



# CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

---

## MEETING RESULTS

**JULY 13, 2023**

**4:30 P.M.**

**2 GEORGE STREET**

---

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Van Slambrook, Martin, Huey, Wilson, Turner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Frankie Pinto, Linda Bennett, Magalie Creech

---

### A. Minutes

#### 1. Review of Minutes from the June 22, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approved with Board corrections

MADE BY: Van Slambrook SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

---

### B. Applications

#### 1. 68 ½ Lee Street

**TMS # 459-05-01-086 | BAR2023-001164**

**NS | East Side | c. 1900 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview**

Request complete demolition of two existing structures.

Owner: Low Country Opportunity Fund LLC

Applicant: Next Vision Development Services LLC

**Site visit 7/13/2023 at 8:30 a.m.**

DECISION: APPROVAL & DENIAL

MOTION: Approval of commercial structure, denial of residential structure

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 2

#### STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Residential structure c. 1896
2. Commercial structure pre- 1971
3. The corner of the commercial building is typical of the neighborhood and is the only remaining character defining feature.
4. Residential structure is vernacular to the neighborhood with many intact character defining features and should be retained.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Approval for the commercial building, Denial for the residential building

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Kevin Eberle
  - References similar issues at 5 Shepherd, was denied, currently restoring
  - Similar can be done here
  - Residential building c. 1896, consistently a rental property
  - Oppose demolition
- HCF
  - Needs extensive work
  - Freedman's cottage can be restored
  - Corner store still historic, important to retain
  - Request denial
- PSC
  - Characteristic of neighborhood, vernacular architecture
  - More information is needed
  - Suggest structural report by preservation engineer who can write presentation plan for owner
- Written public comment read into record

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

- Everything on building would need to be replaced
- Doesn't think there is anything of significance left

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Same opinion as staff, though think someone could restore corner store
- Freedman's cottages are rarity and City continues to lose them
- Important to preserve this side of street since opposite side has been lost
- Commercial has been re clad with CMU block
- Struggle with store, so few left
- Denying demolition means form is to be retained, keeping as much fabric as possible
- Important social function, but not much architecturally

---

**2. 213 E Bay Street**

**TMS # 458-05-03-080 | BAR2023-001169**

**Category 4 | French Quarter | c. 1888 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting appeal of staff decision, right angle sign.

Owner: Zac Dennis, The Habit

Applicant: Jonathan Alcon, Brooks Signs

**DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**MOTION:** Conceptual approval with Board requirement to decrease the width and decrease the overall area thoughtfully

**MADE BY:** Martin **SECOND:** Turner **VOTE: FOR:** 5 **AGAINST:** 0

**STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:**

1. Precedents:
  - a. 215 E Bay: no approval found

- b. 209 E Bay: no approved permit, please bring into compliance
  - c. 205 E Bay: Board approval, 2010
  - d. 199 E Bay: approved to match previous 48" x 36"
  - e. 192 E Bay: sign replaced in 1993, pole was existing
  - f. 198 E Bay: approved sign 30" x 30", existing 36" x 36" not approved
  - g. Previous signs at 213 E Bay: 13" x 36" and 36" diameter
2. The proposed sign is more than half the width of sidewalk.
  3. Denied by staff in permit 5/15/23:
    - a. The sign projects too far into the sidewalk, overwhelming the pedestrian experience.
    - b. The proposed right-angle sign detracts from the architecture of the building.
    - c. The proposed sign is not in keeping with the context of the streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Denial

BOARD COMMENTS:

- What is being proposed is too large
- Reference size of signs on King Street, size of ROW
- Logo would format for square sign very well
- Around 6 sq ft would be appropriate

---

**3. 17 Orange Street**

**TMS # 457-12-04-116 | BAR2023-001170**

**NS | Charlestowne | pre-1852 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval hardscape alteration, new opening in wall, removal of paint from brick, and change in roof material.

Owner: 17 Orange, LLC

Applicant: Simons Young & Glen Gardner

DECISION: DECISION

MOTION: Denial of piercing of the wall, approval of other changes requested with Board condition.

