



REPORT OF ACTIVITIES  
FOR  
FISCAL YEARS 2016-2017

HISTORIC MOUNT PLEASANT, INC.

Incorporated in 1985, Historic Mount Pleasant (HMP) aims to bring neighbors together to celebrate and protect features of the Mount Pleasant Historic District that give the neighborhood its special character. Our website ([www.historicmountpleasant.org](http://www.historicmountpleasant.org)) provides basic information about historic district requirements and links to a variety of other resources on historic preservation. We regularly field inquiries from residents about individual properties and work with the Historic Preservation Office in the D.C. Office of Planning and other official entities to resolve issues affecting the historic district. We sponsor occasional social and educational activities in Mount Pleasant. We welcome the participation of neighbors in all our activities. Please contact us if you are interested in joining our Board of Directors or helping to review projects or working on other things with us.

### Advice and Assistance on Exterior Renovations

Our principal ongoing responsibilities relate to exterior renovations in Mount Pleasant – advising and assisting neighbors on permit requirements, reviewing designs with architects, and providing input on cases going before the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB). Given the broad scope of authority delegated by HPRB to the staff of the Historic Preservation Office (HPO), the cases actually going to HPRB for decision are relatively few in number. HPO advises all applicants to share their plans with both HMP and the Advisory Neighborhood Commission for Mount Pleasant (ANC1D), and HPRB invariably asks for our views during the hearing. If we cannot attend the hearing, we provide comments in writing to HPO beforehand. We invite applicants to discuss their plans with us and also invite the views of neighbors.

During Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017 (December 2015-November 2017), HPRB considered eight cases from Mount Pleasant, approving six rear and/or rooftop additions, new construction on a long vacant lot, and a project to make a rear entrance accessible. Whenever rooftop additions are proposed, it is standard HPO/HPRB practice to ask whether they would be visible from the street – as determined by a flag or stick test – and to require that rooftop additions not be visible from the public right-of-way (generally the vantage point of a pedestrian at any place on the sidewalk across the street from the property in question). Three of the projects also involved extensive work to restore facades, with analysis of materials to be used, including proper window types and configurations. In all cases going to the HPRB, an HPO staff member prepares a written recommendation for the Board. The HPO reports and summaries of HPRB decisions are available on the Office of Planning website under the month of the hearing, which is given for each case below. (<https://planning.dc.gov/page/past-hprb-meeting>)

In the case of **1716 Hobart** (December 2015), the owner sought to reconstruct the enclosed rear porch and add a master bedroom suite in a partial story atop a two-story rowhouse. The HPO report noted a number of problems, including failure to demonstrate that the addition would not be invisible from the street. HPO recommended approval in concept with final approval subject to six conditions, including resolution of the visibility problem. HPRB agreed, adjusting the proposed conditions to address neighbors' concerns about the relationship of the new rear elevation to other houses in the row. However, the design was never finalized because the builder soon learned that, because the house occupied 74% of its lot (well over the 60% allowed), a zoning variance would be required. HMP then worked with neighbors to oppose the variance before the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA). It was not hard to demonstrate that the

application failed to meet the well-established variance test – the property was hardly unique within the Mount Pleasant context – and the application was withdrawn before the hearing. The owner has since moved and is renting the house on Hobart. We were glad the project was abandoned and are ready to oppose a similar proposal elsewhere.

As noted in the 2015 Annual Report, HPRB previously denied approval to a concept design for **3118-3120 16<sup>th</sup>** (November 2015). The contract purchaser then hired a different architect and went to the Board three more times (in April, May and June 2016). The repeated reviews reflected the tension between the purchaser’s ambitious plans for a single condominium building and the rules governing additions to historic properties. There were issues with the amount of demolition, the nature and location of side and rooftop additions, window replacements, possible new openings, the location of mechanical equipment and electrical boxes, materials to be used, and how deteriorated architectural elements would be restored. The Board approved consolidation of the two lots, connection of the houses with only the necessary demolition, construction of a two-story side addition to 3118 16<sup>th</sup> with specific design limitations, a third story atop the rear wing of 3120 16<sup>th</sup>, a roof addition not exceeding 8’6” in height, and other conditions, with final design approval delegated to HPO. The extent of visibility from 16<sup>th</sup> Street of any roof additions remained an issue throughout. At the June 2, 2016, meeting the Board supported the idea of a roof addition, “but only if it is invisible or only minimally visible from 16<sup>th</sup> Street.” We are watching the construction process to make sure that stipulation holds.

