

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
October 17, 2000**

Minutes

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)

Jesse Hook

Preston Coiner

Lynne Ely

Linda Winner

Wade Tremblay

Ken Schwartz

Joe Atkins

W. G. Clark

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

Ms. Fenton called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. She indicated that the first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes, and asked if there were any corrections. No corrections were offered.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Tremblay seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any items to be presented by the public that were not on the formal agenda. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting and turned the floor over to Ms. Vest.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 98-11-52
100 W Main Street

Ms. Vest indicated that this building had been under construction for some time. She stated that the design had been approved, with the condition of final submission of all materials, details, windows and doors, and only the windows, doors and lighting fixtures remained to be considered. Staff had reviewed them all and felt they were appropriate

materials to the historic district, and therefore recommended approval.

Mr. Oliver Kuttner, the applicant, made a brief presentation to the Board. He indicated that if the BAR did not like some of the items, he would be willing to change them, since he was interested in completing construction by Christmas. He stated that in the original jack arch design for the building, there would be a lot of cutting of bricks necessary and a lot of room for error, and so now they would prefer to use a keystone. The keystone would be the color of the brick, and would be quite low key. Concerning the two round window openings in the center section of the building along First Street, he indicated that they would like to fill them with two windows that come out of a church that used to be in Richmond. He stated that the same was true of a window that was not visible on the drawing. The round windows were part of a penthouse, and putting in stained glass would not only be attractive, it would create privacy from the balcony into the kitchen. He then indicated that on the side of the building across from Footlocker, they would like to put in two Gothic-looking, hand-carved limestone door openings from a church in New York City. He stated that one of the main reasons for this would be to provide more headroom, since the doors would be placed between two joists that run the same direction as one would walk in. On the street elevation, he indicated where they would like to rearrange the placement of the ramp and the stairway in relation to the door, which would make the design cleaner and more symmetrical in appearance, and pointed out the addition of a four-foot planter. He stated that they did not have a detail on the railings and light posts yet, but would probably have something to present at the next meeting of the BAR. Using color copies and a color chart, he indicated the color of the blank wall across from Footlocker would be gray-green. The center section of the building, where the two round windows were located, would be terracotta (Georgia Red on the color chart). He indicated that the stucco on the terraces would be the same color as the front of the building. Concerning the railing design on the balconies, he indicated that they would be charcoal-black steel. He stated that part of the back of the building was visible from certain locations on the street, and so might fall under BAR purview. Since it was far from the street, it would

not be worthwhile to stucco it, but they did want it to reflect what the building looked like in the front. He stated that the store fronts on the Water Street section of the building would appear as they did in the drawing, and described the color as powder-coated charcoal, similar to that on the Daily Progress building. He then indicated a section of the building where they would like the store fronts to be wooden.

Mr. Kuttner stated that the last item to present was the light fixtures, but the person who was going to do that presentation had not arrived yet. General discussion followed, and it was agreed either to do the presentation later in the meeting, or at the next meeting of the BAR.

Ms. Fenton called for questions from the members of the Board.

Mr. Atkins asked for clarification on the design of the railing along the edge of the street. Mr. Kuttner indicated that the design was not complete, and would be presented at the next meeting. He stated that the only things on the side of the street that he was seeking approval for that evening were the handicapped ramp, the planters and the walking area.

Mr. Atkins then asked about the jack arches. Mr. Kuttner used the drawing to describe the jack arches, indicating that they were in a fan-like design, with a keystone the same color as the brick.

Ms. Ely indicated that she did not see a detail on the railing design for the balconies on Water Street. Mr. Kuttner stated that there was no detailing beyond what was shown in the drawing.

Ms. Fenton stated that there were several issues of paint color to consider, and suggested that it might be easier to consider the items in pieces for discussion or motions. She asked how everyone felt about the jack arches.

Mr. Atkins indicated he wanted to make several general comments. He commented that he appreciated Mr. Kuttner's interest in using salvaged pieces of architecture. However, he felt that overall, there had not been a comprehensive presentation, and so it

was difficult to keep the total comprehensive design in mind and to evaluate the appropriateness of the individual pieces. He stated that individually, all of the items had merits, but it was hard to see how they worked together.

