



**OAK RIDGE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 17, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.
OAK RIDGE TOWN HALL**

MINUTES

Members Present

Ann Schneider, Chair
Debbie Shoenfeld, Vice Chair
Mac McAtee
Caroline Ruch
Kristin Kubly
Paul Woolf, Alternate (Not sitting)

Staff Present

Sandra Smith, Town Clerk
Bill Bruce, Planning Director

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Ann Schneider called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. She welcomed meeting attendees and introduced Commission members and staff.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Mac McAtee made a **motion** to approve the meeting agenda after removing approval of the September 1, 2015, special meeting and October 14, 2015, meeting minutes. **Debbie Shoenfeld** seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (5-0).

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. Town Council report. Schneider said she attended the last Town Council meeting but there was no report to give since the Commission had not met. She noted that the Council passed a resolution in opposition to HB 799 or similar legislation, and said she appreciated the Council's support. She said she would be happy to present the next report, and Shoenfeld volunteered to draft the report

B. COAs approved/reviewed at staff level.

None

C. COAs approved but not completed.

None

Schneider asked Planning Director Bill Bruce if the issue with the window on the far side of the CrossFit building had been resolved, and Bruce said yes.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of chair and vice chair.

Debbie Shoenfeld nominated Ann Schneider for chair. Mac McAtee nominated Debbie Shoenfeld for vice chair. There were no other nominations.

Mac McAtee made a **motion** to approve Ann Schneider as chair and Debbie Shoenfeld and vice chair. **Caroline Ruch** seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

B. Recommendation to Council to appoint HPC member.

Debbie Shoenfeld made a **motion** to recommend that the Town Council appoint Kristin Kubly as a full voting member of HPC. **Mac McAtee** seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

Schneider thanked Ron Simpson for his years of service on the Commission, and said she was thrilled that he was continuing his service to the Town as chair of the Planning & Zoning Board.

C. COA Case # 16-01: Oak Ridge Marketplace, Lot 5. Philip Cooke requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 9,800-square-foot retail building. The property is located at 8001 Marketplace Drive, Guilford County Tax Parcel #0165103, in Oak Ridge Township. It is zoned CU-SC, Scenic Corridor Overlay, Greensboro (WS-III) Watershed, Historic District, and is owned by Oak Ridge Marketplace III, LLC.

Schneider read the property description into the record. She stated that the Design Guidelines are designed to provide recommendations for design aesthetics within the Oak Ridge Historic District, and they are intentionally broad to allow applicants a broad pathway toward compliance. The goal of the Commission is to see that any proposed changes are compatible with the special character of the Historic District and surrounding buildings. The Commission would be conducting a quasi-judicial evidentiary hearing, meaning each Commission member is acting as an independent judge. She said Commission members are each tasked with being impartial. She said the Commission members' individual opinions should not be expressed and the individual opinions of others should not be taken into consideration; the Commission should take the evidence presented, apply the standards outlined in the Historic District Design Guidelines, make findings of fact, and render a decision. She asked Commission members to cite the applicable sections of the Design Guidelines in their deliberations. The Commission may approve, disapprove or continue consideration of the COA request, but a decision must be made within 180 days of the date the application was submitted.

Schneider then discussed potential conflicts of interest, and asked Commission members to disclose if they have a fixed opinion; have had discussions or communications about a case with the applicant, staff or contractors; have a close business, family or other relationship to the applicant or others involved in the case; or have a financial interest in the outcome of the case. She reminded Commission members that because COAs sometimes come before the Commission again with a request to be amended, and said the limitations on discussing projects extend after

the COA has been issued. She asked Commission members to disclose any potential conflicts of interest involving the COA application about to be heard.

Schneider disclosed that she, Shoenfeld and town staff had met informally with Philip Cooke and project architect Eric Bradley for a discussion so they could get preliminary feedback on the proposed design. Shoenfeld also acknowledged that she was at the meeting, and had also spoken to staff. McAtee, Kubly and Ruch each said they had no conflicts.

Schneider then invited the applicant and his associates come forward; she said if additional information that was not in the packet was to be provided, the Commission generally could not consider it if it includes significant changes or information because it would not have given them sufficient time for review.

