

**Members**

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
 Ken House, *Vice-Chair*  
 Roger Johnson  
 Lysa Schloesser  
 James Steel  
 Eugene Thorne  
 Jeff Williams  
 Kevin Bartoy  
 Ken House



# MINUTES

## Landmarks Preservation Commission Planning and Development Services Department

Marshall McClintock, North Slope Ex-Officio

**Staff**

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer  
 Lauren Hoogkamer, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
 John Griffith, Office Assistant

Date: September 27, 2017

Location: 747 Market Street, Tacoma Municipal Building, Room 243

**Commission Members in Attendance:**

Katie Pratt, *Chair*  
 Lysa Schloesser  
 James Steel  
 Eugene Thorne  
 Kevin Bartoy  
 Marshall McClintock

**Staff Present:**

Lauren Hoogkamer  
 John Griffith

**Others Present:**

Shauna Hansen  
 Cynthia Padilla  
 Isaac Miller  
 Alicia Lawver

**Commission Members Absent:**

Ken House, *Vice-Chair*  
 Roger Johnson  
 Jeff Williams

Chair Katie Pratt called the meeting to order at 5:39 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL****2. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Excusal of Absences
- B. Approval of Minutes: 9/13/17

The consent agenda was approved.

**3. NAMING – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION**

- A. Gwilymn “Skip” Vaughn Trail (between S. 80<sup>th</sup> Street and S. 84<sup>th</sup> Street)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report

**BACKGROUND**

The Office of Environmental Services is requesting to name the new trail, between South 80<sup>th</sup> Street and South 84<sup>th</sup> Street, the Gwilymn “Skip” Vaughn Trail. The currently unnamed trail was referred to as the “Gravel Pit” or the 80<sup>th</sup> Street Regional Stormwater Holding Basin. The South Tacoma Neighborhood Council, of which Vaughn was president, nominated the naming of the trail to honor Vaughn on April 27, 2017. Skip Vaughn was known for his activism in the neighborhood around the trail. Newspaper articles highlighting Vaughn’s contributions, including his advocacy and financial support for the Wapato Hills Park and open space in Tacoma, are included in the packet. He was also known as the “father” of the neighborhood council program. In 2002, the Washington State Senate honored Skip Vaughn for his activism.

Further communication with Environmental Services indicated that the desired name is “Skip Vaughn’s Trail.”

**STANDARDS**

Criteria for name changes are outlined in the City Policy on Place Names and Name Changes, adopted by City Council Resolution 38091 (attached).

### **FINDINGS**

1. Pursuant to Council Resolution 38091, the Landmarks Preservation Commission reviews and makes recommendations to City Council on name change requests.
2. A written request from Environmental Services was submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission on July 12, 2017, to name the new trail, between South 80<sup>th</sup> Street and South 84<sup>th</sup> Street, after Gwilymn "Skip" Vaughn.
3. On July 26, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission determined the proposal was complete and scheduled the public hearing. The hearing notice contained the name "Gwilymn "Skip" Vaughn Trail."
4. On August 23, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission held a public hearing to take testimony on this item.
5. Four written comments were received and three individuals commented at the hearing. All comments were in favor of the proposal.
6. The following Name Change criteria were identified in consideration of the proposed name change:
  - a. A Metro Parks property is named the "Skip and Laura Vaughn Playfield," no other properties have similar names.
  - b. Gwilymn "Skip" Vaughn passed away in March 2017.
  - c. For reasons stated in the request proposal, Gwilymn "Skip" Vaughn contributed greatly to South Tacoma neighborhood and the citywide conservation of open space.
  - d. The trail is currently unnamed.
7. Additional communication from the Environmental Services staff indicates "Skip Vaughn's Trail" as the desired name.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the above, the name change meets the criteria in City Council Resolution 38091 for Name Changes.

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

The Commission may recommend the naming request to City Council, deny the request, or defer if additional information is needed.

