

**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting of the**  
**Edina Heritage Preservation Board**  
**Edina City Hall – Community Room**  
**Tuesday, September 9, 2014**  
**7:00 p.m.**

**I.     CALL TO ORDER           7:00 P.M.**

**II.    ROLL CALL**

Answering roll call was Chair Birdman and Members Weber, Moore, Sussman, O'Brien, Christiaansen, McLellan, Druckman and Otness. Staff present was Senior Planner, Joyce Repya. Member Mellom was absent due to representing the HPB at the "Vision Edina" workshop.

**III.   APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**

Member O'Brien moved to approve the meeting agenda. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**IV.    APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES           **June 10, 2014 and July 8, 2014****

Member McLellan moved approval of the minutes from the June 10, 2014 and July 8, 2014 meetings. Member O'Brien seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**V.     COMMUNITY COMMENT – None**

**VI.    REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

**A.     Certificates of Appropriateness**

**I.    H-14-5    4629 Arden Avenue - New detached garage**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4600 block of Arden Avenue. The existing home, a Mediterranean style constructed in 1935, currently has a 2-car attached garage, 2-stories in height with a flat roof, accessed by a driveway on the south side of the property. The Certificate of Appropriateness request entails the construction of a new detached garage in the southeast corner of the rear yard; and converting the attached garage to living space. The footprint of the existing attached garage conversion will be reduced in order to accommodate the additional square footage of the new detached garage and stay within the square footage allowed by city code.

Ms. Repya pointed out that the plans provide for a 576 square foot 2-car detached garage to compliment the Mediterranean style of the home with traditional stucco walls, dentil molding, and a clay tile roof. On the west elevation attention to detail is provided with custom entry doors. A service door and window are provided on the north elevation; and the south elevation will have a window to provide some architectural detailing. The rear wall does not have a window since it abuts a privacy fence.

The garage plans demonstrate a hip roof with a height of 16' 2" at the highest peak. The height at the mid-point of the gable is shown to be 12' 1.5", and a height of 9'2" is provided at the eave line. The ridge line of the roof is 14'4" and a 6/12 roof pitch is provided. All dimensions

proposed for the structure are consistent with the surrounding detached garages and new garages previously approved by the HPB through the Certificate of Appropriateness process.

The proposed location of the garage is shown at 3' 1", but must be increased to at least 3'7" to accommodate the 6" overhang. No windows or architectural detailing has been provided for rear elevation since it abuts a privacy fence to the east.

Planner Repya observed that plans for the conversion of the attached garage to living space at the rear of the home were provided for the Board's information. The foot print of the conversion was reduced by 320 square feet to accommodate the proposed detached garage on the lot. Furthermore, the new living space has been designed to provide a compatible use of the home while at the same time maintain the home's overall historic character.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel reviewed the proposal and provided a written evaluation for the board citing that both the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the district plan of treatment allow for construction of detached garages in the Country Club District, provided the new garage is architecturally compatible with the historic house and the neighborhood environment. Based on the plans presented with the COA application, the new garage proposed appears to be compatible with the house in scale, size, and building materials. Mr. Vogel observed that property owners rehabilitating historic homes in Country Club often add onto the original structures, which usually can accept new, two-story wings or extensions on secondary elevations without seriously affecting their historic integrity. In this case, an appropriately designed rear addition would not detract from the historic significance and integrity of the house or the neighborhood.

Ms. Repya concluded that both she and Mr. Vogel recommend approval of the COA request. Findings supporting the recommendation included:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed projects.
- The proposed detached garage will complement the architectural style of the home and not be detrimental to the adjacent historic structures.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

Conditions for approval included:

- Subject to the plans presented and
- Placement of a year built plaque on the exterior of the new detached garage.

**Applicant Representative:**

- **Jean Rehkamp Larson, Rehkamp Larson Architects**

Ms. Rehkamp Larson stated that Planner Repya provided a thorough evaluation of the proposed project. She had nothing further to add, but welcomed comments/questions from the board.