Mr. Kuttner commented that there was a philosophy behind the way it had been presented, in that they were interested in there being distinct portions of the building, to keep it from looking as big as it is, while at the same time maintaining some continuity of line and color. He stated that one would never see the building as it appeared in the drawing, because the furthest one could be away from it is 31 feet. He indicated that he was perfectly prepared to change elements of the design, if the BAR was uncomfortable with them.

Mr. Atkins commented that for future meetings, he would be appreciate a more comprehensive presentation.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the regular windows were also being considered, and was informed that they had already been approved.

Mr. Tremblay commented that in his view, the building appeared to be more of a piece of art than a conventional building. He stated that he was not present for the initial presentations on this project, but he had been watching the building go up, and he felt that it was working well, and therefore it did not make sense to pick at the details.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions from the general public or the Board. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting and called for general comments from the public. None were raised. She then opened the meeting to comments by the members of the Board.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that among the items, he only had objections to the keystones and the Gothic arches. He stated that he understood that they were details, but he felt that they seemed completely incompatible with the rest of the building and contributed to a sense of the building being so complex as to be out of control. He stated that the ornate, articulated keystones, which are part of a classical language, as well as the Gothic-looking

church door, seemed contrary to what the applicant was doing with the rest of the building. On the other hand, he did not feel the round windows were out of place, and was comfortable with the color choices throughout the building.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she was unfamiliar with the use of keystones, and asked for clarification.

Mr. Clark explained that there were two ways to make a flat arch, one being a jack arch, where the bricks themselves were shaped; and the other being the keystone, which was a wedged-shaped piece in the middle of the arch. He added that the problem with these keystones, in his view, was that they seemed particularly ornate and over-done. He stated that in its current design, the building ran the risk of being a pastiche, and so would recommend quieting down some of the elements.

Ms. Winner commented that the Gothic arch was inserted to deal with a structural problem, and asked if there was another way to deal with that problem. Mr. Kuttner indicated that the door could be any shape, but reminded the Board members that the building was surrounded by bats, and the door led into a basement which is like a dungeon. He stated that the door would be almost underground, and therefore not very visible unless one were actually entering the basement.

Mr. Kuttner then commented that the original design had been for traditional jack arches, rather than the fake, steel-supported ones so often used these days. He stated that he did not like to use things that only imitated an engineering function.

Ms. Fenton asked if Mr. Schwartz's concern about the keystone had to do with the philosophy of using a keystone in this building, or with the ornateness of this particular design. Mr. Schwartz indicated that the ornateness was the issue, and he would be comfortable with a keystone that was more subdued and flush with the wall.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion to approve item number 2; number 3; number 5, with the condition that a detail of the railings and light poles follow at a later meeting; number 6; number 7; number 8; number 9; number 10; number 11, and number 13, as listed in Mr.

Kuttner's letter dated 10-5-2000. He commented that he left out item number 12 because he felt the Board should look at a specific example of that store front, since it would be fairly prominent, but that that was more of a technicality than a statement against the design as presented.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Ms. Winner commented that after hearing Mr. Kuttner's description of the placement and the reasoning behind the Gothic door, she felt it was not inappropriate and would be happy to let him keep that detail.

Ms. Fenton asked for clarification on the visibility of the Gothic arch from the street. Mr. Kuttner illustrated the slope of the street, and said the visibility of the arch depended on where one stood on the street: from eight feet away, it would be fairly visible; from the other side of the street, it would be less so.

Mr. Coiner commented that he did not feel the arch was appropriate. He asked why the applicant wanted to put it in, if it was not going to be visible from the street. Mr. Kuttner replied that it would be visible as one walked into the area, and it would serve as a nice entrance into the area.

Ms. Ely commented that she felt she had to second Mr. Schwartz's concerns, even though they ran contrary to her own predilections for architectural salvage. She stated that in this instance, the Gothic arch seemed out of place, and just because no one could see it did not mean it should not be consistent with the rest of the building.