The was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission adopt the analysis as findings and recommend, to City Council, naming the new trail, between South 80<sup>th</sup> Street and South 84<sup>th</sup> Street, Skip Vaughn's Trail."

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Schloesser

The motion was approved unanimously.

## **4. DESIGN REVIEW**

A. Theater District Station Design (Old City Hall Historic District)

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report

### **BACKGROUND**

On April, 26, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission approved the design and relocation of the Theater District Station. To reduce costs, the project team is now proposing only one canopy, instead of two. The remaining canopy would cover the ticketing machine and seating area. No other changes are proposed.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

**STANDARDS**

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings**

9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic 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**

1. This construction project is located within in the Old City Hall Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047.
2. No historic material is being destroyed. The new platform is compatible, but differentiated from the district's historic material.
3. The platform could be removed without harming the district's character defining features.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Cynthia Padilla, Sound Transit, reviewed that the project had been approved in April and that she was there to provide an update on the canopies and answer any questions. She reported that they were removing one canopy and were not making any other modifications to the proposed design. She reviewed updated images of the station design that only included one of the canopies. They would still be leaving the second bench on the platform, but it would no longer be covered.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if a light standard had been added where the second canopy had been removed. Ms. Padilla responded that a light fixture had been added, but they had not changed the style.

Commissioner Schloesser asked why they removed the second canopy. Ms. Padilla responded that it had been removed to reduce costs.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if they were still planning on including art at the station. Ms. Padilla confirmed that they were, that the artist was doing outreach to the community, and that they were considering adding columns to the station to provide an alternative location for art.

There was a motion.

"I move that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for the Theater District Station Redesign, as submitted."

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Steel

The motion was approved unanimously.

B. 415 North J Street

*Windows*

Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report

## BACKGROUND

Built in 1924, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. On August 18, 2017, the following was administratively approved:

- Removal of non-historic aluminum windows and replacement with vinyl windows that are consistent with the district design guidelines.
- No changes to configuration or openings are proposed.
- Existing original windows will be retained.

The applicant would now like approval to use replacement vinyl windows, with internal grids, that were purchased prior to the administrative approval. The proposal includes replacing 11 aluminum windows and four missing windows. The replacement windows include a mix of sliders, casements, and picture windows. Existing original windows will be retained.

This item is before the Commission due to the inclusion of the grids.

## ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the above scope of work.

## STANDARDS

### North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines

#### Windows

1. **Preserve Existing Historic Windows.** Existing historic windows in good working order should be maintained on historic homes in the district. The existing wood windows exhibit craftsmanship and carpentry methods in use at the time that the neighborhood was developed. New manufactured windows, even those made of wood, generally do not exhibit these characteristics.
2. **Repair Original Windows Where Possible.** Original wood windows that are in disrepair should be repaired if feasible. The feasibility of different approaches depends on the conditions, estimated cost, and total project scope. Examples of substandard conditions that do not necessarily warrant replacement include: failed glazing compound, broken glass panes, windows painted shut, deteriorated paint surface (interior or exterior) and loose joinery. These conditions alone do not justify window replacement.

Repair of loose or cracked glazing, loose joinery or stuck sashes may be suitable for a carpenter or handyperson. Significant rot, deterioration, or reconstruction of failed joints may require the services of a window restoration company. If information is needed regarding vendors that provide these services, please contact the Historic Preservation Office.

3. **Replace windows with a close visual and material match.** When repairing original windows is not feasible, replacement may be considered.
  - Where replacement is desired, the new windows should match the old windows in design and other details, and, where possible, materials.
  - Certain window products, such as composite clad windows, closely replicate original appearance and therefore may be appropriate. This should be demonstrated to the Commission with material samples and product specification sheets.
  - Changing the configuration, style or pattern of original windows is not encouraged, generally (for example, adding a highly styled divided light window where none existed before, or adding an architecturally incompatible pattern, such as a Prairie style gridded window to a English Cottage house).
  - Vinyl windows are not an acceptable replacement for existing historic windows.

