

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISISON MEETING
January 14, 2014
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Commissioners Present:

Mr. Dan Rosensweig (Chairperson)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Genevieve Keller
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. John Santoski
Mr. Michael Osteen

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, NDS Director
Ms. Missy Creasy, AICP, Planning Manager
Mr. Brian Haluska, AICP, Neighborhood Planner
Ms. Ebony Walden, AICP, Neighborhood Planner
Mr. Michael Smith, Neighborhood Planner

Also Present

Mr. David Neuman, Ex-officio, UVA Office of the Architect
Ms. Lisa Robertson, Chief Deputy City Attorney

Mr. Rosensweig called the meeting to order.

A. Commissioner's Report

Genevieve Keller discussed the PLACE Task Force meeting, in which new officers were elected and priorities were set for the upcoming year. She also noted the ongoing Executive Director search for the TJPDC.

Natasha Sienitsky noted the upcoming Parks and Recreation Committee meeting

Michael Osteen had nothing to report.

Kurt Keesecker noted the upcoming PACC Tech Committee meeting.

Mr. Santoski noted the Free Bridge meeting occurring at Martha Jefferson Hospital

Ms. Lisa Green mentioned the upcoming MPO Technical Committee and ongoing CDBG meetings.

B. University Report

Mr. Neuman highlighted the 29North Vortex project occurring in the Architecture School. Also, he reiterated the PACC Tech meeting occurring soon and noted that PACC will meet on February 6th.

C. Chair's Report

Dan Rosensweig stated the Housing Advisory Committee (HAC) has been meeting as a full body, as well as in subcommittees, to discuss elements of Sec. 34-12 of the City Code. Also, broader discussions are occurring to update Housing Policy #1.

D. Department of NDS

Ms. Creasy noted the upcoming Planning Commission Work Session which would focus on PUDs. Following Ms. Creasy's report, Mr. Tolbert approached the Commission to update them on the Context Sensitive Design Resolution.

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

Jack Brown, 1505 Dairy Road, spoke in opposition to the Meadowbrook Flats project. Concerns noted: scale of project, height of structure fronting on Barracks Rd, and organization of buildings on the site, and pedestrian amenities.

Kurt Woerpel, 2021 Spotswood Road, spoke in opposition to Meadowbrook Flats. Concerns noted: lack of future plan for the entire site, pedestrian access, potential negative impact to Meadow Creek, and traffic.

Tim Heaphy, 2028 Barracks Road, spoke in opposition to Meadowbrook Flats and believes that the application is in conflict with the Entrance Corridor Guidelines.

Rachel Harmon, 1852 Westview Road, spoke in opposition to Meadowbrook Flats, noting the project was inconsistent with the entrance corridor guidelines, specifically its height, setback, and pedestrian access.

Holly Mason, 1910 Barracks Road, spoke in opposition to Meadowbrook Flats due to its mass and scale, incompatibility to the surrounding neighborhood, and lack of green space.

Nancy Summers, 1201 Blue Ridge Road, spoke in opposition to Meadowbrook Flats, believing the development would compromise the historic character of the neighborhood.

Bill Niebel, 2707 Eton Road, thanked Ms. Ebony Walden for all her assistance in regard to the Eton Road project.

Carol Hendrickson, 2706 Eton Road, spoke in opposition to the Eton Road subdivision, noting 83 residents of the neighborhood signed a petition in 2012 when the applicant was proposing a PUD.

Morgan Butler, 1500 Jamestown Road, spoke in reference to the Eton Road subdivision, specifically the critical slope component of the project. Speaking on behalf of SELC, Mr. Butler noted it was not their understanding that the current critical slopes ordinance did not apply to by-right residential development.

F. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes - October 22, 2013 – Joint CC/PC Discussion
2. Minutes - November 12, 2013 – Pre meeting
3. Minutes - November 12, 2013 – Regular meeting
4. Minutes - November 19, 2013 – Joint Council, Planning Commission, PLACE Work session
5. Minutes - November 26, 2013 – Planning Commission Work session
6. Major Subdivision – Eton Road

Mr. Santoski asked to pull item #6, Eton Road subdivision.

