Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes September 15, 2022

Call to Order	In Attend	ance	Absent	Guests
Made by: Derreck Brown Time: 6:00p.m.	Derreck Brown- David Quinn - Chair Carla Pruett-Du Member Lillie Armstrong Member Lisa Schons-Sea Dickon Housma Member Cheryl Hart-Pla Director **Ethics Statem by: Carla, Dick Lillie	Vice ubois - cretary n- nning	n Mitchell – Hing Secretary	 Brian Cohn, COA Submission Mark Hicks, COA Submission Richard Cohart, COA Submission
Approval of Minutes	Date of Minutes	Motion Appro	2 nd	Outcome
	7/21/2022	Dicko Housm	David Quinn	All Members Approved

Treasury Report	Starting Balance	Expenditures since last meeting	Current Balance
	Current: \$1656.53 private donation carry over 1529.00	\$85.00 - Recording Secretary fee	Current General Use Balance \$1656.53
	Spent all of funds for the last fiscal year		
	\$389.00 (*Special Purpose Contest fund can be carried year to year) No disbursements since August		

<u>Summary of Approved Minor Works: 307 Raleigh Street was approved on Oct.</u>

<u>21, 2021. Resubmitted since work was not started but was same as prior application. Approved</u>

<u>Lisa Schons provided the swearing in of the homeowners for COA presentations.</u> No conflicts were stated.

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #1: Richard and Dr. Debbie Cowart Colonial Revival Parks-Routon House CA 1880s

Property Address: 302 Main Street, Oxford NC 27565 Sworn stakeholders: Richard and Dr. Debbie Coward

Property type: Contributing Residential

Project type: Fence and Carriage garage door

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
The property owner is requesting COA approval to	Height of proposed Structure		1. Dickon Housman
1. Fence in backyard	Setback/placement of		made a motion
Carriage garage door	structure		that the COA is
	Exterior Construction	1.C 2.C 3.	congruent with
	Materials	С	Oxford Design
	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C	Guidelines 14.200,
		3.C	14.203 and should
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C	therefore be
		3.C	approved.
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		It was seconded
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C	by Lisa Schons.
		3.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		The HPC voted
	Structural Conditions		unanimously to
	Trees		approve.
			2. Lillie Armstrong
			made a motion
			that the COA is

	congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 9.104, 9.202. 11.105 and should therefore be approved.
	It was seconded by Lisa Schons.
	The HPC voted unanimously to approve.

^{*} See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

^{**} C = Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NC = Not Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NA = This project does not impact this factor

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #2: Brian Cohn

Property Address: 119 W. Front Street, Oxford NC 27565

Sworn stakeholders: Brian Cohn

Property type: Contributing Residential

Project type: Repaint front porch, repair & repaint front concrete steps, repaint porch

foundation walls and repair wooden storage building

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
The property owner is requesting COA approval to	Height of proposed Structure		1. Carla Pruett-
1. Repaint Front Porch	Setback/placement of		Dubois made a
2. Repair & repaint front concrete steps	structure		motion that the
3. Repaint front porch foundation walls (approved	Exterior Construction	1.C 2.C 3.	COA is congruent
as minor works since the color will remain the	Materials	С	with Oxford Design
same)	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C	Guidelines 4.200,
4. Repaint wooden storage building at the rear of		3.C	4.201, 4.202 and
the property	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C	should therefore
		3.C	be approved.
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		It was seconded
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C	by Dickon
		3.C	Housman.
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		The HPC voted
	Trees		unanimously to
			approve.
			2. Dickon Housman
			made a motion