**Public Comments: None**

**Board Discussion:**

**Member McLellan** asked for clarification on the conversion of the attached garage to living space which Ms. Rehkamp Larson provided.

**Members Christiaansen and Weber** both commented that the information provided was very complete. Furthermore, the project is consistent with similar COA requests considered for new detached garages including the conversion of an attached garage to living space.

**Motion:**

**Member Christiaansen moved approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque be installed on the exterior of the garage. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.**

**2. H-14-6 4601 Casco Avenue - New detached garage & changes to Street facing façade**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the southeast corner of Casco Avenue and Bridge Street. The existing home, a Georgian Colonial style constructed in 1935, currently has a single story 2-car attached garage accessed by a driveway on the north side of the property from Bridge Street.

The Certificate of Appropriateness request entails the construction of a new detached garage in the southeast corner of the rear yard. The plans also include converting the single story attached garage to 2 stories of living space at the rear of the home; the north wall of which abuts Bridge Street.

The proposed 440 square foot 2-car detached garage is designed to complement the style of the home with matching horizontal lap siding, 3/4 x 6 frieze board, corner quoins, and asphalt shingles on the flat topped hip roof. On the east elevation attention to detail is provided with carriage entry doors. The height of the garage is shown to be 17' at the highest peak. The height at the mid-point of the gable is shown to be 13' 8", and a height of 10'3" is provided at the eave line. The hip roof is designed with a 9/12 pitch, complimenting the hip roof of the home. All dimensions for the proposed structure are consistent with the surrounding detached garages and new garages previously approved by the HPB through the Certificate of Appropriateness process.

Ms. Repya added that the proposed location of the garage is 4' from the south and east property lines. There is a 6 foot privacy fence abutting the east side elevation, thus no windows or architectural detailing have been provided which is consistent with other garages plans approved in the district.

The existing driveway will be vacated and a curb-cut permit will be required from the city's Engineering Department for the new driveway.

Continuing with an explanation of the plan, Ms. Repya pointed out that the conversion of the attached garage to living space at the rear of the home includes changes to the street facing façade along Bridge Street. The new space has been designed to provide a compatible use of the home while at the same time maintain the home's overall historic character. The square footage of the former attached garage space will be reduced by 228 square feet to ensure that the total footprint of the structures on the lot with the introduction of the new detached garage does not exceed the maximum allowed by the Zoning Ordinance.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel reviewed the proposal and provided a written evaluation for the board citing that based on the plans presented with the COA application, the new garage appears to be compatible with the house in scale, size, and building materials; therefore, it should not detract from the historic significance and integrity of the house or the neighborhood.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that the proposed addition to the house meets applicable historic preservation treatment standards and is consistent with the district plan of treatment, which encourages voluntary compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. No significant, character defining architectural features will be destroyed and the addition appears to be compatible with the size, scale, texture, and color of the existing house.

Mr. Vogel added that there is no requirement for an addition to architecturally duplicate all the stylistic details found on the historic house—it is more important for additions not to attempt to create a false sense of history by “matching” the new to the old. He recommended the owner differentiate the addition from the historic house by not precisely duplicating the original exterior features and finishes—for example, by applying siding with a slightly wider or narrower reveal than that on the original house, so that the new construction could be visually distinguished from the old.

Planner Repya concluded that she agreed with Consultant Vogel's evaluation of the proposed improvements to the property and recommended approval of the COA - citing that the plans for the detached garage are consistent with new garages previously reviewed in the district and conversion of the attached garage to living space will blend in well with the historic façade of the home.

Findings supporting the approval recommendation included:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed projects.
- The proposed detached garage will complement the architectural style of the home and not be detrimental to the adjacent historic structures.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

Conditions for approval:

- The approval recommendation is subject to the plans presented; and
- The placement of a year built plaque on the exterior of the new detached garage.

**Applicant Representatives:**

- **Lon Oberpriller, Replacement Housing Services Consortium, LLC**
- **Troy Eigen, Owner 4601 Casco Avenue**

Mr. Oberpriller stated that Ms. Repya provided a good explanation of the project; he had nothing to add; and he would be happy to answer questions from the board.