Ms. Winner made a motion to approve item number four. Mr. Tremblay seconded. A vote was taken, but the motion did not carry, with two Board members voting in favor, and seven against.

Concerning the keystone, Mr. Kuttner asked if the Board would approve the use of a plain, flat design, the same color as the brick.

Mr. Schwartz offered a motion for approval of the simplified keystone, subject to Staff approval. Mr. Tremblay seconded, and the motion carried

unanimously.

Mr. Clark commented that the light fixtures appeared to be of exceptional quality, and asked the applicant where he stood with them. Mr. Kuttner replied that he could not give an accurate presentation at that point.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-10-42
Vending for "Campbell's Kettle Corn" on Downtown Mall

Ms. Vest indicated that as a rule, the BAR needs to approve vending structures on the Downtown Mall. She stated that she looked at the application against the design guidelines, and found that the kettles that the corn is popped in and stored in both comply with the guidelines, but the wooden barrels and containers do not. Staff's suggestion was to paint the containers, and to leave the barrels out.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the applicant from the general public or the Board members. Seeing none, she closed that portion of the meeting and called for comments from the general public. None were forthcoming, so she turned the floor over to the Board for comments.

Mr. Coiner commented that he felt the barrels should be left natural wood. Mr. Atkins voiced his agreement.

Ms. Fenton commented that it would look worse to paint the barrels.

Mr. Coiner asked the applicant what the storage container was made of, and she replied that was pine. He then asked if the plywood stand could be covered, and she indicated that it could.

Mr. Coiner made a motion to approve the application, with natural wood to be used for the barrel, and the stand for the container to be covered with black cloth. Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

Ms. Hook asked if the stand could be painted black instead of covered with cloth, since black cloth would not look good for very long. Mr. Coiner replied that this structure would also go to other locations, and black paint might not be appropriate there.

Ms. Fenton then called for a vote, and the motion carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 99-6-28
800 Block West Main Street/Union Station

Ms. Vest gave a brief presentation. She indicated that the application for the Wild Wing Cafe had come before the BAR several times, and all elements of it had been approved, with the exception of the three rooftop units on the new addition. She stated that the applicant had explored other options, and was now submitting a proposal for a parapet wall to shield the units. At Ms. Vest's request, the applicant was also submitting more information about the appearance of the units.

Mr. Joe Phillips, the applicant, stated that at the last meeting the question had come up whether or not all options had been thoroughly explored, and he was prepared to discuss that at length. He then gave the Board members materials on both the appearance of the rooftop units and the process that they had gone through in exploring various options. He stated that they had specifically looked at the possibility of incorporating split systems, but even with a split system, there would be a significant piece of exterior equipment to place somewhere on the site. He indicated that a ten-ton split system was being installed in the kitchen, with the air handler being hung over the kitchen area, but the placing of the condensing unit had not been worked out yet. He pointed out a trapezoidal piece of property at the west end of the site, and discussed current ideas about the placement of the units. He stated that they were not able to come up with an alternative to a rooftop unit to serve the first floor, but did plan to use a fifteen-ton split system to serve the second floor. They planned to accomplish that by building a mezzanine platform on the north end of the second floor dining above the bar, and connecting that to a condensing unit. He stated that since a screen would be necessary anyway for the rooftop unit for the first floor, they decided to place the condensing unit for it on the roof as well. However, by putting the split system in on the second floor and therefore removing the ducting requirement, they were able to drop the structure so that the ceiling was not a suspended ceiling but a hard ceiling at eight feet,

thus picking up the height shown in section on the drawings for the rooftop units. He stated that this height was gained without having to alter the brick quoin or the parapet that comes around on the original addition. Concerning the screening options, he stated that several had been considered, and the one being presented was the most minimal. The design was chosen specifically because they did not want the addition to be a competing element with the original building. He stated that the only site where the units would be visible is the Main Street bridge, but elsewhere, the line of sight would screen the units.

Mr. Atkins asked if the units would be visible from Main Street with any of the proposed screening options. Mr. Phillips confirmed this, stating that no matter how high the wall, one would still be able to look down on the units.

