

Members

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Bret Maddox, S.E., *Vice Chair*
Edward Echtle
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Jonah Jensen
Megan Luce
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell
Duke York

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

Staff

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer
Tonie Cook, Landmarks Coordinator



MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Commission Community and Economic Development Department

Date: June 22, 2011

LPC66/11

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 248

Commission Members in Attendance:

Mark McIntire, *Chair*
Bret Maddox, S.E., *Vice Chair*
Edward Echtle
Ken House
Imad Al Janabi, PhD.
Jonah Jensen
Megan Luce
Marshall McClintock
Ha Pham
Pamela Sundell

Staff Present:

Reuben McKnight
Tonie Cook

Others Present:

Tim Smith, Rick Hjelm, Art Jarvis, Pete Wall, Heidi Stephens, Theresea Hanson, Larry Hanson, Brian Fitzgerald, Renee Rossman, Sam Bell, Jim Dugan, Wes Betts, Landon Beylen

Commission Members Excused:

Commissioner Duke York

Chair Mark McIntire called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Excusal of Absences

Commissioner Duke York was excused.

2. NOMINATIONS – Tacoma Register of Historic Places (preliminary)

Chair Mark McIntire presented the meeting instructions, order of business, and speakers.

Mr. Reuben McKnight cited the general procedural notes, followed by the staff report:

Tacoma Register listing follows procedures defined in TMC 13.07.050, and consists of a minimum of two separate Commission meetings. The initial meeting will determine whether the property meets the threshold criteria in the ordinance for age and integrity. If the Commission finds that the age and integrity standards are met, then the Commission may move to have the nomination scheduled for a public hearing and comment period, at which the public may enter comments into the record for consideration. Following the comment period, the Commission may deliberate on the nomination for up to 45 days before recommending to City Council, listing on the register or denying the nomination. Owner consent is not required for the Commission to recommend designation. The purpose of the meeting was to determine whether or not the property met the threshold criteria and should be scheduled for public testimony at a public hearing.

A. 3901 S 60th and 3902 S 59th Streets – Gray Middle / Barlow Annex

Mr. McKnight read the Staff Report which follows:

The Gray Middle School and Barlow Annex complex is located on the west third of a larger Gray Middle School parcel, which is described in, and shown on Tab A of, the nomination application. In 1910 the Barlow Annex was built as an addition to the former Edison Elementary School, which was built in 1892 and demolished in 1951. Gray Middle School was constructed in 1926 as a separate building. A three story addition constructed in 1962 is known as "The 1st Addition" and connects Gray Middle School to the Barlow Annex.

This nomination was submitted by a private citizen. The Tacoma School District is currently working to obtain permits to redevelop the site occupied by both buildings as playgrounds for the new Edison School, which would result in demolition of the Barlow and Gray buildings. This permitting action is on hold during the Landmarks Preservation Commission's deliberations.

Standards to be considered:

The threshold criteria for Tacoma Register listing are listed at 13.07.040B(1), and include:

1. Property is at least 50 years old at the time of nomination; and
2. The property retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association such that it is able to convey its historical, cultural, or architectural significance

Analysis to be considered:

The nomination identifies Nomination Criteria A, B, C and F as applicable to the two schools. The nomination states that each of the three structures represent a unique period of architectural history: the Barlow Addition is a two-story brick masonry rectangular block on a raised base in vernacular Romanesque Revival Style; the Gray building is identified by the Tacoma Historic Schools Inventory "...as a strong example of the Collegiate Gothic style". The 1st Addition building is a 1962 glass and concrete International Style School structure. The buildings are associated with distinct Tacoma architects, including Frederick Heath and E. J. Bresemann.

As the oldest school buildings in South Tacoma, the nomination also states that they are associated with the history of education and school building development in Tacoma and the broad patterns of Tacoma history including the Northern Pacific Railroad's shop headquarters, and as unique familiar structures in the neighborhood; in addition, their association with significant individuals: Captain Robert Gray, American merchant sea-captain, and Orin Watts Barlow, school board member and president.

The purpose of the preliminary meeting is to determine that the age and integrity standards are met. The buildings were constructed between 1910 and 1962; the alterations are few, mostly to accommodate the additions and, each structure appears to meet the threshold criteria for consideration.

Staff deferred recommendation.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission may find that the property meets the threshold criteria and should be scheduled for a public hearing within 90 days, that it does not meet the threshold criteria and should not be scheduled for a public hearing, or may defer the decision.

Action must be taken within 45 days, or the application is considered rejected and may not be resubmitted for (1) calendar year.

