

**City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
March 16, 1999**

Minutes

Present:

Brent Nelson, Vice-Chair
Jessie Hook
James Oschrin
Kenneth Schwartz
Linda Winner

Also Present:

Tarpley Vest

At 5:05 Mr. Nelson introduced himself and indicated that he would be chairing the meeting because Ms. Fenton was unable to attend. He explained the procedure for the meeting, indicating that for each item staff gives a report and there is an opportunity for questions and comments from the applicant, the board members, and the public.

Mr. Nelson explained that the board could not take formal action until a quorum was formed. He indicated that they could go ahead and discuss the last two items on the agenda, the preservation awards and the approval of the minutes.

Preservation Awards: 1201 East Jefferson Street

Ms. Winner indicated that it would be great to receive some media coverage for this event. She indicated that this is a good opportunity for a positive newspaper feature about historic preservation and the BAR.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this is an excellent opportunity to celebrate a property whose owners have given a lot of love and attention to restoring the house. He indicated that the house is historically and architecturally significant and contains a lot of similarities to the Pavilions on the Lawn. He indicated that the restoration is a wonderful success story that has received a lot of regional and national recognition but probably hasn't received its full recognition locally.

Minutes: February 16, 1999

Mr. Nelson indicated two changes to the minutes of February 16, 1999. He indicated that on Page 4, Paragraph 9 the word "asses" should be changed to "assess".

Mr. Nelson indicated that on page 10, Paragraph 5, the word "rude" should be struck from the record.

At this point, Mr. Oschrin arrived and a quorum was formed.

Ms. Hook moved to approve the minutes with the two amendments.
Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

1018 West Main Street: New Asphalt Single Roof

Staff presented the report.

The applicant, Bob Brugh introduced himself and his son, Rob Brugh. He indicated that the portion of the building to be re-roofed is the portion with the columns on the front, known as the bank building. He indicated that the roof is not very visible from the street. He indicated that the shingle they have chosen is the same shingle used on the baggage building at the depot. He indicated that some of the rafters have bowed and that this shingle is lighter than slate. He indicated that the slate shingles are constantly coming loose and he would like to replace the entire roof. He indicated that if you look at the roof from down the street, you see very little of the roof.

Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Brugh about the issue of the weight of the shingles.

Mr. Brugh indicated that the new slate would be a heavier weight than what is on there now. He indicated that he does not want to add any more weight to the roof.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the roof is original.

Mr. Brugh indicated that he does not know if the roof is original. He indicated that this is not the original Patten House. He indicated that this building was built in the early 1900's.

Ms. Galfione asked if the cost of replacing the roof is the main concern in choosing the shingle. She asked if he had considered other materials such as standing seam metal.

Mr. Brugh indicated that he was trying to match the slate.

Mr. Nelson asked if a roofer had looked at the roof and evaluated it.

Mr. Brugh answered yes.

Mr. Nelson asked if the roofers deal with slate roofs.

Mr. Brugh indicated that the roofers deal with older homes.

Eldon Wood indicated that he was on the BAR at the time that the roof for the railroad station was approved. He indicated that they did go to an asphalt shingle. He indicated that his recollection is that although there was slate on the main building the roof on the baggage building was not slate, and so it really is a new condition and not a replacement for slate. He indicated that asphalt shingles are a step down from slate and he questions whether or not this would meet the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards that have been adopted as part of the city's Design Guidelines.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the Design Guidelines clearly state that the roof may be metal, slate, or asphalt shingle and he doesn't see how the board can deny the roof, based on the guidelines. He indicated that he is curious about the National Register Guidelines. He indicated that he assumes that they are more stringent.

Ms. Vest indicated that the National Register guidelines that are incorporated into the city's Design Guidelines and are found on the last page of Chapter 1 are broad overarching guidelines. She

indicated that they form the basis for the more specific guidelines adopted by the city. She indicated that the portion that the city uses is actually broader than our own guidelines.

