

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**

Regular Meeting

March 17, 2026 – 5:00 PM

**Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Council Chambers & virtual
via Zoom)**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review. Staff will introduce each item, followed by the applicant's presentation, which should not exceed ten minutes. The Chair will then ask for questions from the public, followed by questions from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. For each application, members of the public are each allowed three minutes to ask questions and three minutes to offer comments. Speakers shall identify themselves and provide their address. Comments should be limited to the BAR's purview; that is, regarding only the exterior aspects of a project. Following the BAR's discussion and prior to taking action, the applicant will have up to three minutes to respond.

Members Present: Roger Birle, Carl Schwarz, Katherine Tabony, James Zehmer, Jerry Rosenthal, Ron Bailey, David Timmerman

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Kate Richardson, Jeff Werner, Sarah Kim, Eric Morris, Brennen Duncan

Pre-Meeting:

It seems to be prudent to do a modular columns for the Mall crossings. Staff did go over the different options and colors for the different bricks for the Downtown Mall crossings. There are 70 days for the project to be done in time for the 50th anniversary and the 250th birthday this summer. Decisions regarding this project to need to be done. This project was approved by the BAR last summer.

Mr. Zehmer called the meeting to order at 5:33 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Public Comments

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Meeting Minutes – January 21, 2026

Mr. Timmerman – Motion to approve Consent Agenda– Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # HST26-0006
554 Valley Road; TMP 110053200
Oakhurst Circle-Gildersleeve Wood ADC District
Owners/Applicants: Lindsay & Evan Edwards
Project: Addition on front elevation

Kate Richarson, Staff Report – CoA request for a two-story addition on the front (east) elevation and alterations to the house.

Lindsay Edwards, Applicant – I don't have any further commentary. I am here to answer any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Judy Bellifarow – I am going to assume that those metal windows that she is talking about are drafty and not energy efficient that she wants to replace, those old windows.

Ms. Edwards – All of the original windows are going to be replaced. The vinyl ones that were replaced by the previous owner are also going to be replaced with double-pane windows, which are in a style that is more in keeping with the historic nature of the original windows.

Ms. Bellifarow – Are the original windows now in place? Are they all drafty and not energy efficient, those old windows?

Ms. Edwards – Yes, absolutely. I had someone come out and assessed restoring all the original windows. They said that the efficiency of the original windows there was not possible to achieve what I needed to achieve for the envelope of the building.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Birle – How does this relate to Valley Road? I have not had a chance to get over there. Is the addition facing Valley Road? How far is it off the road?

Mr. Werner – I can tell you that you cannot see it.

Ms. Richardson – It is situated on the landform. There is an intentional swale below it. There is a tiny bridge that you must access. There is a screen of vegetation on the front. There are stone facades on every house immediately adjacent to it.

Ms. Edwards – I would also like to add that the house sits at a 45-degree angle to Valley Road. This could not necessarily be considered an addition. There is no possible way to pass from the 1st floor to the 2nd floor in an enclosed space in the existing house. When we talk about this “addition,” the only thing that we are adding is an enclosed stairway on the front of the house to have an interior stair, to have a finished bottom level connect to the upper level.

Mr. Schwarz – There is a site plan. They do have a plat.

Mr. Zehmer – On the gable ends of the house, I guess there is maybe an attic space. There are 2 small windows up at either end. Are you planning to replace those as well?

Ms. Edwards – Yes, these should be replaced. The insulation will be added at the framing, at the attic level. We are going to be insulating at those rafters and not at the roof level. They could remain in place as original windows because we will not meet the envelope to be secured at that level. We will be replacing those attic windows as well.

Mr. Zehmer – You would like to replace them. It is in the documents where one note said something about removing the chimney. Another note said something about repairing the chimney and capping it. What is your intention?

Ms. Edwards – We will be repairing the chimney and capping it.

Mr. Rosenthal – Is there a driveway or way to get to this building?

Ms. Edwards – Yes. There is a gravel driveway across a concrete bridge and then a gravel driveway.

Mr. Rosenthal – What are your plans for the roof?

Ms. Edwards – It will be an asphalt shingle roof.

Mr. Schwarz – Our staff report recommends that we put a condition on here that you replace the metal roof with a metal roof per our Guidelines. Is that doable? It is a big question. We are going to get to that at some point tonight.

Ms. Edwards – Anything is doable. I guess that I would ask my contractor if he would like to chime in.

Mr. Zehmer – We have Design Guidelines that you are hoping to meet. What you are applying to do and what you would like to do. Not everything that you are applying to do meets our Guidelines. That is why we are asking about that in particular. One of our Guidelines says to avoid replacing a standing seam metal with asphalt shingles. More than likely, we are going to recommend or maybe put a condition on the motion that you use a metal roof. That is why the question came up.

Mr. Schwarz – Is it just the budget? Is there another reason an asphalt shingle roof would be preferable for you?

Ms. Edwards – Originally, the roof was standing seam. The budget for renovating this house came in more than the cost of purchasing the house. I have been looking for ways to reduce costs for the renovation because it exceeded the original budget. That was the original intention of switching to an asphalt shingle roof. The original intention of the design was to go to standing seam.

Mr. Zehmer – What is the condition of the roof? Is it leaking? Could it just be painted?

Ms. Edwards – It is leaking. If anybody has driven by this house, it is in the worst condition possible, not even viable for human occupancy right now. There were so many break-ins that the previous owner put in a brand-new security system because so many people were breaking in and squatting in this house.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Rosenthal – I would like to see the roof go back as a metal roof.

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Werner, I feel that there have been some cases where we have allowed asphalt to replace metal. I cannot remember if we did that anywhere.

Mr. Werner – It is a preference recommendation in the Guidelines.

Mr. Schwarz – I just wonder about precedent.

Mr. Werner – We have allowed some changes. We allowed one house where they removed the slate and put on metal so they could do solar panels. As someone in an 1884 house facing a new roof, I am not going to replace it with asphalt. I wish I could. It is not an unusual question that we will be seeing. We know what the roof was. There is a valid argument there that this one needs to be replaced. If anyone were to restore it later, you could certainly return it. Installing asphalt shingles does not negate that possibility. My preference would be yes, it be metal.

