

MINUTES

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 8 AUGUST, 2006 -- 6:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Mr. Jon Fink (Vice-Chairman)

Mr. Michael Farruggio

Ms. Cheri Lewis

Mr. Kevin O'Halloran

Mr. David Neuman, Ex-officio, UVa Office of the Architect

Commissioners Not Present:

Ms. Karen Firehock (Chairman)

Mr. Craig Barton

Mr. Bill Lucy

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director NDS

Ms. Missy Creasy

Mr. Brian Haluska

Also Present

Lisa R. Kelley, Deputy City Attorney

I. REGULAR MEETING

In the absence of Ms. Firehock, Mr. Fink called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. He stated there would be no public hearings at this meeting.

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

Mr. Fink called for any matters not on the formal agenda.

Mr. Jason Pearson, of 829 Nalle Street, stated his property adjoined the 850 Estes Street property. He stated the sites should not be in the Cherry Avenue Corridor. He suggested that the Commission deny approval of the preliminary site plan.

Ms. Katerina Krzancic, of 829 Nalle Street, stated she could not understand how the Planning Commission and City Council could approve this proposal. She stated the proposal did not seem to correspond to the zoning for Mixed Use Development.

Ms. Nancy O'Brien, of 501 Ninth Street Southwest, expressed concern that there was a prevailing sense of resignation that the City and County could not do anything. She asked that the Commissioners provide a first line of defense and provide leadership for the City.

B. MINUTES

1. July 11, 2006 -- Regular Meeting

Mr. Fink called for any corrections to the minutes.

Ms. Lewis asked that June be changed to July on page 2. She also asked that the fourth paragraph on page 8 clarify that Mr. Haluska had stated listing all the trees would be an exercise in futility because the site plan contemplated that all the trees would be destroyed. Ms. Lewis also noted that page 8 stated Ms. Creasy called the question; Ms. Lewis stated only members of the Commission could call the question and that Ms. Creasy took the role call vote.

Mr. Fink asked that the third full paragraph of page 6 include that he said this was a terrific plan and if they could not approve density on this site with all the elevated demographics then where is a location in the City more appropriate than this one.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Farrugio seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called for a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

C. LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Mr. Farrugio moved to accept the list of site plans and subdivisions approved administratively. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called for a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

D. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Lewis stated she was not able to attend the TJPDC meeting in July. A meeting of the Route 250 Interchange Steering Committee had been held during the previous week; they had looked at different configurations of the interchange.

Mr. Farrugio stated the Parks and Recreation Committee had met the previous evening to give the feasibility report to City Council. He stated the Neighborhood Federation had not met.

Mr. O'Halloran stated the Board of Zoning Appeals had a brief meeting in July with only one item on its agenda.

Mr. Neuman stated the South Lawn project would be brought before the Commission and City Council on 14 September. He stated they had met with the Neighborhood Association in July; based on feedback received about that meeting, he expected the neighbors to support the project. Additional information about the project could be found on the College of Arts and Sciences website and would be updated as the project moved along.

E. CHAIR'S REPORT

As acting Chair, Mr. Fink gave his report. He had attended the joint meeting of the Planning Commission, Board of Architectural Review and the City Council. Neighborhood issues had been discussed including how neighborhoods were changing within the City. He stated the MPO Tech Committee had met. Mr. Fink extended an invitation to Mr. Harrison Rue to give a presentation on the UnJAM 2025 Plan.

F. SITE PLANS

1. 850 Estes Street -- 27 Condominium Units (Deferred from July 11, 2006 meeting)

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The preliminary site plan application had been deferred from the July meeting. The specific considerations that the Planning Commission wanted addressed related to the tree survey with the existing conditions on the site. The applicant has looked at the site again and sent a surveyor who indicated additional trees that were not originally included in the survey. Staff had received a letter mentioning a mulberry tree; it is not on the site. All of the trees on the site, as required by Code, are included in the survey. The Commission had also expressed concern about the dimensions of a dumpster pad. The dimensions -- 12 by 20 -- are shown on the site plan layout. Another concern was the lighting of the parking under the building. The light locations have been shown on the plan. The fixtures are not required until the final plan. Included in the members' packets were copies of the letter received by staff from Ms. Kruzancic and Mr. Pearson as well as a letter from Staff to the applicant's engineers.