At the same hearing (June 2016), HPRB considered the request from the long-time owner of **1843 Park** to remove a section of the granite wall along the alley to install an automated gate for a driveway and three parking spaces. The objective was to allow for direct vehicular access to the property, for the owner as well as emergency medical services. While HMP appreciated the desire to accommodate the owner’s changing needs, we asked the family to consider alternatives that would not have removed so much of the granite wall. The same kind of wall stands at eleven other houses along the alley and is indeed the character-defining feature of the alley. We reminded them that, when the prior owners of 1841 Park had proposed removing a small section of their wall, neighbors had persuaded them not to do so. We asked why they could not alter the at-grade garage to provide the desired access. They objected that the garage was needed for other purposes – storage and possibly later conversion to living quarters. However, they did develop a new plan, which, by expanding the existing gate opening near the garage instead of creating a new one, reduced the proposed demolition of the wall from 15’8” to 8’6”.

HMP supported this approach before HPRB as a “reasonable accommodation” for a person with a disability under the Fair Housing Act, not as a change that would otherwise be consistent with the purposes of the preservation law. We did not want to invite others to remove sections of the wall simply to create more parking or for other less than compelling reasons. The HPRB approved the concept design specifying that the gates be solid and that the stone removed from the wall be salvaged and carefully stored so that the wall could be restored later. Unfortunately, in April 2017, the house was badly damaged by fire, and the family is currently living elsewhere.

While the 1800 Park/Monroe neighbors were considering the impact of these changes on the south side of the alley, they were looking with apprehension at the vacant lot to the north. The double house at **1842-1844 Monroe** had burned down in the late 60's, and the owners of 1843 Park then purchased the lot and used it for parking. In May 2015 they sold it to a developer. When we met with the developer in March 2016, we advocated replication of the handsome freestanding duplex with hipped roof and porches similar to 3305-3307 18<sup>th</sup> that had originally stood there. The plans presented in September 2016, however, were for two three-story, two-unit row houses without basements stretching from lot line to lot line. Neighbors and HMP objected, in general that it was too tall, boxy and poorly detailed and did not fit the historic pattern of development along Monroe Street. The neighbors in the detached house to the west objected strenuously to the proposal to build up to their lot line. Had it not been for the 18-foot minimum lot width required by the 1958 zoning regulations, the proposal would have been for three two-unit houses instead of the two proposed.

At the initial HPRB review (October 2016), the objections were discussed and the Board requested revisions. When the project went back in December, the design was essentially unchanged. HPRB approved the project in concept, delegating final approval to HPO, subject to conditions including: that the houses be reduced in height to two stories plus an attic, that they be repeating and not mirror twins, that the electric meters be concealed behind something other than vegetation, that there be further adjustment to the windows, and that the field brick on the two houses not be of different colors. During the permitting process, however, the Zoning Administrator (ZA) determined that a side yard was required west of the new house proposed for 1844 Monroe. The applicant appealed the ZA decision and also applied for a variance to excuse the requirement for a side yard, if the ZA interpretation were upheld. Those cases (Nos. 19613 and 19614) are due to be heard by BZA on February 28, 2018. ANC1D and the Office of Planning have both opposed issuance of the requested variance, but the proper interpretation of the zoning provision in question remains on the table. Neighbors have filed for party status to oppose the requested relief without which significant changes will be required of the project. HMP is prepared to provide testimony to support the neighbors.

