Salisbury Historic District Commission
AGENDA

Wednesday, November 18, 2026 at 7:00 pm
Government Office Building Room 301

1. **7:00 P.M. - CALL TO ORDER – Lisa Gingrich, Vice Chair**

2. **ROLL CALL**

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES –** September 23, 2026

   PUBLIC INPUT – Public members are welcome to comment at this time, subject to a time allotment of two (2) minutes per person

4. **CONSENT DOCKET**

5. **OLD BUSINESS**

6. **NEW BUSINESS**
   - #26-26 – 313 Gay Street – Window Replacement

7. **DISCUSSION**
   - Applicaton Updates
   - Rules and Regulations

8. **SPECIAL ELECTION**

   1. **CALL TO ORDER – Lisa Gingrich, Vice Chair**
   2. **ROLL CALL**
   3. **ELECTION OF OFFICER**
   4. **ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING**

*The structure has been deemed a contributing structure by the SHDC
*The structure has been deemed a non-contributing structure by the SHDC

Times shown are approximate. The SHDC reserves the right to adjust the agenda as circumstances warrant.
The SHDC reserves the right to convene in Closed Session as permitted under the Annotated Code of Maryland, General Provisions Article, Section 3-305(b).

Salisbury Historic District Commission
September 23, 2026

The Salisbury Historic District Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, August 26, 2026. The meeting took place at 125 N Division St, Room 301, with attendance as follows:

COMMISSIONERS
Brenden Frederick – Chairman – *Virtual*
Matt Auchey – Vice Chairman – *Present*
Margaret Lawson – Commissioner – *Present*
Lisa Gingrich – Commissioner – *Present*
Brad Phillips – Commissioner – *Absent*
Harvey Evans – Commissioner – *Present*
Luis DaSilva – Commissioner – *Present*

CITY OFFICIALS
Laura Ryan – City Attorney – *Present*
Scarlett Liberto – Associate Planner – *Present*
Kara Beavers – Office Admin - *Present*

1. **7:00 P.M. - CALL TO ORDER –** Mr. Mattew Auchey called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL -** Each member of the Commission introduced themselves for the record. The Acting Chairman explained the meeting procedure to all applicants and administered the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES –** August 26, 2026

   Motion and Vote:
   Motion: **Lisa Gingrich**
   Second: **Harvey Evans**
   Vote: 5-0 in favor.

4. **PUBLIC INPUT** – Public members are welcome to comment at this time, subject to a time allotment of two (2) minutes per person

5. **CONSENT DOCKET - None**

6. **OLD BUSINESS**

Case #25-21 – SBY Market Center – New Construction

Ms. Liberto read the staff report. Joe Buckley, representative of SBY Market Center LLC, introduced himself for the record. Mr. Buckley explained the developer is unable to commence work due to delays in acquiring necessary permits and litigation with the City of Salisbury. Mr. Buckley confirmed nothing about the project's design had changed from what was presented and approved on October 22, 2025. Motion made to approve extension of COA as requested.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Brendan Frederick**
Second: **Margaret Lawson**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

7. NEW BUSINESS

Case #26-20 – 241 W Main St – Trash Enclosure Replacement/Sign

Ms. Liberto read the staff report. A motion was made to determine the building as contributing based on the property being on the Wicomico County Historic Society's list.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: Lisa Gingrich
Second: Luis DaSilva
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

Brett Davis, representative of Davis Strategic Development LLC, approached the Commission. Mr. Davis presented the physical sign for the Commission for review and comments and gave further detail on their proposal. Ms. Gingrich asked which part of the sign's structure would be AZEK. Mr. Davis clarified the slats on the enclosure would be built from wood or wood-like material.

The Commission discussed the sign's design, its commercial nature, and compatibility with the surrounding Main Street streetscape. Ms. Gingrich shared concerns over the new sign containing more information than the previous, and how it appeared to be a permanent commercial sign rather than a temporary addition. Mr. Davis explained the sign was intended to maintain the spirit of the previous sign while providing an updated appearance and advertising available rental space.

Mr. Evans asked if the applicant had received approval for the sign from the City with a Sign Permit. Ms. Liberto clarified that Historic Commission approval was required before a City sign permit could be obtained. The Commission also discussed the sign's location on the trash enclosure, its removability, deeming it as a temporary addition to the commercial property. A motion was made to approve the sign as submitted.