Mr. Schwarz – Where I am struggling with this one is how precious is it? It is an outbuilding for a more important house on JPA. Is that house on JPA contributing? It is contributing. They are doing a lot of work that is a little less than reversible. They are lowering the sills on the stone windows or the windows set in stone. They are building that bump out with matching stone and some of the salvage stone. If this was a more visible house and maybe a more important contributing structure in one of our districts, some of these things would cause me more concern. As it is, I feel the real form of the house is staying the same. There is still going to be the knowledge that there was an outbuilding right here. I am okay with what is being presented. I am leaning towards being okay with the roof because it is an outbuilding and it is not visible from the street. I have a couple comments on the staff recommendations. One of the recommendations was that with the windows that are in the stucco wall, you said that you want them to be flush or slightly proud from the stucco. The existing windows are recessed. That does not make sense to me push them out.

Mr. Werner – We were looking at the photographs. When the windows were there, if it is reduced into the opening such that it could be done that way without producing whatever that return must be, I did not know if they must widen those or change them. Maybe I should have said on the front where they are making a wider window. You can say to have it inset. They then must do a return at the edge. That is fine.

Mr. Schwarz – It looks like the existing details do a stucco return around all those windows. Just make it consistent.

Mr. Werner – I have no problem with that. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Schwarz – The idea of retaining the garage door on site seems great. It is going to disappear. It is easier to do that when it is a big commercial building. Those are the conditions that I would drop. I would be okay with the rest of the application.

Mr. Zehmer – I think that the doors are neat and honorific of the fact that it was a garage. I was wondering if they couldn't be restored. Restored is probably not the right word but cleaned up, repainted, and maybe just hung on the wall inside somewhere like it is artwork. In that way, they stay with the house. I tend to agree with your general assessment. I thought that the staff put it well in saying the former garage dependency was never intended as a primary residence, nor was the building given a significant position on the landscape or improved access to the street. It is essentially a secondary structure or utilitarian outbuilding. That is how we should view this in a broader scheme. I tend to agree with Mr. Rosenthal on the roof. At the same time, if allowing an asphalt shingle roof helps this building be preserved, maybe take that win. With the casement windows,

looking at the historic photo in the staff report and knowing that we have metal casements in the basement level, I think it is safe to assume. I think the historic photo shows a casement window for the upper level. The Pella Lifestyle Windows that you are specking have a divided light option. Personally, I would like to see that. You can still achieve a casement opening but honor the original appearance of the historic windows while still maintaining your energy standards, I understand the reasoning for enlarging the basement windows. I am not going to push back on that. The wide-open window looks like a hole in the wall.

Mr. Schwarz – My only hesitation is that we don't know what was there. With the windows in the front, they are going to be bigger.

Mr. Zehmer – We do know it is there. There is one historic photo. It was not shown tonight but it was in our packet. I don't know what this elevation is. It shows the side door. It is that window beside it. You can see that it is a casement window. I would also prefer it if they could restore and retain that entrance door, the personnel door to the 2nd floor. I did not know if there was a strong reason for replacing that. I am not opposed to having the divided light for the Pella replacement windows. I have a follow-up question about the replacement for the main door at the entry.

Ms. Edwards – Am I hearing that you have a question on why I am replacing the original door?

Mr. Schwarz – Mr. Zehmer, you are asking about the side door.

Mr. Zehmer – I am asking about the 2nd floor door that goes to the kitchen.

Ms. Edwards – I was intending to have a secure envelope for the whole house. Since I was replacing every opening, I wanted to ensure that the envelope was sealed and energy efficient, so I was replacing all the openings at that point. It is not original.

Mr. Zehmer – It was hard to tell because there is a storm door. If it is not original, I am not going to argue for it. It would be nice to confirm. What do you think about trying to somehow store the garage doors on site or using them as artwork? They are a unique feature to this house and speak to its original function.

Ms. Edwards – I could investigate reusing work. I talked to a contractor about reusing them as doors. They would have to be significantly rebuilt to be rodent resistant and have the proper sealing as part of the envelope. I could consider using them as something on the interior.

Mr. Zehmer – That is the spirit of it in keeping them with the house instead of throwing them in the dumpster if that is possible. It does not necessarily need to be a functioning door. You could get creative with a barn door style with a sliding rail if you wanted to.

Mr. Timmerman – Why didn't the protruding part come down to the ground? It looks like you have some brackets underneath there.

Ms. Edwards – Those were added for structural support. I wanted to keep the base with the stone consistent band across the bottom. I felt it would go to the ground. It would not read as well in the elevation. If there is opposition to that, we could bring it fully to the ground. In my opinion, stone is a more robust material to interact with the ground. I wanted to have that separation.

Mr. Timmerman – That is great. What inspired you to design it this way? I don't know if you did the design. It is worthwhile noting that. There is an intention to it. That is a good intention. It is worthwhile to mention that he tried to do things to try to reinforce the nature of the house. Mr. Zehmer suggested trying to keep some

of the items on site. Why are there 2 roofs above the part that is protruding out? There are the gable roof and the flat part above the bay.

Ms. Edwards – That was an intent to bring some of the standing seam previous roof to visible. When you look at the photos and the existing standing seam, you cannot see the standing seam from the road. In the photos when you go to the rear yard, you are on the top of the hill. That is when you see the standing seam. 90 percent of the time you never see the roof from the ground level. The intent of having the gable and standing seam was to maintain that homage to the existing standing seam. The gabled roof was more of a simplification of the structural system needed for the addition.

