

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
April 15, 2015
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Mayor Pro Tem Allen called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Allen, Argenta, Field, Gudritz, Hoffman, Johnson, Vernacchia
Absent: Johnson, Tartaglia
Also Present: Consultant Elmiger

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: none

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Commissioner Hoffman suggested that Case 5 be heard before Case 4, making Case 4 last on the agenda.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, to approve the agenda as amended. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: March 18, 2015

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to approve the minutes of March 18, 2015 as published. **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. REPORTS:

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None
- B. CITY COUNCIL:** None
- C. PLANNING COMMISSION:** None
- D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None

6. PUBLIC HEARING: None

7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE:

CASE #1

GRAPHIC VISIONS/WOK

NEW WALL SIGN

144 MARY ALEXANDER COURT

Sandy Mustonen, Graphic Visions Inc., 16857 Northville Road, Northville MI 48167, was present on behalf of this application, which was to install a wall sign at 144 Mary Alexander Court (Wok Asian Bistro).

Ms. Mustonen displayed color and material samples. The sign would be 3mm aluminum composite panel. They would be using cardinal red and black vinyl. The sign would be curved to follow the form of the façade.

MOTION Vernacchia, support by Field, to accept the application as complete. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-24 signs, 4-21 materials, and 5-18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #2
KIM VOYTAL
113 WEST**

HOME ADDITION

Applicant Kim Voytal was present on behalf of this application, which was to construct a one-story addition to expand their home. The addition would be approximately 24 square feet on the north side of the house, and would include a fireplace and two new windows. An existing window would be removed to accommodate the fireplace.

Ms. Voytal said the windows they were proposing to replace were not historic, but were part of an addition constructed 30 years ago. The windows to be replaced included a first and second story bay window, which were old and leaky and needed to be replaced. They had an estimate from Anderson Renewal Windows. There would be no color or trim change.

Commissioner Hoffman asked Consultant Elmiger about the question she had noted in her April 7, 2015 letter regarding lot coverage. Ms. Elmiger explained that lot coverage might be a possible issue but this would be for the Building Official to determine.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen asked how the applicants had calculated lot coverage. Gregory Presley, Presley Architecture, 108 N Center Street, Suite 205, Northville MI said lot coverage had been calculated using the 50% rule for non-enclosed porches.

Ms. Voytal showed the Commission color and material samples.

MOTION by Vernacchia, support by Field, to accept the application as complete. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION by Argenta, support by Vernacchia, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.6 windows, 3.11 siding, 3.14 setback spacing, 3.16 mass, 3.17 height, 3.18 scale, 3.19 proportion, 3.21 materials, 5.9 asphalt shingles, 5.17 siding, and 5.18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #3
BRETT & CAROL WHEATLEY
536 W. MAIN STREET**

NEW DOORS & WINDOWS

Applicant Carol Wheatley was present on behalf of this application, which was to replace one set of double doors, add another set of double doors, and add a window along a porch addition on the east side of the residence. Additionally, they would like to replace two small windows on the second floor on the north side. The work was proposed on a building addition constructed in the 1990s.

Ms. Wheatley explained that they were trying to improve an addition that had been there when they purchased the home. Nothing in the historic home would be changed. She distributed pictures concerning the two windows they hoped to replace, as requested in the April 3, 2015 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, along with a description of the existing window/door material. She noted that they had remodeled the home in a similar fashion on the west side of the house in 2006.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gudritz, Ms. Wheatley said that the color of the proposed doors and windows would stay the same.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Gudritz, Ms. Wheatley said basically everything from the kitchen to the back of the house had been added on to this home. The living room, dining room, and the foyer were historic.

In response to a question from Mayor Pro Tem Allen, Ms. Wheatley said the new windows would match the size of the windows in the historic part of the building.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the porch had been added in 1996, and the new doors and window were under that porch.

MOTION by Vernacchia, support by Field to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic Design Standards 3-8 doors, 3-21 materials, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #5

SINGH DEVELOPMENT

PAINT

150 MAINCENTRE

As noted above, the agenda was amended to hear Case #5 before Case #4.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen noted that he had a conflict of interest in this case as he currently had an association with Singh Development.

MOTION by Vernacchia, support by Hoffman, to recuse Mayor Pro Tem Allen from discussion on this case. Motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Hoffman assumed the chair. He noted that the applicants had been before the Commission on March 18, 2015 regarding proposed staining of some of the brick at MainCentre as well as painting some of the trim. At that time, the Commission had referred the application back to the applicant in order to give them time to prepare stain samples and also to organize further information. The stain samples had been applied to a portion of MainCentre and the Commissioners had been able to see these.