**Public Comments: None**

**Board Discussion:**

Several board members asked for clarification on the scope of the COA which the applicant provided.

**Member Sussman** observed that the pitch of the proposed detached garage is steeper than the roof pitches on the home. Mr. Oberpriller responded that the increased pitch on the garage is to allow for storage space.

**Member Christiaansen** questioned why shutters are not proposed for the windows on the addition. Mr. Oberpriller responded that shutters on the addition were considered, however since the window placement on the addition would not accommodate two shutters for each window, it was agreed that rather than placing only one shutter on each window, they would not include them on the addition.

**Member Weber** commented that he was fine with not incorporating shutters on the addition - pointing out that in doing so, the addition is differentiated from the original home as suggested by Consultant Vogel. He added that although the Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommend that additions should be differentiated from the original construction, he did not agree with a strict adherence to that recommendation - particularly on a corner property with a side street frontage. He added that attention to detail on the addition adds nicely to the character of the home. That being said, Mr. Weber added that by not including shutters on the addition, a subtle difference is provided between the original home and the new construction.

**Member McLellan** questioned that materials proposed for the addition and new garage. Mr. Oberpriller responded that the materials will match the existing home. He added that the roof on the original home was recently replaced, thus the plan calls for not re-roofing the home with the addition, but rather utilizing the same roofing material on the addition.

**Motion:**

**Member Weber moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness request subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque be installed on the exterior of the garage. Member O'Brien seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.**

**3. H-14-7 4511 Browndale Avenue - Change to street facing façade**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the east side of the 4500 block of Browndale Avenue. The existing home, constructed in 1924, is a Prairie style with Craftsman influence with an attached 2-car garage. At the first of the year the home was listed for sale with the city receiving several inquiries regarding whether the house could be torn down with a new home constructed on the lot. Because the home was constructed during the District's period of significance the (1924 - 1944) it was made clear that tearing down the home was not an option.

The applicant has indicated that they are not interested in demolition of the home; rather they define the project as a "transformation of the existing structure through renovation". The proposed plans demonstrate changing the Prairie/Craftsman style of the home, and replacing the flat roofed 2-car garage with a 2-story addition including a 3-car attached garage. The style change can be seen in the alteration of the roofline from a 25' height at peak which is consistent with the Prairie/Craftsman style to a 30' height to peak with three gabled windows set into the roof. The plans also propose keeping the window and door openings in the same relationship, but enlarging the windows to provide more daylight inside the home. The stucco exterior façade will remain and will also be provided on the addition.

A walled terrace is proposed on the front elevation of the home accessed from French doors on either side of the front entry. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the setback for the terrace match the average setback of the homes on either side. Although an 80 sq. ft. encroachment is allowed to protrude into the front setback, the terrace as proposed exceeds that encroachment, thus would not be allowed.

In addition to the changes proposed to the façade of the home, the plans provided also call for 2-story addition to the rear of the home - adding an expanded kitchen, family room, mudroom, and rebuilt 3-car garage on the first floor and a master suite, laundry, office and additional bedroom on the second story.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel reviewed the proposal and provided a written evaluation for the board citing that the subject COA is required for what the applicant describes as "a transformation of the existing structure through renovation and addition, rather than demolition and new construction." However, for design review purposes, the proposed work should be treated as a demolition/new construction project because the Country Club District Plan of Treatment defines demolition as "the physical alteration of a building" where 50% or more of the surface area of the exterior walls or roof are removed. The owner proposes to substantially alter the essential architectural character of the house, including its plan, exterior

features, and roof shape. It is unclear how much historic fabric will be preserved.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that like a majority of the homes in the district, the subject two-story stucco house lacks individual distinction and is not eligible for individual designation as an Edina Heritage Landmark. Its contribution to the historic character of the district is entirely the product of its age, although it is assumed that the design of the house was approved by the developer, Sam Thorpe. It is one of the oldest homes in the district and historical documentation is quite good. Therefore, for preservation planning purposes it has been considered a heritage preservation resource.