Mr. Timothy Smith stated that he is a member of the South Tacoma Neighborhood Council. He introduced the nomination by showing the location of the Gray Middle and Barlow Annex buildings on a map and overhead photos. He stated that support was from Councilmember David Boe, who is a sponsor of the application for nomination, which is a citizen driven proposal, therefore allowing for waiver of the application fee. He added that supporters include the South Tacoma Neighborhood Business District and direct family and descendants of Frederick Heath, one of the architects.

Notes on Mr. Smith's presentation follows:

He noted the Tacoma School District's presence and outlined his previous requests (to the District) to place the buildings onto the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

The purpose of this meeting is to determine the threshold for age and integrity of the buildings.

He noted the late hour to nominate the property, however, he explained there would be 14 other uses for this property (if nominated); retaining the historic nature of the buildings would provide opportunity to obtain additional funding.

He complimented Dr. Caroline Swope by stating, she has done more to preserve historic school properties than anyone else in Tacoma, adding the District is at the forefront of preserving historic properties.

He explained the School District has needs and conditions driving its decision-making and offered that these buildings represent a part of the South Tacoma history and now is the important time to save them.

He would use the definitions to nominate the buildings that were used by Dr. Swope in documenting and evaluating potential school buildings for placing onto the historic register in 2010.

He offered the following information to show the integrity of location and design:

There was current work being conducted to gather 2500 documents of the buildings and showed photos of architectural drawings of the existing interior elements; he presented photos and the history of Barlow, of railroad and shops' location in the context of the development of South Tacoma; he described the career of Frederick Heath and his meeting Barlow, the design of the building, and the strategic location of the water ditch and the school buildings.

He further stated, in 1911, Barlow died of a heart attack and later the Edison High School was re-named Barlow High School. He talked about the naming of Gray School showing association with Captain Gray, and explained the work of architect Bresseman. He presented additional photos of infrastructure changes, position on the hill has not changed for 80 years, earthquake damage and its impact on the student schedule; he showed photos of the interior such as the music theatre space, the removal of dormers; he compared this information with the Sanborn insurance maps. He noted that civil defense equipment from the cold war is still stored in Barlow; both buildings have gone through and have been shored up from two (Gray) and three (Barlow) earthquakes; the 1st addition is integral to connecting both buildings.

He displayed the previous evaluation and recommendation to nominate Gray / Barlow by Dr Swope prepared for the School District.

Mr. Timothy Smith talked about the 40 foot fly, explaining the theatre would leave the fly up above the stage until the next performance. He talked about the love of the schools by thousands of students and families over the years. He ended the presentation by describing the significance of the active gathering of the historic record to enhance the memory of the neighborhood, businesses and community of South Tacoma.

Dr. Jarvis, Tacoma School Superintendent, described the school district's decision to build a new Gray Middle School, including the partnership with the state of Washington to receive funding through an irrevocable agreement, based on the existing school's square footage which would be invested into a new school, and noted the overall purpose is to serve children. He described the process of the decision-making on the plans for the school, at the community and school board levels. Dr. Jarvis requested the Commission to deny the nomination.

Mr. Pete Wall, Tacoma Schools Director of Planning and Construction, presented information on the long-term planning for the future use of this site to support K-12 compatible activities, the student based new school and fields, and described the recent challenge of this nomination with the school district's construction schedule.

Mr. Pete Wall stated that the school's principal (Ms. Renee Rossman), architect (Brian Fitzberald, TCF Architecture) and architectural historian consultant (Caroline T. Swope, PhD, Kingstree Studios) are available for presentation and responses to questions.

Ms. Renee Rossman, principal of Edison Elementary School, presented information on the existing school, including the safety of the students' pickup and drop-off area; she reported on the proposed new school and educational program.

Architectural Historian, Caroline T. Swope, Ph.D., Kingstree Studios, presented background data on her previous reports to the School District on these specific buildings within the context of the investigation of a thematic school nomination. She discussed the criteria for the previous schools' thematic nomination.

She described the lengthy discussions on integrity with the School District, whereby, there is more flexibility in a group nomination. She talked about the decision made by the School District and the ability to individually landmark other schools (i.e. outside the group nomination). She described the school buildings with less integrity, including Barlow's Romanesque style which has difficulty in meeting the integrity criteria because of its missing dormers. She further explained that the building must meet integrity with key components, such as the dormers of the building and, not just with events; the building style and components must meet integrity.

She noted the age of the 1963 connector building is outside the period of significance, which does not meet the criteria.