Todd Rankine, Singh Development, LLC, 7125 Orchard Lake Road, #200, West Bloomfield Township, MI was present to speak on behalf of this application. Gregory Presley, Presley Architecture LLC, 108 North Center, Suite 205, Northville MI was also present.

Mr. Rankine handed out 11 x 17 photos of the applied stain. He reviewed the colors, as outlined in the March 26, 2015 letter to the Commission (signed by Greg Presley). They were returning to the Commission to see if there were comments on the stain.

Mr. Rankine noted that the red, blue and green stains would be applied on the lower retail portion below the colonnade of MainCentre, and the dark brown would be applied to the banding along the bottom of the residential portion.

Commissioner Vernacchia said he thought the actual stain looked better than the original sketches. The stain did not make an extreme contrast but did seem to add enough tone differentiation to set the retail portion off.

Commissioner Gudritz asked how painting or staining the brick might impact the life of the brick.

Mr. Presley said that there was no impact on the life of the brick. The stain was permeable, and carried a 30-year warranty. The process of staining was simple, and if desired, the brick could be returned to its original color. There were no downsides to this process.

Noting that he had not been present at the March meeting, Commissioner Argenta said he didn't have a problem with painting the railings, trim, etc. However, he was concerned with staining the brick. Northville Historic Design Standards did not allow painting or coating of unpainted brick (5-4, 5-18). He could not recall any previous approval to paint unpainted bricks in a commercial area. They had approved repainting of already painted brick only. The manufacturer's (NAWKA) materials said that the stain was great for unifying a single area with two different bricks. This was not the need in the present instance, and Commissioner Argenta questioned the application of the stain in this case.

Commissioner Argenta continued that this building was the largest and most predominant in Northville. His experience with staining was that stain could sometimes blotch, especially on brick which had different densities and absorbed color differently. When Commissioner Argenta saw the samples he noted that the color was on the brick and joints, and the wall became one big uniform color, losing the whole brick feeling. Some of the building was thin brick. How would the stain work on dark brick next to light brick, etc?

Mr. Presley said they could mix stain while they were doing the application, in order to correct any issues at the time.

Mr. Rankine said that the stain was semi-transparent, and they wanted a little variation in color. The samples demonstrated this.

Mr. Presley said that while a coating of brick was discouraged in the Historic District, this semi-transparent stain was not a "coating" in the traditional sense – the original color and texture of the brick would still come through.

Commissioner Argenta said stain was like paint – it was used to change color, and in this case both the color of the brick and the joints were being affected – you could not tell the difference between the brick and the joint. He was concerned that this was a permanent solution, and it would be a "real task" getting the stain off for corrections, especially after it permeated into the brick.

Addressing the building generally, Mr. Presley said the intent of the original designers was to create a building where the mass was broken up, and they did a fair job of that, except that they used the same brick throughout the whole project. This created a perhaps unintended monolithic appearance. The brick band did not differentiate visually only 40 to 50 feet from the building. There was an intent to the original design that did not actually come through when the project was built. The current project was an attempt to correct that – to give nuance that was originally intended to the building. The four foot high band that was supposed to separate the upper residential from the lower commercial did not actually accomplish this. What the current application did was to allow nuance – allow the base of the building to stand out as was originally intended. Further the center portion that was now a commons area facing east did break up mass, but by putting a color on it as proposed this evening the space gained character.

Mr. Presley continued that by having the storefronts recessed they were hidden because the storefronts were constantly in shadow. Storefronts in the rest of downtown had color. By having the MainCentre storefronts stained a lighter color it would help them to be noticed appropriately.

Commissioner Argenta said he was most concerned with the affect the stain would have on the brick. The HDC was charged with enforcing the guidelines, and the guidelines specifically said that unpainted brick should not be painted. He was further concerned with putting multiple colors on the lower level. Northville had a lot of signs along Center Street that designated the buildings. He questioned putting additional colors right in the middle of downtown. Buildings that were painted were individual Victorian style buildings. This application was changing a building that was already dominant.

Commissioner Field said he was also concerned with changing the color of the brick. He did not think stain on mortar could be removed. However, he also wondered if this was really a historic building. MainCentre was approximately 30 years old and if they had originally requested stain application as was being proposed this evening, perhaps it would have been granted. He could live with approving stain for the brick because he did not really see this building as being historic.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the guidelines referred to all buildings in the Historic District.

Commissioner Hoffman said that he saw the building as being monolithic and therefore out of place in the Historic District. He liked the idea of breaking the building up from its visual monolithic appearance. He saw this as a balance between an attempt to reduce the mass and scale of a modern building while respecting the guidelines and needs of the historic district.