Ms. Winner indicated that if the shingle meets the guidelines and the property owner requests it, she doesn't know how they could turn it down.

Ms. Hook indicated that she agrees and that the roof is scarcely visible from the street.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he agrees with Ms. Hook and Ms. Winner that because it meets the guidelines he can't vote against it. He indicated that this is a very stately building with a real presence on West Main Street and it is a significant institutional building on the street. He stated no one would say that changing it from slate to asphalt shingles is an improvement over the existing conditions. He indicated that he will vote in support of this because he thinks that he has to, based on the guidelines, but he will also put in a plea that the owner think about the options that haven't been fully considered yet. He indicated that asphalt shingle is one option; slate is another option which may be the most expensive option given that the structure may need to be reinforced, and, as mentioned earlier, it might be that a metal roof is a better solution to have a more compatible version than the asphalt shingle. He indicated that he will vote in favor of this, but he does think that it is the least desirable of the three, from the standpoint of the character of the structure. He indicated that, in response to Mr. Wood's point, he does not know if the owner is interested in seeking any tax credits or if it is possible given the condition of the property, but if the owner were to satisfy the National Register criteria it could be possible to actually realize some financial subvention to actually make it possible. He indicated that it may be worth looking into.

Ms. Winner asked about the shingles that were approved for the house on N 1st Street.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he understands the expense of replacing a slate roof. He indicated that he wishes that they had a roofer to discuss in more precise language the situation with this particular roof. He indicated that in the case of the house on N 1st Street, the applicant brought her roofer to the meeting and the discussion was extremely informative. He indicated that the roof on 1st Street is a better precedent for this project than is the train station. He indicated that, in relation to Mr. Wood's comments, Mrs. Hamlett's house had slate on it since 1909. The originally proposed asphalt shingles were denied twice. He indicated that in an attempt to try to come to a reasonable compromise, the use of 3-D shingles was suggested. He indicated that the 3-D shingle cost more than the flatter shingle, but also has a longer life. He indicated that the roof turned out beautifully. He indicated that it has a real 3-D texture and quality.

Mr. Brugh asked Ms. Vest if this was the shingle she described to him in the letter.

Ms. Vest answered yes.

Mr. Brugh indicated that he checked with a roofing company and they didn't think that shingle came close to the 3-D shingle in terms of quality and that is the reason that he stayed away from that shingle.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he doesn't know what particular brand of shingle was used on North 1st Street, nor does he intend to recommend any particular brand, but he would like to see the applicant explore a three dimensional shingle.

Ms. Winner moved to accept the proposal as submitted based on her previous comments, with the strong recommendation that alternative materials be submitted.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he would like to comment on the motion. He indicated that West Main Street is a very important area of town for the community and for development. He indicated that the added cost amortized over whatever period he chooses to amortize that cost might not be as much as it would seem at first consideration. He indicated that he would second that motion with the strong encouragement for alternative materials because he thinks that it could be a significant benefit to the structure, the property, and the owner's investment over time.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the board really wants to see what other options are available to the owner. He asked Ms. Winner if she wanted to leave that up to the owner.

Ms. Winner indicated that based on the guidelines, she doesn't see how the board can not approve the shingle.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is comfortable with either a shingle that matches the union station or the N 1st street example and the applicant has heard our encouragement about considering a more optimal solution as well.

Mr. Nelson stated that the guidelines recommend "appropriately textured asphalt shingles." He indicated that this provides some leeway to specify a more appropriate shingle.

The motion passed with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Oschrin, Ms. Winner and Ms. Hook voting in favor and with Mr. Nelson voting against.

Rob Brugh asked if they were free to go ahead and install the asphalt shingle.
Mr. Nelson answered yes.

Mr. Brugh thanked Ms. Vest for her help.

Vending Cart on Downtown Mall: Jane Toth, Applicant

Staff presented the report.