Bradley, Williams, Cooke and Bruce were sworn in by Town Clerk Sandra Smith.

Bradley presented the case for the applicant, saying that engineer Chuck Truby had also been engaged to do a sort of viability study for the project. He said he thought Truby and may have been involved in some preliminary discussions, particularly about parking. Bradley said the bulk of the parking would be on the west side of the property. He said the building was initially planned to face inward, with the back of it facing N.C. 68. Bradley said he had met with Schneider, Shoenfeld and staff in an informal session and heard their comments, and as a result the building was turned to face N.C. 68. He said there had been an evolution to the project, which he thought made it better than it had been initially.

He said renderings of the building were in the packet, and he pointed out a representation of the brick that would be used. He said initially a different brick had been selected, but when the sample was received, those working on the project did not like it.

McAtee asked about the mortar color, and Bradley said it likely would not change from the original color. He added that his firm always recommends that clients build a field panel with all the different material samples to see how they work together. He had Williams hand out a different set of renderings, which are hereby incorporated by reference and made a part of the minutes, that he said more accurately reflect the brick color being proposed. He added that when they decided to change the orientation of the building, they had changed the look of the building as well as the parapet height.

Schneider asked Bradley to explain the other samples before them. Bradley said there would be three main materials and pointed out the material for the stone-based pilasters, the main brick, and the upper pilasters. McAtee asked if the brick on the pilings was different than the brick on the main part of the building, and Bradley said yes. He added that they were also set out 4 inches from the building. McAtee asked if the ledge on the pilings would be white; Bradley said that would be the light-colored stone that he presented. McAtee asked about the cap, and Bradley responded that it would be an EIFS cap. In response to McAtee's question, Bradley explained that EIFS was a kind of synthetic stucco. Schneider clarified that the sample Bradley passed around to the Commission would be on the top of the

columns where they meet the darker brick. That material was also proposed for the top of the building.

Schneider asked if the decorative concrete block sample was what would be used in the retaining wall, and Bradley said yes. Bradley said in the renderings just handed out, there was a photo at the end showing a retaining wall his firm had designed elsewhere, although the color of the wall was different and it was about 20 feet tall. Cooke explained that the wall at Tractor Supply was a little different, but this was the closest they could come to matching it. He said the wall height would be 9 feet, and it was a little smaller than originally discussed, as was the size of the building which had been reduced from 9,800 square feet to 9,404 square feet. Bradley said the photo showed a retaining wall that had been built in Greensboro, but it is the same material that is being proposed here but is a slightly different color. Another photo in the packet showed an example of the flat metal canopy that is being proposed for the recessed portion of the façade facing N.C. 68. Schneider confirmed that the flat metal canopy was proposed for the recessed portion of the façade and the other canopies would be the shed-type metal roof.

Schneider asked if there were any other questions, and Bradley passed around a sample of the metal canopy material.

Ruch asked more about the mortar color, and Bradley said it would probably be a standard gray color, but that could be subject to change once the field panel/sample wall is installed. Schneider said an option for the Commission would be to approve the color once the sample wall is installed, similar to what it did with the Lowes Foods project.

Ruch asked if the glass sample presented by Bradley was representative of the windows, and Bradley said yes.

Schneider asked the Commission about the eligibility of the project, if it fell within the scope of what is allowed in the Design Guidelines, and if the Commission felt it had sufficient information to make findings of fact and render a decision. Commission members agreed by consensus.

Schneider asked Bruce if he had anything to add to the staff report. Bruce said he had a conversation with the applicant that morning about the landscaping plan. He said they had agreed that the planting rate on the landscaping plans did not reflect the rate required in the Design Guidelines. He said he believed the applicant was willing to revise that plan to show the recommended planting rates in the Guidelines.

Shoenfeld said the plans she has showed 64 parking spaces on drawing C1, but on the landscape plan, it says there are 71 spaces, although she counted only 70. Schneider said she believed the applicant had changed the parking spaces from straight to slanted ones, and the full site plan is accurate regarding the parking. Shoenfeld asked how many spaces there would be. Bruce said 64, and added that the landscaping plan had not been changed to reflect the slanted parking spaces.

