

Rye Historic District Commission

Thursday, January 5, 2021

5:00 p.m. – Via ZOOM

Members Present: Co-Chairs Alex Herlihy & Kaitlyn Coffey, David Choate, Karen Stewart, Daryl Kent, Alternates Stacey Smith, Katharine Brown, Tom King, Lydia Tilsley and Selectmen's Rep. Mae Bradshaw

Others Present: Daniel Philbrick of 500 Washington LLC, Steven Bedard of Bedard Preservation and Restoration, Huge Lee 220 Pioneer Road, Joanne Hodgdon 63 Cable Road, Karen Oliver 1159 Washington Road and Library Trustee, Victor Azzi, Library Trustee.

A. Call to Order

Chair Herlihy called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance at 5:00 p.m.

B. READING of ATTESTATION

Statement by Kaitlyn Coffey:

As a member of the Rye Historic District Commission, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

- a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video and other electronic means. We are utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting. All members of the Historic District Commission have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone number: 646-558-8656 and Password: 021177 or by clicking on the following website address: www.zoom.com ID #859-0986-8664.
- b) Public notice has been provided to the public for the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting using Zoom telephonically. Instructions have also been provided on the Town of Rye website town.rye.nh.us
- c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access.

If anyone has a problem, call 603-964-5523 or e-mail Janice Ireland at JIreland2@ryenh.us.

- d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.
In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Roll call attendance of Commission:

- Karen Stewart
- Kaitlyn Coffey
- Katharine Brown
- Mae Bradshaw
- Tom King
- Stacey Smith
- Daryl Kent
- David Choate
- Alex Herlihy

Members noted that they were alone in the room for the meeting.

C. Seating of Alternates

Chair Herlihy seated Stacey Smith for Member Tegeder.

D. Approval of Minutes

1. May 28, 2020

The following corrections were noted:

- Page 4, Line 9: the requirement; should read: the requirements.
- Page 4, third paragraph from the bottom: Mr. Farrell when on to say; should read: Mr. Farrell went on to say
- Throughout the document when the word sledge was used it should have been sludge.
- Page 5, sixth paragraph from the bottom: railings around the area last year that makes it extremely hard to get into the area. Should Read: railings around the area last year that make it extremely hard to get into the area.

Motion by Mae Bradshaw to approve the meeting minutes of May 28, 2020 as amended. Seconded by Karen Stewart.

Roll Call Vote: Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; David Choate – Aye; Daryl Kent – Aye.

Motion Passed.

2. September 1, 2020

The following correction was noted:

- Page 3, Under Old Business reads: Parsonage Conception Agreement should read Parsonage Conceptional Agreement.

Motion by David Choate to approve the meeting minutes of September 1, 2020 as amended.

Seconded by Mae Bradshaw.

Roll Call Vote: Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; David Choate – Aye; Daryl Kent – Aye.

Motion Passed.

3. November 24, 2020

Motion by David Choate to approve the meeting minutes of November 24, 2020 as presented.

Seconded by Mae Bradshaw.

Roll Call Vote: Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; David Choate – Aye; Daryl Kent – Aye.

Motion Passed.

E. Announcements:

Co-Chair Coffey made the following announcement: There will be a public hearing of the new building at 575 Washington Road, Thursday, January 7, 2021 at 3:00 pm

Member Choate stated that a public hearing being announced prior to the meeting where the Historic District Commission has had a chance to discuss the project; is not appropriate. He directed attention to page 28 of the ordinance, and read D.1 which talks about application procedures:

Upon receipt of a completed application the Historic District Commission will normally within fifteen days determine the application is of no interest and notify the applicant or; of interest and schedule a public hearing.

Member Choate asserted that the Commission has not met to discuss it; therefore, no public hearing could be scheduled yet. The action of scheduling a public hearing is out of order.

Selectwoman Bradshaw pointed out that historically the Chair has made the decision of no interest, without even having a meeting. This property is known to be of high interest to the public and so was immediately schedule for a public hearing in order to allow the public to be involved in it.

F. Discussion and vote:

1. Request for recusal of member David Choate and alternate member Tom King for vote on 575 Washington Road application based on conflict of interest as litigants.