Motion and Vote:
***Motion:* Harvey Evans**
***Second:* Margaret Lawson**
Vote: 4-1 in favor.

Case #26-22 – 100 W Main St – Sign *

Ms. Liberto read the staff report. Ben Phillips, representative of Phillips Signs, approached the Commission and introduced himself for the record. Mr. Phillips presented a sample of the proposed sign, and explained how it would be attached at the top and bottom ledges of the existing stone panels to avoid damaging the original stoneface.

The Commission discussed the proposed sign's color, attachment method, and impact on the existing stone façade. Mr. Phillips confirmed that the original stone mounting hardware remained in place, but the previous sign's hardware was no longer usable. The Commission expressed concern that the proposed white background of the sign would contrast with the stone and recommended a color that better matched the existing stone. Mr. Phillips responded while his client had requested white, he agreed to consider a more appropriate color with his client.

Ms. Gingrich asked Ms. Ryan if approving this case would require the applicant to return to the Commission for approval of the updated sign. Ms. Ryan clarified that the applicant could select a revised background color consistent with the Commission's recommendation without necessarily returning for further approval. There was discussion over if a Commission member should assist the applicant in selecting a new sign background color. Ms. Ryan advised against officially delegating this power to a single member of the Commission, but members could assist on their own time. A motion was made to approve the sign with the recommendation that the background color match the existing stone façade.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Lisa Gingrich**
Second: **Margaret Lawson**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

Case #26-23 – 118 N Division St – Awning *

Mr. Alexander Scott, representative of Brick Row Market, approached the Commission and introduced himself for the record. Ms. Liberto read the Staff Report. Mr. Scott had provided updated design drawings for the Commission to review prior to the start of the meeting, these were distributed among the Commission and added to the record.

Mr. Scott explained the storefront of Brick Row Market had issues with water from people entering and leaving the entrances, which led him to proposed a plan for the addition of an awning. Mr. Scott added he had received a historical grant to fund this project, and he had the awning designed to match the historic nature of the surrounding area and match other awnings present in Downtown Salisbury. Mr. Scott also provided more detail on how the awning would be fastened to the building, with the attachments going into the mortars.

Commission members agreed the proposed awning was common in the Downtown area and would improve the building façade. More discussion was had on the construction of the proposed awning, Mr. Scott explaining it would be light in weight to not add stress to the building. Ms. Gingrich asked if the placement of the awning attachments would require new holes in the brick, Mr. Scott stated new holes would be required in the brick mortar only. Mr. Evans asked if this awning is a functional addition or a cosmetic one and what the material would be used. Mr. Scott responded it was a functional awning which would be constructed primarily with aluminum. A motion was made to approve the case as submitted.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Harvey Evans**
Second: **Luis DaSilva**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

Case #26-24 – 309 Park Ave – Fence *

Ms. Liberto read staff report. The applicant, Brian Hanratty of Superior Fence & Rail, approached the Commission on behalf of the property owners for 307 and 309 Park Avenue.

Ms. Liberto added email correspondence from Michael Vogel, owner of 307 Park Ave., to the record. Ms. Liberto read the email received from Mr. Vogel to the Commission, which provided written consent for the proposed fence to be installed on his property.

The Commission discussed the application and the location of the proposed fence. It was clarified that although the application identified 309 Park Ave. as the property, the proposed fence would be located on 307 Park Ave. The Commission also discussed the shared driveway, the property line identified by a recent survey, and the proposed location and configuration of the fence. Mr. Hanratty demonstrated the proposed fence location using the site plan. Mr. Auchey recommended that a return be added to the fence, and Mr. Hanratty confirmed that the modification could be made at no additional cost.

Mr. Hanratty presented a signed agreement between Mr. Vogel and Mohammed Saleem Malik, owner of 309 Park Ave., authorizing installation of the fence on Mr. Vogel's property as well as other stipulations. The agreement was reviewed by Ms. Ryan and added to the record.

The Commission discussed whether the application could proceed given that the fence would be located on property owned by Mr. Vogel. Ms. Ryan advised that, based on Mr. Vogel's written consent and the signed agreement, the Commission could proceed with the application if they desired.