Mr. Timmerman – My thoughts are the same as Mr. Schwarz. I do not feel like this building is significant enough to make you foot a bill that is \$50,000 more than the roof is going to cost you. For me, it is just a matter of preference that you are intentional and how you treat the house. The only suggestion that I might offer is that the house is simple. Try to maintain simplicity. I found that the bay is at that 3-sided thing is not necessarily from a design standpoint in keeping with the general proportion and detailing of the house. The double roof feels a little busy to me as well. I appreciate your intention and nodding to the standing metal seam. I am willing to approve it. The brackets feel funny being inset the way they are. These are minor details for conversation.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City’s ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed addition and alterations satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted noting the following conditions:**

- **A recommendation, not a requirement, that the garage doors be kept on-site and be reused in some way [perhaps decoratively, or however possible].**
- **That window and door trim that is on the stucco be treated consistently, [whether its installed recessed, flush or slightly proud]; windows in the stone wall should be recessed.**
- **The new gutters should be half round.**
- **The existing chimney should be retained.**
- **The recommendation that all replacement windows in the house should have divided lights, excluding the hopper window on the west elevation, and applied grills with an internal spacer bar.**

Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 6-0 with one abstention (Mr. Rosenthal).

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # HST26-0007

707-709 West Main Street; TMP 320156000

West Main Street ADC District

Owner: Starr Hill Properties, LLC

Applicant: Cliff Fox

Project: Seasonal vestibule

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA for seasonal, temporary vestibule at doorway to commercial address 707 West Main Street currently in operation as Smyrna Restaurant. (Note: Applicant has replaced the operable door with a cloth and clear-vinyl curtain. See Discussion and Recommendation.)

Mr. Timmerman – Is this the first year it has been put up?

Mr. Werner – No.

Mr. Timmerman – Has it been up permanently since it was put up? Has it been taken down during the summer?

Mr. Schwarz – It has been up consistently for about 15 months now.

Mr. Rosenthal – If I remember correctly, this area out in the sidewalk is city property?

Mr. Werner – I don't know exactly where the city property line starts. You can assume it is close to the front wall.

Mr. Rosenthal – I think we discussed about handicapped access.

Mr. Werner – I asked when Mr. Fox contacted me initially about it. There is no code issue. I had wondered if there was a code issue with a door opening out into the sidewalk. There wasn't a code issue. Apparently, the restaurant did this in response to some concerns that were expressed to them. This was not something they were required to do. A door could not go in because of the ramp part. This is another question we must resolve, and we would look at it in the policy. Is that ADA accessible? I don't know. That would have to be something that we would incorporate into that. You are looking at it relative to whether this is compatible or incompatible with the architecture and character of that building. We will address the ADA and building code issues.

Mr. Timmerman – In the summertime, they take the blanket down?

Mr. Werner – We would remove the entire thing. That is the original piece on the recommendation. If someone wished to do this permanently, my recommendation would be to work with a glazing company and to fabricate an extension of the storefront that respected what is there. That could be installed permanently. What you see there were not intended to be permanent installations. It would not last, and I would not recommend approval.

Mr. Timmerman – How did they use it in the summertime? Did they just take the blanket down and keep the plexiglass panel on the side?

Mr. Schwarz – I think there was a moment where it was not there. The applicant is here.

Mr. Zehmer – I want to ask the applicant to come up and speak to us. I did not see their application. I just saw the staff report.

Mr. Werner – It should be attached. There are some photographs that we augmented with some information we had.

Mr. Zehmer – I want to be clear on what they are submitting.

Mr. Werner – They are submitting that image right there. There is no question about it being a seasonal temporary vestibule. Whether they intend to reinstall the door or retain that fabric opening, it is unclear. I am assuming that is what they want in there. That is the door as installed. I would be fine with that. I would prefer that. That is what is there now.

Mr. Zehmer – Even with the door, it did not get approved.

Ms. Tabony – I have a question about your recommendation to approve it until April 1st. If we approve it now, that does not imply that it would be able to be reinstalled at any point.

Mr. Werner – No. Every application is viewed independently. You certainly can state that. You could say in any motion that under the circumstances. What we are trying to do is to recognize this is a zoning violation. I am trying to find a solution that works for the applicant and works for us. As I had told the property manager a year or two ago, this is something that we would entertain. We could consider it. I don't want to slam the door on it, but only as a temporary item. You can see the air curtain that was installed. You all may have an opinion of that. There has not been any application for that. I would have no problem if you wished to address that in the motion. I am assuming that this current arrangement is what they are requesting a CoA for with the understanding that it might have the door reinstalled. I don't see how that would happen in the next month or why they would do that.

Mr. Rosenthal – Do we need an end date so that it starts again on October 1st?

Mr. Werner – No. Anything new would be a new CoA request and would come to you.

Mr. Zehmer – They never brought it to us.

Mr. Werner – You have done that before. You have approved things. The only thing in our Guidelines that you currently approve formally are temporary and seasonal tents. You have applied timelines and conditions to other things. I am just trying to bridge the zoning violation and resolve that by getting CoA. If they get a CoA, they have resolved the zoning violation. The CoA also stipulates that it gets removed. If they want to reinstall it, it will come back.

Mr. Zehmer – I am curious about the potential building code violations. That is not our purview.

Mr. Werner – My understanding is that there are none other than whether this required a building permit or not, I don't know. I was told that the building code official said that the door can open out. We do have buildings where the doors open out. As far as that thing being accessible, I don't know.

Cliff Fox, Applicant – I am the property manager for most of that strip. The CoA application was produced in a rush to make this meeting deadline. The goal is to come up with a curative solution that as feasible honors the historic character of the property. If you look at 707 through 711, that has been attempted over the past decade. What we are trying to achieve is a seasonal temporary vestibule that can be installed and maintained. I understand that we might have to come back for another permit annually from October 1st through March 31st. It relieves a hardship for the restaurant seating it knocks. Staff had recommended an interior solution, which knocked out 8 seats, which translates into a huge sum of lost revenue each month. We are trying to accommodate the tenants' needs while respecting the building. The tenant was instructed to make the application in 2024. That did not happen. This is a remedial process to get us current. They replaced the door with the flexible magnetic opening thing this past October. The property owners would like a solution that was completely removed from April through September depending on whether a viable temporary installation for the cold weather season.

Mr. Werner – When I spoke with them 2 years ago about a permanent solution, I had suggested that an interior vestibule could be constructed with a 3x3 small-framed wall. The idea of building something permanent, they could do it if the inside won't work. My suggestion was something on the outside could be pursued. It would have to be something designed and working with a professional company to extend the storefront.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Birle – The door that we see in image 5, it was installed with a door at one point. That door was removed.