Mr. Daniel Philbrick, 500 Washington Road, LLC, asked that Member David Choate and Alternate Member Tom King recuse themselves, as they both have filed a lawsuit against him. He added it is very clear they have a bias against this project and a clear conflict of interest.

Member Stewart stated that she read and understands Mr. Philbrick's concerns; however, she does not agree that Member Choate and King are bias, as she sees no evidence of that. She felt that the fact that these members were taking great steps to prevent a historic building in the Town's small Historic District from being demolished, illustrates a commitment to the District and demonstrates a fitness and qualifications for them to review and stand in solid judgement to the proposed development for that site. She added that she has worked with this Commission for many years and can't understand why, moving forward, everyone on the Commission wouldn't be very interested in making sure that in making sure that whatever structure that is erected there is in keeping with the District, with this Commission's guidance. She was not sure she would support the recusal of discussion of a new building that would be in the Historic District.

Selectwoman Bradshaw referred to RSA 673:14 Disqualification of a Member. She read:

No member of the Historic District Commission shall participate in deciding or shall sit upon the hearing of any question which the board is to decide in a judicial capacity if that member has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the outcome which differs from the interest of other citizens, or if that member would be disqualified for any cause to act as a juror upon the trial of the same matter in any action at law.

She asserted that "this is" Tom King and David Choate, as plaintiffs in the lawsuit against Dan Philbrick specifically. She added that with all certainty, these two individuals, as plaintiffs against Dan Philbrick, would be excluded from any trial relating to this matter. It is a very clear violation if they are not recused, and would serve as a basis for appeal for Mr. Philbrick if he does not get a positive result.

Member Choate rebutted by reading RSA 673:14 II. As follows:

When uncertainty arises as to the application of paragraph I to a board member in particular circumstances, the board shall, upon the request of that member or another member of the board, vote on the question of whether that member should be disqualified. Any such request and vote shall be made prior to or at the commencement of any required public hearing. Such a vote shall be advisory and non-binding, and may not be requested by persons other than board members, except as provided by local ordinance or by a procedural rule adopted under RSA 676:1.

He continued by explaining that Mr. King and he filed suit to stop the demolition of the Parsonage, not to stop future development of the property. They also sued to have the swap agreement declared illegal; which it clearly is, as it does not reflect the voters' wishes. Right now, that is in litigation. The Library Trustees are still involved in that litigation. He added that he feels that he personally can have an open mind to the redevelopment of the site and what is best for the Town of Rye.

Karen Oliver, Library Trustee, reported that in terms of the counts of pending litigation before the court from Tom King and David Choate there are none still pending. So, there is nothing pending before the court.

Selectwoman Bradshaw reported that they have not dismissed their claim against Mr. Philbrick.

Member Choate pointed out that any vote is advisory and non-binding, so it will be up to Mr. King and himself to recuse themselves. He would like to participate in the discussion, whether or not he votes on the application is a different issue. He also pointed out that Ms. Bradshaw was a party to the lawsuit as well. To say that she should not recuse herself is inaccurate. She is also bias and that would be grounds for an appeal, if the application is granted.

Selectwoman Bradshaw pointed out that she is a co-defendant and does not have a conflict of interest against Mr. Philbrick.

Mr. Philbrick responded to Member Choate. The intent of having someone recuse themselves is not to allow them to participate in the discussion; sabotage it, have their say, express their bias, and then decide whether they carried enough votes and have thrown enough bombs; and then decide if they will vote or not, or whether they should recuse themselves. It should be done in advance. If any one of the members of this board were going before a board that had members who were suing them, each and every one of them would think that there was a conflict of interest with that person. It is absolutely, unconscionable to not acknowledge that there is a conflict of interest. This is true of both Mr. King and Mr. Choate. This is about the creditability of this board.

Member Kent interjected that he felt that it will be difficult for Mr. King and Mr. Choate to be objective. He felt that the Commission needed to get on with the meeting in a positive manner. He stated that he was at the meeting to offer his expertise as a builder and to discuss the completeness of the application. He pointed out that the Town has an opportunity to have a really nice building built in the Center of Town that can be in harmony with the rest of the buildings that are already there. He stated that he is concerned as to where this meeting is heading.

Co-Chair Coffey asked that the meeting be pulled back to the agenda. She asked if there was a motion to ask for a recusal. If not, she will move on to the sign request.