Ms. Lewis stated the criteria for the dumpster was that the dumpster shall have adequate access to a city street with sufficient space for collection trucks to maneuver. She sought assurance from Mr. Haluska that the best position for maneuverability on the entire site had been chosen by the applicant. Mr. Haluska stated the site plan had been submitted to all of the staff reviewers including the Traffic Engineering Department and the Traffic Engineering Consultant. The parking layout is one of the things considered by the Traffic Engineering Department. Mr. Haluska stated he would have to rely on the analysis provided by the traffic engineers. He stated they had not raised that concern.

Mr. Fink stated his discomfort with the proximity of the handicap parking space and the dumpster. He felt the location of the dumpster was awkward with regard to the handicap space. He stated his belief that the dumpster had to be fenced 6 feet past its physical location. Mr. Fink wanted to know if that would interfere with backing out a car. Mr. Haluska stated the fencing does go beyond the dumpster but would not be on the dumpster pad. Mr. Haluska stated the fenced area was 8 by 12 while the entire face of the dumpster pad was 20 by 12.

Ms. Lewis asked Mr. Haluska to again explain why the parking area was not considered a parking garage. Mr. Haluska stated a parking garage was an enclosed space with four walls with an entryway. Mr. Haluska further stated there were numerous examples throughout the city of pull under parking.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know how this development encouraged mixed use development. Mr. Haluska thought this development did not.

Mr. Farrugio sought clarification of how this development created a dynamic street life. Mr. Haluska expressed his opinion that the plan did not.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know how this facilitated an appropriate use of scale with the neighborhood surrounding it. Mr. Haluska stated this project was similar in scale to Walker Square and the Fifth Street Flats. Mr. Haluska further stated that while the three projects were similar in scale, that scale did not fit in with the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Farrugio asked Mr. Haluska to demonstrate an area of the site that was landscaped for pedestrian use. Mr. Haluska stated there was not an active area for use.

Mr. Fink wanted to know how, given the mixed use initiative, they could allow a ceremonial use of 1.9 percent commercial space and 98.1 percent residential space. Mr. Haluska stated his agreement with Mr. Fink. He further stated this was the only mixed use district that did not have a definition of what constituted a mixed use building in terms of gross floor area devoted to a commercial use. Mr. Haluska added that the only standard was that it have a mix of uses.

Ms. Lewis cited page 7 of the staff report: The Director of Neighborhood Development Services could have deemed it appropriate to ask the applicant to get actual traffic figures. She then asked if that had been done. Mr. Haluska stated the Traffic Engineering Department makes the recommendation on that. Mr. Tolbert stated he follows the advice of the Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Fink asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Driver, of Terra Engineering and Land Solutions, stated the site plan was strictly a by right use based on adhering to the Code.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification of how the handicap space accessed the building. Mr. Driver stated there were multiple entrances to the building. Handicap spaces were located to access two doorways; one on the eastern wall and the other in the southern corridor.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know how the development encouraged mixed use development. Mr. Driver stated he would have to defer those questions to the owner of the property. Mr. Farrugio asked if the owner was present. Mr. Driver did not think he was.

Mr. Farrugio then asked how this proposal created a dynamic street life. Mr. Driver stated he would defer that question to the owner as well.

Mr. Farrugio asked if the proposal facilitated an appropriateness of scale with the neighborhood. Mr. Driver stated his response would probably be the same as Mr. Haluska's. Mr. Farrugio asked if the proposal would have an appropriateness of scale to the ten closest buildings. Mr. Driver stated that with some of the current development it was. Mr. Driver added that with respect to the adjoining homes it was certainly larger in scale.

Mr. Farrugio asked Mr. Driver to demonstrate where the project encouraged a landscape for pedestrian use. Mr. Driver stated the owner intended to widen damaged sections of the sidewalk to promote pedestrian access. There was further discussion that the sidewalks would be required by code.