In July 2016, the owner of **3109 18<sup>th</sup>** submitted a plan for a full third-story addition to his end-unit rowhouse. Rejecting HPO advice to reduce its visibility from the street but with ANC1D support, he appealed directly to HPRB, which “found the addition to detract from rather than enhance the subject property.” Noting ANC1D’s favorable recommendation, HPRB “disagreed with its contention that adversely altering the character of a single property [was] irrelevant to the question and standard of compatibility with the character of the historic district.” HPRB denied approval and recommended “that the applicant explore options to add behind the attic in a manner that would not be conspicuous from 18<sup>th</sup> Street.” When the project returned in January 2017, neither HPO nor HMP was satisfied that the visibility issue had been resolved. The applicant insisted that he needed the additional space to remain in the house. Following an inconclusive discussion of alternatives, HPRB “approved the general concept for the roof addition and deck, but recommended that the staff and a couple of Board members meet with the applicant to discuss possible refinements to the plan.” This highly irregular and in our experience unprecedented result – failing to delegate final approval to HPO with guidance on changes needed – reflected the inexperience of the new chair. The project is under construction and is plainly visible from 18<sup>th</sup> Street.

In March 2017, HPRB approved the demolition of most of a single-story garage and construction of a two-story “carriage house” in its place at **3304 19<sup>th</sup>**. The HPO report found the garage to be a “noncontributing structure” within the historic district, subject to raze or heavy alteration, and based its support for a two-story structure at this location largely on the steep slope of the terrain. The Board had approved two-story accessory structures at 3308 and 3310 19th in 2006 and 2007. The Board approved the concept design for 3304 19<sup>th</sup> subject to four conditions: reduction of the setback from the alley, use of the same material on all four sides of the building (probably stucco), rectilinear openings, and placement of mechanical equipment, utility meters and skylights so as not to be visible from the alley.

In May 2017, HPRB approved the demolition of a one-story enclosed porch and construction in its place of a two-story addition at **1745 Harvard**. The HPO report analyzed the size of the proposed addition in comparison with others in the row and concluded that the proposed depth of fifteen feet with another foot for a rear bay “should be viewed as about the proper limit of depth.” (The depth was later reduced by two feet to match the footprint of the porch being removed, see BZA Case 19576.) The larger issue which HMP had had with the initial design – and which was corrected before the case went to HPRB – was that the addition had been proposed to extend 7’ above the roof line and would have been visible from 18<sup>th</sup> Street. The projection was in the form of an oversized bay window. As approved in concept by HPRB, the upward projection was only 2’6”’, but has been reduced further so as not to extend above the neighboring chimney.

In October 2017, HPRB approved a two-story rear addition at **1730 Kenyon**, along with extensive repairs including rebuilding the front porch, removing formstone from the façade, replacing the windows and storm door and reconstructing the lead walk and front fence. While the addition requires demolition of the original rear wing, that wing – just 10’ deep – constitutes a relatively small proportion of the historic building. Demolition is thus not inconsistent with the purposes of the preservation act. The addition will measure sixteen by twenty feet, plus a one-story screened porch. While this is larger than other houses in its immediate row, the resulting depth will be comparable to adjoining rows at 1712-1722 and 1742-1752 Kenyon. In approving the project, HPRB noted the amount of difficult restoration work that was required. In addition to removing the formstone and restoring the original brick underneath, the new owner must raise the west side of the house to make it reasonably level.

Exterior renovations to properties in Mount Pleasant close to Rock Creek Park are subject to review by the US Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) under the 1910 Shipstead-Luce Act, in addition to HPO/HPRB. While CFA’s mandate does not include historic preservation, CFA refers all cases involving historic properties to HPO and incorporates their comments in its reviews. Final approval in these cases of concurrent jurisdiction, however, is generally given by CFA without HPRB involvement. In 2017, there were two such cases in Mount Pleasant -- **2059 Park** and **2034 Peirce Mill**. HMP provided comments directly to the architect for 2059 Park and to HPO but was not involved in approval of the front porch replacement at 2034 Peirce Mill. 2059 Park raised a number of interesting questions given changes previously made to the façade. The new owners also proposed replacing the original brick rear wall with another material to change the location of windows – which we vigorously opposed and was not approved. In

general, we have found it difficult to work with CFA and rely upon HPO to represent our interests there.