Mr. Fox – Yes. They installed this with the opening door. I thought that this was a remedial solution that the tenant came up with and dealt with building codes and fire department. I thought that they had complied with making an application. That door is still there. It is in the basement. That door could be reinstalled.

Mr. Birle – Was there a reason why it was removed?

Mr. Fox – It was perceived from the comments we got from the city. That was the tenant's interpretation. The opening door was a fire code issue or a building code issue because it opened out across the sidewalk. I think that was a question that came up early on.

Mr. Birle – This is basically a curtain that you pull aside and walk in.

Mr. Fox – That is correct.

Mr. Zehmer – You are the property manager, but you mentioned the building owner. Does the whole building have a single owner?

Mr. Fox – Yes.

Mr. Zehmer – I heard you say that they wanted a more permanent solution? Would they prefer a solution that is seasonal?

Mr. Fox – They want the tenant to do what they are supposed to have done. We want a permanent solution, which is either a seasonal or permanent solution that meets the code.

Mr. Zehmer – I could potentially see a way forward. As much as the recessed opening is part of the historic form of the building, possibly a more successful approach to this would be to have a storefront across the entire thing. To each of those, is it 2 or 3 entrances across there and provide a uniform vestibule for all of those instead of this telephone booth right there? I think that is to be discussed in a future submission.

Ms. Tabony – I have a question about our role tonight. Because it already exists, we cannot say that we want to modify it in such a way. It is whether we are either approving it or denying it. If we deny it, are we discussing how we would modify it to make an approval? Is that for another date?

Mr. Zehmer – I would rather save that for another date personally. I know where I stand on this.

Mr. Werner – There is the give & take of this. We are not trying to draw too bold of a line. Mr. Fox could say that they want the option of keeping this up for the number of weeks or putting the door back up for a period of x-weeks. The only caveat I would say to that is I don't know if either of these, whether the door or this fabric opening, whether there are code issues relative to ADA or building code. I don't know. I just want to be clear. Even if you all say that you love this thing and it can stay up, the reality is that the building code or fire department might tell me something else. The timeline for it is you can certainly modify that. This is not the result because the applicant has stated that this is a seasonal, temporary installation. That means at some point in time it is removed, you can determine when that is. You can be flexible here. This is about finding a solution.

Mr. Bailey – What we could do is simply say that this must be removed by April 1st. If you ever want to put it up again, come back and ask about it.

Mr. Werner – That is my recommendation. With that, not part of the CoA, is you all instructing. It helps when it comes from you. Ms. Richardson and I can say that we were asked by the BAR to do the following. It goes to the top of the list. You may say that you are fine. The current provisions for temporary, seasonal tents cover this. That is a possibility.

Mr. Birle – I would agree with Mr. Bailey’s assessment if that were a strategy that we can take. We can come back and say ‘you can’t put a curtain. It must be something better than that.’

Mr. Timmerman – It is hard to react to something that we don’t know what it is going to be. I don’t think this is acceptable for one of our main streets. I would certainly recommend putting a timeline on it but doing it in a way that is feasible for the restaurant.

Mr. Schwarz – I think that it would be useful to discuss what is and is not acceptable. If they come back in September with this and we say it is fine to put it back up, we are running into an issue where they are potentially damaging the existing wall by taking this down, putting it back up in September because it is currently fastened into the storefront and the wall. It might be worthwhile having a conversation about what would be acceptable.

Mr. Rosenthal – I feel that we want to accommodate this tenant. The restaurant is a benefit to our community. I want to commend the chef for his honors that he has recently received. We will want to work and make sure that the seating is available inside and we come up with a good design that will benefit that street and the restaurant.

Mr. Timmerman – Whoever procured this, is the intention for it to be an impermanent structure? Is it something that is meant to be put up and taken down during the summer season?

Orhun Dikmen, Owner – Last year, we applied. It was denied because the door was blocking the sidewalk. We removed the door. I thought that was the issue to not approve it. In the summer, I don’t need the door. I asked my next-door neighbor if it was blocking. They said it was okay. Winter came and we put up the curtain. I know it is maybe not the best design, but you recommend it. It was temporary. Maybe after your approval or not, I would like to work on a better design or take it off. I have the violation right now.

Mr. Timmerman – I guess you sourced it. You found this item. Did you buy it?

Mr. Dikmen – Yes, I installed that. The first company put in the vestibule. We removed the door after the BAR decision last year. It was because it was blocking the sidewalk. We realized that it should not be on that side. It should be the other side. It was going to block the other side. The BAR recommended putting the vestibule inside. With that plan, I am losing 3 tables. That means less profit monthly and yearly. The solution was to remove the door, not block the sidewalk. I have an open mind to have a better curtain. That is not the only solution. We tried that. I am okay to buy the new one. In the wintertime, it is in the entire room, and it is cold.

Mr. Timmerman – When you did your research on this, was it sold like an impermanent or a temporary structure? Is there something about the way you put this thing up that allows you to take it down and then put it back up? Is it more you screw it to the side?

Mr. Dikmen – It is with the screw. I agree with Mr. Schwarz. It is going to be the screw issue after several times, maybe not in the second time. My purpose is the seasonal solution. That is why I apply for the seasonal. If the BAR says that I can keep it on the side, I will keep it and remove the door or curtain for the summer. That even helps sometimes in the summer. It is windy there and it helps with my entrance.

Mr. Fox – The air curtain is an artifact from the prior tenant. We are happy to get rid of that.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – I will start with a technical comment. I hate to disagree with our code official. There is a section in the code, 3302.2. It forbids doors and windows from projecting or opening into the public right-of-way. I only complained to you, Mr. Werner. I was never complaining to you guys or the city. I was smacked in the face by that door when it was first installed. I know you guys think it looks better. It is a wide door. It is wider than 3 feet. It swings way over the sidewalk all the way to where the tree pit is. People walk out of the restaurant. If you are not paying attention, you get smacked.