The Commission discussed property ownership, the location of the fence, and continued access to the shared driveway. Mr. Auchey clarified that the question of property ownership and related private agreements were outside the Commission's purview. It was noted that Mr. Vogel would retain ownership of the fence because it would be located on his property, although the owner of 309 Park Ave. would install and pay for it.

Mr. Hanratty commented the fence should have not been included in the boundary survey, as it contained a 10- foot mutual driveway easement putting access to the driveway into question. Mr. Hanratty clarified 309 Park Ave. was essentially requesting 307 Park Ave. to remove the fence from the easement. Ms. Gingrich further clarified when the boundary survey was performed the owner of 309 park Avenue was requesting 307 Park Avenue to remove the current fence, but to this the previous owner of 307 declined to remove it.

Ms. Ryan for confirmation an application had been submitted for this case, Ms. Liberto responded this was the first application submitted through OpenGov so it would look different. Ms. Ryan commented the OpenGov application was improperly captioned, as it had the primary location as 309 Park Avenue when it should've included 307 Park Avenue. Ms. Ryan recommended staff amend the application in their records to note this case should be added to the histories of 307 Park Avenue and 309 Park Avenue. Ms. Liberto agreed to reflect the involvement of both properties in staff records. Ms. Ryan further clarified based on Mr. Vogel's written consent and the agreement between the property owners, the Commission could proceed with the application without requiring a separate application.

The Commission discussed the possibility of future disputes between the property owners, Ms. Ryan and Mr. Auchey clarified that such matters would be outside the Historic Commission's purview. When asked, Mr. Hanratty stated while a start date has not been established construction would begin as soon as possible. It was determined Mr. Hanratty represented the interests of both property owners. A motion was made to approve the application with the following amendments: the existing fence at 309 Park Avenue would be removed in its entirety, the small white return and gate at 307 Park Avenue would be removed, and a new fence with a return to the house would be installed in the same location and style.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Lisa Gingrich**
Second: **Harvey Evans**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

8. DISCUSSION

Annual Meeting – Election of Officers

Mr. Auchey nominated Mr. Frederick for Chair, Mr. Frederick accepted. A motion was made to elect Mr. Fredrick as Chair.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Luis DaSilva**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

Mr. Auchey nominated Ms. Gingrich for Vice Chair, Ms. Gingrich accepted. A motion was made to elect Ms. Gingrich as Vice Chair.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Harvey Evans**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

Ms. Gingrich nominated Mr. DaSilva for Open Meetings Representative, Mr. DaSilva accepted. A motion was made to elect Mr. DaSilva as Open Meetings Representative.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Lisa Gingrich**
Second: **Matt Auchey**
Vote: 5-0 in favor.

Revisions to Rules & Regulations

Mr. DaSilva asked to discuss the revised Rules & Regulations for approval. Having been unable to review the revisions in full prior to meeting, the Commission agreed to push review of the revisions to next month's meeting.

Historic Commission Recommendation Follow-Up

Mr. Evans asked how the Commission could applicants submit accurate photos and renderings of proposed projects. Mr. Evans cited a previously approved case where submitted plans were approved by the Commission, but the end results of the project did not appear to match what was approved. It was decided for all applications, the best the Commission could do is request applicants follow their reccommendations and coordinate with contractors to provide detailed plans.

Mr. DaSilva cited the current Rules & Regulations section on Applicant Guidance, stating further clarification is needed for situations such as the one discussed. It was decided to discuss this topic further in next month's meeting and add it to the next agenda.

9. ADJOURN ANNUAL MEETING

There being no further business, **Mr. DaSilva** moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by **Mr. Evans**, which was brought to a vote and approved unanimously.

This is a summary of the proceedings of this meeting. Detailed information is in the permanent files of each case as presented and filed in the City of Salisbury Department of Infrastructure and Development.