Smaller projects have continued to arise, some without building permits posted. While repairs involving replacement of original materials in kind generally do not require permits, larger projects – as well as the replacement of windows or exterior doors in historic districts – do, and the permits must be displayed where they are visible from the street. The D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) issues all building permits. The Historic Preservation Office (HPO) in the Office of Planning must clear on all permits in historic districts. Work in public space, such as excavations in front yards that are part of the right of way for our streets, requires a permit from the District Department of Transportation (DDOT). If you are concerned about work proceeding without the proper permits, you may report it to Toni Cherry, chief inspector for HPO ([toni.cherry@dc.gov](mailto:toni.cherry@dc.gov)), the DCRA illegal construction hotline at 442-STOP (7867), or the Mayor’s call center (311). We try to answer all questions from neighbors about possible illegal construction but cannot always do so in a timely manner. The best time to stop such activity is when it is in process.

### Zoning

Much of the development pressure we now face in Mount Pleasant can be traced to the 1958 zoning regulations that permitted the conversion of single family dwellings in R-4 zones to multiple units based on lot size (one unit for each 900 square feet). Such zones were located almost exclusively east of Rock Creek Park, and Mount Pleasant was one of the principal areas affected. During the 1930’s and 1940’s, many houses in our neighborhood functioned as rooming houses and, after 1958, received certificates of occupancy as apartment houses – even though the 1958 regulations stated that R-4 zones were not intended to become apartment house zones. Moreover, while the 1958 regulations established a limit on the number of units for new conversions based on lot size, there was no limit of the number of units carried over from prior rooming houses. There are many houses in Mount Pleasant being used as “apartment houses” – that is, dwellings with 3 or more units – with more units than allowed under the 1958 rules. Under zoning regulations, a legal use at any one time may continue notwithstanding a subsequent change barring that use as long as it is uninterrupted. Such use is deemed “nonconforming,” or one that is “grandfathered.”

Under D.C. law, “no person shall use any structure . . . for any purpose [other than as a one-family dwelling or a certain kind of community-based residential facility] until a certificate of occupancy has been issued to that person stating that the use complies with the [zoning regulations] and the D.C. Construction Code.” This provision was codified as 11 DCMR 3203.1 in the 1958 regulations and is retained in the new regulations that took effect in September 2016. Certificates of Occupancy (C’s of O) should specify the number of units allowed in any house converted to multi-family use; and whenever a property changes hands, the new owner should apply for a certificate of occupancy in his or her name. However, like many regulations affecting housing in the District of Columbia, violations of this requirement are widespread. With developers seeking to maximize the number of units in any property purchased, the question frequently arises as to how many units are being proposed or should be allowed. HMP evaluates this issue with every project presented for design review and goes to DCRA to evaluate

certificates of occupancy on file when necessary. There is no publicly accessible database with this information.

In April 2016, we received plans from HPO for the renovation of **1833 Lamont**. The plans identified both current and intended uses as a single family residence but included “rough-ins” for four kitchens, with the notation “Rough-ins this area for future work kitchen not part of this permit submittal.” We expressed concern about this discrepancy to the architects and to the Director of DCRA, and we asked DCRA not to approve the proposed rough-ins as the property, at 2530 square feet, did not qualify for conversion to more than 2 units. In August, the Zoning Office approved the project as submitted, having concluded that the house had “always” been four units. Our own research, however, showed that, while a C of O for an apartment house had issued in 1967 without specifying the number of units, the property had changed hands in 1987, and the new owners had used the house as three units – and had advertised and sold it as three units in 2015. They never acquired a new C of O in their name. So this case squarely presented a problem we believe to be common in the neighborhood: how to ensure that developers cannot use outdated C’s of O to lock in higher occupancy than allowed under the 1958 regulations when renovating houses as luxury condos.