Mr. Farrugio asked if there were any pocket parks or tree lined areas on the street. Mr. Driver stated the site plan was laid out to come up with the efficient and best use of the property based on the zoning. He stated there was a fair amount of green space on the southern side of the property. Mr. Driver added there would be additional green space in the area to the east of the main parking lot.

Mr. Farrugio sought clarification of "the best use of the space within the zoning of that area." Mr. Driver stated he could not speak for the owner, but typically when land is developed, the owner will determine what the current zoning is for the property and then employees develop the property based on the current zoning or request a rezoning. He further stated most developers, when developing a property by right, will use the property to its best and fullest use.

Mr. Fink called for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Farrugio stated he had questions for Ms. Kelley. He sought clarification if a reason to deny would be the proposal not meeting the purpose or intent of 540 or 541. Ms. Kelley stated she would say not because the purposes and intent clauses, while illustrating why a zone was enacted, were supposed to be the opening statement for that zoning district. When the uses that are allowed in that district are set forth, it is presumed that, at least with respect to uses that are allowed by right, you have already determined the zoning district regulations articulated the standards that will apply to a development that meets those requirements. She further stated if that was not the case for this particular district, then perhaps the City had work to do on the regulations that apply to by right developments. Mr. O'Halloran sought clarification of what would happen if a project was denied. Ms. Kelley did not know.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know if a project fit within the general umbrella of the by right development, what was there to focus one down into what the true purpose, intent of the use is going to be. Ms. Kelley stated every zoning district had by right uses and other uses that may be allowed by Special Use Permit. The City has specified by right densities and by right uses and has articulated certain standards. Those regulations are supposed to describe or obtain for the Commission the by right development that is desired within that zoning district.

Mr. Fink stated this was the only zoning district that had no mixed use requirements. Ms. Kelley stated this district was formerly known as a transition zone and had only been established for a few years.

Mr. O'Halloran stated this corridor was put together by some very optimistic people. It was the first attempt at writing a mixed use district. He felt it had been a huge mistake not to review the transition zone as was borne out by the development that has occurred in that zone. Mr. O'Halloran stated this was the worst case scenario for the district. He added he was not in favor of the project and would like to find some way to deny it.

Mr. Farrugio stated that he could understand the portion of the by right development. He stated this did not meet the purpose, intent or the description of what is in 34-540 and 34-541: 34-540 (a) The purpose of this article is to encourage mixed-use development. He stated that when none of the encouragers were done at all, you were failing to meet the purpose of the article. Under 34-540(a)(i) it should have the "creation of a dynamic street life, encouraging the placement of buildings close to property lines, and/or heavily landscaped yard areas, in order to engage pedestrians and de-emphasize parking facilities." He stated this clearly did not create a dynamic street life. Citing 34-450(a)(iii): "facilitation of development that demonstrates an appropriateness of scale," he stated anyone reading this would think of the scale of the immediate area adjacent to the buildings. This proposal was clearly not on the same scale. He cited 34-540(a)(v): "encouragement of landscaped spaces available for pedestrian use (e.g., pocket parks, tree-lined streets and walkways)." There was no tree lining or pocket parks. Mr. Farrugio then cited 34-541(6): "It permits increased development on busier streets without fostering a strip-commercial appearance." Mr. Farrugio stated this was not a busier street but the development did

foster a commercial strip appearance. Mr. Farrugio stated the proposal also did not meet the portion of that section which stated "It is anticipated that development will occur in a pattern consisting of ground-floor commercial uses, with offices and residential uses located on upper floors." Mr. Farrugio stated this project could not possibly meet this section of the Code. He stated he could not vote to move this forward at all.