Commissioner Vernacchia said he had concerns regarding the color at the March meeting which had been mitigated by seeing the actual stain on the brick. He offered the perspective that painting bricks was not appropriate for historic structures. This building not being an historic structure, he was more comfortable with the staining as presented. The intention of trying to offset the businesses under the colonnade was a good one. The colors presented at the last meeting seemed a little harsh, but the actual stain samples were considerably toned down and presented a nice compromise.

Discussion followed regarding staining brick generally. Commissioner Argenta said that twice in his career he had stained brick with disastrous results. Commissioner Hoffman suggested that perhaps stain technology had improved over the course of time.

Commissioner Field said that he supported breaking up the mass of the building. He clarified with Mr. Rankine that all the fabric canopies and balcony railings, light fixtures, etc. were black.

Mr. Rankine pointed out that this matched the streetlight poles and benches in the rest of Northville.

Commissioner Gudritz said that if this was an older building he would be opposed to staining the brick. In this instance, because of the building's age, he did not have a problem with staining the brick.

Commissioner Field thought the stain would be an improvement.

Commissioner Hoffman supported the staining as presented. He opposed using only the dark stain, however, which would simply continue the monolithic feel of the building.

Commissioner Field noted that the stain colors were subtle and wondered if they would give enough definition to the retail space.

Mr. Rankine replied that they felt the stain colors would differentiate the spaces enough to call out the retail space. The colors would be brighter than the brown and also have some variation from each other.

**MOTION by Vernacchia, support by Gudritz, to accept the application as complete.
Motion carried unanimously.**

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Vernacchia, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 5-18 paint and color.

Commissioner Argenta confirmed there was no metal roof.

Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Argenta noted that he voted for the motion but he was still concerned about the technique used to stain the brick.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen rejoined the Commission.

CASE #4

CORNER HOUSE

335 E. CADY STREET

NEW BUILDING

As noted above, the agenda was amended to place Case #4 last.

Commissioner Argenta asked if this building was classified commercial or residential. Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that since the zoning was Commercial Business District (CBD), commercial standards should be used.

Roger Berent, of Roger Berent Architects, 53064 Nadine Court, Shelby Township, MI 48316, and a partner in the proposed development, was present on behalf of this application. Realtor Shelby Fulkerson, Hub LLC, 829 Penniman Avenue, Plymouth MI, also a partner in the development, was also present.

Utilizing the overhead projector, Mr. Berent gave the background for this application. He explained that they had been working with the city for over a year. They did receive preliminary site plan approval from the Planning Commission on December 16, 2014. They then had to wait until the Cady Street Overlay Zoning District (CSO) was approved. They hoped to receive approval from the HDC this evening, and then would return to the Planning Commission for final site plan approval.

Mr. Berent showed various views of the proposed development, including

- The main East Cady Street elevation, noting the context of the New Victorian and the Tipping Point Theater to the east.
- The main corner of the proposed Corner House, from the corner of E. Cady Street and South Griswold Street looking west.
- From the corner of East Main Street and South Griswold Street looking south.
- A night rendering showing the energizing impact of the building on the street.

Mr. Berent said this building was a boundary threshold to Main Street and to the City. The southeast was industrial zoning, directly south was the racetrack district, and their parcel was in the CBD District with the Cady Street Overlay District.

The Cady Street Overlay District was instituted to encourage the type of development they were proposing, including first floor residential, which was not allowed within the CBD District previously. The CSO recognized the uniqueness of the area, allowing a unique mix of land uses to serve the commercial and residential needs of the community, including townhouses, rowhouses, and live/work units.

Mr. Berent said he also interpreted this parcel to be commercial in nature, as it was in the CBD District, and was multi-family.

Mr. Berent reviewed the design guidelines for the CSO District, noting that materials regarding these guidelines were in the packet, including:

- Setback guidelines: the building was proposed to be zero setback up against the New Victorian on the side and up against the sidewalk (a 5-foot setback), to align exactly with the New Victorian.
- Mass: They were specific and intentional in breaking up the mass of the building. Each of the 11 units was unique in either being set back up against the street or it had a set back terrace on the top. They were conscious regarding engaging the street at the pedestrian level. The choice of materials included a stone base, cedar siding, and brick and glass.
- Height: The New Victorian at the edge of their site was 48.5 feet tall. The subject parcel was on a slope. They would take advantage of the grade change; as the units moved to the east they would be taller and larger. This gave a diversity in what they were able to offer, and also blended nicely with the area. They were in the area of the CSO District limited to 36 feet in height, but with the grade change they were able to accentuate that somewhat. In terms of transition, the proposed building bridged the gap between the New Victorian and the Tipping Point, stepping down toward the Tipping Point, mediating that height difference.
- Scale: This involved scale relative to the surrounding buildings, scale relative to the building itself (windows, verticals, etc.), and the first-floor pedestrian scale.
- Proportion: This involved repetition and proportion of windows. The light gray outer box was the general size of the unit. The darker gray was the size of the infill brick, with the dark rectangles being the actual windows themselves. The proportion was 1 foot in width to 1.6 feet in height, repeating throughout the building.