Mr. Phillips then commented that he understood color was an issue for the units, and although he did not yet have a color selected, he was prepared to repaint them if necessary.

Mr. Clark asked if the applicant had considered screening the units horizontally rather than vertically. Mr. Phillips indicated that they had looked at putting some kind of roofing structure over the units, but too much height would be needed for clear air circulation. Mr. Clark suggested a grill rather than a roof, and Mr. Phillips stated that they had not considered that.

Mr. Atkins asked if the proposed screen was the same height as the wall that was presented before, and the applicant confirmed this. However, with the reconfiguration of the units, the roof structure itself was able to be dropped.

Ms. Fenton asked if the illustration showed the actual view from the bridge, and the applicant confirmed this.

Mr. Clark stated that in his experience, the engineer often informed him at the last minute that the unit would have to be raised up a foot, and asked if that was the case in this instance. Mr. Phillips indicated that the unit would need to be raised up four inches, which was not reflected in the drawing.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the plan was for two units on the rooftop. Mr. Phillips replied that there was one rooftop unit, and one rooftop condensing unit.

Mr. Clark asked about the size of the units, and the applicant indicated that he did not have the exact dimensions, but the condensing unit was smaller than the main unit.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions. Seeing none, she called for comments from the general public. None were raised. She then asked if the Board members had any comments for the applicant.

Mr. Atkins commented that it was a very good idea to lower the roof. He stated that it was a shame that there was not another eight to twelve inches somewhere, but nevertheless, he felt that this proposal was much better than the previous one.

Mr. Tremblay asked if the fascia detail would give more elevation, and the applicant confirmed that it would. He added that the reason they chose not to do that at this time was that the intent for the addition was to have it differentiated from the main building, and bringing the element around would tie the two buildings together too much visually.

Ms. Fenton commented that she felt the fascia detail was the most attractive of the options, and Mr. Tremblay voiced his agreement.

Mr. Clark commented that he disagreed with them, because he felt that the preservation of the existing cornice was important. The addition of the modern cornice would obscure it, and would in fact serve to frame the air conditioning unit. He stated that in all of the options presented, the units would still be visible from the bridge, and therefore he felt it would be better to paint the units flat black, to make them recede, than to build cornices.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he could provisionally paint the units different colors and photograph them, to see which color made them recede the most.

Ms. Fenton asked if the Board members felt there was a better option than what was being proposed.

Mr. Schwartz commented his only big concern was the

visibility of the electrical and venting systems that might come into the unit, and the applicant indicated that the units were self-contained and nothing else would be visible beyond what was shown in the illustrations. Mr. Schwartz commented that this proposal was certainly a big improvement from what the Board saw the previous month, and it was clear that the applicant had worked very hard to try to mitigate the problems, but he was concerned that unforeseen elements might crop up that even the applicant was unaware of, once the system was built.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the solution as presented. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion.

Concerning the color of the units, Mr. Schwartz made a friendly amendment that the applicant bring several possible test samples before the Board for consideration. Mr. Clark accepted the amendment.

A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously approved.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION BAR 00-9-41
400 East Jefferson Street

Ms. Vest reminded the Board members that they had approved the design of the building, excluding the final details of the windows and everything north of the main wall of the building, and with particular concerns raised about the porch. She indicated that the applicant, Mr. Jerry Dixon, was back with a solution.

Mr. Dixon made a brief presentation. Concerning the windows, he indicated that they were proposing to use the same window design as was found across the street in the synagogue, with the exact same colors. He stated that all the elements that were shown as white in the illustrations would be painted the same green as the windows. Using a small scale model, he went over plans for the connection of the curved canopy and other elements of the building. He stated that they were willing to leave the existing porch in place, but it would pose problems being so close to the addition. Concerning the connector, he stated that as far as code goes, it had to be made of metal or another non-combustible material.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any questions for the

applicant.

Ms. Ely commented that the Staff report indicated that the copper that was wrapped around the gable had been changed to brick, and she asked if that was reflected on the model. The applicant replied that it was not shown on the model, but it did appear on the elevations.