Ms. Toth indicated that she is interested in opening a small vending business on the Mall. She indicated that this will provide an opportunity for people to buy small bouquets on the Mall. She indicated that she will be selling the flowers from about 11:00 AM until dinnertime. She indicated that the cart is mobile and she has made provisions to store it off of the Mall in the evenings. She indicated that she thinks that it will be an attractive addition to the Mall. She indicated that there is already a good florist on the Mall that handles mostly larger orders. She indicated that this would be more for impulse buys. She indicated that it will be a cheerful and colorful thing to have on the Mall.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he is somewhat concerned about the color.

Bill Toth introduced himself and indicated that he built the cart himself. He indicated that he could stain the cart a dark wood color.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the cart can be placed anywhere on the Mall.
Ms. Toth indicated that the cart must be out of the fire lane.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that in order to be more consistent with the design guidelines it may be possible to stain the cart very dark. He indicated that the cart looks very nice.

Ms. Toth indicated that with the stain the wood should be dark.

Ms. Winner indicated that she likes the cart very much. She indicated that the wood is neutral and she doesn't think that it will be an eyesore.

Ms. Hook indicated that she is very much in favor of the cart. She indicated that it looks like a nice proposal. She indicated that in some other applications they have had some other materials mixed in with the black.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the cart as submitted.
Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

300 Preston Avenue: Parking Attendant's Booth/Dumpster Enclosure

Staff presented the report.

Robin Lee, applicant, pointed out the drawing, showing the view from Preston Avenue. He indicated that the design is an attempt to make the booth as invisible as possible.

A member of the public asked what the construction is for.

Mr. Lee indicated that it is a parking attendant's booth and dumpster enclosure.

Ms. Hook indicated that the application has improved a lot and she could feel comfortable approving it as it stands now. She indicated that the proposal is better than the dumpster that we see now.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the green roll roofing shown on the drawing is sheet roofing.

Mr. Lee indicated that the roof will be applied in one piece. He indicated that green will be the least noticeable color underneath the pine tree.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the application is definitely an improvement over what they saw last month. He indicated that the basic idea to make the building as quiet and low key as possible is a good strategy. He indicated that approval would be easier for him if the building didn't have the roll roofing. He indicated that a flat roof element would simplify the exposure. He indicated that an EPDM roof seems like it would be a cleaner line. He indicated that he suggests an EPDM roof with no eave detail. Mr. Schwartz indicated that he supports the goal of making the building as subtle as possible. He indicated that the roof is not as quiet as it could be. He indicated that the board is not

supposed to design the building and that he is making suggestions. He indicated that the goals are good goals.

Mr. Lee indicated that he could lower the pitch and put a rubber roof on it.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that roof should have a simple detail instead of having an exposed fascia board.

Mr. Lee indicated that this could present a drainage problem.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the roof suggestions are a way of advancing the goal of what Mr. Lee has described. He indicated that he is concerned about the green sheet roofing.

Mr. Lee indicated that he is not wedded to the green roof. He indicated that the pitch shown is the pitch needed for that material. He indicated that he has concerns about the coping of the parapet.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the green roll roofing looks like something that might be put in a backyard. He indicated that he has concerns about this shed being placed in the middle of this prominent parking lot. He indicated that the green sheet roofing is not appropriate in the commercial context.

Ms. Winner indicated that she was not present the last time that the application was presented. She indicated that she read over the minutes but that she is at a disadvantage. She indicated that it seems like the applicant has responded to the previous concerns. She indicated that she does not feel strongly opposed.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he was not at the last meeting. He indicated that he does see an improvement in the design. He indicated that he appreciates Mr. Schwartz' comments about the roof. He indicated that the structure has been sited in the least obvious place from the street. He indicated that he is glad the applicant chose that area rather than a more visible area.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application with the following condition:
Further exploration of the roof and coping detail with the provision that this condition could be met through administrative staff review.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he understands the concern about keeping the roof water tight.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the Design Guidelines state that buildings of this type should pick up on details from the surrounding buildings. He indicated that the roof does not relate to the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the goals of improving the dumpster and controlling access to private property are reasonable.