Motion by Mae Bradshaw: As a member of the Commission, I wish the Commissioners vote upon the request that David Choate and Tom King be disqualified from any participation in any hearing of the applications of Dan Philbrick or his entities in the 575 Washington application and the sign application for the TD Bank.

Member King interjected that the sign request at the TD Bank has nothing to do with the Parsonage.

Co-Chair Coffey stated that she explained at the beginning of the meeting that this was part of the request from the same applicant.

Member King rebutted that it is a completely different parcel, property and issue. He asked if the members felt that they (he & Member Choate) could not be objective about the sign at the bank building.

Co-Chair Coffey stated that it is because it is the same applicant. It has nothing to do with them being objective. It has to do with the overall conflict of interest of Mr. King and Mr. Choate with the applicant.

Member Stewart asked if Mr. Philbrick owned the Parsonage property. If not, isn't this application out of order?

Selectwoman Bradshaw clarified that the contract with the Select Board requires that Mr. Philbrick proceeds with the application for this Board's approval.

Alternate King announced that he does not intend to recuse himself unless Selectwoman Bradshaw also recuses, as he feels that she also has a conflict of interest.

Mr. Philbrick pointed out that Selectwoman Bradshaw has not filed a suit against him.

After a lengthy discussion, Selectwoman Bradshaw noted that there was a motion on the table.

Seconded by Alex Herlihy.

Member Stewart asked that the motion to be repeated.

Motion by Mae Bradshaw: As a member of the Commission, I wish the Commissioners vote upon the request that David Choate and Tom King be disqualified from any participation in any hearing of the applications of Dan Philbrick or his entities in the 575 Washington application and the sign application for the TD Bank.

Selectwoman Bradshaw explained that this does not disqualify them from speaking at the public hearing on Thursday as a member of the public; however, they will not be able to vote during this judicial process.

Co-Chair Coffey asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call Vote: Daryl Kent – Aye; Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye.
Motion Passed.

Member Choate announced that the vote was only advisory. He refused to recuse himself, unless Selectwoman Bradshaw also recused herself. He stated that there were two attorneys on the call this evening and he would like for them to weigh in on the matter.

Co-Chair Chair Coffey stated that she felt that it was not appropriate for members of the public, who are not on the Commission, to join the discussion. She asserted that the Commission has taken a vote and reviewed the RSA. The Commission is within their realm, as to the way they have proceeded. They are already an hour into their time and they have two applications to review. She felt that they needed to proceed.

Chair Herlihy agreed.

Co-Chair Coffey stated that they need to seat alternates at this time.

Chair Herlihy seated Katharine Brown for David Choate.

2. Sign Request: 500 Washington Road

Mr. Dan Philbrick explained that the sign is a replacement sign for the TD sign. It is of like material and size. The sign post and light have been there for over twenty years. He will be using the same post and lighting, just changing out the sign itself. He does not feel it is subject to review of the HDC.

Selectwoman Bradshaw referred to the opinion of Attorney Donovan dated December 18, 2020. She suggested that this sign seems to be an identification sign. It says, "Future Home of Rye Town Clerk's Office". As such, it would fall under the exception and would not even need a certificate of approval. The other exception in Attorney Donovan's opinion is a sign made of like material.

Member Kent pointed out that it is really just the wording that is being changed and that the sign seems to be temporary in nature; as in six months, the wording will change again. He doesn't see the point in discussing it now. When the Town Offices go into the building, the Town will have its own sign and the Commission should weigh in on it at that time.

Motion by Daryl Kent allow the sign as presented. Seconded by Stacey Smith.

Roll Call Vote: Daryl Kent – Aye; Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Katharine Brown – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye. Motion Passed.

Co-Chair Coffey stated that the Commission has agreed to accept the “like in kind” application of the sign. She will notify the building inspector of their decision.

3. Completeness of application of Dan Philbrick for certificate of approval for new building at 575 Washington Road

Mr. Philbrick asked if everyone had the packets with the elevations.

Co-Chair Coffey stated that they were available for pickup and they were also distributed electronically.