Board condition: use hand crimped copper instead of galvalume for roof

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

RECUSED: Fillmore Wilson

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Hardscape alterations currently are not visible from Orange Street and are minimally visible from Broad Street.
2. Porch with terne metal roof is a later addition.
3. Property has been subdivided since 1950s.
4. Previous openings in the wall have been approved by BAR.
5. Approximately 9.9 % of the wall is proposed to be removed.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Pan tile roof is character defining feature and should be retained. Perhaps not original to house, but there are few remaining in Charleston.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

At this time staff does not have a recommendation, or deferral in order to confer with other departments, such as T&T on the feasibility of creating a vehicular opening in order to connect to Orange Street

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

- Asks locations of samples
- Theory on what original roof material was

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- Received 27 written public comments in opposition, Board read prior to meeting
- Edward Bennett, 16 Orange
  - Request denial
  - Parking concerns, T&T/Livability, width of street
  - Objection to opening in wall
  - Other properties with similar access, driveway/easement
- Emily Grimball Longley, daughter of 11 Orange
  - In opposition
  - Identifying, retaining, preserving
  - BAR policies and standards
- Charles Duell, 21 E Battery
  - Chairman of BAR in 1980s
  - Application should be denied
  - Takeaway from presentation is the changes, history of stucco in the City, Greek revival
- Henry Grimball, 11 Orange
  - Break in wall is too much
  - Board powers/purview (provided 4 handouts)
- Martin Alloy, 15 Orange
  - Prescriptive easement, 20 years use
  - Earthquake damage, Portland cement use
- Therese Smythe, neighborhood association
  - Don't oppose architectural portion, just the opening in the wall
- Rainey
  - Member of tourist commission
  - Express opposition
  - Not resident of Orange Street, but native of Charleston
  - Isn't about the condition of the wall, but the removal
  - Wall belongs to all citizens
- Ellis Lesemann, representative of neighbors
  - Age of site, 1760s
  - In past 11 months, number of requested changes
  - Access from Broad
  - Lack of changes from time of postcard image
  - Violation of BAR guidelines, preservation plan
- PSC
  - Dependency – comfortable with change in roof and paint removal
  - Wall – discourage removal
- HCF
  - Ability to open wall needs legal resolution
  - Reference to restrictive covenant

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Property is not intact, has been divided several times
- Wall has a lot of character, many stories, and changes over time
- Brian Hellman, lawyer for owners
  - Separate property from 117 Broad
  - There is no easement for access to Broad Street

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Kitchen house
  - appreciate removing the paint
  - Tile roof is not original, believe it is post Hugo
  - Galvalume is not appropriate for this location, maybe copper
  - Board debate on galvalume appropriateness
  - Concern about details. Better for newer, more modest structures and locations
- Hard time factoring in parking concerns, not an architectural issue
- Respect integrity of wall. Interruption in 1990s with subdivision
- Questions for applicant on when 13 & 15 Orange lots were created
- Photo c. 1890 shows coping wall
- Questions to city legal on whether access is required
- Traffic & Transportation issues  
(Executive session with City legal)
- If wall is assessed as is, with no other aspects, it is difficult to support alteration
- If something happens and items needs to come back to Board, can consider

---

**4. 8 Smith Street**

**TMS # 457-08-03-062 | BAR2023-001171**

**NR | Harleston Village | c. 1940 | Old and Historic District**

Request after the fact approval for installation of shed.

Owner: John Miklos

Applicant: Ken Strickland, CLC Homes LLC

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Board conditions 1-3, staff conditions 2 & 3 and final review by staff

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Shift to masonry base, not post
2. Simplify canopy over door, add brackets
3. Reduce eave overhang to match section drawing

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. May 2022 – Notified of unapproved shed.
2. 5.27.22 – New contractor stated a previous contractor had placed the shed and new contractor was trying to get permits.
3. June 2022 – Zoning issues, item did not go to Board.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Staff recommend relocating the shed to behind the house
2. The drawings do not show a step detail, please provide.
3. Lights on either side of door seem unnecessary.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Applicant clarifies that previous shed has been removed and the proposal is for a new structure

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- HCF
  - Not enough information has been provided
- No written public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Questions reason for 4x4 posts instead of piers
- Two different floor levels, rear at grade
- Fine with location
- Simplify, lower hood, remove lights
- Concerns about structure, 4x4 posts in ground

---

**5. 119 Coming Street**

**TMS # 460-16-03-031 | BAR2023-001172**

**Category 3 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1850 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for new accessory dwelling unit at rear.

