

Canal Winchester

*Town Hall
10 North High Street
Canal Winchester, OH 43110*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 23, 2017

7:00 PM

Landmarks Commission

*Joe Abbott – Chairman
Patrick Lynch – Vice Chairman
Ronnie Woodrow – Secretary
David Craycraft
Pete Lynch
Bob Wood II
Roger White*

Call To Order

Time In: 7:00pm

Declaring A Quorum (Roll Call)

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Roger White, that Member Peter Lynch be excused. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

Excused: 1 – Peter Lynch

Approval of Minutes

September 25, 2017 Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Member Bob Wood II, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that the September 25, 2017 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, & Bob Wood II

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft & Ronnie Woodrow

Pending Applications**CA-17-033**

Property Owner: Jessica Ashworth

Applicant: Jessica Ashworth

Location: 28 East Oak Street

Request: New vinyl siding and removing chimney.

Staff discussed that no applicant was present for the meeting to answer questions so the application should be tabled.

A motion was made by Member Roger White, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that the Certificate of Appropriateness be tabled to the November meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

CA-17-039

Property Owner: Lynn + Kathryn Boyd

Applicant: Lynn & Kathryn Boyd

Location: 94 West Waterloo Street

Request: Rear Yard Cedar Privacy Fence

Mr. Moore presented the application for Lynn + Kathryn Boyd for property located at 94 West Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new rear yard privacy fence. Staff presented the application to the commission and noted that the applicant is requesting an amendment to their application to include a rear deck and to change the fencing style.

Staff shared with the commission the updated information on the fence and noted that the area connecting the rear door to the yard behind the detached garage will be a 4 foot solid fence and transition to a 6 foot fence once behind the garage. This suggestion was made to the applicant from staff early on in the process. Additionally, staff noted that the applicant would like to replace the stoop at the rear door and construct a small floating deck in its place. This deck will use the fence as the barrier on the driveway side.

Rob Bruno with Ace Fence and Deck is available for questions.

Mr. Craycraft confirmed with the applicant that the fence is solid and has no gaps.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the fence slats will be cedar. The applicant affirmed and noted the posts will be pressure treated.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked about the orientation of the fence. Mr. Bruno stated the rails will face interior to the property.

Mr. Craycraft asked if the fence was going to be natural cedar or painted or stained. Mr. Bruno stated he does not know because his company does not offer those services.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked about the 12 foot wide track at the rear of the property. Staff indicated they believe the fence is being offset due to large trees in that area. Mr. Lynch wanted to verify that the owner can get mowing equipment back there to maintain that space. The applicant indicated that they can install a gate in the rear yard.

Mr. Patrick Lynch and the applicant discussed the design of the deck.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member David Craycraft, that this certificate of appropriateness be approved as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

CA-17-040

Property Owner: Shawn Monohon

Applicant: Shawn Monohon

Location: 151 West Waterloo Street (Body Masters)

Request: Add an exterior paint booth behind the building

Mr. Moore presented the application for Shawn Monohon for 151 West Waterloo Street, commonly known as Body Masters. The applicant is requesting approval to install an exterior paint booth unit to the rear of the building. Staff presented the supplied drawings for the paint booth and indicated the location of it on the site.

Staff indicated that the Madison Township during an inspection of the site indicated to the business owner that they did not have a proper environment to paint automobiles so is why the applicant is looking to install this self-contained paint booth at the rear of the building. This approval will not only allow the applicant to install this item but will release a current fire code violation. Staff indicated that initially the applicant wanted to install this unit indoors, but due to limited space inside the building it makes more sense to keep it outdoors to free up space inside.

One item staff noted during the presentation was the number of junk vehicles and storage piles that were to the rear and side of the building. Staff discussed that the site should be cleaned up as part of the project and mentioned there have been several complaints recently about the property to city staff.

Mr. Craycraft indicated to the commission that he is the architect for the project.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if this unit is a prefabricated structure would it have any screening installed around it.

Shawn Monohon discussed the application with the commission and noted the details of the unit and why it is being installed.

Mr. White asked the applicant if this is an exterior unit. Mr. Monohon indicated that it both an exterior or interior application.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the impact of the structure on the surrounding homes. The applicant indicated that it is a metal structure and he could paint it to match the main building. The height of the unit is around 13 feet, not taller than the existing building.

Mr. White asked if this unit will create any noise. The applicant indicated it will not.

Mr. Wood asked how long the applicant has operated at the facility. Mr. Monohon stated he has been there for 3 years but the business is 30 years old. Mr. Wood asked when the Fire Marshal was in to do the inspection and discussed the violation. The applicant responded two years ago, and the last inspection was done in 1998. The current building did not meet code so they need to suppress the building to be in compliance. To be in compliance they had to buy this unit because you cannot suppress a wood structure.

Mr. Wood commented that based on the condition of the site looks like they need a wood privacy fence around the site for the neighbors. Mr. Patrick Lynch affirms.

Mr. Abbott asked if anyone from the public would like to make any comment on the application.

Vicki Bogart discussed the project on behalf of her daughter, an adjoining property owner. Mrs. Bogart discussed her concerns with the junk vehicles parked behind the building and that they are certain there is an electric easement where these vehicles are being stored. Additionally, Mrs. Bogart discussed her concern with excessive noise after hours on site.

Mr. Woodrow discussed staff's comment on the junk vehicles on the property. Staff indicated that they wanted to use the meeting as an opportunity to make the business owner aware of the issue rather than sending a formal violation notice.

Mr. Abbott asked if the property owner would be comfortable with the addition of a 6 foot screening fence around the property. The applicant indicated that should not be an issue.

Mr. Monohon stated that he will paint the paint booth to match the rest of the building.