Mr. Atkins asked if the applicant was saying that he had looked at the option of saving the porch, but was respectfully requesting the removal of the original, and the applicant stated that that would be his preference.

Mr. Dixon then commented that he had not looked at the option of using glass for the connector, but he had no problem with that.

Mr. Clark commented that the one unit had very nice proportions to it, with a strict and flat appearance, and so the curving motif was at some odds with the structure. He stated that he would favor something flatter, and would support the simpler of the designs presented by the applicant. Mr. Dixon replied that the purpose of the curve was to cover the steps.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any further questions. Seeing none, she called for comments from the general public.

A member of the public commented that the back porch of the building was more historic than the front porch, and was more in keeping with the rest of Court Square. She stated that 4th Street and 5th Street would be the main corridors to the new renovations of Court Square, and so in her view, the windows looked too modern and were out of keeping with the rest of what the City was trying to do with Court Square.

Ms. Fenton called for comments from members of the Board.

Ms. Ely indicated that she shared those concerns. She stated that according to the maps, it appears that the porch was original to the house, so while she was sympathetic with the applicant's desire to connect the two buildings, she did not find it appropriate to tear the porch off of the back of the house. She commented that she did not feel the

windows were compatible with either the oldest house in the area, or with the two townhouses that were across the street, which are the gems of Court Square.

Mr. Tremblay commented that putting the steps up so close to the rear porch was a real compromise. He stated that the porch was a residential element in a commercial setting, and so it was not as meaningful to him in that regard. He added that he liked the curved roof covering the steps, and felt that from a utility standpoint, it worked well.

Ms. Fenton commented that she believed the porch should stay, since it was part of the integrity of the building. She stated she hoped the house would be there a long time, and the porch should be a part of it.

Mr. Clark stated he wasn't present at the last meeting, and asked if some of the Board members were entertaining the idea of a motion that would forbid the removal of the porch. Ms. Fenton confirmed this. He then commented that there was nothing graphic on which to base their decision.

General discussion followed, in which the Board members pointed out the existing porch on the model and discussed the solutions in massing considered by the applicant.

Mr. Clark asked the applicant what was wrong with keeping the porch. Mr. Dixon indicated that his feeling was that it was too close. Mr. Clark asked him to explain the advantage of connection, and he explained that the connection would give coverage to the existing building, which the porch does now, and would also provide cover for the steps. Mr. Clark then commented that he was sorry he had missed the earlier presentation, but he felt the porch made the building even better.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he had been thinking a lot about this issue, and he really appreciated the clarity given by the model. He stated that it was a tradeoff: if the applicant were to keep the porch, he would lose the covering of the steps, and would have to do additional work once he put the steps in, which would not be easy, but it would be possible; on the other hand, if the applicant went with his own

approach, he would be able to simultaneously cover the steps and deal with the challenge posed by the other option. Mr. Schwartz commented that he had visited the site several times, and he personally favored retaining the porch, since it is an integral part of that historic structure, but he acknowledged that this would pose some challenges. He then echoed Mr. Clark's comments that a viable and attractive solution would be to have the historic building exist on its own terms, with the porch attached; to have the new building exist on its own terms; and to have the stairs between them.

Ms. Fenton called for a motion.

Mr. Schwartz made a motion for approval of the windows and the lights. Mr. Atkins seconded the motion.

General discussion followed about the color of the window, and the Board members agreed that they preferred the dark green to the white.

A vote was taken, and the motion carried.

Mr. Clark made a motion that the existing porch be retained. Ms. Ely seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz explained that the BAR was denying the application to demolish the historic porch because they feel the porch is sufficiently important to the historic fabric of the structure that it merits being protected.

A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously. The Board members thanked the applicant for the model, and Ms. Fenton informed him that Ms. Vest would follow up with a letter confirming the decision.

Ms. Fenton called the next item on the agenda. Ms. Vest made a brief presentation, and Ms. Fenton asked if there was a motion to approve the National/State Register nomination of 521 North 1st Street. Mr. Schwartz so moved, Mr. Atkins seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fenton asked if the Board members had any comments they wanted to make on the Corridor Study Recommendations. Ms. Fenton commented that the

original intent had been to discuss this at the next meeting, to make recommendations as to which parts of the recommendations for the historic corridors they would like to see implemented, and so she would suggest taking time to read the materials they had been given before taking this up.