Schneider proposed discussing the building, parking lot and retaining wall first and then discussing the landscaping. She said she thought turning the building on the site worked well, she thought the recessed area was compatible with the Guidelines and it effectively breaks up the wall, and the scale and proportion of the building seemed appropriate as stated in the primary design concepts. She said she had noted that the gooseneck lamps were also used at Tractor Supply, and that they were very attractive and were compatible with surrounding buildings.

McAtee agreed, saying the building looks like it fits.

Shoenfeld noted the topography, saying the plan calls for building a retaining wall, which was discussed in the preliminary meeting. She said she had offered a suggestion to push the building more to the north, and in doing so, hopefully a retaining wall would not be necessary. She noted that the Design Guidelines on page 38, section D, item c, say it is not appropriate to alter topography. She also noted in the Guidelines on page 49, Section B, item 3, where it says to minimize disturbance to a site's terrain. However, she said the entire site had been graded several years ago when the property was rezoned for commercial use, and the property no longer retained its original grade at this point.

Schneider said she was curious whether the amount of fill required on the property has decreased since the preliminary meeting. She said, after walking the site, that she thought it was important to note that there was already a large retaining wall behind Tractor Supply, which extends to the corner of this lot, and the proposed retaining wall would connect to that. She said she felt like that was a mitigating factor. She said she thought another mitigating factor was that the wall would not rise above ground level. Schneider said in the preliminary meeting they had suggested doing plantings to screen the wall, and it seemed the applicant had taken that seriously. She said she was less concerned than she originally was about the amount of fill and the retaining wall.

McAtee said in looking at the site and renderings, he felt a retaining wall was a practical solution in order to have a parking lot, and a parking lot was required to serve the building. He said without a retaining wall, the parking lot would eventually slide off into the gully. He said he did not see how the property could be used without the retaining wall, and he had no issues with it. He said there would be plantings in front of the wall and the block in the wall had a rough texture, so he believed the wall was a good practical solution to locating a building on the site.

Ruch said she agreed, but asked about the connection to the Tractor Supply wall, and whether it would connect visually or literally. Philip Cooke said he was not sure, but he thought it would literally connect to the Tractor Supply wall. He said he could find out and let the Commission know.

Schneider said it may not actually meet and interlock, but the Tractor Supply wall comes all the way up to the corner of this lot, so it would be close. Cooke said Eric Bradley thought it did connect, but Chuck Truby, the engineer, was not there to verify. Ruch asked Cooke to come forward and point out specifically what he was talking about, and he came to the dais. Bradley said that factor might change as the engineering is completed for the site.

Schneider referred to the Design Guidelines regarding windows and doors, and said Section G on page 52 says no more than 40 percent of a façade should be windows, and preferably the percentage should be 10 to 20 percent. She said Bruce had noted the window coverage was about 25 percent of the building. She said she noticed that the north and south sides of the building have short windows and the front of the building has full height windows. She said the only full height windows she could find in the District were in the Oak Ridge Commons shopping center. She said the other buildings in Marketplace shopping center do not have any full height windows, and asked why they were included here. She added that she liked the decorative stone work under the windows on the sides of the building, and thought it was consistent with other nearby structures.

Ruch agreed, saying, per the Guidelines, she thought it was more visually appealing to have less window coverage where possible, so the windows were more of a standout feature. She said she thought the front of the proposed building had a lot of window coverage.

Schneider said that the large windows could be considered an architectural detail, and the discussion of it was a finer point in the Design Guidelines. Bradley said the portion of the building on the right side facing N.C. 68 was set out somewhat, and that Cooke had a pretty solid tenant for that space, which would be a medical office. Bradley said no space plan had been done, but in doing one previously for a medical office, he thought they may want fewer storefront-type windows and more individual windows, such as those shown on the north and south ends of the building. Schneider asked if the medical office would be located in the northern third of the building, and Bradley said that was correct. Schneider noted that if the COA is approved, any changes to the windows would need to also be approved by the Commission. Bradley said he understood. McAtee said the Commission considers what is shown in the elevations is exactly what will be built. He noted there had been issues with that fact in the past. Bradley said he had discussed that factor with Bruce, and understood they would have to come back before the Commission to have changes approved.