Owner: Lowry & Connie Hughes

Applicant: Batton Kennon, Herlong Architects

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for restudy with staff conditions and Board condition to clarify proposed landscape/hardscape with reduction in paving

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF ANALYSIS AND CONTEXT:

1. Proposed structure is raised above DFE to park underneath, which is in opposition to BAR guidelines.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Proposed structure feels massive compared to original due to height it is raised.
2. Staff suggest lowering to DFE, similar to the placement of the existing house.
3. While compatible with the existing house, the proposed details, such as the 6/6 windows, are the same as existing house and should be further differentiated.
4. The faux window on the second floor, south elevation feels awkward.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Deferral for restudy with staff comments

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Jim Doyle, vice president of neighborhood association
  - Recommend approval
  - Infill at its best
  - Keeps family intact, in place
- PSC
  - Further study needed to make subordinate
  - Opening reads as garage, restudy needed
- Written public comment in support (4)

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Clarifies that height above DFE is 5'
- Property supporting additional dwellings
- Raised house behind house that isn't raised, 3 story building v. 2 (2 1/2) story at front
- Typically prefer eave to be noticeably lower than front structure
- As close to DFE as possible, lowering would address concerns
- Differentiate from existing
- Odd to have dependency raised without the front house being raised, too tall
- Would be more compatible if didn't read as raised
- Agree about faux window
- Abundance of paving, needs to be reduced
  - Double driveway and turn around
- Need more comprehensive site package
- Since didn't use accessory structure setbacks, could also have another structure, such as shed, for storage

---

**6. 4 Trumbo Street**

**TMS # 457-12-01-010 | BAR2023-001089**

**Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1870 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval to elevate home above DFE, enclose portion of first floor porch, second floor addition, and new entry stair.

Owner: Charleston & Erica Missel  
Applicant: Chatauk Studio, Jeremy Kruska

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferred to allow applicant to determine whether there is precedent for second floor piazza. With staff comments 1, 4-8

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 1

**STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:**

1. From BAR policy on piazza enclosure:
  - a. *The Charleston piazza/porch is a building feature unique to, and closely identified with, the architectural history and urban character of the city.*
  - b. *This unique feature of the Charleston Single House should be preserved in order to retain the prevailing character of our vernacular architecture.*
  - c. *To enclose the piazza and incorporate it into the interior of a building eliminates this unique feature, and eliminate the use of the piazza as a*

*transitioning space between the interior and its surrounding urban environment.*

- d. *Enclosing piazzas in whole, or in part, may result in irreversible damage to our architectural heritage.*
2. The first-floor piazza enclosure is to relocate the breakfast room, expand a bathroom, and create a mud room and new bedroom.
3. The second-floor faux piazza enclosure is to accommodate a vanity room and create larger closets.
4. Remaining area of first floor piazza will be entirely occupied by new stairs.

**STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:**

1. If the piazza is enclosed, it should be behind columns and balustrade so that these features can remain in place and changes are reversible, as required in the BAR policy.
2. Staff encourage investigation into a variance for a rear addition to accomplish the proposed changes.
3. Second floor piazza is conjecture? Creates a false sense of history
4. Proposed piazza door is very high style for the vernacular style of house. Door height and transom window are too tall.
5. Add detail to the new masonry base in the form of piers or recesses.
6. Location of flood vents should be shown, in appropriate places. not included on front of house
7. New doors in base should include some type of detailing.
8. Elevate the chimney with the building

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

- Denial as proposed

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- HCF
  - Faux piazza enclosure
- PSC
  - Submittal requirements not met
- No written public comment