- Rhythm: This was demonstrated by the upper vertical pieces along with the infill of different brick. Below that were the windows themselves, all forming a rhythm that tied the building together.
- Materials Guidelines: Only natural materials would be used, predominantly brick. At the pedestrian level along with the upper walkout terraced areas, stained red cedar siding would be used. Railings would be black aluminum, with a black aluminum glazing system around the windows.
- Rear Façade Development: The rear façade would use simplified themes taken from the front, including all brick for the three units to the far east, the next three moving west with siding, the next three with brick, and the last units again with siding. The garage doors would be walnut color, with lighting over the garage doors.

Mr. Berent noted that as the project had progressed they had looked at Northville as a whole, and he showed photos of different buildings that illustrated the diversity of buildings, materials, and textures within the Historic District. They wanted their building to be original but to also fit in and complement Northville and he described various buildings and how they informed the design of tonight's proposal.

Mr. Berent quoted from the CSO District regarding Architectural Design, and spoke to how their development met these guidelines, including first floor architecture and garage doors. He also quoted from the language regarding Corner Building Standards, noting the distinctive corner design features of the proposed building, including the planter box at the corner and other features.

Mr. Berent referred the Commissioners to their packets, pointing out the screening of the HVAC units, the masonry screening of the dumpster, the details of the retaining wall, railing, etc. He pointed out similar details in the Historic District.

Mr. Berent said lighting was simple and straightforward. They had four city lamps in front of their building, with accent lights on the building itself, and lights over the garages for parking and safety.

Mr. Berent said they had chosen an East Jordan tree grate that was complementary to other grates in the City.

They would use an insulated Clopay garage door with a walnut finish, as already noted. Resident doors on the rear would be solid vertical grain fir doors with deadbolts.

Mr. Berent concluded his presentation by saying they had received positive feedback in terms of interest in the building, and asked for approval from the Commission.

Commissioner Vernacchia said that while there were aspects he liked regarding this building, he had two areas of concern: (1) There was a lack of any Victorian cues or continuity in the front elevation. The building seemed very modern, especially juxtaposed right next to the New Victorian. (2) He was extremely concerned regarding the minimalist rear elevation, which seemed antiseptic and very much like an apartment complex.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said the previously approved building (2006) had been even more modern, with copper siding. Both the Planning Commission and the HDC had approved that building as a transition to the industrial area.

Mr. Berent showed elevations of the building approved in 2006.

Ms. Fulkerson said market feedback showed the desirability of the building as presented.

Mr. Berent explained that it was not the intention or direction of the project to add Victorian details. The market they were seeking wanted more loft-type buildings. Their intent was to reflect the industrial nature of their surroundings.

Commissioner Vernacchia said that what the market wanted and what the Historic District preferred might be two different things. The rear elevation could perhaps benefit by arches over the windows, to break up the monotony.

Mr. Berent said that the rendering of the rear elevation was problematic, as normally the entire rear façade would not be seen. Additionally, the rear elevation was a backdrop to the buildings off Main Street. The intent was to break up the design into smaller scaled pieces.

Commissioner Field said he agreed with Commissioner Vernacchia. While the market might want this type of housing, the HDC was charged with protecting the Victorian nature of the Historic District. How did this building fit in with that Historic District requirement?

Commissioner Field was also concerned with the night view as presented this evening. This view showed all glass providing a nighttime light show within the Historic District. The front elevation in general didn't seem to be in keeping with the charge of the Historic District as referenced on page IV of the guidelines: *What is a Historic District?* He was also concerned regarding the rear elevation.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said the question now as well as during the discussion in 2006 was: did everything have to be built to be Victorian period? Or did a more modern building with the rhythm of the industrial area make sense, especially as the contrast would make the other buildings look older?