Ms. Lewis expressed her agreement with her colleagues Mr. O'Halloran and Mr. Farrugio. She cited Section 34-827(d)(2): "The preliminary site plan shall contain the following information: Written schedules or data as necessary to" determine "that the site can accommodate the proposed use, including: proposed uses and maximum acreage occupied by each use; maximum number of dwelling units by type; gross residential density; square footage." Ms. Lewis stated her belief that the site plan met the criteria in that it provides that information but it does not meet the criteria for the proposed mixed use. She stated 1.89 percent did not constitute mixed use. She stated the Commission should have revisited the district in 2003. Ms. Lewis noted that although this could not serve as a reason for denial, she was disappointed that the applicant refused to meet with the neighborhood as they had been encouraged to do on many occasions. Ms. Lewis expressed her embarrassment that the applicant was not present for this meeting. Ms. Lewis stated she could not support this application.

Mr. Fink stated he had many feelings about this application. He stated the applicant went after the maximum possible personal gain with no regard for the neighborhood, and no regard as a working partner with the City. He added that from a Zoning side 1.9 percent commercial use is ceremonial only. If someone sensibly looked at the other zoning requirements for mixed use across the City, one would say a ten or 15 percent ratio would be in keeping with what else is being done in the City. Mr. Fink stated he saw this as an unfortunate power play by an applicant who did not give them the regard to be present for the meeting. He stated he was shocked and dismayed at this application. He stated successful economic development encourages a dynamic and social intercourse; this has none of that. Mr. Fink stated the City was better than this. He stated they owed it to the City to give the best development possible. Mr. Fink stated he would emphatically deny this. He again expressed his shock and dismay that someone thought they could pull a fast one on the Commission.

Mr. O'Halloran moved that they deny. Ms. Lewis wanted to make that denial on the basis of 84-827(d)(2) [sic] of the City Code. Mr. O'Halloran accepted the amendment. Mr. Farrugio offered another amendment that the denial be based on 34-540(a)(i), (iii), and (v) and 34-541(6). Mr. O'Halloran accepted that amendment as well. Mr. Farrugio seconded Ms. Lewis' motion. Ms. Lewis stated she could not accept Mr. Farrugio's friendly amendment in light of Ms. Kelley's opinion that at this juncture the consideration of purpose of intent of the district is not part of the Commission's consideration. Ms. Lewis preferred to say that an element on the site plan did not meet the code under 827(d)(2) although she agreed with Mr. Farrugio's sentiments. Mr. O'Halloran withdrew his original motion.

Mr. O'Halloran moved that they deny this application based on Chapter 34 Section 827(d)(2). Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis stated she completely agreed with the reasons why Mr. Farrugio wanted to make his friendly amendment; she was concerned for larger reasons that they hang their hat on a safer place. Mr. Fink asked Ms. Creasy to call the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fink stated they would recommend to City Council that they deny this going forward.

Ms. Kelley had one further matter for the Commissioners. Ms. Kelley stated they had specified the reason for the denial and now needed to tell the applicant exactly what he needed to put in the site plan to bring it back to obtain their approval.

Ms. Lewis stated he needed to make it mixed use.

Mr. O'Halloran asked if that had to be part of a motion or if that needed to be part of the discussion. Ms. Kelley stated they needed to give some instruction because the letter of denial that will go out from the Secretary following the meeting has to include that specific information.

Mr. Fink sought clarification that the ratio was 15 percent. Mr. O'Halloran stated the one big element was that there had to be some mixed use.

Mr. O'Halloran asked if they could require engaging with the neighborhood as that had been completely missing from this whole process.

Mr. Fink sought clarification from Ms. Kelley if they could only refer to the Code section referenced in the motion or if they could include the other items from 540 and 541 that are extremely pertinent to this.

Ms. Kelley stated that the legal requirement was that once they had stated the Code section that is the basis for the denial, the denial needs to include information as to what needs to be in the site plan if they represent it to the Commission that will allow approval under that Code section used for denial.

Ms. Lewis stated their direction to staff was: a recommended percentage such as 15 percent in other districts, and that the mixed use elements be defined by the purposes of intent in the Chapter on Mixed Use and that this plan conform with the purpose and intent and nature of the descriptions of a Mixed Use Project that are in the Code.

Mr. O'Halloran suggested that it be brought into conformity with the other Mixed Use sections.

Mr. Farrugio stated he would like to see the other sections brought out and written down for the applicant, specifically that were mentioned that they don't meet.