Ms. Repya pointed out that Consultant Vogel has recommended the Board take a 2-step approach to evaluating the subject request:

1. Carefully evaluate the historic significance and integrity of the existing house to determine whether the house is significant within the historic context of the Country Club District, The board needs to decide whether the existing house has relevance and importance in illustrating the historic character of the district. If the existing house is determined not worthy of preservation because it is incompatible with the architectural or aesthetic character of the neighborhood, the proposed “transformation” could be considered. However, if it is determined that the house in its current condition contributes significantly to the integrity of the district, the COA should be denied.
2. If the HPB determines that the existing home is incompatible with the architectural or aesthetic character of the neighborhood, then an evaluation of the proposed plan relative to its design style meeting the district’s plan of treatment, and being compatible with the adjacent historic properties could then be considered.

Ms. Repya concluded that Staff agrees with Consultant Vogel comments and recommends that if the Board believes that the existing 1924 Prairie/Craftsman style home is compatible with the architectural and aesthetic character of the historic neighborhood, and significant to the historic integrity of the district that the subject request for a transformation be denied.

**Applicant Representatives:**

- **Lon Oberpriller, Replacement Housing Services Consortium, LLC**
- **Kevin & Laura Carlson, owners 4511 Arden Avenue**
- 

**Owner, Kevin Carlson** stated that his family has lived in Edina for 9 years and have been looking for a new home in the community for 2 years. They were excited to purchase 4511 Browndale Avenue due to its marvelous view of Minnehaha Creek; and look forward to make changes to the home so it fits in better with the character of the historic Country Club District.

**Owner, Laura Carlson** explained that when she became aware that some Country Club District residents had issues with their plans to improve the property, she reached out approximately 15 Country Club District residents who signed a petition stating that “I do not deem the existing home at 4511 Browndale Avenue as historically significant or relevant to the fabric of the neighborhood. I have no objection to the Carlson’s changing the façade of the home.” Ms. Carlson provided the petition with signatures for the record.

**Public Comments:**

The following members of the public expressed concerns that the proposed plans were neither consistent with the District’s plan of treatment nor the compatible with the historic integrity of the surrounding homes:

- **Jane Lonquist**                      **4510 Drexel Avenue**
- **Becky Briggs**                      **4509 Browndale Avenue**
- **Carol Hancock**                      **4503 Arden Avenue**
- **Colleen Pearson**                      **4513 Browndale Avenue**
- **Miriam Stake**                      **4617 Edina Boulevard**
- **Dan Dulas**                      **4609 Bruce Avenue**
- **John Gordon**                      **4505 Browndale Avenue**

Additionally, emails expressing concerns that the proposed plans were not in keeping with the Country Club District’s historic integrity were received from the following:

- **Nancy Jarrett**                      **4500 Browndale Avenue**
- **Todd/Allyson Aldrich**                      **4518 Browndale Avenue**
- **Kristina Matsch**                      **4502 Drexel Avenue**
- **David Pearson**                      **4513 Browndale Avenue**
- **Julie Baker**                      **4613 Edina Boulevard**

**Applicant Comments:**

**Lon Oberpriller, Replacement Housing Services Consortium, LLC** responded to the comments from the public defending the changes proposed for the home - pointing out that the intent is for the home to maintain the character of the neighborhood. He pointed out that the roof is taller and the windows larger, but the window/door openings are in the same locations; and the project is not a tear-down of the original home.

Mr. Oberpriller also provided data on the sale of homes in the Country Club District when compared to homes in other areas of Edina; pointing out that the District is not recovering at the same rate as the rest of the city because of the restrictions for upgrading the homes. He concluded that he advocates addressing changes in a forgiving way and considering mitigating and extenuating circumstances.

**Board Discussion:**

Board members discussed the pertinent elements of the District's plan of treatment that needed to be considered for the proposed project. It was agreed that they needed to determine whether there was justification provided to remove the heritage resource classification of the home which would then make way for the removal of more than 50% of the walls or roof as proposed.