_____ _____

Brendan Frederick, Chairman Date

_____ _____

Scarlett Liberto, Associate Planner Date

Salisbury Historic District Commission

Hearing Notification

Hearing Date:	November 18, 2026
Time:	7:00 pm
Location:	Government Office Building 125 N. Division Street Salisbury, MD. 21804 Room 301
Case Number:	#26-26
Commission Considering:	Alterations – Window Replacement
Owner's Name:	James Weaver & Elizabeth Scheid
Applicant Name:	David Scheid
Agent/Contractor:	N/A
Subject Property Address:	313 Gay Street Salisbury, MD 21801
Historic District:	Newtown Historic District
Use Category:	Residential
Chairman:	Ms. Lisa Gingrich
HDC Staff contact:	Scarlett Liberto Associate Planner (410) 548-3170

Salisbury Historic District Commission
125 N. Division Street Room 304
Salisbury, MD 21801
(410) 548-3170

Permit Application
$150 Fee Received on **October 18, 2026**

Date Submitted: October 18, 2026
Date Accepted as Complete: October 19, 2026

Case #: #26-26
Action Required By (45 days):

Subject Location:
313 GAY ST, SALISBURY, Maryland, 21801
Application by: David Scheid

Applicant Address: 200 E William St

Applicant Phone: 301-742-6872
Applicant Email: dtscheid@hotmail.com

Additional Locaition(s):

Owner Name: James Weaver and Elizabeth Scheid
Owner Address: 6701 Jerome Ave Springfield VA 22150
Owner Phone: 703-971-0490
Owner Email: Skeetfeats@gmail.com

Work Involves: Alterations

Estimated Cost:

DESCRIPTION OF WORK PROPOSED:
Replace rotted exterior (not under porch) first floor windows with Pella Reserve Luxury Clad Pine to match existing profile painted standard enduraclad white with half screen.

Are there any easements or deed restrictions for the exterior of this property? **No**
Do you intend to apply for Federal or State Rehabilitation Tax Credits? If yes, have you contacted Maryland Historical Trust staff? **No**

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS REQUIRED & SUBMITTED WITH APPLICATION
A. The completed application form.
B. The application fee of $150. Payment received through OpenGov or check on **October 18, 2026**

E. Images of Existing Structure - For an existing structure, color photographs of the structure showing all elevations, the area to be altered, close-ups of architectural detail and the area in the immediate vicinity (the property to the immediate left and right of subject property)

G. All photographs should be submitted in PDF form, each attachment should be labeled with a description of the contents of the photograph.

All required documents must be submitted to the City Planner, Department of Infrastructure and Development at least 30 days prior to the next public meeting. Failure to include all the required attachments and/or failure of the applicant or his/her authorized representative to appear at the scheduled meeting may result in postponement of the application until the next regular scheduled meeting. If an application is denied, the same application cannot be resubmitted for one year from date of such action. Please be advised that members of the Salisbury Historic District Commission or staff, may visit the subject property prior to the scheduled meeting date to familiarize themselves with the project.

The Salisbury Historic District Commission Rules and Regulations and Design Guidelines are available for review in the office of the Department of Infrastructure and Development for the City of Salisbury as well as on the city's website: www.ci.salisbury.md.us.

Applicant, or an authorized representative, will appear at the meeting of the Salisbury Historic District Commission on **November 18, 2026**.
I hereby certify that the owner of the subject premises has been fully informed of the alterations herein proposed and that said owner is in full agreement with this proposal.

Applicant's Signature: David T. Scheid Date: October 18, 2026

– –



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner

30 Parlor



Viewed From Exterior

PK # 2242

Pella Reserve, Traditional Single Hung, 32 X 72, White

Qty 1

1: Non-Standard SizeNon-Standard Size Single Hung, Equal
Frame Size: 32 X 72
General Information: Standard, Luxury, Clad, Pine, 5", 3 11/16"
Exterior Color / Finish: Painted, Standard Enduraclad, White
Interior Color / Finish: Bright White Paint Interior
Sash / Panel: Putty Glaze, Ogee, Standard, No Sash Lugs
Glass: Insulated Dual Low-E Advanced Low-E Insulating Glass Argon Non High Altitude
Hardware Options: Cam-Action Lock, White, No Window Opening Control Device, No Limited Opening Hardware, Order Sash Lift, Shipped In Unit, No Integrated Sensor
Screen: Half Screen, Standard EnduraClad, White, Standard, InView™ , Shipped Separate
Performance Information: U-Factor 0.29, SHGC 0.28, VLT 0.53, CPD PEL-N-232-01141-00001, Performance Class CW, PG 50, Calculated Positive DP Rating 50, Calculated Negative DP Rating 50, FPA FL14341, STC 28, OITC 24, Clear Opening Width 28.625, Clear Opening Height 31.562, Clear Opening Area 6.274044, Egress Meets minimum clear opening and 5.7 sq.ft
Grille: No Grille,
Wrapping Information: No Attachment Method, No Exterior Trim, 4-9/16", 5 7/8", Standard Four Sided Jamb Extension, Factory Applied, Manufacturer Recommended Clearance, Perimeter Length = 208".