Depending on specific project needs, replacement windows may include:

- Sash replacement kits. These utilize the existing window frame (opening) and trim, but replace the existing sashes and substitute a vinyl or plastic track for the rope and pulley system. Sash replacement kits require that the existing window opening be plumb and square to work properly, but unlike insert

windows, do not reduce the size of the glazed area of the window or require shimming and additional trim.

- An insert window is a fully contained window system (frame and sashes) that is “inserted” into an existing opening. Because insert windows must accommodate a new window frame within the existing opening, the sashes and glazed area of an insert window will be slightly smaller than the original window sashes. Additional trim must be added to cover the seams between the insert frame and the original window. However, for window openings that are no longer plumb, the insert frame allows the new sashes to operate smoothly.

4. **Non-historic existing windows do not require “upgrading.”** Sometimes the original windows were replaced prior to the formation of the historic district, and now must be replaced again. Although it is highly encouraged, there is no requirement to “upgrade” a non-historic window to a historically appropriate wood window. For example, a vinyl replacement window may be an acceptable replacement for a non-historic aluminum horizontal slider window, especially if the historic configuration (vertically operated sash) is restored.

5. **New Window Openings/Changing Window Openings**

- Enlargement or changes to the configurations of existing window openings is to be avoided on the primary elevation(s) of a historic building within the district. In specific cases, such as an egress requirement, this may not be avoidable, but steps should be taken to minimize the visual impact.
- Changes to window configurations on secondary (side and rear) elevations in order to accommodate interior remodeling are not discouraged, provided that character defining elements, such as a projecting bay window in the dining room, are not affected. A typical example of this type of change might be to reconfigure a kitchen window on the side of a home to accommodate base cabinets
- In general, openings on buildings in the historic district are vertically oriented and are aligned along the same height as the headers and transoms of other windows and doors, and may engage the fascia or belly band that runs above the window course. This pattern should be maintained for new windows.
- Window size and orientation is a function of architectural style and construction technique. Scale, placement, symmetry or asymmetry, contribute to and reflect the historic and architectural character of a building.

6. **Sustainability and thermal retrofitting.**

- a. Window replacement is often the least cost effective way to improve thermal efficiency. Insulation of walls, sealing of gaps and insulation of switch plates, lights, and windows, as well as upgrades to the heating system all have a higher return on investment and are consistent with preservation of the character of a historic home.
- b. Properly maintained and weather stripped historic windows generally will improve comfort by reducing drafts.
- c. The energy invested in the manufacture of a new window and the cost of its purchase and installation may not be offset by the gains in thermal efficiency for 40 to 80 years, whereas unnecessary removal and disposal of a 100 year old window wastes old growth fir and contributes to the waste stream.
- d. If thermal retrofitting is proposed as a rationale for window replacement, the owner should also furnish information that shows:
  - The above systematic steps have been taken to improve the performance of the whole house.
  - That the original windows, properly weather stripped and with a storm window added, is not a feasible solution to improve thermal efficiency.
  - Minimal retrofit, such as replacing only the sash or glass with thermal paned glass, is not possible.
  - Steps to be taken to salvage the historic windows either on site or to an appropriate architectural salvage company.

**ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. Replacement of the aluminum and missing windows with vinyl windows has been administratively approved.

3. Existing historic windows are being retained.
4. There is no requirement to upgrade non-historic windows and vinyl windows are considered acceptable replacements for non-historic aluminum windows; however, the district design guidelines do recommend that vinyl windows retain the historic configuration. Sliders, picture windows, and internal grids are not recommended by the guidelines.
5. Enlargement or changes to the configurations of existing window openings may be required for egress or to accommodate interior remodels; these types of changes are allowable according to the design guidelines, although steps should be taken to minimize the visual impact.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff defers recommendation.

Isaac Miller, the owner of the home, commented that they had been informed by others that in a historic district they had to replace wood windows with wood windows, so they ordered windows with grids and found out afterwards that the style they ordered wasn't allowed in the guidelines. He reported that they had been told by the supplier that removing the internal grids would cost \$4000 because they were sandwiched between the glass and he could not return the windows due to the custom size.