Ms. Hook asked when this would be presented to City Council. Ms. Fenton indicated it had been presented on October 12th, with a period for questions and answers, and then asked what would be happening next.

Ms. Vest stated that she was not sure about the schedule, but she would find out and inform the Board members. She stated that they should prepare to take this matter up at the next BAR meeting.

Mr. Schwartz commented that this was part of the Planning Commission's comprehensive planning process. He stated that if anyone had any thoughts, comments, questions or suggestions, they should direct them to the Planning Commission through Ms. Vest. He indicated that the reason this came about was through a combined interest on the part of the City to look at economic development in conjunction with design strategies in these key 13 or 14 corridors, and also through recognition of the failure of traditional zoning to allow community members to achieve as a City what they would like to see happening. For instance, when the private sector comes together on Preston Avenue, a study such as this is intended to encourage a more positive result than just the reaction of market forces to restrictive zoning. He stated that this should be of interest to the BAR, because a lot of the qualities that this touches on are exactly the kinds of things that the BAR routinely looks at within the design control districts. He then commented that in the Comments and Recommendations section, which was a result of surveys from developers and others throughout the community and beyond, it was important to note that the BAR was perceived as a significant problem in the design review process. Part of the discussion therefore would revolve around looking at and considering the process of design review, where there was authority, to see if there was some better way to handle it.

Ms. Fenton commented that this was a very important issue, and the Board should plan to spend some time

discussing this at the end of the November meeting.

Mr. Atkins commented that the BAR should pay careful attention to how some of the recommendations might affect the guidelines, positively or adversely. He then suggested as a topic for future discussion the question of whether the theming or homogenizing of the Downtown Mall fixtures was appropriate or was going too far.

Ms. Fenton commented that in connection with that, two restaurant people had complained to her about the plastic furniture that other restaurants were using, and had requested that they be required to upgrade to wrought iron. She stated she thought this was interesting, and that it very likely would come up in future discussion on guidelines.

Ms. Fenton then informed the Board members that Preston Avenue was now an entrance corridor, in case any were unaware of that. She stated that the deadline for the January meeting was going to change to 21 days, which would allow Staff a much better chance to review the application. She added that if there was ever a question, or if there was any way she or other Board members could see the applications early, that would help clarify the issues involved in the applications.

Ms. Vest commented that one thing that she had been doing with the Planning Commission, and which she would start doing with the BAR, was posting a preliminary agenda on the web. She stated that this would help Board members be aware of what was coming ahead of time. Also, by December, a wall would be put up which would be where all current plans under review would be mounted. That way, Board members would have access both to the preliminary agenda and to the plans before the applications actually came before them.

Ms. Fenton asked if there was any other business to be addressed.

Mr. Coiner asked about changes being made to the Tower Insurance building. Ms. Vest indicated that the repair being done was ruled an item for administrative approval, which was why it did not come before the BAR.

Ms. Ely asked if there was anything the BAR could do about buildings that were falling apart, or if that was more of a City issue. Ms. Vest replied that there was a provision for maintenance in the historic preservation ordinance, which was part of the zoning ordinance. But the building code was a much stronger law than the zoning ordinance, and was much easier to go after, and so that was normally the route that was taken.

Ms. Ely suggested designating Maplewood Cemetery an individual historic district in and of itself, as is done with individual properties throughout the City, because she felt the condition of the cemetery was a travesty. She stated it would be good for someone to hold the City or some entity accountable for the condition of one of the two oldest cemeteries in Charlottesville.

Ms. Vest commented that the Comprehensive Plan calls for parts of the Martha Jefferson neighborhood to be designated as historic districts, which could include that cemetery. She stated that the BAR has the authority to initiate designations, and so if the Board members were interested, they could formally initiate a study of the cemetery and then make a recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission could then make a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Schwartz suggested formalizing this issue and putting it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Tremblay made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Atkins seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:38 p.m.