Mr. Werner – I told Mr. Fox that when we first talked about it. I said that is probably the bigger headache. Even if the code official had said that they had no problem with it, I said that the first person you hit, it is going to be a PR nightmare. I want to emphasize that again. I don't know if this would come from the code official and certainly from any ADA review if necessary. I want to stay away from that and make sure that we are clear that even if you all love this thing, if the life-safety people tell me it is a problem, it is a problem.

Mr. Zehmer – I want to help frame this. I will try and take some notes about what we talk about. I agree with Mr. Schwarz. If we can give any constructive feedback to the applicant, so that when they come back, they are not just starting from scratch. That is a bonus. It will help us out too in the long run. I want to echo Mr. Rosenthal's sentiments. We do want to support our businesses up and down Main Street and make sure that they are as successful as they can be. That is what keeps the city thriving and keeps people using our historic buildings. We appreciate that. I would prefer for us to approve this until April 1st as recommended in the staff report. Ask that it be taken down and ask that you bring us a formal CoA application with a real design so we can do our thing and get into it and get something approved for you so that you have your plan moving forward. I would be willing to support either a permanent solution or a temporary seasonal solution. It does need to be well thought out and designed. Taking screws out of the same hole repeatedly is going to wallow that hole out. It won't hold anymore. Possibly a track system that this thing can clip into and has toggles or something that would make it easier to remove and reinstall each year or each season would make sense. I wonder whether something would go across this whole opening. I am grappling with that one a little bit. I recognize that it is a historic step-in to the building entrances. Maybe that makes this feel like less of a one-off. You could have a better overall design there. With the air curtain, if you could take it down, that would be great. It does block the transom window over the door.

Mr. Birle – I would generally agree. I would also encourage you to come up with a permanent solution for this. Get a design professional to help you come up with a solution. It is an issue in the summertime too with air conditioning. You then don't have to worry about it.

Mr. Bailey – Would that be something that the owner of the property should probably do as opposed to the renter?

Mr. Zehmer – I think so. That is why I asked that question about whether the whole building had a single owner. This feature would then benefit their multiple tenants. Something we would look for is maybe holding the face of this thing back maybe an inch or two from the original storefront plane. It is something we often do when you are adding on to a historic building. It gives a sense of that original opening. When you are talking to a designer, that is something you might mention.

Mr. Werner – You are correct. We have talked to Mr. Fox about the vestibule that was approved at the Jefferson Theater, which is deep inside that. That was for privacy. It was a full glass wall and opening. I am thinking about the courthouse and the vestibule area there that they are enclosing in glass. There is precedent for doing that. That idea of distinguishing it between the historic storefront. We are talking about the length of that storefront. I have 2 or 3 doors there between those more formal storefronts.

Mr. Bailey – Would the door in that case still open out though?

Mr. Werner – That would not be my call.

Mr. Schwarz – ADA is another thing. It is not our purview. I do wonder how that is going to turn out if this ends up coming up for a building permit. Speaking of the storefront, I know there is some disagreement in the staff report. I am certain that this storefront is original. I think it is bronze. The staff report says it is copper. It is patinaed too dark to be copper with at least the few pieces that are still not painted.

Mr. Werner – The glass was replaced but the metal was not.

Mr. Schwarz – It matches what is happening on the adjacent building. Whatever they come up with, I hope that it is something that does not destroy that storefront every time it attaches to it. Although it is original, I think it is still in decent shape. It has some places where there are still some holes. It looks like it is thin. You could easily damage it. That would be my 1 caution. If we are having them remove and replace something constantly, it is that they do that without damaging it.

Mr. Zehmer – That is why I was suggesting some kind of track system. You would only screw into it once.

Mr. Schwarz – What they have, we don't want to see that again. I am not sure how you do it better than what they have. I cannot think of any other solution. It is not the most attractive thing. I cannot think of anything that would be lighter unless you did some structural glass thing like at The Jefferson. You still have a curtain on the front. At Public, they have a different situation. They have their own alcove for their door. They have strung a heavy curtain across that. That shows up every winter. It seems to be functional and does not cause a problem. Is this the specific curtain that they have? Is that something that we have a problem with? If they came back with this same thing, what would we do in August or September?

Ms. Tabony – I am so glad that Smyrna has a restaurant on Main Street. I want you all to succeed. Whatever we suggest is in the spirit of wanting to help you. I would say materiality is a big one for me. I think Mr. Zehmer's comment about pushing it back a few inches would be helpful. There is a jog on the top where the top of the glass meets the ceiling. If you moved it back to that point of the jog, that would be enough for me to move it beyond the trim detail of that front façade. On one hand, the kind of galvanized aluminum is a little jarring next to the bronze. I don't have a huge problem with it, maybe something of a darker color would blend a little bit better. A curtain could be nice there. There is something about the kind of continuation of that glass façade that I find confusing. It is like the existing glass. It looks like a shower curtain. It feels inappropriate. If that was a nice, heavy fabric material that, if it pushes back, you would get the same kind of rain damage there. Some kind of weatherproof material that will not fade too much in the sun. It is a tricky spot. A fabric solution would be better than the shower curtain.

Mr. Timmerman – Those are all good points. It leads to the issue of creating guidelines for these things that are hard to do. It is the reason why you need to come back and submit for a design. We have a chance to provide these kinds of solutions. It is place specific. That is why it is difficult for me to say yes to this and no to that.

Mr. Rosenthal – I will support letting you keep this until April 1st and then ask you to come back with designs. You can decide whether you want something permanent or something seasonal. You have heard some thoughts from the BAR about those designs. It is fine to talk with staff, get a little bit further stuff, and come back to us with your designs. We can then work with you to get this done in a timely manner before it gets cold again.

Mr. Timmerman – I have a question about April 1st. Does that work for your business? Is that going to impinge on your business? I can't think of how cold it is on April 1st versus April 15th. I am willing to make that date flexible to make sure that you don't lose any kind of business.

Mr. Dikmen – It sounds good to me. I just want to make sure your point on the design with the curtain. The design looks good on this place or just the curtain.

Ms. Tabony – If this was my project, I would consider doing a curtain the full length unless there is a reason you need the light coming in from the south.