In September 2016, HMP appealed DCRA’s approval of renovation of 1833 Lamont as 4 units to the BZA (Case No. 19370). Our filing set out the ownership and C of O history of the property, including testimony from neighbors as to prior use, and argued that the new owners did not have the right to reestablish a prior nonconforming use (more than 2 units) after it had been abandoned by the prior owners. The BZA accepted our evidence that the immediate prior use had been as only 3 units but ruled in favor of the Office of Zoning, which argued that, notwithstanding the longstanding absence of a valid C of O, the legal status of the property remained what was on the books at DCRA – as a 4-unit apartment building. In other words, if DCRA is not informed of a change of use, the new use will not be recognized by BZA – even if it decreases the “nonconformity” (i.e., excess number of units) and should be favored by the underlying zoning principle that nonconforming uses be phased out wherever possible.

As a result, the longstanding problem of illegal construction throughout the city and DCRA’s failure to maintain up-to-date records may come back to haunt us when these properties are renovated. A house currently used for one or two units may in fact have a certificate of occupancy on file for a greater number, and that outdated record will be accepted as the legal status of the house. In this case, the immediate neighbor – hearing the verdict and having also reduced the number of units in his house without getting a new C of O – applied to DCRA to have that record corrected. As of this time, that is the only remedy DCRA has offered to constrain future renovations based on outdated C of O that authorize more than the actual number of units in use at a particular address.

In the summer of 2017, BZA received applications for special exceptions to allow construction of rear additions at **1739 and 1745 Harvard** extending more than 10 feet beyond houses to either side (BZA Cases Nos. 19560 and 19576). These were the first cases in Mount Pleasant to test the new limitation on rear additions that took effect in July 2016 as part of Zoning Commission (ZC) Case No. 14-11. The HMP Report of Activities for 2015 (available at our website) provides an overview of the case, which amended provisions of the zoning

regulations for R-4 zones. While billed as needed relief from pop-ups and pop-backs, it continued to allow the conversion of houses to apartment houses of 3 or more units as a matter of “special exception.”

The 10-foot limitation took effect in September 2016, following an appeal by “case participants” (including the HMP President) who argued that it had been omitted from the initial decision by mistake. Like other new conditions required for special exception relief, the 10-foot limit may be waived by the BZA, based on its judgment of the impact of any proposed extension beyond on the light and air available to neighbors, their privacy, and the scale of houses along the street or alley. The waiver language employed has a long history of liberal interpretation by BZA. Zoning experts predicted that BZA would waive the new conditions on a routine basis, which it is now doing.

The application for **1739 Harvard** was filed in June 2016, before the design had been reviewed by HPO or HPRB. The application for **1745 Harvard** followed in July, after HPRB had approved a concept design for an addition beyond the 10’ limit. In both cases, neighbors voiced opposition, and the Office of Planning (OP) recommended approval. HMP did not participate. OP’s analysis found that the small increments over 10’ (4’ in the case of 1739, 3’ in the case of 1745) would not create an “undue effect” on light and air to neighboring properties, citing shadow studies as well as the fact that the second floor of both proposals were set back from the first floor. The absence of windows overlooking the neighbors was a significant factor in finding that neighbors’ privacy would not be “unduly compromised.” The fact that HPRB had just approved the addition at 1745 Harvard as compatible with the historic district essentially removed the need for further consideration of overall design considerations, such as scale. BZA approved special exceptions for both projects. A building permit application was filed for 1745 on November 30, 2017, but none is yet on file for 1739 which still requires full review by HPO.

The cases on Harvard illustrate the futility of attempting to address the serious problems of pop-ups, pop-backs and continued conversions of houses to apartment houses as special exceptions before BZA. Throughout Case No. 14-11, HMP argued that conversions should be subject to review as variances and not special exceptions, but other neighborhoods which have borne the brunt of unsightly pop-ups did not support that position. Two members of the ZC were intent on continuing conversions, as long as their size and visual impact could be reduced. Those two members ultimately swayed a third member to their position (gaining a majority of the five-member body), and BZA adopted the confusing and ineffective amendments in force today. There is simply nothing “special” about special exceptions, as the BZA approves the vast majority of them. DC Council Chairman Mendelson is looking into complaints about this situation and has asked for data on special exception approvals. We hope this will lead to further amendments to the zoning regulations.