**Member Christiaansen** observed that the project as proposed appears to fit the definition of a "demolition" as set out in the plan of treatment since the roof will be removed to accommodate a third story and increased height of 5 feet. She added that in order to allow a demolition of the home, justification to remove the historic resource status of the home would be required.

**Member O'Brien** asked Planner Repya whether she believed the subject home should be considered an historic resource in the District. Ms. Repya explained that the 1980 historic resource survey of homes in the District identified only 2 Prairie/Craftsman homes in the neighborhood, and one could consider the home insignificant since the design is unlike the majority of the homes in the neighborhood - or, one could consider the home very significant for the very same reason. Ms. Repya concluded that she believed the home to be a significant historic resource because if it were to be removed, one of the few Prairie/Craftsman design style homes would be lost. Member O'Brien stated that he agreed with Ms. Repya's evaluation.

**Members McLellan and Weber** observed that the home, a Prairie/Craftsman design built in 1924, was one of a few of its kind approved by the developer, which makes it a unique property in the neighborhood, and a valuable heritage resource

**Member Sussman** pointed out that he drove past the home and found that the Prairie/Craftsman design fit in well with its surroundings. He added that since the home is one of the first approved and built in the district, one could surmise that by approving the Prairie Craftsman style, Samuel Thorpe was looking to achieve some diversity of character in the neighborhood.

**Student Member Druckman** observed that in 1924 when the subject home was built, times were different; and the house is reminiscent of those times. It would be a shame to lose this connection with Edina's past. People from that era are gone, but this house remains. He added that he did not believe extreme changes to the façade were justifiable.

**Member O'Brien** stated that he agreed with the comments expressed from the board.

**Chair Birdman** reported that **Member Mellom** was absent due to representing the HPB at the "Vision Edina" workshop; however she submitted a written opinion for the subject COA request. Mr. Birdman summarized Ms. Mellom's comments in which she opined that the subject plans were inconsistent with the Districts plan of treatment and the Secretary of The Interior's

Standards. She encouraged the board to deny the COA, and the homeowners to revise the plans to be more in keeping with the Prairie/Craftsman design of the home.

Chair Birdman then summarized the comments of the board pointing out that the project as proposed falls within the plan of treatment's definition of a demolition; and since there has been no evidence to support removing the historic resource status of the home, the demolition would not be appropriate. Mr. Birdman pointed out that does not mean that the home can't be altered; however the plans should be sensitive to the Prairie/Craftsman architectural style of the home and the. He added that a major change from one architectural style to another would violate the District's plan of treatment.

A brief discussion ensued amongst the board.

**Motion:**

**Member Ryan observed that no evidence was provided to justify removing the "historic resource" classification of the subject home thus allowing for its "demolition" as defined in the plan of treatment; thus he moved to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness request for changes to the home. Member O'Brien seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion Carried.**

**B. Edina Heritage Landmarks:** Determination of Eligibility for 10 properties  
Planner Repya explained that at the August meeting Consultant Vogel provided the board with a description and photographs of the following properties to add to the Determined Eligible for Heritage Landmark Designation list:

1. *Schaefer House and Stable*, 5117 Schaefer Road
2. *Arthur Erickson House*, 5501 Londonderry Road
3. *Paul and Mary Carson House ("Maryhill")*, 6001 Pine Grove
4. *Mill Pond Cascade*, Minnehaha Creek
5. *Claude D. Kimball House*, 4520 W. 44<sup>th</sup> Street
6. *House*, 4247 Grimes Avenue
7. *Johnson House*, 4300 France Avenue S.
8. *Marri Oskam House*, 6901 Dakota Trail
9. *Bruce A. Abrahamson House*, 7205 Shannon Drive
10. *Sara W. Moore House*, 6909 Hillcrest Lane

Ms. Repya pointed out that identifying properties to the "designated eligible" is the first step toward a potential heritage landmark designation. She added that expanding the list of determined eligible properties was identified in the 2014 work plan as a way to identify significant properties and promote the preservation program in the community without imposing restrictions or regulations on the property owners.

The board briefly discussed the properties listed, commenting that they found they found the list encouraging and appreciated the variety of properties.