Dr. Caroline Swope described Gray as a challenge because it was a hybrid of Gothic Revival style with missing parapets, change in fenestration patterns with new windows, and noted the significant impacts of a previous earthquake and the 1960s addition on the side elevation.

She summarized by stating that her advice to the School District on architectural significance was as a thematic nomination and not as an individual, stand-alone landmark nomination, as is the current proposal on the Gray-Barlow nomination.

There was discussion on the concern for safety because of the existing condition [location] of the buildings, the difficulty in improving the view needed to supervise children, increasing the campus with a playfield, size of the usable campus, metal roof, original vents, significant changes to buildings after the 1950s, current seismic code compliance on structural safety, 1983 work on wall anchors, and challenge of school district function with the historic value of the buildings.

Commissioner Bret Maddox recused himself from the decision on the nomination.

Mr. Timothy Smith complimented the School District for the recent school nominations and offered that his appeal is to have a school for their community and presented lists of ideas for future use of the school buildings.

Commissioner House highlighted the purpose of the preliminary meeting, which is to base the threshold decision on the criteria of integrity and age.

There was a motion.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, determine that Gray Barlow Buildings (excluding the 1963 Addition) do meet the recommended criteria on threshold for age and integrity and, eligibility criteria A, B, C, and F, for nomination to the Tacoma Register of Historic Places".

MOTION: Sundell

SECOND: Pham

MOTION: Failed (two-yes; five-no; one-recusal)

There was acceptance of an amendment on the above motion to exclude the 1963 Addition because it does not meet the age criteria.

Mr. Reuben McKnight confirmed the 1963 addition was not 50 years old.

There was a motion.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, determine that Gray Barlow School Buildings (excluding the 1963 Addition) do not meet the recommended criteria on threshold for age and integrity due to changes to the exterior and loss of integrity".

MOTION: House

SECOND: Jensen

MOTION: Carried (five-yes; two-no; one-recusal)

Mr. McKnight stated that a written decision would be forthcoming, a note prepared that this matter cannot come up for a calendar year per Tacoma Municipal Code, and he would notify the building permit department on this decision.

3. DESIGN REVIEW

A. 102 West Road

Mr. Reuben McKnight read the Staff Report which follows:

This is a proposal to construct a new two-story 25'X40' garage, including a new one-story addition that connects the new garage to the south wall of the existing home on the property.

Constructed in 1917, the James McNeely House was listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places on April 28, 2006, as a significant example of a Craftsman-style home, designed by prominent architect Ambrose Russell. The house is the only portion of the property that is designated; the site and other buildings were not designated. Recently the non historic detached garage was removed from the location of the proposed new garage.

This project is subject to Landmarks Preservation Commission review due to the physical attachment to the original house created by the addition.

Staff enclosed the property file's copy of a 1917 Tacoma News Ledger newspaper that shows a drawing of the proposed construction on the residence.

Three of the existing windows on the south wall of the existing home will be relocated to the west wall on the new addition. A new door opening will connect the existing residence and new addition. A decorative trellis and posts with frames will be constructed on the west front entrance of the new one-story addition. This entry with the trellis/post will be similar to the existing home's porch front entry trellis features.

The proposed materials will match the existing home, including the beveled cedar siding, cedar shingles, wood and wood clad windows and doors, wood window trim.

Standards to be considered:

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis to be considered:

1. Constructed in 1917, the James McNeely House is a historically significant Craftsman-style home, which is listed on the Tacoma Register of Historic Places.

2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building including new construction per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.

3. The purpose of the proposed new family living area addition and garage will provide additional living and storage space. The decision to connect the garage to the main house is driven by code requirements and site constraints.

4. The proposal to construct the addition onto the south wall of the historic residence meets *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* No. 9, specifically, for, *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.* The new addition will be at the height of the existing first story roof and will not increase the existing footprint of the historic building. In addition, this area next to the front porch appears to be a recessed buffer area between the new garage construction and the historic home, which may meet *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* No. 9, specifically, for, "...*The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*".

5. The proposed new construction materials are wood, cedar shingles and/or wood clad and similar to match the existing historic home's materials and are compatible with traditional historic materials in design and dimension, which meets *Secretary of Interior's Standard* No. 9, specifically, for, "[materials] *will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*".

6. The access to the garage has historically been from the front of the lot, due to the gulch behind the property.

7. The existing south wall appears to have been altered in previous remodels. Moreover, the addition will result in minimal physical disruption of the main house, and could be demolished in the future if the house were to be returned to its original state. Therefore, the application meets SOI Standard #10: *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

Staff recommended adoption of the above as findings and approval of the application by the Commission.