Mr. Dikmen – That is not the reason for the curtain. I bought many heavy curtains because it is windy. It blows everywhere. It was not helpful. It was my experience. The idea was coming from the public. This is the only magnet that keeps it straight. It is not easy to open. I am happy to remove the curtain if the best side of the vestibule stays there. Even that is going to be helpful if the wind is coming from one direction. I can put a better curtain on top of the door. At that point, I would not need any door or curtain over there. I can find many curtains that would hopefully be the best. I will try to do that. If you are not okay with many curtains, I am okay not to do anything.

Mr. Timmerman – I don't want to speak for you. One of your ideas was that the point of the curtain is that it is a different material than the beautiful glass façade that is existing. Our point is that we want to be sure that as much as we can, we support moves that preserve that, that accentuate that. One idea that came up here is that a curtain is a different material set in. It allows that beautiful façade to remain. It keeps people's attention on it. It provides you with an opportunity to shield in a certain way the wind and cold weather. The discussion about whether the left-hand panel is appropriate, you need to think about it comprehensively. It would be a good idea to maybe get with a designer and come up with a creative solution that is holistic in that temporary little spot. It also should be something that works with the greater whole, the beautiful existing façade.

Mr. Werner – You are now entertaining ideas of what might be considered acceptable at a later date.

Mr. Zehmer – There is support to suggest that this be removed April 1st. If we want to discuss a later date. I am happy to entertain that. My understanding is that this gets removed in its entirety. It is not just the curtain. The wall needs to come down. The transom over the curtain needs to come down. The frame needs to come down. We will then see the new design.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City's ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed seasonal vestibule at 707-709 West Main Street, as currently installed, satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this**

property and other properties in this ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- By April 1, 2026, the vestibule, in its entirety, be removed and impacts of its installation be repaired.
- Any future vestibule be brought to the BAR for a new Certificate of Appropriateness application.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Birle and passed 7-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # HST26-0009

208 3rd Street NE; TMP 330215100

Downtown ADC District

Owner: Asharper. LLC [The Luck Group II, LLC]

Applicant: Jennifer Batchelder, Glickman Design Studio

Project: Window replacements and exterior modifications

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA for replacement windows, new windows within entry alcove, and other alterations at the front façade.

Mr. Zehmer – The history said that there was a renovation in 1968. Do we have any photos before or after that?

Ms. Richardson – We do not have any photos.

Mr. Rosenthal – Are they taking out these 25 panes on each side because they are energy inefficient?

Jennifer Glickman, Applicant – The purpose and the intent of the future use is to be an interior design studio and a retail space for homewares. I am an interior designer. The purpose of opening up the 2 front windows is to display items that I will be selling.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Staff had mentioned the trash receptacles. Did that fence finally fall? Is that even on your property?

Ms. Glickman – No. I did have a survey conducted. I do not own any property outside of the actual footprint of the building.

Mr. Zehmer – Any objection to removing abandoned wiring or conduit on the building?

Ms. Glickman – No. There is also some unsavory graffiti on one side that we plan to clean up as well.

Mr. Zehmer – You are welcome to do that without our approval.

Ms. Glickman – The intent is to make this a charming destination. We don't have parking. I want to make this feel warm and welcoming so that people want to come visit. However, I can improve the appeal of the exterior of the building while maintaining historical integrity as the goal.

Mr. Timmerman – You have one paint color selected for the entire front. It looks like the doors are a little lighter. Maybe that is the rendering.

Ms. Glickman – It is just the rendering. It is a simple color.

Mr. Werner – On paint color, that is something staff can approve. Ms. Glickman came in this fall and wanted to change the colors. I would look at it and weigh it. I used to be adamantly against that sort of color palette up to 5 or 6 years ago. Robert Watkins shared with me an image from Williamsburg. He said, ‘you don’t like this.’ In Williamsburg, this is very much a common color palette. I had to yield on that. I would also yield to you all if you feel strongly.

Mr. Rosenthal – What is the tile that you are proposing for the entranceway?

Ms. Glickman – I have been working with Sarisand Tile on appropriate materials that would withstand weather but most of all the salt. The salt has eroded the brick below the wood portion of the façade. We have been repointing that. You can see through some of the former mortar locations into the interior of the building. We are working with Sarisand Tile to look at some natural stone materials. They would be mosaic in size, smaller in size to prevent slippage.

Mr. Rosenthal – Is going to be neutral as shown here.

Ms. Glickman – I have not yet presented that but would explore a traditional pattern, maybe a border around the offset of the interior of the perimeter. I could present an actual rendering.

Mr. Werner – That is something I am comfortable looking at.

Mr. Timmerman – Do you think you are going to put a sign up somewhere?

Ms. Glickman – I was not sure if I submit that separately to a separate person. The hope was potentially 2 locations. One is above the door on the wood portion of the façade, like the historic image previously shown and potentially etched onto the glass. It would maybe be white or gold.

Mr. Rosenthal – Is there a flat roof on this?

Ms. Glickman – There is a flat roof. It is recessed below the front façade.

Mr. Rosenthal – Is your HVAC up on the roof?

Mr. Glickman – The HVAC is on the roof. We are planning to remove the current defunct HVAC unit that is there and replace it with a working new HVAC unit.

Mr. Rosenthal – I think our regulations say that needs to be screened.

Mr. Werner – That is something we will take care of. The new ordinance requires that on the rooftop. With a parapet wall like that, it is likely not an issue.

Mr. Zehmer – If you currently cannot see the unit from the street but you could see the screening, I would recommend not doing the screening.

Ms. Glickman – Our new HVAC unit will be much smaller than the current one. My contractor said that the current HVAC unit that is sitting on the roof is above and beyond what is needed for that space.

Ms. Tabony – I was wondering if you could take us through your decision to get rid of the divided lights? Explain to us why that is bad for your business.

Ms. Glickman – I hope to bring my clients into this space but also welcome people who happen to be walking around the Downtown Mall on a nice afternoon. On the interior of the space on both the left and right side, we are building platforms. On top of the platforms, I will have vignettes of furniture, decorative objects, and things like that, just welcoming warm scenes to draw people inside. Having the muttons as they are today block a lot of that view. The hope is to open that up and draw your eyes inside and welcome people in.