Ms. Green made a motion to approve the consent agenda with minor amendments made to the minutes and removal of item #6 to the regular agenda.

Mr. Keesecker seconded the motion.

G. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program FY 2015-2019:** Consideration of the proposed 5-year Capital Improvement Program totaling \$71,750,289 in the areas of Education, Economic Development, Neighborhood Improvements, Public Safety & Justice, Facilities Management, Transportation & Access, Parks & Recreation, Technology Infrastructure, Stormwater Initiatives and General Government Infrastructure. **Report prepared by Ryan Davidson, Office of Budget and Performance Management.**

Jim Tolbert presented data on CIP projects completed during the last 3 years followed by a presentation of the CIP by Ryan Davidson.

Questions from the Commission for staff

Mr. Rosensweig asked for clarification of the review process.

Speakers

Mr. Rosensweig opened the public hearing.

Rick Zeller, 603 Lexington Ave, spoke on behalf of the Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Association and thanked the Commission for considering traffic improvements in the CIP at Lexington and High Street.

Tom McCrystle, 308 10th St NE, would like to see better coordination of services. He doesn't want to see new streets being dug up.

Mark Kavit, 400 Altamont Street, would like to see better coordination on widening and paving of sidewalks. He would also like to know how much money is being proposed for this project.

Mr. Rosensweig closed the public hearing

Summary of Discussion

Ms. Green wanted to make sure funds are being appropriated for the firing range. She would like to see additional funding for underground utilities to make room for more bike and pedestrian facilities. This could also decrease power outages.

Mr. Santoski feels there are conflicting priorities. He asked if we are being diligent on public transit and emergency services vehicle enhancements.

Mr. Keesecker feels more money should be allocated to Economic Development to link to the SIA.

Ms. Sienitsky would also like to see more money allocated to the SIA. She asked if there was money allocated in the CIP for the firing range.

Ms. Keller cited the relationship between increased heights and public safety and the relationship to overhead wires. She also asked for increased consultation with public safety officials regarding appropriateness and adequacy of emergency apparatus and the current street configurations and development patterns, including the possibility of adding smaller fire-fighting vehicles. She noted that the Planning Commission doesn't have the expertise to come up with budget recommendations for the installation of underground utilities and other projects.

Mr. Rosensweig would like to see more funds go towards the SIA. He would also like to see the SIA report to match the CHF funding schedule.

Motion

Ms. Sienitsky recommended approval of the CIP as presented to City Council with the following recommendations;

1. To provide funding for the SIA for first year implementation as well as provide funding for future years.
2. Have enough funding for one small area plan in an amount of \$150,000 to \$300,000. Augment substantial funding increase to underground utility funding.
3. Funding of CHF (Charlottesville Housing Fund) consistent with the housing advisory table 8 and list the details that were noted previous.
4. Reallocate funds from the firing range project, if possible not to impact that project.
5. To augment substantial funding increase for underground utilities.

Ms. Keller seconded the motion

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller yes
Ms. Sienitsky yes
Mr. Osteen yes
Mr. Keesecker yes
Mr. Santoski yes
Ms. Green yes
Mr. Rosensweig yes

Motion passes

1. **Spot Blight Abatement (Landmark Hotel):** A request for the Planning Commission to make findings and recommendations to City Council concerning the repair or other disposition of the property located at 201 East Water Street, which has been determined to be a blighted property pursuant to City Code Article V, Division 5. The property is identified on the City Real Property Tax Maps as Tax Map 28 Parcel 31, having frontage on West Water Street and containing approximately 0.2760 acres. **Report prepared by Jim Tolbert, NDS Director.**

Mr. Tolbert presented the staff report.

Questions from the Commission for staff

Commissioners asked for clarification of the historic marble wall, its structural integrity and whether a structural report could be required of the property owner. The Commissioners additionally asked about installing security cameras and the details associated with the proposed fencing of the property. Commissioners also asked if Council could compel the property owner to authorize law enforcement right of entry.

The property owner, nor a representative of the owner, was in attendance.

Mr. Rosensweig opened the public hearing

Speakers

Mark Kavit, 400 Altamont Street, spoke in favor of securing the property and was in support of deeming the property blighted.