On September 8, 2017, the owners of **1665 Harvard** applied for both special exception and variance relief to build a two-story single-family dwelling on the separate alley lot they own behind 1701 Harvard (Case No. 19629). A public walkway separates the alley lot from the lot on which 1665 Harvard stands. In 2008, they had sought permission to build a one-story garage on the alley lot. HPRB approved a design but BZA denied the necessary area variance (Case No 17833). With new zoning regulations in 2016 encouraging “accessory” dwellings, they decided



to try again – this time increasing their bid to a two-story structure with parking on the lower level. The new owners of 1701 Harvard were surprised by this development and naturally opposed it, as did other neighbors. HMP shared records of the 2008 case and its own prior research on the property with the new owners and encouraged them to hire an experienced zoning lawyer, given the lack of precedents under the 2016 amendments. Several neighbors have requested party status to oppose the application; others have filed letters with the BZA, most in opposition. A resolution from ANC1D advises the BZA to deny the zoning relief requested. An experienced zoning attorney is working with the neighbors, and HMP, as well as some neighbors, are helping to cover the legal fees. The case is scheduled to be heard February 21, 2018.

### Advocacy before DC Council

Each spring, the DC Council convenes oversight and budget hearings for individual agencies of the DC Government. HMP generally provides input to and endorses the testimony of the DC Preservation League (DCPL), which reiterates longstanding pleas of the preservation community for more transparency, accountability, and resources to protect our city's historic building stock. In 2016, testimony was presented regarding performance of the Office of Planning, including HPO, as well as DCRA and the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), which adjudicates enforcement cases initiated by HPO and DCRA. The statements highlighted problems such as the lack of personnel (e.g., only two inspectors in HPO), the need to rely on reports from neighbors to initiate inspections of possible violations, the lack of reliable public information on what has been approved, uncertain coordination among agencies, and a complete lack of transparency with regard to cases referred for decision to OAH.

In July 2016, the HMP President testified about our neighborhood's experience with DCRA before a Public Oversight Roundtable. We joined other witnesses (39 in all) in calling for a thorough review of building permit enforcement within DCRA with a view toward closing all gaps in the system. We pointed out, yet again, that DCRA was in violation of D.C. law for failing to maintain its full permit files online and asked that similar public access be provided for occupancy records and zoning rulings. If DCRA does not make this information available to the public, it cannot expect members of the public to report possible illegal activity so that it may initiate enforcement action. The current system is designed to fail – and does so on a regular basis.

In 2017, there was another round of oversight hearings with testimony about enforcement problems at HPO and DCRA. Complicating matters is the fact that HPO does not have its own enforcement authority and must work through DCRA, a thoroughly dysfunctional agency. In response to DCPL's testimony on HPO, DC Council Chairman Mendelson asked for specific recommendations to fix these longstanding problems. DCPL asked again for funding for additional staff at HPO and funding was approved for FY 2018. HPO now has a third enforcement officer as well as much-needed administrative assistant.

Additional Public Oversight Roundtables on DCRA took place in October and November 2017 focused on illegal construction and permitting and vacant and blighted properties. In response to the unrelenting criticism of DCRA, Chairman Mendelson and seven other

Councilmembers have now proposed to reorganize DCRA itself. A bill, introduced January 23, 2018, would create a new Department of Buildings and redesignate DCRA as the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection. While separating these functions into different agencies makes sense, the building permitting and construction functions of DCRA require serious internal reform. We will be reviewing the legislation and expect to join others in testifying before the Council regarding the changes that will be needed to create a well-functioning Department of Buildings.