Mr. Philbrick led the discussion by addressing the parcel itself. He stated that there is not a piece of property with any more significance than this parcel. It is right in the Town Center, in the heart of the community, directly in front of the museum and beside the library. It is an important property and he is proud to be part of this project. He saw the Parsonage as eight tired units that overburdened the property and blocked the architectural integrity of the library. He pointed out two other historic properties as examples of his work; 32 Cable Road, the Werner property, and the old Crown Colony. His intentions at the Parsonage property are to display a different type of building that is more appropriate to the setting. He spoke about his experience in historic restoration, most recently Three Rivers Farm in Dover, NH. It is a Georgian Greek Revival built in 1901. It was the former summer home of E.W. Rawlings. The building was completely restored, down to having the historic wallpaper put back into production. While the Cable Road and Philbrick By the Sea properties are cottages, this property speaks to a totally different level of detail. He stated that he has a long-term relationship with the library. In 1997, he dedicated the Children's Wing to his sister Jackie, who passed away when she was three. He also made a contribution to the library and has supported the library ever since. He understands the importance and significance of the Rye Public Library. It is one of the major cornerstones of this community. The importance of that locale will be of the utmost importance to him as he moves forward with this project.

He went on to explain the differences at the Parsonage. He pointed out that when the building was converted to eight units, the historic integrity of the building was lost. He is proposing a building that is to be designed by Connor Historic Design and Consulting. Mr. Philbrick had an opportunity to see one of the buildings that they designed. He was so impressed that he searched them out and toured their facilities. It was quite impressive. Mr. Philbrick stated that he had never seen a new building built with such detail that spoke to history. The main body of the building design that he is proposing on the Parsonage parcel is the same design he had done for the parcel where Partner's Bank is located. He has loved this building for a long time and feels it is extremely appropriate for the Parsonage property. The Connors are the only historic design and consulting firm that have ever been licensed by Wither Museum. They have built over eight hundred historic buildings.

After his introduction, Mr. Philbrick reviewed the drawings with the Commission. He presented a house that was built in Wells, ME, as the Timothy Wells house. He drove up there and took a picture of the house so that the Commission would have more detail than a drawing.

- **Highlights as follows:**

- Front Elevation Plan A200
 - All Copper Flashing
 - The application reduces the non-conformity of the lot
 - Eight units reduced to five units

The location of the building will be shifted from 13 feet off the library's property line to 75 feet off the property line. The intention is to create a garden park in the open space, giving a great view from Washington Road to the library. He would like to place a statue in the park in memory of his sister Jackie, dedicated to the children of Rye.

Question: Why is the office section of the building on the side nearest to the park rather than the residential section?

Answer:

1. The building sets back a little - the idea was not to have the larger section close to the library for better view and balance
2. To create the feeling of a nicer and larger green space.
3. The office space will have a full kitchen. There is a lot of glass facing the garden, with centered French doors. As they host functions for fund raisers and charitable events for organizations such as Friends of the Library, etc., it will flow easily.
4. The view will be of the steeple on the church and the library.

- Elevation A204
 - View of the front from the Town Hall on Washington
 - Shows the open space

Question: While there be railings on the outside steps?

Answer: Only if dictated by code. If that were the case, Mr. Philbrick understands he would have to come back to the Commission. However, he has been very sensitive in the regard that he does not want the building too high out of the ground. He felt that it would not be appropriate for this type of building. His preference would be to have only one step if possible. It is extremely important for this structure to maintain the proper scale.

- Back Elevation A201
 - There are two faces on the building
 - Curb Appeal
 - Important due to the people using the library that it does not look like the back of a house

Mr. Philbrick announced that the house will be named the Mary Ahern house, named after his mother.

Question: How many feet will the building set back from the front sidewalk?

Answer: The setback in the front will now become compliant with the 30 feet set back in the District. The Parsonage was not. They are using the grandfathered setback off the library side. The reason for this is to get the building back as far as possible, in order to get a better view of the library.

Question: On the entryway; the pediments return and stop. Why did the designers choose not to complete it all the way across? Looking at books of other historic homes show the pediments continuing. It helps to lower the visual.

Answer: In speaking with the designer regarding all the detail, it came down to the era of the property. They were focused on the Colonial Era. They wanted to bring detail to the design, but not so much that they missed the era.

Question: The dimensions of the standard centered chimney colonial house is roughly 40X30 feet. The closest one is the Garland Tavern. Does that hold true to this building?

Answer: The front of the building (for the main house) is 48X35.