Rough Opening: 32 - 3/4" X 72 - 3/4"

RIW2215 - Standard Pocket Install Qty 1

RIW6211 - Additional Unit within same opening over 96 united inches Qty 1

Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner



Scanned with CamScanner

Salisbury Historic District Commission

STAFF FINDINGS

Meeting of November 18, 2026

Case Number:	#26-26
Commission Considering:	Window Replacement
Owner Name:	James Weaver & Elizabeth Scheid
Owners Address:	6701 Jerome Ave Springfield, VA 22150
Applicant Name:	David Scheid
Applicant's Address:	200 E William Street
Agent/Contractor:	NA
Subject Property Address:	313 Gay Street Salisbury, MD 21801
Historic District:	Newtown Historic District
Use Category:	Residential
Zoning Classification:	R-5, Residential
Structure / Site Description:	
Built Date:	1870
Enclosed Area:	1,724 sq. ft. (SDAT Real Property Database)
Lot Size:	4,543 sq. ft. (SDAT Real Property Database)
Number of Stories:	2
Contributing Structure:	NA
Wicomico County Historic Survey on file:	No
Nearby Properties on County Survey:	Yes

Properties included below but not limited to:

- National Register of Historic Places – Perry-Cooper House

- WI-639 – Baptist Church Parsonage
- WI-258 – St. Peter's Church Rectory, Thomas J. Truitt House

Explanation of Request:

The applicant is seeking retroactive approval to replace the rotted exterior first floor windows (not under the front porch) with Pella Reserve Luxury Enduraclad Pine.

Areas of Historic Guidelines to be considered:

UNIVERSAL GUIDELINES

Guideline 1: Preserve Significant Historic Features
Each style of architecture has a distinctive set of details which contribute to the overall character of the building.

a. Avoid the removal of historic architectural features and materials. Historic architectural features include large scale characteristics, such as roof form and fenestration patterns; as well as small- scale features like moldings, brackets, columns, and other examples of skilled craftsmanship. A reasonable effort should be made to retain existing historic building materials, including brick and stone masonry, wood shingles and siding, stucco, etc.
b. Materials and additions which were installed at a later date than the original building construction which may have since gained significance should be retained.

Guideline 3: Restore Significant Historic Features

a. Whenever feasible, historic materials and details should be restored. Restorations of historic buildings should be completed under the direction of architects or professionals with specialized skill in building restoration and preservation.
b. Inappropriate coverings, such as vinyl siding applied over historic wood siding, should be removed and the underlying material repaired or replaced with siding which mimics the appearance of the historic material as closely as possible.
c. Non-historic alterations should be removed to restore the historic appearance. This may include re-opening infilled windows or replacing inappropriate vinyl porch posts with new turned wood posts to recreate the porch's historic appearance. Such changes should be supported by physical evidence, historic photographs or other documentary evidence. Where no evidence of the appearance of the original feature exists, a simple design consistent with the scale and massing of the building and surrounding area is generally preferred.
d. Historic alterations that have achieved significance in their own right should be retained.

Guideline 4: Make Sensitive Replacements

c. If replacement is required, replace as little historic material as possible with matching, compatible replacement materials.
d. Replacement parts should match the original as closely as possible in size, shape, detailing, and material.

Guideline 17: Retain Historic Windows

a. Maintain or restore the historic shape, size, alignment, pattern, and details of existing historic windows, particularly those in upper stories of commercial properties. (For guidelines on storefront windows, see the Storefronts Guidelines in the following section).
b. Do not infill window openings or cover existing historic windows.
c. Consider reopening windows that are presently blocked, if your budget allows.