Michael Williams, 101 3rd St SE, spoke in favor of the City doing what needed to be done in order to ensure safety of the site and adjacent buildings.

Bob Stroh, 1412 Kenwood Lane, representing Charlottesville Parking Center and the Downtown Business Association, encouraged the Commission to determine this property as a blighted property and take the most aggressive approach available to protect the public.

Janet Yance, Gleason Building, spoke on the danger of the building in its current state. She feels this building is very dangerous.

Jill Williams, 101 3rd St SE, was concerned about the debris from the structure and the many entries to the building that allows people to get in that shouldn't be in the building.

Mr. Rosensweig closed the public hearing

Summary of Discussion

All Commissioners agreed that the property was blighted; however, the Commission was split between option #1 and option #2. Ms. Robertson provided clarification to the Commission on their review and the evaluation they could make on the structure's current impact to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The Commission continued to deliberate various scenarios and timelines in which to secure the structure, inspect its structural integrity, and evaluate following the study.

Motion

Ms. Green made a motion to recommend the property at 201 Water Street a blighted property based on the finding that it fits within the definition of a blighted property as outlined in Code Section 5-192.

Ms. Keller seconded.

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller yes
Ms. Sienitsky yes
Mr. Osteen yes
Mr. Keesecker yes

Mr. Santoski yes
Ms. Green yes
Mr. Rosensweig yes

Motion approved 7-0

Ms. Sienitsky made the motion to recommend approval of the remediation plan noted in Option 1. In addition, the full building must be weatherized within 30 days and evaluation of the historic portion of the building occur for structural concerns and appropriate remediation taken in consultation with the BAR.

Mr. Osteen seconded.

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller yes
Ms. Sienitsky yes
Mr. Osteen yes
Mr. Keesecker yes
Mr. Santoski yes
Ms. Green yes
Mr. Rosensweig yes

Motion approved 7-0

Mr. Keesecker made the motion to recommend a longer term remediation plan for the site requiring that the applicant provide a structural report by a Virginia licensed professional for the building with the first report provided within 90 days. Following that submission, every four months an updated report must be provided for the entire building. Upon finding of a structure concern, it would be schedule for a Commission meeting. Information reports will be forwarded to the Planning Commission regularly.

Mr. Santoski seconded.

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller yes
Ms. Sienitsky yes
Mr. Osteen yes
Mr. Keesecker yes
Mr. Santoski yes
Ms. Green yes
Mr. Rosensweig yes

Motion passes

1. **ZM-13-07-11 -Water Street PUD:** An application to rezone the vacant parcel adjacent to Water Street from Downtown Extended (DE) Mixed-Use Corridor with Individually Protected Property Overlay (portion) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) with Individually Protected Property Overlay (portion) with proffers. Proffers include a contribution to the City's Affordable Housing fund and dedication of property to the City. The parcel is bordered by CSX Railroad to the south, 10th Street commercial properties to the west, commercial properties fronting along E. Market Street to the north, and the City Walk project to the east. The property is further identified as Tax Map 57 Parcel 157A having road frontage on Water Street and containing approximately 91, 911 square feet of land or 2.11 acres. The PUD zoning allows an applicant to present a proposal independent of established zoning categories for consideration by the governing body. This proposal consists of 24 single-family dwelling units. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan are for Mixed Use. **Report prepared by Michael Smith, Neighborhood Planner.**

The report was presented by Michael Smith.

Questions from the Commission for staff

Ms. Keller was concerned there was a lack of architectural standards noted in the PUD application and wondered how more clear standards could be expressed in the application. Additionally, Councilors questioned the availability of open space and

visibility of the units. Councilors and Commissioners also questioned the function of the proposed donation of open space within the proffer statement.

Applicant's Presentation

Allen Taylor, Riverbend Associates, gave a presentation on the project. He also explained how the development will be keeping with the Downtown Corridor. They will also be giving \$100,000 to the affordable housing fund.