Mr. McClintock commented that the grid pattern was in the perimeter prairie style with the grid at the far edges. He commented that he was torn since the grid was small, but the amount of money was minor given the overall plans for the house.

Commissioner Bartoy commented that when they move to vinyl there was an expectation that they remove non historic things like sliders, which were present in the proposed windows. Mr. McClintock responded that in the past they had accepted slider windows replacing aluminum, provided that the configuration was not changed.

Ms. Hoogkamer reviewed images of the home where the location of the windows being replaced was noted.

Chair Pratt asked if window #6, the master bathroom window, was a slider. Mr. Miller responded that it was a slider.

Commissioner Schloesser asked if #8, the upstairs flex room window, was original. Mr. Miller confirmed that it was an original wood window and would be retained.

Commissioner Steel asked if #6 was an egress window. Mr. Miller responded that it was not and was a bathroom window.

Chair Pratt commented that the biggest concern was the front façade because it included two substantial openings. She commented that her preference and her interpretation of the guidelines was that the front elevation was more critical, so if those two windows could be swapped out for something more accurate, then the other window replacements would be fine. Chair Pratt commented that especially for #7, the living room window, that the slider replacement would detract from the character of the house. She recommended either replacing with like for like or a larger center window with double hung windows on the side and no grids for both windows on the front.

Commissioner Steel commented that it was regrettable that the windows on the side elevations had grids, but not as critical as windows #6 and #7. Mr. McClintock reported that #6 was originally a small centered picture window with two double hung windows on either side. #7 probably was as well. Commissioner Steel commented that he recommend the configuration for #7 and wouldn't be opposed to it for #6. Mr. Miller asked if picture windows would be okay. Commissioner Steel commented that it would greatly enhance the character of the home to have more historic windows and that the cost difference would be marginal. He recommended a picture window in the center with double hung windows on either side for both #6 and #7 or three double hung windows for #6 with framing between each window.

There was a motion.

"I motion to approve the application as submitted for all of the windows except for windows #6 and #7 on the front façade which could be kept as they are currently or replaced with a picture window with two double hung windows on either side for both #6 and #7 or replaced with three double hung windows for #6. In all cases, all three windows

should be separated by a mullion or wood framing member with trim. I recommended that it be submitted to staff for administrative approval.”

Motion: Steel

Second: Thorne

Commissioner Bartoy wanted to be clear that windows #8 and #17, which were currently wood, were not being replaced.

The motion was approved unanimously.

C. 1115 North L Street

*Siding*

The item was deferred to after item 5.A. as the applicant was not present. Ms. Hoogkamer read the staff report.

**BACKGROUND**

Built in 1890, this is a contributing property in the North Slope Historic District. The applicant, who recently purchased the home, is seeking retroactive approval for the siding replacement and front stairs. The front stairs were highly deteriorated and the replacement involved very minimal visual change. Additionally, non-historic siding was replaced with 6” HardiePlank siding and trim. No other windows or doors were changed, except for the non-historic windows in the front gable.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the above scope of work.

**STANDARDS**

**North Slope Historic District Design Guidelines for Exterior Siding and Materials**

1. **Avoid removal of large amounts of original siding.**
2. **Repair small areas of failure before replacing all siding.** It is rarely advisable to replace all of the existing siding on a home, both for conservation reasons and for cost reasons. Where there are areas of siding failure, it is most appropriate to spot repair as needed with small amounts of matching material. Where extensive damage, including rot or other failure, has occurred, siding should be replaced with as close a material and visual match as is feasible, including matching reveals, widths, configuration, patterns and detailing.
3. **Other materials/configurations.** It is not historically appropriate to replace deteriorated siding with substitute materials, unless it can be demonstrated that:
  - The replacement material is a close visual match to the historic material and can be installed in a manner in which the historically character defining details may be reproduced (mitered corners, dentil molding, etc); and
  - Replacement of the existing historic material is necessary, or the original material is no longer present; and
  - There is no feasible alternative to using a substitute material due to cost or availability.
4. **Avoid changing the appearance, pattern or configuration of original siding.** The siding type, configuration, reveal, and shingle pattern all are important elements of a home’s historic character.