Ms. Hook indicated that it is important that the structure stay inconspicuous.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he does not disagree with the desire to construct something here. He indicated that he is disappointed and this could have been done in a more interesting and creative way. He indicated that making the building as undetailed and boring as possible doesn't mean that people won't notice it.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion.

The motion passed with Ms. Winner, Ms. Hook, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and with Mr. Oschrin voting against.

104 W. High Street: New Window

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Oschrin moved to approve the window as submitted.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he had a comment. He indicated that he had never noticed the property before the wall was rebuilt. He indicated that he has been admiring the house ever since. He indicated that the house has been beautifully cared for.

John Conover, applicant, stated that the only drawback to the house has been the lack of southern windows upstairs.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Exchange Center: New Side Windows

Staff presented the report.

Tim Slagle, applicant, introduced himself. He indicated that the intent of the windows was to allow more natural light into the restaurant and to create more of a viewpoint for pedestrians on 2nd Street. He indicated that they are trying to mirror the new windows on 2nd Street at Durango Bagel. He indicated that he thinks that the design compliments the building and the surrounding area.

Mr. Oschrin asked why there is no new window shown at the last semi-circular window on the elevation.

Mr. Slagle indicated that this is the air intake louver for the kitchen. He stated that this is where mechanical and hvac is being placed. He stated that this space is in front of the kitchen and is not as desirable a location for a window.

Mr. Oschrin asked if they had considered blackening the inside of a window at this site.

Ms. Galfione indicated that it may be more appropriate to match the windows on this building rather than trying to match the windows on the building across the street.

Mr. Slagle indicated that the semi-circular windows are an existing condition and they are trying to work with what is there.

Ms. Galfione indicated that it may be better to make larger windows to have even more light.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the wooden fence on the elevation drawing.

Mr. Slagle indicated that the original trash enclosure is not feasible due to budget constraints. He indicated that the fence is affordable but more attractive than seeing trash cans.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is surprised that the windows were not brought to the board the first time that the project was submitted.

Mr. Slagle indicated that the windows were an inspiration that came to them during construction.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he fully supports the windows. He indicated that he could see the last arch going either way. He indicated that he likes Mr. Oschrin's suggestion of treating it as a raised black panel. He indicated that the fence looks residential and is out of character.

Mr. Slagle indicated that indicated that the fence is more attractive than garbage cans. He indicated that cost was a consideration and that the original enclosure got to be too expensive.

Ms. Winner asked why the fence was being put there?

Mr. Slagle indicated that this is a garbage enclosure.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that this is something that this is something that he would put in his yard. He indicated that this is not appropriate for a civic building. He indicated that he would like to see something more done with it.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that they already have approval for the first approach. He indicated that there is a solution that is available to the applicant.

Mr. Slagle indicated that they cannot afford the first approach. He indicated that he could certainly look at the fence. He indicated that the supplier has other additions that may be available for the fence.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the windows as proposed and to deny the enclosure in the back. The basis for the denial is that the fence is incompatible with a commercial historic district.

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion.

Mr. Nelson stated that the applicant has the benefit and the curse of being on the one street that crosses the Mall. He indicated that the enclosure is in a very visible space.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the guidelines recommend picking up on elements of the existing building.

113 West Market Street: Monsoon Café Decking:
Staff presented the report.

Ed Walker, applicant, introduced himself. He indicated that he is representing the project on behalf of Lou Mei Chang. He indicated that the proposal has changed since the package was sent out. He indicated that they want to keep the goldfish pond. He indicated that they want to substitute the wooden railing with an iron railing. He indicated that the railing is prefabricated. He passed out manufacturer's information about the railing. He indicated that he wanted to replace the wood decking with tile pavers set into sand.

A member of the public asked if there would be a metal fence on two sides of the property.

Mr. Walker indicated that the fence would be on three sides. He indicated that the iron rail eliminates the need for the wood flower boxes. He indicated that he needs a 42" rail in order to meet code.

Mrs. Papas indicated that she does not understand what happens with the fence on the third side of the property.