Questions from the Commission for the applicant

The Commission had concerns with the road and asked if the project could withstand losing one house. They also asked about parking and landscaping. Members of City Council had concerns with the alley and how the trash would be collected. City Council also asked about storm water management being a part of the site plan. The Commission asked about design continuity and how many houses would actually be on the side of the coal tower. City Council asked if there were any type of utility conflicts.

Mr. Rosensweig opened the public hearing

Speakers

Bruce Odell, 878 Locust Ave, thanked the applicant for being available and briefing the community on the development. He listed concerns that they had and hoped that the Planning Commission would take their concerns into consideration.

Judy Zeigler, 200 Douglas, had concerns with the City Walk development and the PUD. She feels with these two developments in the works, the Coal Tower needs some attention.

Mr. Rosensweig closed the public hearing

Summary of Discussion

The Planning Commission feel this is one of the more appropriate PUD's they have seen in a long time. They would like to see the noise ordinance on construction allowances reviewed. They have concerns with houses being near the Coal Tower and not having any on street parking. They feel that having an HOA is very important. It was noted that concrete between the houses is not really environmentally safe and concerns were raised with the open space and would like to see it utilized better.

Motion

Mr. Keesecker moved to recommend the approval of this application, including submitted proffers, to rezone the subject property from Downtown Extended Mixed-Use (DE) with Individually Protected Property Overlay to PUD with Individually Protected Property Overlay, on the basis that the proposal would serve the interests of the general public welfare and good zoning practice."

Ms. Sienitsky seconded the motion

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller	yes
Ms. Sienitsky	yes
Mr. Osteen	yes
Mr. Keesecker	yes
Mr. Santoski	yes
Ms. Green	no
Mr. Rosensweig	yes

Motion passes

1. **SP-13-10-19 (1000 West Main Street):** An application for a special use permit for a mixed use development pursuant to City Code sec. 34-641, to allow for increased residential density of up to 193 units per acre, instead of the 43 units per acre allowed by right; and pursuant to City Code sec. 34-637(b) to allow an additional 31 feet in height, in addition to the 70 feet allowed by right. The subject property has an address of 1000 West Main Street, and consists of approximately 1.2777 acres of land fronting on West Main Street and Roosevelt Brown Boulevard. The subject property is further identified on City

Real Property Tax Map 10 as Parcels 68 and 70. The subject property is zoned WMS (West Main Street South Corridor) with Architectural Design Control Overlay District, and Parking Modified Zone. The Land Use Plan generally calls for Mixed Use. **Report prepared by Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner.**

The report was presented by Brian Haluska.

Questions from the Commission for staff

Commissioners had concerns with the zoning of West Main, when the zoning was determined and if any of the current or past projects had utilized the zoning. They asked if the traffic study would address the left turn lane and what comments had been provided by the West Main consultants.

City Council has issues with the way 10th St is being designed and if pedestrian friendly measures are being taken on Main Street. They asked what type of mix use would go into the development.

Applicant's Presentation

The applicant gave a presentation and answered concerns. They outlined the type of retail expected in the development.

Questions from the Commission for the applicant

Concerns from Commissioners include: had there been a market rate analysis done on student housing in the area and questions about the maximum height and setbacks.

Mr. Rosensweig opened the public hearing

Speaker

Jim Morris, 520 Woodlands Road, was supportive of the project.

Christopher Murray, 1217 Hazel Street, feels the project will be senior friendly and although they are unable to live there now, it is nice to know in the future that they can.

Joe Bonistalli, 455 Valley Circle, feels this is the answer to the complaint from the community of the market to want to rent to UVA students and not having housing for families.

Gordon Walker, 1512 East Market Street, feels this project will allow other property owners to convert units away from students and free up housing for UVA employees and their families

James Treakle, Park Street, feels that this project and the other two will bring more people downtown and will make West Main and Downtown more vibrant.

Dick Gibson, 1431 Grove Road, would like for Commissioners to support the project. He is the Chair of JABA and they have looked into the project and feel it will be great for the area.

Marta Keane, Earlysville, Va, is in support of the project. She feels with the increase in student population and faculty at UVA that this project is greatly needed.

Craig VanderLinde, feels the building will be great and it will not have a great impact on West Main. He likes the fact that students will be concentrated.