There was discussion regarding the landscaping. The plan is to have appropriate New England landscaping. In addition to the four trees required to be planted along Old Parish Road. The vision is to create a campus with the surrounding buildings.

- Elevation Plan A203
 - The side of the building facing Old Parish Road
 - There will be six parking spaces on this side.
 - Removes all asphalt from in front of the building
 - Creating more green space

Mr. Philbrick went on to explain the floor plans.

- Plan A101
 - Four residential units are less than 700 square feet.
 - There is an elevator in the rear entrance, which services the two upstairs units.
 - The office space has 9-foot walls and cathedral ceiling and an open concept.
 - The office space has a kitchen and a conference room
 - The ceiling height in the units in the main house at just shy of 8 feet.
 - There will be small modifications to the interior as they get the specs for the elevator and the other mechanicals in the building.

The window dimensions arrived during this meeting from the designer. Mr. Philbrick emailed them to Chair Herlihy and Selectwoman Bradshaw.

Another thing that Mr. Philbrick is proposing on the building in order to keep a lower elevation, is to install a reverse brick shelf in the foundation on the inside. This allows the floor joist to sit at grade and saves a foot in elevation.

Mr. Philbrick will be going before the Zoning Board of Adjustment tomorrow night. The set backs are on the Zoning Board Plan.

Member Kent stated that he was truly impressed with Mr. Philbrick's attention to details with his other historic projects. However, he expressed concern of not having enough detailed information on the plan, on several items that included:

1. Windows
 - a. Size
 - b. Egress
 - c. Pediments
 - In the District there are some pediments but not a lot
 - Plain Window surrounds with a 1 1/4" band
 - d. Sills
 - 1 1/2 to 3-inch exposure
 - e. Double hung or casements?
 - The windows are egress casements.
 - f. Glass saturation on the office side of the building.
2. Needs a section detail of the overhangs, eaves, returns, soffits, fascia, and venting
3. What is the height of the mud sills?
4. Is that historic outside crown molding on the eaves or is it one that has a sill on the bottom, or intergraded to a new Azek gutter?
5. Detail on the gable extension
6. No detail on flashings
7. Exposed brick; what kind is it; Water struck, Southern?
8. Air Conditioner; where will the condenser be on the property?
9. What are the steps made of? Granite, Blue Cap Bricks, Brick treads?

Mr. Philbrick tried to explain the balance between reaching the requirements of the Commission and moving the project forward. He pointed out that there are plenty of people in town that want to stop this project; so, some of this has been on a time constraint. He has been trying to get as much of this information before the commission, prior to those people ruining a years' worth of work; so, it has been a balancing act. He added that he does not disagree with Member Kent's remarks concerning detail. Mr. Philbrick asked if the Commission would object to having Mike Conner at the public hearing meeting on the 7th. He pointed out that there are certain things, such as the mechanics, that are not going to be able to be done at this time. He needs the approvals of this Commission so that they can move forward. The opponents to this are crafty. They will do everything they possible can to stop it. The details on a building like this, by the time the engineering and architecture are completed, can run into tens of thousands of dollars, all the while running against a stop watch with people that want to sabotage the whole thing because they didn't vote for it in the beginning. Mr. Philbrick reiterated that he absolutely understands Member Kent's concerns and he fully intends to address them all. They all have merit. He asked the Commission for consideration, knowing that if they are to achieve this, it will have to be done in a reasonable matter.

Member Stewart stated that she agreed with Member Kent's concerns regarding the building. However, she has many questions regarding the landscaping as well. She asked when the Commission would see the plans for the landscaping.

Mr. Philbrick explained that he is not prepared to submit the landscaping plans at this time. He understands that he will have to come back to the Commission for approval prior to enacting those plans.

Member Kent reported that he would not be able to be at the meeting on Thursday, but would like to recommend that the Commission gets an addendum to the plans, or just note-up the plans, outlining the criteria that they are agreeing on.

Mr. Philbrick stated that he was in full agreement. If he was sitting on the Commission he would be asking for the same thing. He felt that this was a reasonable request and the historic significance of this property in this location warrants extra precautions.

Selectwoman Bradshaw read; New Construction within the Boundaries of Historic Properties, The Secretary of Interiors Standards of Rehabilitation; Standard 9, which addresses new construction within Historic Districts. She explained that these standards should inform the Commission. As a member of the CLG, the Commission has committed to follow these standards whenever possible.