that the COA is congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 3,103, 3,200, 3,202, 3,201 4,200, 4,201, 4,202 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion that the COA is some configuration.		
Oxford Design Guidelines 3.103, 3.200, 3.202, 3.201 4.200, 4.201, 4.202 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett- Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		that the COA is
Oxford Design Guidelines 3.103, 3.200, 3.202, 3.201 4.200, 4.201, 4.202 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett- Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		congruent with
Guidelines 3.103, 3.200, 3.202, 3.201 4.200, 4.201, 4.202 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett- Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
3.200, 3.202, 3.201 4.200, 4.201, 4.202 and should therefore be approved. If was seconded by Carla Pruett- Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
4.200, 4.201, 4.202 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett- Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		3.200, 3.202, 3.201
and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
approved. It was seconded by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
It was seconded by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		therefore be
It was seconded by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		approved.
by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
by Carla Pruett-Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		It was seconded
Dubois. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		by Carla Pruett-
unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
unanimously to approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		The HPC voted
approve. 3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		unanimously to
3. Was approved as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
as a minor works since paint will remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		3. Was approved
remain the same as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
as currently on the foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		since paint will
foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		
foundation. 4. Lisa Schons made a motion		as currently on the
made a motion		
made a motion		
		4. Lisa Schons
11 1 11 COA :-		made a motion
that the COA is		that the COA is

	congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 4.200,
	4.201, 9.109 and
	should therefore be approved.
	It was seconded by Lillie Armstrong.
	The HPC voted unanimously to approve.

^{*} See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

^{**} C = Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NC = Not Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NA = This project does not impact this factor

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #3: Mark Hicks Building Inc/Chuck Steffenella Henry Furman House 1900

Property Address: 226 College Street, Oxford NC 27565

Sworn stakeholders: Mark Hicks Building, INC, Agent for Chuck Steffenella

Property type: Contributing Commercial property

Project type: Tree removal, window replacement, chimney repaint, roofing, etc.

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
The property owner is requesting COA approval to	Height of proposed Structure		1. Siding was
1. Exterior - Siding	Setback/placement of		approved as minor
2. Windows – as long as like for like since existing	structure		works since it will
windows will be used.	Exterior Construction	1.C 2.C 3.	remain the same
3. Front Doors	Materials	С	with same
4. Back Door	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C	material.
5. Driveway/Parking – Parking will remain the		3.C	
same. Include some sort of landscaping to	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C	2. Dickon Housman
maintain historical architectural look.		3.C	made a motion
6. Landscaping Plan	Roof (shape/form/materials)		that the COA is
7. Tree Removal – 2 maples and ash tree.	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		congruent with
Magnolia was not big enough to be considered	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C	Oxford Design
by the board. David stated the 2 maples are		3.C	Guidelines 6.100,
not causing structural damage that he can see	Appurtenant fixtures		6.101. 6.102. 6.103
based on his observation. David stated a	Structural Conditions		as long as window
couple of limbs needed to be removed.	Trees		replacement is like
8. Deck & stairs			for like, any
9. Fencing			window
10.Storm Windows – will be last and brought back			replacement
to the board.			would need to be

11.Chimney's painted	approved at a
12. Roofing	future meeting
	and should
	therefore be
	approved.
	It was seconded
	by David Quinn.
	by baria domin.
	The HPC voted
	unanimously to
	approve.
	αρριόνο.
	3. Dickon Housman
	made a motion
	that the COA is
	congruent with
	Oxford Design
	Guidelines 6.103,
	6.105 and should
	therefore be
	approved.
	It was seconded
	by Lisa Schons.

	The HPC voted
l l	unanimously to
	approve.
	4. Dickon Housman
	made a motion
	that the COA is
	congruent with
	Oxford Design
	Guidelines 6.105,
	whether metal or
	fiberglass and
	keeping with
	existing style, and
	should therefore
	be approved.
	t was seconded
	oy Lisa Schons.
	The HPC voted
	unanimously to
	approve.
	5. David Quinn
	made a motion
	that the COA is
	congruent with

Oxford Design Guidelines 13.104, 13.105, 13.106, 13.107, 13.108 contingent upon for concrete driveway with 6 spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later meeting, and		
13.105, 13.106, 13.107, 13.108 contingent upon for concrete driveway with 6 spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		Oxford Design
13.107, 13.108 contingent upon for concrete driveway with 6 spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		Guidelines 13.104,
contingent upon for concrete driveway with 6 spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	1	3.105, 13.106,
for concrete driveway with 6 spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		3.107, 13.108
driveway with 6 spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		contingent upon
spaces and installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	f	or concrete
installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		driveway with 6
installation of appropriate shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	S	paces and
shrubbery installed in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	ii	nstallation of
in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		appropriate
in front and along the side of driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	s	hrubbery installed
driveway and replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		
replacement of brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		he side of
brick walkway with concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		driveway and
concrete walkway that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	r	eplacement of
that extends to the front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	k	orick walkway with
front, pending future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later		concrete walkway
future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	t	hat extends to the
future submissions inclusive of front sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	f	ront, pending
sidewalk size and finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	f	uture submissions
finish. Width does not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	i i	nclusive of front
not exceed 48 inches, will be approved at later	s	idewalk size and
inches, will be approved at later	f	inish. Width does
approved at later	r	not exceed 48
	i	nches, will be
		approved at later
		meeting, and