**ANALYSIS**

1. This property is a contributing structure in the North Slope Historic District and, as such, is subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission pursuant to TMC 13.05.047 for exterior modifications.
2. The condition of the original siding is not known.
3. Non-historic siding was removed and replaced.
4. HardiPlank siding has been approved in this district when other options have been determined infeasible (such as large areas of siding loss).

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff defers recommendation

Commissioner Bartoy asked if there were any remnants of the original siding underneath the asbestos siding. Ms. Hoogkamer responded that the applicant reported having taken it down to the sheathing and finding no evidence of original siding.

Commissioner Bartoy asked if the applicant had removed the return that forms the pediment in the gable, which was a character defining feature, and if the window had been enlarged. Mr. McClintock responded that he believed that the lower portion taken off to accommodate the larger window, but that the applicant had stated that it had already been removed. Commissioner Schloesser asked if they could check against historic photos. Mr. McClintock responded that all of the photos he could find including the listing on Redfin showed the original home with the asbestos siding that still had the pediment in the gable.

Mr. McClintock reviewed that the home had received a stop work order as the work had been done without permits, so they were being retroactively asked to approve the changes. Commissioner Bartoy asked what would happen if they could not retroactively approve the alteration. Ms. Hoogkamer responded that they could make recommendations as to what they would like to see and the applicant could appeal it.

Chair Pratt noted that the porch hood brackets were missing as well.

Commissioner Bartoy commented that if it was not retroactive and the existing alterations were being proposed for the first time, he would have to vote no because it was violating several of the guidelines.

It was noted that the Commission typically could approve the Hardie Plank siding. Commissioner Steel asked to verify if the siding was smooth or wood grain. Mr. McClintock commented that Hardie was only supposed to be approved in special cases. He commented that aside from the gable, the windows had not been touched and that it was really just the siding that had been changed. Commissioner Bartoy commented that the trim was the element that stood out much more than the siding itself.

Chair Pratt commented that the front porch steps seemed to meet the guidelines.

Chair Pratt commented that they might have been able to approve the siding replacement but the applicant had not demonstrated that original siding was not present or could not be repaired, which would be a requirement of the guidelines. She noted that they also removed character defining features. She commented that in the older photo the house read as a Queen Anne Free Classic style of house, particularly with the pediment in the gable.

Commissioner Steel asked if the style typically had the shingle like aesthetic without much trim. Chair Pratt responded that if they weren't going to have a lot of the spindle work they would have likely had shingles of some kind in the gable pediment and possibly shingles along the upper story, then a belly band, and lap siding below. There would have been thicker window trim, but it had been removed or covered by the asbestos siding.

Commissioner Steel commented that the corner trim was problematic, as the Commission would typically recommend mitered corners.

Mr. McClintock asked what kind of changes the Commissioners would be asking for when they had the owners present. He added that putting things back the way they were was obviously not an option in this case. Commissioner Bartoy suggested that they could offer some examples of the style, noting that the window trims made the home look extremely blocky. Chair Pratt commented that the trim wouldn't normally go above the windows to the belly band. It was noted that there were many examples in the district of that style of house both original and renovated.

There was a motion.

"I move that we defer action and have staff forward the questions on."

Motion: Bartoy

Second: Schloesser

Commissioner Thorne suggested that bringing back the porch hood brackets would bring back some of the building's character.

The motion was approved unanimously.

## 5. BOARD BRIEFINGS

### A. Stadium High School (Individual Landmark)

Alicia Lawver, Tacoma Public Schools, reviewed that they would be explaining the situation with the interior downspouts which had been deteriorating resulting in flooding damage. They would be seeking Commission feedback to determine the next steps.