Mr. Rick Hjelm of Phase II, stated that the garage was falling into the gulch, therefore, the garage was demolished. He noted that he had been working with the City to propose a new garage.

There was discussion on the altered south elevation, the attachment of the garage to the historic house, the appearance of the connecting addition area to the new garage; the height of the garage is 25 feet; it was noted that the shingles in the rendering did not appear to match the house, however it was confirmed that the cladding will match the existing house; concern on the possibility of mimicking the existing front porch on the connector addition, and recommendation to remove the decorative features on the new connector area.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, adopt the analysis as findings, and approve the application with the exception of the decorative trellis and posts with frames at the entrance of the new addition".

MOTION: Maddox

SECOND: House

MOTION: Carried

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated that a written decision would be issued within the next few days.

A. 914 N M Street (North Slope Historic Special Review District)

Ms. Tonie Cook read the Staff Report which follows.

Constructed in 1924, this bungalow is a contributing structure located in the North Slope Special Review District. The property has been under enforcement as a Derelict Building since May, 2010 and was foreclosed in September.

The current proposal is to stabilize the front porch by repairing the wood deck, and the removal and replacement of the existing baluster system. The non historic lath porch elements and non historic wood railing and steps will be removed and replaced with a composite baluster system and solid wood risers. The existing porch columns will be retained. New lathe to match the old will be installed under the porch deck. The proposed porch dimensions are listed on the enclosed project description sheet. A photo of an example of the porch and railing system is enclosed and titled N 9th Sheridan.

2X12 stone treads will be installed onto the existing concrete stairs as shown in the enclosed example photo, N 9th Sheridan. In addition, two handrails will be installed in the same material and dimensions as the upper porch handrails, which will not be attached to the building.

Staff enclosed copies of two photos of the home from 1977 and 1996.

Standards to be considered:

North Slope Historic District Guidelines

1. Exterior Materials. Goals: Use compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings. Buildings in the North Slope Neighborhood were sided with shingles or with lapped, horizontal wood siding of various widths. Subsequently, a few compatible brick or stucco covered structures

were constructed, although many later uses of these two materials do not fit the character of the neighborhood. Additions to existing buildings should be sided with a material to match, or be compatible with, the original or existing materials. New structures should utilize exterior materials similar to those typically found in the neighborhood.

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Analysis to be considered

1. The home on the property is historically significant as a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District; it was constructed in 1924. As part of the North Slope it is listed on the Tacoma, Washington and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. The Landmarks Preservation Commission has jurisdiction to review and approve, or not approve, changes to this building including new construction per TMC 13.07.095, prior to those changes being made, by virtue of its status as a City Landmark.
3. The proposal is part of the new owner's repair and cleanup of the house, which has been vacant and in disrepair for quite some time. The purpose of the proposal is to improve safety as the existing porch, steps and rail system which are in poor condition as shown in the enclosed Staff Photo.
4. The proposal to remove and replace the deteriorated front porch, steps, and handrail elements in a design that matches a similar home in the neighborhood is appropriate since there are no historic photos of the original porch. The severity of the deterioration of the porch and steps, necessitates its replacement and meets Secretary of Interiors Standard for Rehabilitation # 6, specifically, "...Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
5. The removal of the nonhistoric porch, steps and railings does not violate Secretary of Interior's Standard Number 5, which states, "*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved*" as these are not character defining features.
6. The proposed materials are solid wood steps. Lathe under the porch, and composite on the railing system, which are similar to exterior materials found in the neighborhood, which meets North Slope Historic District Guideline Number 6, Exterior Materials, specifically, for, "*Use [ing] compatible materials that respect the visual appearance of the surrounding buildings...*" and appear to meet Secretary of Interior's Standard #9, for, "*The new work will be...compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*". Although not an original material, it is a close visual match and has been approved by the Commission for similar applications.

Staff recommended adoption of the above analysis as findings and approval of the proposal to the Commission.

Mr. Wes Betts stated that the railings were proposed for safety purposes.

There was discussion on the range of the width of the stairs, confirmation on the proposed stair width of 60 inches, horizontal vertical lattice, recommendation to install one simple pipe handrail system on the lower stairs, and confirmation on the use of unpainted composite material.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the analysis as findings, and approve the application at the property at 914 N M Street".

There was a motion:

MOTION: Sundell
 SECOND: Luce
 MOTION: Carried

Ms. Tonie Cook stated that a written decision would be issued and the permit department would also be notified on the decision.