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

- Clarification, panel above door is solid, not a transom window

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Staff withdraws condition #3, recommend deferral for restudy
- Still thing proposal is heavy handed, piazza shouldn't be enclosed further
- Addition should be limited to area above breakfast and powder rooms
- Stairs eat up entire remaining piazza
- Thing Sanborn is incorrect regarding 2 story piazzas
- Appreciate moving stairs
- Agree with staff, work with zoning on variances for rear addition
- Moving in right direction
- Consensus is that Sanborn is incorrect, need further evidence to justify
- If it was two story piazza, would support rear infill since it would be new construction
- Defer to give chance to verify if there was a two story piazza, maybe use selective demo



- Appreciate willingness to elevate, factor into level of sympathy, can work with applicant
  - Infill should be behind columns
  - Piazza screen intersects first floor awkwardly
  - Retain entry door, creates floating wall in front of piazza
  - Awkward banding at piazza
  - Difficult to merge second floor roof, questions of there was a piazza
  - Detailing of foundation, compatible with house
  - Details out of norm, are they too far? Need further thought out, cleaned up
- 

## 7. 14 Gadsden Street

**TMS # 457-03-03-067 | BAR2023-001173**

**Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1830 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval to elevate existing structure.

Owner: Cozy Development

Applicant: Michael Fisher

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with staff and Board conditions, and final review by staff

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Consider widening front stair
2. Relocate secondary stair to rear

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Change in stair configuration will require approval from engineering for additional encroachment.
2. Buildings should remain in their original location on the lot, unless doing so prevents the reasonable introduction of stairs.
3. Recessed arches create nice rhythm
4. Change in wall height helps mitigate change in elevation

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Elevate chimney with the building

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Conceptual approval with staff comment and final review by staff

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- HFC
  - Has existing easement, have worked closely with applicant
  - Request approval
- No written comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Why are secondary stair at side instead of at rear
- If encroachment hasn't been issued, request to widen stairs

- Tuck secondary stairs around corner at rear
- Appreciate recessed arches, maybe add score lines
- Decrease sidewalk planter if possible

---

**8. 369 King Street**

**TMS # 457-04-02-027 | BAR2023-001179**

**Category 4 | c. 1850 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for storefront alterations.

Owner: New Vintage Capital - Jon Pannoni

Applicant: Eddie Bello

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval with details to staff

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Proposal compliments the existing building and is sympathetic to the historic storefronts of King Street.
2. Staff appreciate the attention to detail in retaining the historic tile

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Final review by staff

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- No public comment

---

**9. 54 Church Street**

**TMS # 458-13-01-093 | BAR2023-001174**

**Category 4 | Charlestowne | c. 1880 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for fenestration alterations and stucco changes.

Owner: Benjamin Mack

Applicant: Alexandra Little, Cozy Development

**Deferred**

---

**10. 20 Atlantic Street**

**TMS # 457-16-04-030 | BAR2023-001175**

**NS | Charlestowne | c. 1935 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for fenestration alterations.

Owner: Aaron Kirchner

Applicant: Evan Gonzalez, Beau Clowney Architects

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with staff comment 2, unless new info is provided, and Board conditions 1-3

MADE BY: Member SECOND: Member VOTE: FOR: 0 AGAINST: 0

**BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:**

1. Retain transoms
2. Eliminate second window, upstairs, east side
3. Restudy stabilization of rail

**STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:**

1. Staff appreciate the proposed changes to the attic vents.

**STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:**

1. Windows should stay in original location. The proposed relocation will necessitate changing the majority of the siding.
2. Shutters on the first floor should remain louvered.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

- Deferral for restudy with staff comments

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- PSC
  - Request limiting changes to rear unless documentation
- HCF
  - Front railing is character defining, should be supported from rear
  - Keep transom above porch doors

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

- Did meet with preservation groups
- Willing to keep transom and omit rail support
- Added window necessary to interior changes

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- East – no issue with new window at first floor
  - Don't see need to create double window at second floor
- Research transom
- Secure rail in a more subtle manner
- Solid panel shutter details
- Confusion over original/non-original windows
  - Window survey would help, want to keep original windows in place, prevent eliminating
- Depending on site line, some windows are not under purview

---

**11.14 Colonial Street**

**TMS # 457-12-03-009 | BAR2023-001135**

**Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1920 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for rear porch enclosure and second floor addition.