Ruch noted that in the night view rendering of the building that had been submitted, some of the windows on the front of the building did appear to mimic those on the end. She noted that they included the raised panel underneath some of the windows. Bradley said he was not sure how the building would evolve once a tenant is secured. Schneider said it appeared the night view elevation of the building was inconsistent with other elevations submitted. Bradley said no, and on the far right end of the building facing N.C.68, some windows came all the way to the ground, while the windows flanking them did not. Ruch asked if there was a reason the windows had been designed that way. Bradley said with a medical office, the odds were that other than the front entrance, the tenant would likely not want windows all the way to the ground. He said the three center bays of the building, if they had retail tenants, would likely want as much window exposure as they could get, and that was their logic in designing the building as they did.

Schneider asked if the Commission felt the percentage of windows was appropriate given the size of the structure and compatibility with the surrounding structures.

McAtee said he had no problem with it. He said if the windows are redesigned to accommodate a particular tenant, the percentage of the windows in the entire building would have to be revisited too. Schneider agreed, but said if the medical tenant did not want any windows on a particular side of the building, that might not be approved if it significantly changes the appearance, rhythm and balance, or percentage of windows in the building. She noted that there were good examples of faux windows, such as at JP Looney's and other buildings, and there are lots of ways to address a tenant's issues.

Shoenfeld asked if the Commission was saying that, unless a revised COA is required, the percentage of windows in the building was OK and that the fact that there was 25 percent of window coverage was overridden by the architectural design elements. Schneider said that was what made the Design Guidelines somewhat difficult. She pointed out that the Guidelines say 10 to 20 percent of window to building is preferred, but because this design did not exceed the maximum of 40 percent as stated in the Guidelines, she thought the Commission was saying that the coverage was within an acceptable range. She said the applicant was aware they would have to come back before the Commission with any changes, and that the applicant would be coming back for a separate COA for the building's signage.

McAtee noted that in the night rendering of the building, the signs had letters that were backlit in the center bays of the building. He said on page 35, item k, of the Guidelines, it says it is not appropriate to use backlighting. Schneider said this COA application did not include signage, and she assumed the applicant would take that into consideration.

Shoenfeld said that on page 41 of the Guidelines, it talks about fences and walls. She said one of the renderings shows a fence on top of the retaining wall. She asked if that was planned. Bradley said building code would require them to put up a guard rail, and referred the Commission to the photo he included in the packet of a similar retaining wall with fence. It said whenever a wall reaches more than 30 inches above grade, a guard rail is required. McAtee said he thought a building code requirement would override the Guidelines. Shoenfeld read from the Guidelines, which say to "construct privacy or screen fencing or walls with brick, lattice, and/or individual boards rather than plywood and soften their visual impact...." Ruch noted that this was not a privacy fence. Schneider asked what type of material the fence would be constructed of, and Bradley said probably aluminum. Ruch asked if a COA would be required for the fence, and Schneider said ideally she would like to consider the fence as part of this application. She said it sounded like the applicant was saying the fence would appear like what is shown on the third rendering in the packet. She asked if Bradley knew the dimensions, and Bradley said it would be required to be 42 inches tall.

Kubly asked if the fencing would also be screened by the landscaping. She noted that it appearing on the rendering that the landscaping gets shorter as the wall gets taller. Schneider said she thought as the ravine gets deeper, the wall is less visible. She said she thought there was no grass planted in front of it, but that it was a ravine filled with small trees, grasses and brush. She asked if any trees would be removed, and Cooke said they would not. He said the rendering was meant to show how the

landscaping would work with the wall. He said once the wall gets to the back of the building and meets the corner with the wall at Tractor Supply, they felt there was no landscaping needed because it was at the back of the building. He came to the dais to point out what he was talking about. Schneider agreed that it was pretty far from the right of way.

McAtee said the landscaping plan showed arborvitae planted at the higher end of the wall. He said he thought they had been projected to grow to perhaps 20 feet. Cooke agreed, saying they would be 5 to 6 feet tall at planting, and he thought they would grow to about 20 feet. McAtee said with the 9-foot wall and about 4 feet of guard rail, that would be a total of about 13 feet. Cooke said at some point, the trees would likely have to be pruned, but the intent was to see the landscaping, not the wall.