Mr. Walker indicated that the existing wall on the eastside belongs to the Papas. He indicated that the railing on that side will come down to the ground and will be placed on the Monsoon property before the fence.

Mrs. Papas indicated that there is a drainpipe leading to the street from the two properties.

Mrs. Papas indicated that she is happy that they are using concrete pavers instead of wood slats.

A member of the public asked about the existing wall.

Mr. Walker indicated that it is a poured concrete wall.

A member of the public indicated that he likes the look of the planters. He indicated that when the railing begins to rust, the planters will conceal the rust that will stream down over the wall.

Mr. Oschrin asked how tall the railing will be.

Mr. Walker indicated that it will be 42" to meet code.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the tile will go all the way to the edge of the wall.

Mr. Walker answered that the tile will cover the entire yard, from wall to wall.

Mr. Oschrin asked if the pavers would sit on sand.

Mr. Walker answered yes.

Mr. Oschrin stated that the paver that was presented doesn't seem thick enough.

Ms. Hook asked if the pavers would be installed on a cement base.

Mr. Walker answered no.

Ms. Winner indicated that the neighbor has seen the materials and seems fine with it.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he is concerned with the thickness of the tile.

Ms. Hook asked how deep the goldfish pond is.

Mr. Walker indicated that the pond is 16 inches.

Ms. Hook asked if the pond would be a hazard for children coming in.

Mr. Walker answered that he didn't think that it would be a hazard.

Mr. Schwartz asked how far the guardrail is below the existing wall. He asked about the corner of the rail. He indicated that the corner would be a concern to him from the adjacent property. He asked if the owner had talked with the city about placing the rail on their property. He indicated that he was thrilled to see that they got rid of the wooden fence. He indicated that when he got the first drawings in his packet he was really concerned. He indicated that the new system is much more compatible. He asked if they intended to use the embassy railing.

Mr. Walker indicated that they would probably use the embassy railing.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he supports the "Embassy" railing. He indicated that there is value in keeping it as simple as possible. He indicated that he pleased to see the metal fence they are proposing. He indicated that he is glad that they worked out an arrangement with the adjacent property owner. He indicated that the big question is how the fence will be worked out relative to the property line question.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the project is heading in the right direction. He indicated that this is a very prominent corner in the district. He indicated that he needs to see more drawings. He indicated that he needs to see how high the terrace will be relative to the wall. He indicated that the applicant needs to come back with more drawings.

Ms. Winner indicated that this is a very different proposal. She indicated that they need to specify the information that is missing. She indicated that she likes it but she does not think that they have a full proposal.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that they cannot lose sight of the fact that it is the applicant's responsibility to submit a complete application. He indicated that the incomplete application is not the board's problem. He indicated that their issue is whether they have enough information to know what they want to do.

Ms. Hook indicated that she is sympathetic to the time issue. She indicated that it is hard to give approval when they are so uncertain of what the final analysis would look like on paper.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he echoes the other comments. He indicated that he likes what he has seen. He indicated that the project has made a really good progression. He indicated that he is anxious to see the details and to see how it all ties together. He indicated that the proposed railing is an improvement. He indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz about the particular railing used.

Mr. Oschrin moved to deny the application as submitted.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that at a recent Planning Commissioner's training session he learned that the motion should always include a specific basis for denial. He indicated that in this case the basis for denial is that the submission is incomplete and specifically lacks a clear description of the railing where it interacts with the existing wall. He indicated that the issue of a detailed site plan is not as important to him. He indicated that it is important that the board stick to the regular requirements by making this as complete a submission as possible.

Mr. Oschrin amended his motion to deny the application as submitted with the basis for denial as Mr. Schwartz described.

