. They are both rotten. He said that the trees on his property; one being 39 inches in diameter, is healthy. He said that he would like to honor the tree and create a preservation area around it. He said the other tree on his property is in bad shape, according to the arborist and will likely require some coordination between the Town arborist and his arborist to confirm this. He said the grade lines slope to Friend Street and his goal is to put an attractive home on this lot that is small, honors the street, provides an answer to the grades, provides a nice rear yard without harming the trees that are to be saved and hopefully improve

the corner. He said that he was advised that he will require three on-site parking spaces. He has a current curb cut for one and a half cars, but it very old and he is not sure it is even permitted. He is proposing a garage, which will be set back 18 feet from the street, which is similar to the setbacks of the adjacent house. He set it at 18 feet to preserve some yard and emulate the neighborhood. He said that he would like to keep 115 Friend Street as the front yard. He would like to have the house pulled forward, with a small pool which is 6 feet off the property line to maintain the grade in the back. He said when looking at the primary elevation, which would have a one and a half story look, front facing gable, which cues off some of the high pitch gables that accentuate some of the other houses on the street. He said the detached garage is in line with the detached garage next door. He said on the front elevation, the front porch would be approximately two and a half to three feet at grade, which will allow him to step out one step in the back with a screened in porch terrace, because there is a slight grade dropping in the back, with the retaining wall taking up some of it. He said he has not determined whether the porch in the back will be screened or not. He said there is another side entrance to the backyard which is an area for the dog. He said on the Royall Street entrance, he is proposing a secondary accessory building. He said that he would like to re-create the existing shed that is currently there, making it 8'x10' to park his bicycle and golf cart, as well as store his garbage and recycling bins. He said the right side elevation will rarely be seen and said that the fence line is set back almost to the end of the garage in the back, with an outdoor shower hidden behind it. He said upstairs in the primary gable, there is an overlook planned, letting light into the second story with eyebrow sheds that will keep the heat out. He stated that he would like to turn the concrete section into gravel where the current shed is located, which will also provide some privacy in the backyard. He said there is a low wall where the pool is which will provide low vegetation behind it. He stated that originally he proposed a large portico, which was set in. He said that he put a

full porch on the front that began to influence other things on the street.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he is not in favor of the multiple out buildings and historically, does not believe the homes have multiple accessory buildings. He believes the proposed home design looks great.

Ms. Rowe stated that this will bring so much to the street and the corner. She said that she does not have an issue with the two out buildings because you do not see them at the same time. She said if you are coming down Royall Street, it will be difficult to see the garage.

Mr. Smith stated that he has set the garage back in order to take advantage of the same driveway that is there.

Ms. Rowe stated that in this situation, the two out buildings do not concern her. She believes Mr. Smith has done a great job capturing the spirit of the village and a smaller house is very appealing.

Ms. Dickson asked if the garage is a two car garage.

Mr. Smith said that it is only a one car garage. He said that it is 12 ½' x 22', and the other two required spaces are directly in front of the garage, which is where the parking is now. He said that he was advised that he would need an encroachment.

Mr. Pohlman stated that Mr. Smith will be required to apply for an encroachment with the SCDOT if the street is owned by the State. He said that if it is owned by the Town, he would need the permit from the Town.

Mr. Smith stated that he was advised that he would be required to have three off-site parking spaces. He said that he will have occasional visitors and golf cart friends.

Ms. Wilson said that she agrees with both Mr. Hirshorn and Ms. Rowe, as she does not typically support multiple out buildings; however, in this case, Royall is a busy street and it is a small accessory building and will provide some protection to the yard.

Mr. Smith stated that he will be parking his vehicle away in the garage for the most part, using his bicycle and golf cart primarily. He said the reason for the other accessory building is for storage.

Ms. Wilson stated that she thought it was more to protect the pool and provide privacy.

Mr. Smith stated that there is a small storage shed currently back there; however, it is not six foot off the property line, but more like four feet and is caddy-corner.

Ms. Wilson stated that her other comments are regarding the material list. She said that the list indicates a chimney, but she does not see one.

Mr. Smith said that it is a board and batten structure, taking on a shed configuration. He said that it is 16 inches deep with a wood frame, in between the two windows is a prefabricated gas fireplace inside.

Ms. Wilson said that the Commission has embraced hardy plank and said that she has issues with the synthetic shake or shingles. She said that if this is something that Mr. Smith prefers, she would like to see a sample of the material. She said it indicates cementitious shingles on the second floor gables and dormers. She stated that hardy shingles do not particularly look great; however, if Mr. Smith is able to provide samples or pictures or installation, this would be helpful.

Mr. Smith stated that he has completed this application on projects he has done and will provide photographs to the Commission members at the next meeting. He said that he sees corner boards all over and said that one of the things he has seen here that he likes is the way the thicker siding is laced so it does not look like hardy, but wood, so there is no corner board. He said that he would also like to do this on this house.

Ms. Wilson said that this would look great.

**Linda Balzac**, 422 Hobcaw Drive, stated that it is refreshing to see a small house being newly constructed. She stated that this is the best application she has seen.