Schneider reminded the Commission that the staff report could be included in the findings of fact. She said they had discussed the gooseneck light fixtures, and the other fixtures are to match those at McDonald's. She asked Cooke if there were any other comments on the lighting, and McAtee asked if there was any additional lighting, perhaps in the landscaping. Cooke said no, but the difference was that LED lighting would be used; he said Danny Yanusz, the Town's lighting consultant, had helped design the plan and that it meets the lighting guidelines. Ruch asked if he would use the blue-toned lights, and Cooke said he thought it would be more of a crisp white, more like other lighting in the Historic District. Ruch said she understood it met the lighting guidelines, but asked if it would look drastically different from other parking lots in the Historic District and would have a blue hue like some car headlights. Cooke said a good example is at the back of Oak Ridge Commons, which has wall packs installed there. He said Commission members could see the color of the light if they went to the rear of Goodwill.

Schneider said the Commission had discussed building shape and massing. She said there had been no specific discussion on siting, and no one had noted any nonconformance.

Shoenfeld directed the Commission to page 51, item 4, which says it is not appropriate to use simulated stucco. She asked if it had been approved at Lowes Foods, and Bruce said yes, and every shopping center had it. McAtee said advances had been made in simulated stucco since the Guidelines were written, and he thought that item needed to be addressed when the Commission discussed revising the Design Guidelines. Ruch agreed that every shopping center in Oak Ridge contained simulated stucco.

Schneider said the Commission had discussed materials as well as building shape and massing. She asked if there were other comments. Kubly asked about the color of the brick and whether that would be congruous with the buildings nearby. She said she thought less variation in color was better. She pointed the Commission to page 51 of the Design Guidelines, which says unusually colored brick should not be used. Schneider said the Tractor Supply and the Sherwin Williams buildings have much redder brick. She asked about 68 Place, and Bruce said it was not within the Historic District. Ruch said she thought McDonald's brick was a browner tone.

Bradley said his firm had designed the McDonald's and Tractor Supply, and they had planned for more the tone of brick of McDonald's, which has almost a mottled effect. McAtee pointed out that the Guidelines say something about avoiding monotony. Schneider agreed, saying the Commission did not want the buildings to look "cookie cutter," especially since they have the same design origin. Bradley said the brick chosen had almost a tumbled effect, so there was some texture to it. Schneider said it looked aged.

Schneider asked if the mechanical and other systems would be located on the roof of the building, and Bradley said yes. Bradley said that had been discussed with the engineer so the mechanical systems would be screened by the parapet.

Schneider said the Commission had been discussing whether flagpoles were structures. She asked if there was any plan for any flagpoles, and Cooke said no.

Schneider asked if there were any outbuildings or other features to be discussed. Bradley said one additional feature was shown on one of the renderings, which was the dumpster enclosure.

With no additional discussion on the building, Schneider then directed the Commission to the landscaping plan. She said it looked like about 350 linear feet of road frontage; Bruce said the number was about 374 linear feet. Schneider said it looked like there should be 20 canopy trees, but she had counted 17 trees, which included the retaining wall trees. She said she counted 187 shrubs, and 75 were required, so it appeared they had a good amount of shrubs. She said she did not think she saw any understory trees, like crepe myrtles, except along the retaining wall.

Shoenfeld asked for clarification on the amount of road frontage. Bruce said on the landscaping plan, he thought the Commission could see a chart showing the rate of landscaping applied, and said the amount of road frontage on N.C. 68 was about 374 feet.

Schneider said she was thrilled that the applicant wanted to meet higher planting standards than are required in the Historic District. She pointed out that three canopy trees, five understory trees and 25 shrubs were needed per 100 linear feet, as well as one canopy tree per every 6 parking spaces, so 10 total would be needed in the parking lot. She said the plan looks close as far as the number of canopy trees and good on shrubs, but perhaps some of the shrubs could be replaced by understory trees. She proposed the Commission consider the plantings along the retention wall separately from the other required plantings.

As the Commission began to figure out how many plantings were required, Bruce said that, in anticipation of the discussion, he had calculated the amount, although the Commission was welcome to look at it too. He said his calculations showed that, if the N.C. 68 road frontage, the Marketplace Drive road frontage and the parking lot requirements were added up, the applicant was nine canopy trees short of the number required. He said the total numbers required were 27 canopy trees and 27 understory trees; he said the applicant showed plenty of shrubs on the plan. Schneider asked for the total number of shrubs required, and Bruce said 139.