Mr. O'Halloran sought clarification from Ms. Kelley that what had been suggested would be sufficient. Ms. Kelley had no further comment.

Mr. Fink wanted to know if that needed to be drafted as a motion. Mr. O'Halloran stated Ms. Kelley had said this would need to be mentioned in a letter that goes to the applicant.

Ms. Lewis stated that, if any further work needed to be done, any of them would be willing to help out with that, but certainly the Chair was the point person for that. Mr. Fink stated he would be delighted to do that.

Mr. Farrugio asked if it would be proper for Mr. Fink to ask that the letter be brought before him. Mr. Fink stated he would be leaving the country on business on 9 August. Mr. Fink asked that someone volunteer their services for this. Mr. O'Halloran stated he would also be out of the country. Mr. Tolbert stated that the proper way to do this according to Code was to get the minutes from the minutes taker as quickly as possible, so that the Secretary -- Mr. Tolbert -- could draft the letter and send it to Mr. Farrugio and Ms. Lewis to review it before sending it.

G. PRELIMINARY PUD APPLICATION DISCUSSION

1. Paton Street PUD Phase II -- Hanover Street -- 23 Residential units

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The site is 1.358 acres, Tax Map 23 Parcel 92. It is adjacent to the previously approved Paton Street PUD. This is an amendment to that PUD to include this portion in the overall PUD. The applicants propose to keep the existing house on the property and construct six single-family detached units, five single-family cottage-type units, two single-family attached units and one multi-family unit with four dwelling units, and three garage apartments for a total of 23 dwelling units on that block of the PUD. Once finished, the entire site will have 30 percent open space. The overall density of this portion would be 17 and-a-half dwelling units an acre; when considering the entire PUD, there would be 11 units per acre.

Mr. Fink recognized the applicant.

Mr. Overton McGehee, of Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville, stated the design had come about with the help of the Fifeville Neighborhood Association. The Neighborhood Association had expressed a desire for more owner occupied housing in the neighborhood that was affordable to residents from the neighborhood. Mr. McGehee stated 26 trees would be planted along with some small ornamentals. The most impressive trees on the site would be preserved. Mr. McGehee stated there were 47 parking spaces proposed.

Ms. Marcia Joseph, Planning Consultant for Habitat for Humanity, stated they would be using low impact designs.

Mr. Farrugio asked if there would be decks on the homes. Ms. Joseph stated there could be.

Mr. Farrugio applauded Habitat for its mission and its techniques. However, he felt the density was too high. He expressed a desire to see something a little more spread out with a little bit larger houses. Mr. McGehee asked that the Commission consider the desire of the Fifeville neighborhood.

Mr. O'Halloran stated this was a great project and he commended Habitat for Humanity for working so closely with the neighborhood. He expressed a desire to see the open space calculations when the project returns. He stated he did not share Mr. Farrugio's concerns about density for this project.

Ms. Lewis expressed concern about the condominium portion of the project. She stated she had had some concern about the density initially but not as strong a concern as Mr. Farrugio's. Ms. Lewis stated her concern was whether the neighborhood would think it was too dense.

2. Rialto Beach PUD -- Rialto Street -- 19 Residential units

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. This is Tax Map 59 Parcels 375, 375.1, and 379. The proposed PUD is a rezoning from R1-S. The proposal is for three single-family attached units and 13 single-family detached units. There is 39.59 percent open space. There are 19 parking spaces provided. It is adjacent to the Moore's Creek PUD and near the Avon Terraces PUD and the Belmont Cottages PUD.

Mr. Fink expressed concern that the open space may not be met under Section 34-493 (c): "Land within a floodway or floodway fringe may be used to satisfy the open space requirement for a PUD; however, not more than thirty-three (33) percent of such land may be counted towards open space

requirements." He felt that there may need to be a recalculation as he believed that included up to the limits of the hundred year floodplain.

Ms. Lewis expressed a desire to see the actual open space calculation from the applicant.

Mr. Tom Hickman, of Robinson Woods, was present to answer any questions.