Mr. Schwarz – If you push lightly on that window, it is mobile?

Ms. Glickman – Yes. We are replacing the glass.

Mr. Schwarz – Getting rid of those muttons and everything, it would be much more stable. It is falling apart.

Ms. Glickman – A lot of it is falling apart. We would also replace the doors. The door on the left is broken.

Mr. Zehmer – Is that in the application?

Ms. Glickman – It is not. It could have been something that we needed to figure out afterwards.

Mr. Zehmer – Are you planning to replace both doors?

Ms. Glickman – Yes. Both doors are a matching set.

Mr. Zehmer – You would replace both doors.

Ms. Glickman – Yes. The structural integrity of the doors has been compromised. They have been kicked in.

Mr. Zehmer – Where I was going was if you are going to replace both doors anyways, would you consider replacing them back to the original design?

Ms. Glickman – Yes, something very similar with glass above. One of the thoughts was to keep the mail slot at its current location so that it is usable for the mail person.

Mr. Zehmer – There is a photo that is called Shapiro Office in August 1974 which I would venture to guess are maybe the original doors. It basically has a single panel in the lower portion of the door still glazed above. They are slightly different. They are handsome.

Mr. Birle – That is a door you can get easily made to look like that.

Mr. Zehmer – If you are planning to replace them anyways, why not go back to the historic door?

Ms. Glickman – We can do that.

Mr. Birle – Are you going to be using insulated glass?

Ms. Glickman – Yes, we will be using insulated glass.

Mr. Birle – We do have a requirement that there are spacer bars that it is an SDL

Mr. Werner – If it is an applied grill, there should be and must be a spacer bar.

Mr. Birle – These are not going to be true divided lights.

Ms. Richardson – There are specs that I printed that are there today. I have made a copy for everyone.

Mr. Werner – The important thing with the large sash is that this is a true storefront. This is where that clear glass specification becomes important. We want visible light. It is not a mirror. It is high VLT. It is clear glass. It is for a storefront. When people are walking outside, they are not looking in a mirror. They are seeing through the glass with that higher VLT. As a matter of guidance, we have established 70 percent VLT as clear glass. There is some flexibility in that. If you could ask Marvin what the VLT on is that.

Ms. Glickman – We want it to be as transparent as possible because those are the 2 main windows in the whole space. They really bring the main natural light in through the space.

Mr. Birle – This cut sheet has 8 lights on the transom of the big windows whereas with the renderings we only see 4.

Ms. Glickman – We were looking at both. We are open to both options. We have explored many renderings and are open to both options.

Mr. Rosenthal – Do you have a preference?

Ms. Glickman – The one in the cut sheet, the 8 lights.

Mr. Birle – It is going to be closer to the transom above the doors.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – Did anybody have thoughts or objections on the proposed 2 new windows on the sidewalls of the alcove?

Ms. Tabony – Conceptually, it is a good idea. I am looking at the rendering and your cut sheet. I am seeing 2 different situations. In the rendering, I am seeing the bottom bar of the divided light portion higher. It would be helpful to see elevations of this straight-on or hear your intention. Are those windows supposed to be the same height with the same transom top being the same dimension? It would be better if they matched. In this version, you see how the bottom of the divided light portion is higher than the sidewall. It would be helpful to see elevations of this straight on or hear your intention. Are those windows supposed to be the same height with the same transom top being the same dimension? I think it would be better if they matched. In this version, you see how the bottom of the divided light portion is higher than the sidewall? That is different than the door. If we could have some consistency, that would be great.

Ms. Glickman – It is better reflected in the cut sheets that those lines will be consistent. We were testing out an AI rendering in this instance. It is not as successful as we hoped

Mr. Birle – I think to have a dotted line that is the top of the door that just tracks would probably be the cleanest.

Mr. Werner – What is currently in the transom is the 6 lights, which are in the old photograph. Is the intent to change? I thought that the transom was staying the same.

Mr. Birle – It is. There is a note that says no change to transom window. That line might be too low on the front.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think it needs to match up with the door transom.

Ms. Tabony – It also looks like your cut sheet says the windows are coconut cream clad sash exterior. You are showing the blue painted. Are you planning to paint the cladding?

Ms. Glickman – We are. They are paintable.

Mr. Zehmer – I can get behind some of this proposal. I can get behind the tile on the floor. I can get behind the sconce lights. I can get behind the replacing of the doors with original. I can get behind the walls and the new windows in the alcove walls. I cannot get behind replacing the big windows. They are one of the major character defining features of this building along with maybe the pilasters. Other than that, there is not much else going for this building. That is where I stand. I find it hard to agree to replace what is as far as we can tell the original windows. They are kind of a storefront. Even if they have muttons break it up, they are large. You could still have your vignettes. I would not mind breaking up the color a little bit. Instead of monochromatic, maybe highlighting the pilasters or something like that would be fun.

Mr. Bailey – I disagree with my colleague here. Getting rid of those would be fine. Originally there was an office building. It is now going to be a storefront. The idea of displaying your wares is exactly what you need to do. This would get in the way. If you go to this original Walston company issue, they have blinds in the window. They did not intend for people to look in. This design is appropriate for what you are intending to reuse this. It is an undistinguished building. Perhaps you can improve it.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think the building is precious enough to warrant preservation of the windows. They do not represent handcraft. They don't represent something that cannot be replaced. In that sense, I am okay with a replacement.

Mr. Birle – I agree with my colleagues on the right.

Mr. Werner – In the staff report, we noted that when we were looking at similar buildings, we drove down High Street. That seems to be what this is representative of those single-story small commercial buildings you see there.

Mr. Timmerman – I tend to agree. Form follows function in this case. It is going to be a boom for you to have a large storefront window. It would be good for you to show a true elevation. We know that it is an AI rendering. Who knows what is going to come? Is it going to be 8 panes? That stuff does tend to make a difference, those details. Whether we decide it is a good idea to align the door, the head of the door with the bottom of the window or not, we will not know until we see it as a building elevation. I would like to see that to make sure we don't miss anything, and you don't miss anything.