Bob Perkins, 514 West Main Street, owns a few properties on West Main and feels there are only overpriced restaurants there. He would love to see more people there to give back to West Main.

Otist Amory for JD Shisler, 901 Rugby Road, Mr. Shisler has lived in Charlottesville his entire life. He remembers when West Main was a thriving place. He now feels there is nothing there and this project will bring more vibrancy to the area.

Donna Deloria for Ivy Land Trust and U Station LLC, noted they are in favor of height, density and economic vitality.

Thomas Harkins, Earlysville, VA, is representing The University of Virginia. He noted some concerns that the University has with the project.

Stewart Kessler, stated that West Main used to be gasoline alley. He feels this project is right for this area. He agrees with the height and density.

Ivo Romenesko is in favor of the project. He would like to see rentals pulled out of residential neighborhoods and he feels this will do it.

Mr. Rosensweig closed the public hearing

Summary of Discussion

The Commissioners would like to see a reduction in the number four bedroom units. They would also like to see a traffic study done and see a more diverse type of housing in this project. They have concerns on how this development would affect the University as well as the height, traffic and street activity.

Motion

Mr. Keesecker moved to recommend approval of this application for a special use permit for additional height and density in the West Main South zone for 1000 West Main Street, with the conditions listed in the staff report with the following amendment of changes:

1. The applicant will complete a traffic study to help identify and eliminate impact on emergency vehicle access to UVA hospital.
2. The applicant will complete a traffic study that will take into account the cumulative account proposed developments adjacent to them during both construction and occupancy.
3. The applicant will complete an airflow study of the site as written in the report
4. The applicant will complete all filings with federal aviation administration to ensure the building and its construction doesn't interfere with the operation of the helipad for the UVA medical center.
5. The applicant will show in the site plan how the loading and unloading to support the commercial space will be accomplished internal to the site.
6. The applicant will confirm with the City of Charlottesville on an annual basis that they have provided civil seminars to their residents.

Mr. Osteen seconded the motion

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller	No
Ms. Sienitsky	No
Mr. Osteen	Yes
Mr. Keesecker	Yes
Mr. Santoski	No
Ms. Green	No
Mr. Rosensweig	Yes

Motion was denied

Ms. Keller feels that she would be able to support this if there was a condition added concerning the number of four bedrooms units were reduced.

Ms. Green moved to recommend approval of this application for a special use permit for additional height and density in the West Main south zone for 1000 West Main Street, with the following conditions:

1. The applicant will complete a traffic study that will take into account the impacts on emergency vehicle access to the University Hospital.
2. The applicant will complete a traffic study that will take into account the cumulative effect of proposed development on the streets immediately adjacent to the site.
3. The applicant and the University of Virginia will collaborate on an airflow study of the site and surrounding properties to ensure that the operation of the existing buildings adjacent to the proposed structure will not suffer because of the

construction of the building. Additionally, the study should ensure that exhaust from the adjacent generators can be accommodated without impacting the residents of the proposed development.

4. The applicant will complete all required filings with the Federal Aviation Administration to ensure that the building and the construction of the building does not interfere with the operation of the heliport at the University Medical Center.
5. The applicant shall in the preliminary site plan demonstrate how the loading and unloading of deliveries to support the commercial space can be accomplished internal to the site.
6. Confirm with the city annually that the residents have received safety and civil living information.
7. The number of four bedroom units will be reduced by 25%. (Reduction from 106 4-bedroom units to 80 4-bedroom units).”

Ms. Keller seconded the motion

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller	Yes
Ms. Sienitsky	Yes
Mr. Osteen	Yes
Mr. Keesecker	Yes
Mr. Santoski	No
Ms. Green	Yes
Mr. Rosensweig	Yes