should therefor be approved. It was seconde by Dickon Housman. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upor future submission regarding the location and heights and	
It was seconded by Dickon Housman. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	;
by Dickon Housman. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upo future submission regarding the location and	
by Dickon Housman. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upo future submission regarding the location and	
Housman. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upofuture submission regarding the location and	k
Housman. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upofuture submission regarding the location and	
The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upofuture submission regarding the location and	
unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upofuture submission regarding the location and	
unanimously to approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upofuture submission regarding the location and	
approve. 6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	
6. David Quinn made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	
made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	
made a motion that the landscaping is contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	
that the landscaping is contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	
landscaping is contingent upon future submissions regarding the location and	
contingent upon future submission regarding the location and	
future submission regarding the location and	
future submission regarding the location and	n a
location and	n
location and	
vegetation sho	ıld
therefore be	
approved.	
аррючеа.	
It was seconde	7
	ل
by Dickon	
Housman.	

	The HPC voted
	unanimously to
	approve.
	7. Lillie Armstrong
	made a motion
	that the COA is
	congruent with
	Oxford Design
	Guidelines 15.102
	for the Ash tree
	and 15.207 for the
	2 maple trees and
	should therefore
	be approved.
	It was seconded
	by Dickon
	Housman.
	David Quinn
	disapproved. The
	HPC voted majority
	approved.
	8. Lisa Schons
	made a motion
	that the COA is

	congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 15.203 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Carla Dubois- Pruett. The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
	made a motion that the COA is congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 14.202, 14.203 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by David Quinn.

The HPC volumanimous approve. 10. Fencing discussed of future mee 11. Dickon Housman in motion that COA is continuous approve.	ly to g will be
approve. 10. Fencing discussed of future mee 11. Dickon Housman no motion that COA is continuous approve.	g will be
10. Fencing discussed of future mee 11. Dickon Housman notion that COA is con	
discussed of future mee 11. Dickon Housman n motion tha COA is con	
discussed of future mee 11. Dickon Housman n motion tha COA is con	
future mee 11. Dickon Housman n motion tha COA is con	
11. Dickon Housman n motion tha COA is cor	at a
Housman n motion tha COA is cor	ting.
Housman n motion tha COA is cor	
motion tha COA is cor	
COA is cor	nade a
	t the
	ngruent
with Oxford	d Design
Guidelines	3.202,
5.107, as lo	ng as
chimney is	kept
white and	chimney
cap will be	voted
on at a late	er
meeting ar	nd
should ther	efore
be approve	ed.
It was seco	
by David G	Quinn.

The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
12. Roofing will be discussed when additional details are presented to the HPC board.

^{*} See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

NC = Not Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NA = This project does not impact this factor

^{**} C = Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #4: Dickon Housman

House Italianate

Property Address: 306 Broad Street, Oxford NC 27565

Sworn stakeholders: Dickon Housman

Property type: Contributing Residential

Project type: Shed restoration, painting, replace doors, repair siding, add pavers, etc