Mr. Rosenthal – At the same time, bring back from Sarisand some of your potential designs.

Mr. Birle – We are not asking that she reapply.

Mr. Zehmer – There are a couple different ways this can go. We can either vote for approval as is or with conditions. We can deny it, which does not sound like that is going to happen. You can request a deferral, which means you have your own timeline to bring it back to us, or we can request a deferral, which means you must bring it back to us within a month.

Ms. Tabony – I am in support of the project. It would be important to see the elevations. I am also maybe comfortable saying that if the windows are the same height and the muttons are continuous across the multiple window units, I might not need to see it again. I see on your cut sheet that the windows are different vertical sizes. Maybe that is a resubmittal to staff

Mr. Schwarz – I wanted to ask about that. I noticed that. I am assuming it is because the window on the bottom has a frame around it. The one on the top doesn't. Is that what is causing the difference? One of them is 78 and 5/8 inches tall and the other one 81 and 9/16 inches tall. There are about 3 inches there that is different. Is that because of an extra frame material?

Ms. Glickman – I believe there was a construction influence on that. I would have to defer to my contractor on why that was. I can come back to that with that response.

Mr. Birle – It looks like the ceiling in the alcove is a little lower than the bottom of the entablature.

Ms. Glickman – The goal is to align every line as much as possible.

Mr. Birle – I think that horizontal line of the big picture unit, which is the bottom of the transom, should wrap the corner.

Mr. Zehmer – What is your timeline?

Ms. Glickman – As soon as possible.

Mr. Zehmer – It is trying to gauge how much we want to see this again or we just put conditions on it.

Mr. Rosenthal – Do you think you could come back to us with elevations and the answers to these questions at the next meeting?

Mr. Werner – Something with the longest lead time is ordering these windows. If there is something that you would like to see modified, in the interest of helping the applicant, it would be great to articulate that.

Mr. Birle – Can we put conditions on it that you could then approve before the next meeting as soon as those conditions are met?

Mr. Werner – This is where I wish we had a big whiteboard. If there is some alignment that you would like to see, doodle' it for me and we all can agree on it.

Mr. Schwarz – I think it is the horizontal mutton.

Mr. Birle – This AI image is showing a big mullion in between. That is now what is happening on that side window. It is going to be a mutton.

Mr. Werner – What you are looking at is we have this line. We have enlarged windows. We have that spring line there at the door between the door and the transom. Is the intent to see some alignment of that?

Mr. Zehmer – I think the driver might be the ceiling height of the alcove. If the exterior windows are taller, you will need to drop this line down to where that ends up.

Mr. Werner – That line could conceivably align.

Mr. Timmerman – I don't think we are the designers. All I want is somebody who is going to design it and build it to show me what it is going to be. Right now, we don't know. It would behoove you to have a construction document that delineates what the windows are going to be like.

Mr. Werner – You are okay with replacing the 2 storefronts and with installing a window on either side of the door. The question is that we are clear with the mutton, spring line, and if the applicant can demonstrate what that alignment is, I can circulate that to you all. You seem prepared to approve the CoA. You are fine with these alterations. There is detail that you want some clarification on. I will not sign off on the building permit until the CoA and until we are comfortable with this. In the past, we have asked for some clarification that has been provided after the fact. As long as that is stated clearly in your condition and that you express which is it that you prefer as the result and instruct staff to confirm that, I don't have any problem with that responsibility.

Scott Patton, Contractor – The answer on the size of the windows is the original frame on the front is staying in. We are just replacing the sash. That is why the difference looks they are not the same size on the drawings. They will be the same size when you look at the lines. The lines will line up. The cell will line up. The transoms will line up on the windows. The door is completely different because it is a door. I was trying to line up the windows. In the room, you are looking at the windows. The doors are nilyte doors, like what was there originally. I think it is a 2-panel underneath because that would be a custom door. They are 10 times as much as a custom door made with a single panel underneath. With the windows, they will look at the same height inside and out. It is just that we are replacing the sash, not the window frame on the other one. They will have a bar between the SDLs. That is the standard for us. That is what makes if you are looking at the drawings look different because it is the height of the window on the inside. The front of the window slides down a little because that has a fall on the sill on the original window. The window itself is the same size. The transom is the same size.

Mr. Werner – Am I correct in reading this where the intent is this sill line being maintained? The top of this sash cannot be replicated here.

Mr. Patton – Yes it can. It is the same. We are not taking the original windowsill out. I used to do historic preservation. I knew there were going to be some issues. We duplicated the exact size and height. The width is narrower because it is fitting in the alcove. Everything else will line up. The spring line will be the same all the way around except for the door because it is a 6-8 door. It is a 15-inch light above the transom. It is going to be a different height there. When you are in each room on the interior, with those windows, everything lines up. The original windows did not line up with the door either. The light configuration of that transom is what is on those details that you have of the windows. That is the exact order. I don't remember how many lights there are.

Motion – Mr. Rosenthal – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City's ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed window replacements and**

alterations at 208 3rd Street NE satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- The applicant will work with staff to document the existing glazing, widths and profiles of the 25-light windows.
- The applicant should refer to the BAR's 2018 window policy regarding the definition of clear glass [to allow additional flexibility].
- All orphaned services lines, cables, wires or unnecessary attachments on the exterior of the building are removed.
- Staff will review and approve of tile selected for the alcove.
- Staff will be provided with an front elevation for verification [prior to any exterior alterations being done].

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bailey and passed 6-1 (Mr. Zehmer dissented).

E. Other Business [Including work sessions, staff questions/discussion, non-action items]

5. Staff questions/discussion

- Preservation Month Events:
 - Preservation Month – May
 - 218 West Market Street Cultural Resource Assessment-met condition of CoA and will be added to the BAR archive.
 - Freeing the Fountains-Parks & Rec has a designer that will investigate and address the ADA issues.
 - Downtown Mall 50th Anniversary-Plaque to commemorate 50th Anniversary

F. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 PM