**Sam Lisi**, builder, stated that it looks great.

**Ashley Woody**, 110 Friend Street, which is across the street from Mr. Smith's property. She said that she has some concerns, because she has lived on Friend Street for 22 years and has seen it change considerably over the years. She said that regarding off street parking, she believes that including a garage as an off street parking place is wrong, because it has already happened on this street. She said to her knowledge, no one parks in the garage and the cars park on the street, creating a parking issue. She said that 100 Friend Street does not have any off street parking, which was built before off street parking was required. She said this family has five vehicles and a golf cart. She said that an 18 foot driveway is enough to pull one car off and if there are two vehicles side by side, this will provide two off street parking places. She said that the request for a decrease of the Royall Avenue setback should be denied. She realizes that the house is oddly set on the lot; however, the house was built prior to any paving of the roads in the Old Village. She said no one should keep a tree that is rotted; however, doing whatever possible to conserve is a noble cause. She said that the proposed lot coverage is at 39.2% which is pushing it, just because 40% is allowed. She said she is learning about what is legal and what is just. She said the house is attractive.

Ms. Wilson stated that she will defend her opinion on the 18 foot setback. She said that the tree that is not rotten is the one that Mr. Smith is looking to preserve. She said that the more off-street parking Mr. Smith has, the more he will need to pave, which is going to create worse conditions for Ms. Woody. She stated that Mr. Smith is keeping quite a generous amount of greenspace in the back to capture the grade at the rear of his lot. She said allowing for the house to push to the front corner is helpful for a number of reasons, such as runoff, trees and massing. She said that the house was there before the

streets were paved; however, the Old Village is full of streetscapes with undulations; therefore, no houses line up. She said that she is in favor of this house stepping forward and the next one steps back, which is good for privacy and breezes.

Mr. Keenan suggested pushing the garage back to create more driveway space.

Ms. Wilson said it would depend on how much further back.

Mr. Keenan said enough to park two cars deep; however, he does not know what the grade will be.

Mr. Smith stated that the garage is currently 20 feet deep overall.

Mr. Keenan stated that his preference would be to push it back further.

Mr. Smith stated that he is concerned about pushing it back to the point where it affects the grade where the tree sits, because he was cautioned about the tree's root system, which is why he is pulling the house as far forward on the corner of Royall Street as possible.

Mr. Keenan said that he is okay with the setback, but agrees with Mr. Hirshorn about the accessory building on Royall, because it is such a prominent street that he is uncertain how it will look next to the house. He said that he would prefer that it not be there and put fencing; however, it is only his personal preference. He said that he echoes members' comments on the cottage style house, which is refreshing to see. He said that it will be a good addition for the corner.

Ms. Dickson asked if the space between the garage and the street is long enough to park cars.

Mr. Smith stated that it is at least 10 feet wide from the lot line to the street; therefore, he has 18 feet plus the 10 feet. He said he would like to put a lawn in the front area; however, believes that the neighbors without parking will park on it.

Ms. Woody stated that if Mr. Smith is contemplating putting grass in the area up front, he may want to put up a picket fence to keep people from parking on the grass.

Mr. Pohlman stated that across the street on Royall is outside the Commission's purview and nothing can be put in the right of way other than the one approved parking pad. He said that the placing of pickets would be both against Town ordinance, as well as State DOT regulations.

Mr. Smith stated that he is unclear about demolition; however, is requesting demolition.

Ms. Wilson asked if the house was below flood.

Mr. Smith stated that the lot is A, E & X.

Ms. Wilson stated that typically they would grant demolition if it is below flood and cannot be raised or has structural failure or cannot be renovated. She said that this house does not fit into those categories, so it would be addressed in the third category which is that it is being replaced with a home that is more in keeping with the Old Village. He said that this cannot be granted until final consideration.

Mr. Pohlman said that this would be the most appropriate time, as Mr. Smith will not be able to demolish until final COA is granted.

Mr. Keenan advised Mr. Smith that he would return next month to be considered for final approval and demolition would be approved simultaneously.

Mr. Smith asked about coordination of the trees.

Mr. Pohlman said that it would be coordinated with the Town arborist, Eddie Bernard.

#### **IV. Staff Approvals**

#### **V. [Re-adoption of Bylaws](#)**

*Ms. Wilson made a motion to adopt the bylaws for 2018; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.*

## **VI. Election of Officers**

Mr. Pohlman stated that this would be to vote on a Chair and Co-Chair. He said that Mr. Keenan's and Ms. Dickson's terms will be expiring and will not be up for re-election. He stated that any appointments made by Town Council will occur tomorrow night at the Town Council meeting. He said that the election of a Chair and Co-Chair is a closed secret ballot.

Mr. Pohlman stated that there are 5 votes for Mr. Scott Hirshorn to become Chairman and 4 votes for Ms. Heather Wilson to become Vice Chair. He stated that these appointments become effective at the February OVHDC meeting.

## **VI. Motion to Adjourn**

*Ms. Wilson moved to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Dickson.*

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Ashe

January 8, 2018