As with new additions; the massing, size, scale and architectural features of new construction on the site of a historic building must be compatible with those of the historic building. When visible and in close proximity to historic buildings, the new construction must be subordinate to these buildings. New construction should also be distinct from the old, must not attempt to replicate buildings elsewhere on the site and to avoid creating a false sense of historic development. The limitations on the size, scale and design of new construction may be less critical the further it is located from historic buildings.

There was further discussion regarding the park. Mr. Philbrick is envisioning a stone wall around the park, like what would be found on a campus.

There was further discussion regarding the style and number of windows.

Chair Herlihy recommended that the Commission not use the phrase “fast track”. That is not the intent and not helpful. He suggested that this meeting is a work session that will continue Thursday, as the Commission gets more information on the member’s questions. There may not be a vote on Thursday because there is so much to take in and discuss. The Commission will need to deliberate more and not rush to make a decision.

There was a question of whether or not the application was complete, as the Commission has asked for additional information from Mr. Philbrick.

Selectwoman Bradshaw read what constitutes a completed application from the application list of submittal requirements from the building office.

- Completed form
- Provide plans showing proposed changes
- Elevation drawings clearly showing proposed applicable views
- Photos of existing structure from all views
- Any other photos or drawing the applicant would like to submit.
- List of materials to be used, including color and material samples, window samples
- Site information, tax map etc.
- Consultant lists
- Abutters

- Mailing labels
- Fees

Selectwoman Bradshaw asserted that the application is complete, as outlined by the building office. Whether the Commission wants more detailed information is another matter.

Mr. Philbrick agreed with Selectwoman Bradshaw on the completeness of the application. However, he added that he understands the need for the extra details and is happy to provide them. This is important that they get it right.

After further discussion it was agreed that this process is unprecedented, as there has not been many new structures in the District. The application is complete to the standard of what the Town has asked for. As a Commission they will need more details before they vote to approve. To clarify, the Commission can vote to accept the application as complete. They are not approving the project.

Motion by Daryl Kent to accept the application that is before the Commission, however the Commission will not be giving an approval until a list of details has been reviewed by the Commission. Seconded by Karen Stewart.

Roll Call Vote: Daryl Kent – Aye; Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Katharine Brown – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye.

Motion Passed.

Member Kent will forward his list of concerns to Mr. Philbrick for Thursday's meeting.

4. 2021 Certified Local Government application for grant for educational program to be held summer 2021

Selectwoman Bradshaw reported that this application is due. The Historic Preservation Alliance is proposing to do an educational program with Rye this summer. The CLG is very excited about the program and Rye will be the first town to participate. The subject of the education is how to communicate better with the community. It is a very timely subject. She asked for the Commission's approval to submit the application. The total project will be \$8,000 with \$2,000 being the Commission's share, which is in the budget.

Motion by David Choate to apply for the CLG grant for the educational program. Seconded by Katharine Brown.

Roll Call Vote: Daryl Kent – Aye; Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Katharine Brown – Aye; David Choate – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye.

Motion Passed.

5. 2020 Design Grant Scope: whether to limit guidelines to current district or to expand for town overlay. – *Tabled to another meeting due to lack of time.*

Member Choate announced that the Historic Structure Task Force (for lack of a better name) will be having a kickoff Zoom meeting tomorrow at 5:00. They are going to start brainstorming ideas about how to protect historic buildings that are not within the District.

Selectwoman Bradshaw reported that CLG wants to meet with her and Ms. Hawkins to find out how the program is advancing.

6. Quarterly meeting Schedule.

It was planned to hold a special meeting with Ms. Hawkins, based on her availability, but prior to the next quarterly meeting. The next official quarterly meeting will be decided at a later date.

G. Next Meeting: January 7, 2021

Adjourn

Motion by Daryl Kent to adjourn at 8:09 p.m. Seconded by Stacey Smith.

Roll Call Vote: Daryl Kent – Aye; Kaitlyn Coffey – Aye; Mae Bradshaw – Aye; Katharine Brown – Aye; David Choate – Aye; Alex Herlihy – Aye; Stacey Smith – Aye; Karen Stewart – Aye.

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dyana F. Ledger