Schneider said she thought it would be clearer to the applicant if the Commission were to state the total number of each type of planting that is required. McAtee asked to hear from the applicant on the matter. Cooke said the landscape architect was the same one he had used elsewhere in the Historic District, but unfortunately he had not used the correct planting rate here. Cooke said he had told Bruce earlier in the day that he would be happy to bring a corrected plan back to the Commission for approval. Cooke said he could present it at the next HPC meeting, or he could present it to Bruce for staff approval. Schneider said the Commission would like to see it, but it could continue approval of the COA until the next meeting to allow Cooke to correct the landscaping plan, or it could give conditional approval on the overall plan and Commission members could be polled individually on the landscaping plan. Cooke said he would prefer the second option since he had a tenant who wanted to get started in the building.

Ruch suggested a larger landscaping rendering be submitted, and Cooke said that was not a problem. Shoenfeld also suggested understory and canopy trees be labeled, and Schneider also requested the required planting rate be sent to the Commission as well.

The Commission then outlined the following findings of fact:

- There are a total of 64 parking spaces.
- No mortar sample was submitted, but a sample wall will be constructed that shows the brick and the mortar color.
- The design of the building with recessed walls, columns and other design elements is compatible with the Design Guidelines and with surrounding buildings.
- The windows cover 25 to 30 percent of the building, but do not exceed the maximum allowed by the Design Guidelines. The tenants may prefer different window designs, but the applicant understands any changes will need a revised COA.
- The topography will be changed, but it had already been changed from its original form.
- There will be a retaining wall, which includes a 42-inch guard rail fence.
- The retaining wall will be screened by plantings and does not rise above the ground level of the parking lot.
- Parking lot lights will match those in surrounding areas and will have crisp white LED lights.
- Parking lot lights and poles will be dark bronze in color and will be mounted on concrete pedestals 20 to 25 feet tall.
- The staff report is included in the findings of fact.
- The landscaping requirements are for 27 canopy trees, 27 understory trees, and 139 shrubs. The applicant has agreed to revise the landscaping plan to meet those requirements.
- The cast stone has been approved in commercial buildings in the commercial district.

Mac McAtee made a **motion** to accept the findings of fact as previously outlined relating to parking, the sample wall, building design, windows, guard rail fence, staff report,

landscaping, lighting and cast stone. **Debbie Shoenfeld** seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (5-0).

Debbie Shoenfeld made a **motion** to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a 9,400-square-foot retail building located at 8001 Marketplace Drive, Guilford County Tax Parcel Tax Parcel #0165103, in Oak Ridge Township, zoned CU-SC, Scenic Corridor Overlay, Greensboro (WS-III) Watershed, Historic District, and owned by Oak Ridge Marketplace III, LLC, as presented and described by the applicant and with the following conditions:

- That a sample board of brick, stone and mortar be constructed for HPC approval
- That the landscaping design plan be revised and brought before HPC for approval

Mac McAtee seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (5-0).

Cooke asked how the sample board should be submitted; Schneider said the last time one was considered by the Commission, it was constructed on site.

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS/UPDATES

A. 2015-16 budget updates.

The 2015-16 budget update was included in the packet, which is hereby incorporated by reference and made a part of the minutes.

B. 2016-17 budget proposal.

The Commission discussed the 2016-17 budget proposal, with Schneider proposing including funding for a celebrating marking the 20th anniversary of the creation of the Historic District.

C. Historic inventory/Markers.

The Ai Church marker dedication ceremony would be held April 23. Dedications for the Larkins House and Col. Zack Whitaker House markers would be scheduled for late summer/early fall.

D. Land Use Plan update

Schneider said the update had been completed and adopted by the Council.

E. Communications outreach.

No report

D. Display case.

No report

E. Training.

No report

7. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

McAtee said he had prepared and distributed information on flagpoles for the Commission to consider. He asked that it be discussed at the next meeting.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Mac McAtee made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m. **Debbie Shoenfeld** seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (5-0).

Respectfully Submitted:



Sandra B. Smith, CMC, Town Clerk



Ann Schneider, Chair