Commissioner Hoffman noted that the recently adopted Master Plan discussions had focused on how to bring the industrial section of the city into transition with the residential, and how to make the transition from Cady Street to any future residential in the Racetrack area. While he was sympathetic to those who felt the building was too modern, he also understood the need to create appropriate transitions. The question for him was: would this building set a standard or would it just be a corner piece of an overall transition?

Commissioner Vernacchia clarified that he would prefer some different accents on the building's front, providing a better transition with the adjacent architecture. However, his bigger concern was with the back of the building, which he felt needed more attention.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen commented on the voids in the New Victorian building, and spoke to the voids he perceived at the top of the building proposed this evening. He suggested putting the bedroom on the third floor to the front, which would create a line that would help step down the building visually, giving a parapet all the way across, with patios placed in the rear.

Commissioner Argenta said that he thought the architect had "nailed it" with the front of the building. He thought the back was suffering from "ink jet curse," i.e., the failure of a rendering to effectively show what was going on. He said he had used this brick a lot himself, and it was a knockout – really nice. The bricks as presented would give a really nice appearance to the rear.

Commissioner Argenta asked the applicant if they were clear-cutting the site so that it was level with the sidewalk. Mr. Berent explained that the site would slope gently east to west.

Commissioner Argenta commented that from Main Street “you would not see a lot of this building.”

Regarding the front, the two bricks fit together really well, and would not be as differentiated as shown in the rendering. It would be subtler than shown.

Regarding the Commission’s charge for new construction for the HDC District, Commissioner Argenta noted that the Guidelines addressed new construction by making a point that the main things to look at were setback, spacing, proportion, mass, height, rhythm, materials and details (4-14). After quoting the entire paragraph *General Design Issues* for new commercial construction, Commissioner Argenta said the only problem he had with the design was the cedar siding, which would weather. With its location at the southeast corner of the downtown area, this mostly all brick building extended sidewalks and the downtown pattern, and seemed to him to be entirely appropriate.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that across Cady Street from this development, four stories were allowed.

Commissioner Vernacchia clarified that Commissioner Argenta was not as concerned as he was about the back of the building because Commissioner Argenta felt the rendering was providing a distorted picture. Additionally, there was probably no place a person could stand and see an entirely unobstructed view of the rear elevation.

Mr. Berent noted that the page titled *Rear Façade Development* handed out this evening was the correct rendering of the rear. They would have a common wall with the New Victorian.

Commissioner Hoffman pointed out the landscaping that would soften the view between the Credit Union and this building.

During discussion, Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that landscaping guidelines were not precise, and landscaping would have to be further discussed at final site plan review before the Planning Commission. The developers were encouraged to provide more landscaping and flower beds at the front of the building, helping to provide privacy there.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Berent said that the retaining wall would be Prairie Stone material, not concrete block. Mr. Berent showed material samples for the project to the Commission.

Commissioner Vernacchia acknowledged the information provided this evening regarding the Master Plan discussions, permitted elevations across Cady Street, and the further explanations of the views of the back of the building. While he remained concerned, he was not as concerned as he was at the beginning of this discussion.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen confirmed with Mr. Berent that the stone at the base of the building would be the same as on the steps leading up to the entrances.

Mr. Berent affirmed that this would be a quality building that would stand the test of time.

In response to questions from Commissioner Field, Mr. Berent said that there would be outdoor terraces atop the units, and an architectural element shown on the far east unit on the page *Corner House Rendering* was in error and would be removed.

Commissioner Hoffman initiated a discussion regarding providing a higher elevation on the ~~east~~ west end of this building, next to the New Victorian. After discussion, the design of the building's height was accepted as provided.

Mr. Berent confirmed that the proposed Corner House was flush with the New Victorian.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen asked about trash pickup. Mr. Berent said that the dumpster would be in the back corner as shown on the plan.

Mr. Berent pointed out that the units and parking fit the site, with no variances needed. They were not trying to force anything onto the site – it was a comfortable fit.

Commissioner Gudritz complimented Mr. Berent on his presentation. He commented that the presentation had gone a long way to helping him make a decision this evening.

Commissioner Vernacchia agreed with Commissioner Gudritz. He was much more comfortable with this building after sitting through tonight's presentation and discussion.

MOTION Vernacchia, support by Hoffman, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-12 new commercial building, 4-12 streetscape amenities, 4-13 parking, 4-14 setback and spacing, 4-16 mass, 4-17 height, 4-18 scale, 4-19 proportion, 4-20 rhythm, 4-21 materials, 4-22 ornament, 4-27 rear façade development, 5-7 roofing, 5-12 stone, 5-14 windows, 5-16 metal, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

9. DISCUSSION: None.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Argenta, support by Vernacchia, to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended 5-20-15