Guideline 51: Replacement Windows for Residential Properties

a. Where window replacement is necessary, the new window should match the historic window in size, type, glazing pattern, and profile.
b. The number of window panes and the approximate muntin and mullion profile should match the historic window.
c. Removable, snap-in, or "between the glass" muntins are not historically appropriate.
d. Maintain the historic window opening size and surrounding trim.
e. Do not alter the size of the historic window opening to accommodate larger or smaller windows.
f. Do not remove or cover surrounding trim, including wood and masonry details.
g. Maintain the window type. For example, do not replace double-hung windows with new casement windows, or replace casement windows with fixed windows.

STAFF COMMENT

The windows that have been installed are made from enduraclud which is a natural wood interior with a protective metal exterior layer. According to Guideline 51 new windows should match the historic window in size, type, glazing and profile. The new windows have an entirely different casing than the original windows, offering a more modern aesthetic to the structure. The staff recommends denial as the windows do not match the existing wood windows in style, material or profile.

Evaluation Criteria:

Pursuant to Section 17.52.040 A & B of the Salisbury Zoning Code, it is the duty of the Historic District Commission to review and make determinations on all applications to construct, alter, reconstruct, move or demolish a site or structure within a Historic District whenever "*exterior changes are involved which would affect the historic archeological, or architectural significance of a site or structure, any portion of which is visible or intended to be visible from a public way*." In reviewing an application and plans, the Commission should consider review criteria, and may decide as to which of said Criteria are applicable.

Staff Findings Prepared By: Scarlett Liberto
Infrastructure and Development
125 N Division Street, Suite 304
Salisbury, MD 21801
(410) 548-3170
Date: November 2, 2026

Search Tax Maps | **No Ground Rent Redemption on File** | **No Ground Rent Registration on File**

Special Tax Recapture: None

Account Number: **District -** 05 **Account Identifier -** 000432

Owner Information

Owner Name:	WEAVER WILLIAM JAMES SCHEID ELIZABETH A	**Use:**	RESIDENTIAL
		Principal Residence:	NO
Mailing Address:	6701 JEROME ST SPRINGFIELD VA 22150-	**Deed Reference:**	/04267/ 00155

Location & Structure Information

Premises Address:	313 GAY ST SALISBURY 21801-0000	**Legal Description:**	4,543 SQFT 313 GAY ST CITY OF SALIS

Map:	Grid:	Parcel:	Neighborhood:	Subdivision:	Section:	Block:	Lot:	Assessment Year:	Plat No:
0107	0009	0792	5030164.23	0000				2025	Plat Ref:

Town: SALISBURY

Primary Structure Built	Above Grade Living Area	Finished Basement Area	Property Land Area	County Use
1870	1,724 SF		4,543 SF	

Stories	Basement	Type	Exterior	Quality	Full/Half Bath	Garage	Last Notice of Major Improvements	Pending Permit
2	NO	STANDARD UNIT	FRAME/ SIDING	3	2 full			None

Value Information

	Base Value	Value	Phase-in Assessments	
		As of 01/01/2025	As of 07/01/2026	As of 07/01/2027
Land:	15,000	15,000		
Improvements	108,800	132,800		
Total:	123,800	147,800	139,800	147,800
Preferential Land:	0	0		

Transfer Information

Seller: BROADWAY STEPHEN T	**Date:** 12/19/2017	**Price:** $115,000
Type: ARMS LENGTH IMPROVED	**Deed1:** /04267/ 00155	**Deed2:**
Seller: BROADWAY, STEPHEN T &	**Date:** 09/28/2006	**Price:** $0
Type: NON-ARMS LENGTH OTHER	**Deed1:** /02674/ 00124	**Deed2:**
Seller: HEISHMAN, DONNA P	**Date:** 05/22/2003	**Price:** $124,893
Type: ARMS LENGTH IMPROVED	**Deed1:** /02068/ 00430	**Deed2:**

Exemption Information

Partial Exempt Assessments:	Class	07/01/2026	07/01/2027
County:	000	0.00	
State:	000	0.00	
Municipal:	000	0.00|0.00	0.00|0.00

Special Tax Recapture: None

Homestead Application Information

Homestead Application Status: No Application

Homeowners' Tax Credit Application Information

Homeowners' Tax Credit Application Status: No Application **Date:**