Member O'Brien asked if the owners of the proposed properties were notified that they were being considered for the determined eligible list. Planner Repya replied that Marri Oskam, 6901 Dakota Trail, and Bob Moore (HPB member), 6909 Hillcrest Lane have requested being designated Edina Heritage Landmark properties, and adding them to the determined eligible list is the first step. She added that the other property owners were not been notified. She added that since the determined eligible list was created in 1980, it has not been the practice of the HPB to notify the property owners of being added to the list since it entailed no responsibilities or regulations.

Member Birdman observed that if the determined eligible list is meant to be a first step toward heritage landmark designation, notifying property owners of their property's significance would be a natural first step to promoting the city's heritage landmark program. Member Sussman agreed, pointing out that if his property were to be considered for the list, he would want to know. He added that since the determined eligible list has been determined to be an additional way to recognize significant properties in the community, notifying the property owners makes sense; and if they indicate they are not interested in being included on the list, that does not negate the significance of the property.

A brief discussion ensued in which the board agreed that during the upcoming work session with the City Council, they would like to gain their input regarding whether the board should notify property owners of sites being considered for the determined eligible list.

Member Sussman then moved to add Marri Oskam's home at 6901 Dakota Trail and the Sara W. Moore home at 6909 Hillcrest Lane since both property owners have been notified. Member O'Brien seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

Planner Repya then agreed to send out a notification to owners of the other properties on the proposed list, explaining the significance of their properties, and asking for input on the potential of being added to the determined eligible list.

## VII. **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Work Plan 2014 Update**

### **B. 2015 Work Plan Proposal**

### **C. City Council Work Session: September 16<sup>th</sup>, 6:00 p.m.**

Planner Repya explained that the agenda for joint work session with the City Council on September 16<sup>th</sup> provides for an update on the 2014 Work Plan initiatives, as well as vetting the proposed 2015 Work Plan past the Council for input.

Board members discussed the content of both work plans and agreed that the explanation of the initiatives appeared through. It was agreed that at the work session, Chair Birdman would serve as spokesperson for the board with members being free to engage in the discussions.

**D. Human Services Task Force: Request for a Volunteer**

Chair Birdman asked if there were any volunteers to serve on the 2015 Human Services Task Force which will entail attending evening meetings on October 15<sup>th</sup>, October 29<sup>th</sup>, November 5<sup>th</sup>, and November 18<sup>th</sup>. He pointed out that the purpose of the task force is to appropriate \$80,000 from the City's General Fund to pay selected human service agencies to provide outsourced services to Edina residents.

Board members discussed the mission of the task force and the time commitment involved - with no volunteers coming forward, Chair Birdman stated that he would double-check his calendar for the meeting dates and if possible, represent the HPB on the task force.

**C. CORRESPONDENCE & PETITIONS**

**IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

**Chair Birdman** welcomed the new student members, Joe Druckman and Peter Otness. **Member O'Brien** asked if the board had a policy on regulating commentary on issues from the public. Chair Birdman explained that on each agenda the "Community Comment" section provides polices for the community to address issues or concerns that have not been considered in the past 30 days - those are limited to 3 minutes; and the chair may limit the number of speakers on the same issue. Planner Repya observed that the City Council limits community comments during public hearings to 3 minutes; adding that would be a reasonable limit for the HPB issues as well. Chair Birdman agreed, stating that the 3 minute time limit for comments during a COA can be included when explaining the meeting process.

**X. STAFF COMMENTS**

**Planner Repya** reported that September 17 - 19, Minnesota is hosting the AASLH (American Association for State and Local History) National Conference which will serve as the 2014 State Preservation Conference. Board members Ryan Weber and Peter Sussman will be representing the Edina HPB with partial reimbursement for registration and sessions coming from a Minnesota Legacy Grant. The board thanked Members Weber and Sussman for representing them, and agreed that they looked forward to receiving a report on the conference at the October meeting.

**XI. NEXT MEETING DATE                      October 14, 2014**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT                              9:15 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,  
*Joyce Repya***