Ms. Hook seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

100 W Main Street: New Building Construction at Woolworth's site

Ms. Galfione, applicant introduced herself. She indicated that there has been an evolution from the preliminary design to the present. She indicated that all facades have been developed and refined. She indicated that she is offering a palette of colors but would like to experiment a bit with the design. She indicated that the level of the street has found its middle ground. She indicated that it is not the more majestic cut and it is not the smaller cut. She indicated that the board supported both of those solutions. She indicated that she has worked with city staff and the adjacent property owners and developed a solution that is in between the first two options. She indicated that the proposal now has a ramp down to the lower plaza and a series of steps that lead to the central recession. She pointed out a series of planters along the street. Ms. Galfione presented the elevation drawings. She indicated that the corner piece has been updated. She pointed out the materials are listed in the packet and on the elevations. She indicated that she proposed the brick on the Footlocker to be a light gray/green. She indicated that upper level will be a stucco mix.

Mr. Galfione pointed out the W Main Street façade. She indicated that the façade does not have a big loggia but that they have added a little terrace that is more characteristic of the Mall. She indicated that Footlocker may agree more easily to the smaller terrace.

A member of the public asked about the doors on 1st Street.

Ms. Galfione answered that the doors are 1/2 between the street level and the lower plaza.

Ms. Winner asked if they are still discussing the colors, details and materials.

Ms. Galfione answered that she is quite sure that the light scheme is a good match with the painted brick. She indicated that she would like to see some light pink on the north wall because it seems unbalanced.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he is abstaining from discussing the project and from voting because he is currently working with RBGC architects as a consultant on another project in a design control district.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that the proposal is splendid. He indicated that a lot of work has gone into it. He indicated that he likes how she has resolved the street issue. He indicated that he likes the part

over the Footlocker and that the little balcony is great. He indicated that he likes the color scheme and that the yellow gives weight to the corner.

Ms. Winner indicated that the proposal is beautiful and very nicely done. She indicated that it seems to comply with the guidelines. Ms. Winner thanked Ms. Galfione for having so many consultations with the board throughout the design process. She indicated that she has appreciated it very much and that the process had been very positive.

Ms. Hook indicated that she echos the previous comments. She indicated that this is the most creative and exciting thing she had seen happen Downtown.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that it would be great if we could capture the process that has occurred on this project. He stated that the process involved consultations and a real concerted effort on the part of the architect and the owner to balance conflicting desires. He indicated that they have achieved a balanced and repetitive symmetry along 1st Street. He indicated that 1st Street also has variety. He indicated that the balance is very well accomplished. He indicated that he is particularly impressed with the way that this building turns the corner. He indicated that they may want to look at the handicap ramp as it may be a little steep.

Ms. Galfione indicated that she has reached an agreement with Mr. Smiley on the handicap ramp.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that this is very successful and he is very impressed with the project. He stated that he is very grateful for the work of the architect and grateful for the owner's willingness to invest in great design. He indicated that he had pointed out the slope of the ramp as a concern, but if they have that under control, that is great.

Ms. Winner asked if the applicant would be returning for final approval of the materials and colors.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is comfortable making a motion for approval but that he is unclear what the motion should address in the realm of additional information. He indicated that it will be important to see final details of the specific window and door systems. He indicated that these types of details can make a huge difference in new construction.

Mr. Kenneth Schwartz moved to approve the application with the condition that the final window and door systems and the finishes be submitted for approval at the appropriate time.

Ms. Linda Winner seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Oschrin, Ms. Hook, and Ms. Winner voting in favor and with Mr. Nelson abstaining.

The Farm: 1201 East Jefferson Street: Preservation Award

Mr. Oschrin stated that he lives nearby and that he knows the building very well. He indicated that he has admired the building for a number of years.

Mr. Winner indicated that this is a good opportunity to get local publicity and to let people know that the BAR sponsored this award.

Mr. Schwartz moved to award 1201 East Jefferson Street a preservation award. He indicated that it would be great if there was an interview with the property owners and the chair of the BAR. He indicated that it would be great if this occurred before Historic Preservation Week.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Winner asked Ms. Vest if she could include an adjournment time in the minutes.

Mr. Oschrin moved to adjourn the meeting
Ms. Winner seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved.
At 7:30 the meeting was adjourned.