Ms. Lewis wanted to know what experience Mr. Hickman had with any other projects in the city with regard to rain gardens and rooftop retention of rainwater. Mr. Hickman stated he had none but he was using a good engineer.

Mr. Fink lauded Mr. Hickman for the work being done with the Police Foundation. He asked Mr. Hickman to consider for future applications that there are other foundations to accommodate other City employees. Mr. Hickman stated, if other projects were done, he would like to find other foundations.

Mr. Fink commended the applicant for stating in the application that developers will work to incorporate new forward thinking storm water quality features which will include, but not be limited to, rain gardens, run off swales, specific landscape conditions, and retention of rooftop rainwater.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know how much of the yards would be of usable space. Mr. Hickman stated the lots were deep and the yards would be bigger in the back.

Ms. Lewis stated the concept plan was a good one but expressed concern that the home design was going a little too far.

Mr. O'Halloran stated this was a good project with appropriate scale.

Mr. Fink stated it was a good preliminary articulation. He stated the open space numbers would be helpful.

H. OTHER PLANNING ITEMS

1. Capital Improvement Program (follow up from July Work Session)

Ms. Creasy stated Staff was working on the information from the July work session. She stated there should be something in writing for the Commissioners for the August work session.

I. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. August 22, 2006 Planning Commission Work Session

2. Thursday September 14, 2006 - 6:30 p.m. -- Planning Commission Regular Meeting -- Note date change

-- UVA South Lawn Project Presentation

-- Special Use Permit for 201 Avon Street

-- Special Use Permit for 322 14th Street NW

-- Carters View Subdivision -- Final

Mr. Tolbert stated the Commission needed to make an appointment to the Eastern Connector Study Committee. Mr. Tolbert reminded the Commissioners that Mr. Fink had volunteered to serve; however, an official appointment was needed. Ms. Lewis so moved. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called a vote by acclamation. The motion passed, 3-0-1; Mr. Fink abstained from voting.

Mr. Tolbert stated City Council had approved a reorganized Housing Advisory Committee. The new members would be the Executive Director of AHIP, the Executive Director of PHA, the Executive Director of Habitat for Humanity and of the Housing Authority. Mr. Tolbert stated Ms. Lewis would still be the Planning Commission representative to the Committee. There would also be representatives for realtors, banking, developers, the Neighborhood Associations, and a City Council member. City Council suggested that three other positions be added to represent FAR, the Free Enterprise Forum and Region Ten.

Mr. Tolbert stated a press release was going out regarding the Neighborhood Leadership Institute.

Mr. Tolbert stated three Commission seats -- currently held by Ms. Firehock, Mr. Fink, and Mr. O'Halloran -- would be vacant at the end of the month. He further stated that Mr. Barton had submitted his resignation, also effective at the end of the month. Mr. Tolbert stated City Council had 14 applicants but was extending the deadline for applications to allow for greater diversity. Ms. Lewis stated her belief that the Planning Commission needed a demographic diversity and that applicants from a wide variety of the City should feel encouraged to apply and become part of this Commission. She expressed concern that the Commission became less diverse all the time.

Mr. Tolbert stated the UVA proposal for a garage and office development on West Main Street was going before the BAR in September and would be coming to the CPC shortly thereafter.

Mr. Tolbert stated an agenda for the work session would be going out in the next week. Mr. Fink, Mr. O'Halloran, and Ms. Lewis all stated they would not be able to attend the work session on 22 August. Mr. Tolbert stated that, given the changes happening to the Commission, it may be better to hold that work session at a later date.

Mr. Fink called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. O'Halloran so moved. Ms. Lewis commented that, since this was the last official meeting for Ms. Firehock, Mr. O'Halloran, and Mr. Barton, she wanted to thank them for continuing to serve at sufferance until their replacements are appointed. She stated they would be at a great loss for the experience and hard work and camaraderie, and fellowship of these three. Mr. O'Halloran reminded Ms. Lewis that they had both been appointed at the same time and their first meeting was to have been 11 September 2001. He stated that meeting had been postponed and that they had seen a lot happen since then.

Mr. Fink stated there was a motion on the floor. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called for a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

James E Tolbert, Secretary