Motion was approved

1. **CP-13-11-20: (Comprehensive Plan Amendment)** - The Planning Commission and City Council will jointly conduct a public hearing on a proposed amendment to the 2013 Comprehensive Plan to include the contents of the Strategic Investment Area (SIA) Plan (dated November 26, 2013) as supplemental provisions of the plan. The SIA plan provides guidance for the future redevelopment and investment, including improvements to affordable housing, multimodal connections and employment opportunities for an area of the city (the Strategic Investment Area, or “SIA”) inclusive of property bounded by the CSX Buckingham Rail Line, Rialto Street, Ridge Street and Palatine Avenue, extending north to include an area bounded by East High, 8th Street NE and 10th Street in total containing approximately 330 acres. The SIA includes portions of the following neighborhood planning areas: Belmont, Martha Jefferson, Ridge Street, Fifeville and North Downtown. The SIA implements one of the small area plans referenced in the implementation chapter of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan and the guidance referred to in the SIA Plan will supplement, and in some cases will amend and supersede, the existing Comprehensive Plan recommendations for portions of those neighborhoods. The SIA Plan, including a map of the areas affected, may be viewed at <https://www.charlottesville.org/index.aspx?page=3409> City Council has referred the SIA Plan to the Planning Commission, for the Commission’s review as a proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Following the joint public hearing the Planning Commission may recommend to City Council that it should approve the SIA Plan as presented, make recommendations for changes to the SIA Plan and recommend approval of the SIA Plan with the recommended changes, or disapprove the proposed SIA Plan as a Comprehensive Plan amendment. **Report prepared by Jim Tolbert, Director.**

The report was presented by Jim Tolbert

Mr. Rosensweig opened the public hearing

Speakers

Ludwig Kuttner, Keene VA, owner of the IX Property, feels the SIA is a great project and he is looking forward to what is being done.

Mr. Rosensweig closed the public hearing.

Summary of Discussion

They were really impressed with the SIA report and hope they are able to enjoy and benefit from the study.

Motion

Ms. Keller moved to recommend approval of the amendment to the comprehensive plan of the SIA plan of 2013 along with the goals and objectives.

Mr. Santoski seconded the motion

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller	yes
Ms. Sienitsky	yes
Mr. Osteen	yes
Mr. Keesecker	yes
Mr. Santoski	yes
Ms. Green	yes
Mr. Rosensweig	yes

Motion was approved

H. Entrance Corridor Review

a. Meadowbrook Flats

Mr. Rosensweig gaveled out of the Planning Commission meeting and into the meeting of the Entrance Corridor Review Board for this application.

Ms. Creasy provided the staff report

Questions from the Commission for staff

They asked for an explanation to what they are recommending and what part zoning plays in their decision.

Applicant's Presentation

The applicant came forward and answered all questions and concerns that the Commissioners had. He explained that an updated application and comments that were made.

Questions from the Commission for the applicant

They have concerns with how the buildings relate to each other on the site and how they will affect the entrance of the site.

Summary of Discussion

Some Commissioners do not have concerns with the extra traffic on Emmet and Barracks Rd. They feel if traffic can't be put there where else could they put traffic. This area will be the only area that will be able to take the building size if zoning allows it. They feel this project is not suitable for the area and don't see this project moving forward. The guidelines were not addressed appropriately. They feel the entire site should not be developed.

The applicant requested a deferral from the Planning Commission and the Commission has granted the applicant a deferral.

Mr. Rosensweig gaveled out of Entrance Corridor and back into the regular meeting.

Return to the item pulled from Consent

1. Major Subdivision – Eton Road

Ebony Walden provided the report

Questions from the Commission for staff

They had concerns to whether there was a conflict with the subdivision ordinance and the E & S ordinance.

Applicant's Presentation

The applicant wasn't prepared to present a presentation, but he offered to answer any questions that may arise.

Summary of Discussion

Commissioners have a lot of concerns with different issues and some feel they are unable to approve this. They would like confirmation that a critical slope is not being disturbed.

Ms. Robertson explained the way the motion could be worded to protect critical slopes.

Motion

Mr. Santoski made a motion to recommend approval subject to verification that each building site is outside of critical slopes and the final plat comes back to the Planning Commission for final review.

Ms. Green seconded the motion.

Ms. Creasy provided the roll call.

Ms. Keller	No
Ms. Sienitsky	Yes
Mr. Osteen	No
Mr. Keesecker	Yes
Mr. Santoski	Yes
Ms. Green	Yes
Mr. Rosensweig	Yes

Motion was approved

Ms. Green made a motion to adjourn to the second Tuesday in February