4. BOARD BUSINESS/PRESERVATION PLANNING

A. OLD TOWN

Mr. McKnight presented the results of the Old Town Neighborhood questionnaire which is part of the Staff Report, which follows.

On April 13, 2011, the Landmarks Preservation Commission directed staff to mail a postage paid return survey to the property owners within the proposed Old Town Historic District area. This survey was mailed in mid-May, followed by an errata letter due to a map error on the original survey. Respondents were given until May 31 to return the survey cards.

The following is the aggregate result:

	Opposed ¹	Support	Neutral	Not Enough Information	Total	Percent Support
Homeowners	124	28	6	7	165	17%
Business owners ²	1				1	0%
Nearby property owners ²	2	2	1		5	
	127	30	7	7	171 ³	40%

Notes:

1. For this summary table, multiple responses were tallied only once per category; if someone marked both "Opposed" and "Not Enough Information," only the "Opposed" mark was counted.
2. The survey was intended to be for property owners, and the geographic scope was limited to the proposed district area. However, because there is always some variances in address, categories were offered for "Business Owners" and "Nearby Property Owners." Neither of these categories of owners would be directly affected by the proposal. However, if someone checked both "Property Owner" and either of the former categories, they were counted only as a "Property Owner."
3. Several individuals responded that they had not received their survey, and requested that their email be used as their survey response. These have been included in the total.

The total number of surveys mailed was 402; 171 replies equates to a 43% response rate. This is a relatively high return. Of those who responded, 165 identified as property owners within the proposed district. Of these, only 17% indicated that they support the proposed district, while approximately 75% indicated opposition.

The survey result is consistent with the petition in opposition submitted by residents.

Staff recommended that the Landmarks Preservation Commission table the proposal for a local historic special review district in the Old Town Neighborhood, with no further action.

The Commission may consider recommending to the supporters of the nomination the following actions:

1. Pursue listing on the Washington Heritage Register, which is honorary and has no effect on property rights or gaining City permits;
2. Generate a "thematic" nomination, which will not create a historic district, but provide the bulk of the documentation needed for individual property owners in the neighborhood who wish to historically designate their property to do so.

There was a motion:

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, table the proposed Old Town Neighborhood Historic Special Review District with no further action".

MOTION: Maddox
SECOND: Luce
MOTION: Carried

Mr. McKnight stated that a closing letter will be sent to the supporters with the above noted recommendations on possible actions.

B. Design Guidelines

Mr. McKnight presented the proposed design guidelines report which follows:

With the adoption of the 2011 Comprehensive Plan Annual Amendment on June 14, 2011, the existing historic district design guidelines will become administrative documents and will no longer be part of TMC 13.07. The effective date of the regulatory amendments is August 1, 2011.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission is authorized to adopt design guidelines for Tacoma's historic districts and to review them once a year for potential amendments. The attached draft guidelines use the existing language in TMC 13.07, with visual aids for readability.

Future, substantive changes should go through the public hearings process, if the Commission desires to amend the guidelines. For the near term, however, staff proposes these drafts be adopted as the official design guidelines for Union Station, the Wedge and North Slope.

"I move that we, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, approve the draft guidelines as the official design guidelines for Union Station, Wedge and North Slope Historic Special Review Districts".

MOTION: McIntire
SECOND: Al Janabi
MOTION: Carried

C. Camp Six Logging Museum

Mr. Reuben McKnight stated that recent public announcements about Camp Six being closed, dismantled, and removed from Point Defiance initiated research on Camp Six to understand the intent of its name as a historic park. He knew that Camp Six has been administratively listed as a landmark in City documents, but it was never listed in a resolution or ordinance establishing it with the status of a landmark. .

He reported on the 1972 adoption of Resolution #21726, whereby Camp Six was named a historic park and the logging museum building, which was used to assemble artifacts in the park, was leased for \$1 per year. The historic park status was for the purpose of appearing increasingly competitive in the pursuit of grant funds. This predates the establishment of the Landmarks Preservation Commission in 1973 with the adoption of TMC 1.42. Additional research included the dates of the City's first landmarks, such as Old City Hall, Union Station, which were after the Camp Six naming as a historic park; it also predates the TMC 13.07 land use code. In summary, there is no jurisdiction for Camp Six; no other purpose has been found other than for naming purposes, as a historic park.

D. Other

Commissioner Imad Al Janabi was recognized for his four years of service.

The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Submitted as True and Correct:

Reuben McKnight
Historic Preservation Officer