### Annual Meeting

The HMP by-laws require an annual membership meeting to review prior year activities and vote on the proposed slate of Directors and officers for the coming year. For many years, we held those meetings at Stoddard Baptist Home and sought to attract participation with keynote speakers on topics of interest, such as the history of the 42 Streetcar. Nevertheless, participation has continued to decline. In the last two years, we have tried other things. In lieu of an oral summary of the annual report at the meeting, followed by its posting on our website, we have begun posting the annual report as soon as it is completed. We welcome questions at any time. (We apologize for the long delay in reporting on activities during 2016.) Annual elections are now also being conducted on-line. In March 2016, we invited the public to a presentation at the library on home renovations in Mount Pleasant by three resident architects. The event was well-attended, as was an April 2017 “garden” party for members, that was held indoors due to rain. The conclusion is clear – no more in person “meetings.”

### Promoting Broader Membership and Involvement

The annual Holiday Party, held on the first Friday in December, has long been our main membership drive. We thank Katie and Tim Tyler and Olivia Kibler for hosting in 2016 and 2017, respectively. If you are willing to host the party, have a new site to suggest, or think we should begin a new tradition, please let us know. As of November 30, 2017, HMP had 63 members – 23 individual and 40 family, including 11 life memberships.

In its early years, HMP had active standing committees for membership, communications, education and design review, among other things. As participation in the organization declined, all activities came to be vested in the Board of Directors. However, with the increased demands of design review and the new – and we believe very important – focus on zoning, it is evident that the Board needs more active support from and involvement by its members to move forward. Are there volunteers to serve on the Design Review Committee, which currently consists of two architects and the HMP President? Are there volunteers to help with zoning issues or other events or issues?

Please give us your ideas and be willing to share your time. We urge you to help us reach out to neighbors, particularly new ones, to tell them about Historic Mount Pleasant and elicit their support and participation. HMP can only be as effective as it is representative of its membership at large. You may contact any member of the Board of Directors or send your suggestions to our website at any time -- [www.historicmountpleasant.org](http://www.historicmountpleasant.org).

**Historic Mount Pleasant, Inc.  
Profit and Loss Statement**

**Fiscal Year 2016 (December 1, 2015 – November 30, 2016)**

**Income**

Memberships and undesignated contributions	1900.00
Memberships made through PayPal	430.00
Holiday party bar donations	157.00
Interest earned	9.47
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2496.47</b>

**Expenses**

2015 Holiday Party	1367.92
Copying, office supplies, zoning project	365.04
Website development	450.00
PayPal charges	11.92
Adams Mill Road Project	388.00

**Total** **\$2582.88**

**Net Loss** **(\$86.41)**

**Assets as of 11/30/2016**

DGEFCU Acceso Share Draft	3,348.78
DGEFCU Acceso Regular Shares	19,013.69

**Total** **\$22,362.47**

**Liabilities & Equity**

Total Liabilities	0.00
Equity: Opening Balance as of 12/01/2015	<b>\$22,329.81</b>
Net Gain	\$32.66

**Total** **\$22,362.47**

**Historic Mount Pleasant, Inc.  
Profit and Loss Statement**

**Fiscal Year 2017 (December 1, 2016 – November 30, 2017)**

**Income**

Memberships and undesignated contributions	1,411.72
Memberships made through PayPal	817.39
Holiday party bar donations	120.00
Interest earned	10.25
Contributions -1665 Harvard BZA Proposal Opposition	2,250.00
Bequest (Estate of Elinor A. Budelier)	5,000.00

**Total** **\$ 9,609.36**

**Expenses**

2016 Holiday Party	1,385.82
Copying, office supplies, zoning project	50.75
PayPal charges	22.61
April Garden Party	854.15
Lawyer's fee (partial) - 1665 Harvard BZA Opposition	1,800.00

**Total** **\$ 4,113.33**

**Net Gain** **\$ 5,496.03**

**Assets as of 11/30/2017**

DGEFCU Acceso Share Draft	00.00
DGEFCU Acceso Regular Shares	27,858.50

**Total** **\$ 27,858.50**

**Liabilities & Equity**

Total Liabilities	00.00
Equity: Opening Balance as of 12/01/2016	<b>\$ 22,362.47</b>
Net Gain	5,496.03

**Total** **\$ 27,858.50.**