Owner: Clay and Rachael Cowherd

Applicant: Tyler A Smyth Architects

**DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**MOTION: Conceptual approval with staff conditions 2-4, Board conditions 1 & 2**

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Alter roofline of rear addition to disengage from historic eave
2. Leaded glass (if used) to be placed in existing sashes

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Staff appreciate the proposed change removing the vinyl windows.
2. The proposed addition is subordinate and differentiated from the existing structure.
3. Project received a special exception from zoning, so purview is regardless of visibility.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

3. The decorative muntin pattern is not currently existing on the structure. Provide justification of proposed changes to fenestration.
4. Door surround on addition from an earlier period, staff suggest restudying to something more in character with the existing house.
5. Windows should remain in original locations.
6. The French doors with transoms are not appropriate for this structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Deferral for restudy with staff comments

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- HCF
  - No objection to work at rear and siding
  - Decorative muntins are attractive, but should be identifiable as porch infill
  - Removal of historic fabric
  - No objection to stained glass
- PSC
  - Suggest lighter touch
  - Concern about decorative muntin patters and leaded glass

APPLICANT RESPONDS:

- Decorative windows differentiate as new
- Placing leaded glass in existing sashes is a good idea

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Questions the age of windows being replaces (with leaded glass), believe to be original sash.
  - Question if leaded glass could be placed in existing sashes
  - Changes to infill front porch are positive
  - Leaded glass should be in existing sash
  - Door surround a little high style
  - Rear addition roof should tuck under existing eave
  - Removing interior fireplace byt supporting exterior chimney
  - Minimize window reconfiguration
  - No issue with French doors at rear, read as new
  - Debate over French doors
  - Tuck roof under eave
-

**12. 16 Murray Boulevard**

**TMS # 457-16-03-006 | BAR2023-001117**

**NS | Charlestowne | c. 1980s | Old and Historic District**

Request to elevate structure above DFE and provide parking under structure.

Owner: Susan & Chris McHugh

Applicant: Thomas & Denzinger Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 1

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Structure has not been lowered per previous Board motion.
2. Per the building department, the lowest member of the structure must be above DFE.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Staff recommend reducing proposed height by 1' as per previous Board motion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Conceptual approval with staff comment and final review by staff

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Question if anything has changed since last presentation
  - Requesting additional height because placing ductwork below house
  - Existing first floor construction is open web
  - Can install ductwork below BFE if meeting requirements
- 

**13. 16 Nassau Street**

**TMS # 459-09-03-052 | BAR2023-001176**

**NS | East Side | c. 1890 | Old City District**

Request conceptual approval for new rear porch and reconstruction of two-story piazza.

Owner: Colin Bumby

Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Preliminary approval with final review by staff

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Staff appreciate the proposal cleaning up the existing façade and allowing the piazza to be reinstated.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Staff suggest providing a detail indicating the location of previous balustrade

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Conceptual approval with final review by staff

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Nice improvement
- 

**14.4 Archdale Street**

**TMS # 457-08-04-060 | BAR2023-001177**

**Category 1 | Harleston Village | c. 1852 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for hardscape alterations.

Owner: Unitarian Church in Charleston

Applicant: Amanda Graham Barton Landscape Architect and JHLA Design

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Staff appreciate the proposed changes to make the existing site more accessible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Final approval

BOARD COMMENTS:

- none
- 

**15.90 Hasell Street**

**TMS # 457-08-01-005 | BAR2023-001178**

**Category 1 | c. 1840 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for hardscape alterations.

Owner: Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim

Applicant: Amanda Graham Barton Landscape Architect and JHLA Design

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Staff appreciate the proposed changes to adapt the existing site to the congregations needs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- Final approval

BOARD COMMENTS:

- none

---

Motion to adjourn by Member; seconded by Member. ( 9:54 pm)

---