It was noted that that the interior downspouts went down through the bathrooms and down into the basements. The interior downspouts were 100 years old and had been leaking into the bathrooms, which needed to be refurbished almost yearly. They were looking at doing an exterior downspout that would allow them to save the interior of the building and cut off the interior downspouts. Ms. Lawver discussed the damage from recent rain that resulted in several bathrooms being closed. She noted that the front of the building was currently the only downspouts being discussed now, but they would need to plan for the long term for the rest of the downspouts. There were currently no external downspouts. Issues with a significant clog in the basement and rusted out sections of the pipe were noted.

Ms. Lawver discussed potential solutions.

Ms. Lawver reported that replacing internal downspouts would cost \$30,000-\$45,000. Commissioner Bartoy asked if they had considered sleeving the spouts. It was noted that they had considered it but because there was deterioration all the way through the downspout. Ms. Lawver responded that they would investigate the option.

The next option was to block the internal drain and add standard commercial downspouts to the front of the school. Ms. Lawver commented that at \$5,000 to \$7,000 it was the cheapest options, but would not be allowed for historic renovation.

The last option discussed was to block the internal drain and add custom commercial downspouts to the front of the school that would be more accessible for future maintenance. Ms. Lawver commented that they were looking for preferences and advice on exterior downspout options.

It was noted that the cost estimates were for each downspout.

Commissioner Steel asked if they had access stormwater drains in the courtyard that would meet the needed capacity. Ms. Lawver responded that additional stormwater drains would be part of the project.

Commissioner Steel commented that like with any other mechanical fitting within a building, it was going to break down and need to be replaced over time and that when they own a historic building there would be things that would be dramatically more expensive to repair than if the building was not historic. Commissioner Steel commented that the architect went to the trouble of internal downspouts and they needed to make a larger effort to find a solution that maintains what was existing and if there was a way to prevent failure of the other downspouts they needed to improve the existing system. He added that historic buildings have added costs and he saw this as one of those.

Commissioner Steel commented that he didn't know how they would do sleeving since the downspouts had many bends and turns, but that they should investigate it.

Mr. McClintock commented that for their cost estimates they should consider where they put the water if they do exterior downspouts and how much it costs.

Chair Pratt commented that if they were going to consider exterior downspouts, material and location would be important. It would be important that they could be removed without damaging the building. She commented that some of the options would have the appearance of having originally been there and that they did not want to create a false sense of history. Commissioner Steel commented that they would prefer something non-decorative that matched the building without being embellished. Mr. McClintock suggested that not having the scupper and just having the pipe might be the better solution, since it would draw less attention.

Commissioner Bartoy commented that they could also consider tucking the downspouts into the corner to minimize the appearance.

Commissioner Steel suggested that they would need to explore how difficult it would be to replace what was there now and then they could then present an alternative that still met the criteria. He added that if it was an emergency, they could approve a temporary solution without any difficulty.

Chair Pratt reviewed that they preferred to repair historic features and that if historic features were being replaced they needed more photo evidence of the deterioration and information on the other downspouts on the building.

Ms. Hoogkamer asked if they could use a material besides copper for exterior pipes. Commissioner Steel responded that since so many of the details on the building were copper, the pipes would need to be copper to match.

## **6. PRESERVATION PLANNING/BOARD BUSINESS**

### **A. Events and Activities Update**

Ms. Hoogkamer provided an update on the following events and activities:

#### **2017 Events**

1. South Tacoma Way Walking Tour Recap
2. History Happy Hour Trivia Night Recap
3. Wood Windows Workshop Recap
4. Prairie Line Trail Celebration and Artists Forum (4:30pm @ TAM, October 19<sup>th</sup>)
5. Lincoln District Tour (11am, October 21<sup>st</sup>)
6. Fourth Annual Holiday Heritage Dance: Browns Point Bop (Tour: 5pm; Dance: 6-9pm @ Browns Point Improvement Club, November 3<sup>rd</sup>)

## **7. CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Pratt noted that the applicant from the previous meeting was appealing the Commission's decision. It was likely that the Chair and the Commissioner who put forward the motion would be called as witnesses.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m.