Project Description Eactors Considered * ** Outcome				
Project Description	Factors Considered *	77.77	Outcome	
The property owner is requesting COA approval to	Height of proposed Structure		1. David Quinn	
Overall restoration of shed	Setback/placement of		made a motion	
Painting exterior as necessary with matching	structure		that the COA is	
color (minor works)	Exterior Construction	1.C 2.C 3.	congruent with	
3. Replace existing street-facing doors with	Materials	С	Oxford Design	
improved and more historically compatible	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C	Guidelines 9.103	
4. Addition of door to side elevation in a matching		3.C	and should	
style to the present side door	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C	therefore be	
5. Repair siding if needed that will match casing		3.C	approved.	
on door	Roof (shape/form/materials)			
6. Replace failing portion of roof (approx. 200 sq.	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		It was seconded	
ft) and repaint entire roof (5 panels will be	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C	by Lisa Schons.	
replaced and repainted same color)		3.C		
7. Addition of pavers to protect the character of	Appurtenant fixtures		The HPC voted	
the streetscape. ~18-22 sq. ft. 3x6 pad area	Structural Conditions		unanimously to	
with brick that matches current brick in front of	Trees		approve.	
home.				
8. Addition of HVAC unit screened with fencing			2. Was approved	
covered in vegetation, matching existing			as minor works	

9. Addition of wooden deck on the side-elevation	since paint will be
withing the fenced yard (will resubmit at the	replaced with
next meeting)	same color as
	currently on the
	home.
	3. David Quinn
	made a motion
	that the COA is
	congruent with
	Oxford Design
	Guidelines 9.202
	and should
	therefore be
	approved.
	appioved.
	It was seconded
	by Lisa Schons.
	The HPC voted
	unanimously to
	approve.
	4. David Quinn
	made a motion
	that the COA is
	congruent with
	Oxford Design

Guidelines 6.105
and should
therefore be
approved.
It was seconded
by Lisa Schons.
,
The HPC voted
unanimously to
approve.
Spirit St.
5. David Quinn
made a motion
that the COA is
congruent with
Oxford Design
Guidelines 1.100,
1.102 and should
therefore be
approved.
5,55.5.5
It was seconded
by Lisa Schons.
3, 233, 33, 13, 13, 13, 13, 13, 13, 13, 13,
The HPC voted
unanimously to
approve.
5/2/2 / 5 /

	6. David Quinn made a motion that the COA is congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 5.100, 5.103 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by Lisa Schons. The HPC voted unanimously to approve. 7. David Quinn made a motion that the COA is congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 15.103, 15.104 and should

	It was seconded by Lisa Schons.
	The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
	8. David Quinn made a motion that the COA is congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines 8.100, 14.101 and should therefore be approved.
	It was seconded by Lisa Schons.
	The HPC voted unanimously to approve.

^{*} See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

C = Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District
 NC = Not Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District
 NA = This project does not impact this factor

Old Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
(1) Stewardship Award	Derreck stated the stewardship award photo was published in the Oxford Ledger	(1) Stewardship Award –.
(2) Update regarding Walking Tour Pamphlet	Derreck stated the printers have not started printing but should be done soon.	(2) Update regarding Walking Tour Pamphlet – Derreck will give to Angela once done
(3) Update PocketSight.com website	Derreck stated the PocketSite is complete.	(3) Update PocketSight.com Website –
(4) Update regarding Recording Secretary Search	Derreck stated we are still looking for replacement. Lou will continue for the time.	(4) Update regarding Recording Secretary Search – Derreck stated Lou will continue to help

(5) Update regarding City Assistance regarding "Historic Oxford" installation at exit 204 on 1-85.	Derreck and Carla have not heard back from their contacts regarding the sign installation.	(5) Update regarding City Assistance regarding "Historic Oxford" installation – Carla and Derreck will follow up with their contacts
(6) Update regarding filling Tony Armento's seat	Derreck stated that the board appointed James Branch to this seat.	(6) Update regarding filing Tony's vacant seat – Derreck will reach out to James Branch and set up his training.
(7) CLG Re- certification of members	Carla and Lillie agreed to complete the virtual training. Viewing of the videos is due by Sept. 30, 2022, a minimum of 3 sessions each and provide a summary to Kristy Brantley by Nov. 1, 2022	(7) Re-certification – Derreck will send the links to Carla and Lillie.
(8) Old Home Article	Jayne Kirkpatrick will reach out to David regarding the article.	(8)Old Home Article -
(9) Lighting of the Greens	The commission will discuss in the October meeting.	

(10) Photo Contest	Will be discussed at the October meeting.	

Motion to	1 st	2 nd	Outcome
Adjourn	Dickon Housman		The HPC adjourned at 8:22pm.

Date of Next Meeting: Thursday, October 20, 2022

Minutes Prepared by: Lou Ann Mitchell