Mr. Craycraft noted that there will be a door from inside of the building into the paint booth and second door added to lead outside the building adjacent to the paint booth.

Mr. Wood commented that he thinks the most important piece of this application is cleaning up the site.

Mr. Monohon indicated that he will clean up the property.

Mr. Woodrow stated that he thinks the commission's recommendation is that a privacy fence will help neighboring concerns in the future.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Ronnie Woodrow, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with conditions that a 6' privacy fence be installed around the property line to shield the booth and surrounding area from view.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow & Bob Wood II

Abstain: 1 – David Craycraft

CA-17-041

Property Owner: Dick Burton

Applicant: Dick Burton

Location: 65 East Columbus Street

Request: Replacing slate roof on outbuilding to match main roof. Replacing porch asphalt shingles to match main roof. Replace 4" K Style gutters with 6" K style gutters.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Dick Burton for property located at 65 East Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the slate roof on the detached building behind the home with matching asphalt shingles to the main house, replace the second story balcony and rear addition asphalt roof with new asphalt to match the main house, and to replace the 4" K Style gutters with 6" K style gutters on the entire property. Staff presented a brief history of the property and a photograph of the new shingle style and the requested locations.

Mr. Burton stated that he is requesting to replace the second story porch roof and the rear addition roof with the same style asphalt shingles that resemble slate. These asphalt shingles are on the same of the main house. The little building has damaged and cracking slate and he would like to replace the slate on that roof with new asphalt shingles to create an art studio for his wife.

Mr. Abbott asked staff what their recommendation was on the structure. Staff indicated that if the applicant wants all of the roofs to match as a reason to remove the slate then the detached garage should have its roof replaced to match the rest of the property.

Mr. Burton stated that he also would like to replace the 4" OG gutters with 6" OG gutters. Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if there were half-rounds on the house now.

The applicant stated that there is a small section on the back side of the house that are half-round.

Mr. White asked if the second story porch has a rubber roof under the shingles due to the pitch. The applicant indicated it does not and never needed one.

Mr. Abbott asked if the shingles he is looking to install on the summer kitchen are the same as what is on the main house. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked what documentation there is to show the deterioration of the slate roof beyond repair. The applicant indicated the photos in the packet.

Mr. White asked if any professionals have looked at the slate condition. The applicant stated that he looked at the slate. Mr. Burton stated that the age of the slate is enough for it to be removed.

Mr. White asked if the building was built the same time as the house. The applicant stated he believes so.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked member Bob Wood if the summer kitchen at his place has a slate roof. Mr. Wood stated that it is a metal roof.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated he had the slate fixed on his house and the people that did the work said that he could expect another 40-50 years out of the life of the roof. Mr. Burton stated he is not at a point where he can install new slate on his house.

Mr. Abbott stated that the original slate was allowed to be removed for this product so maybe the detached building should be replaced too.

Mr. White asked the applicant if he has looked at a metal roof. The applicant stated he did back in 2011 when the main roof was replaced and the product that was best suited for his house is what is on there now. Mr. White commented that since the stand along building is detached it might look good with a contrast of a metal roof. The applicant stated he would not object a metal roof.

Staff commented that they thought a standing seam metal roof might look better.

Mr. Craycraft stated it would be nice if he could maintain the slate on the detached building.

Mr. White commented he has no objection to the porch or addition but the slight concern is removing the only slate.

Mr. Patrick Lynch discussed how he thinks there are a lot of characteristics that make historic districts desirable places and one thing is the authenticity of wood siding and slate roofs.

Mr. Burton stated that in 2011 he got a quote to do new slate on his house and it was 80,000 dollars. The request today is to replace the slate on the out building with the same shingles that was approved on the rest of the property.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that it is a shame that all of the slate in the community is being lost. Even keeping the slate on this one building makes a big difference.

Mr. Burton stated if the commission would like to fund a slate roof he would be glad to do so.

Staff stated that the approval in 2011 to remove the slate on the main house was tabled 3 times by Landmarks Commission. The applicant stated that the reason it was tabled was due to the commission pushing the applicant to work hard to find an optimal solution.

The commission discussed a motion and opted to break the application into three separate approvals.

A motion was made by Member Roger White, seconded by Member David Craycraft that slate roof on the detached summer kitchen's slate roof, be replaced with a black standing seam metal roof. The replacement of the asphalt shingles on the addition and second story porch and gutter replacement approved as presented.

The motion Carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

CA-17-042

Property Owner: Rodney Storts

Applicant: Rodney Storts

Location: 48 East Waterloo Street

Request: Wood privacy gate to screen camper from alley.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Rodney Storts for property located at 48 East Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to install a wood privacy gate to screen his RV from the alley. Staff discussed the application and

noted that the applicant is requesting this gate to meet zoning requirements to park a recreational vehicle on residential property. Staff discussed the pending zoning violation with the commission and noted that the property owner's options are to remove the RV or install a screening mechanism to reduce the visibility of the RV. Staff presented a rendering of what the applicant is looking to construct.

Staff discussed that historically the regulations allowed for these types of equipment screening to be done with 6 foot privacy fence. The rendering that has been put together is an attempt to show a 6 foot privacy gate in a barn door style.

Mr. Abbott asked if the applicant could split the gate in half and have it swing both directions. Staff stated that they discussed that option with the applicant.

Mr. Wood asked staff what the options are for the applicant. Staff indicated that the three options are to apply for a screening mechanism, remove the RV from the site, or apply for a variance.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the fence to the left is existing. Staff indicated that fence belongs to Wagon Wheel Wine.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Ronnie Woodrow, to approve this certificate of appropriateness as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

CA-17-043

Property Owner: Morley Properties

Applicant: Ken Morley

Location: 95 Trine Street

Request: New vinyl siding installed over wood siding. New Trex Composite Decking on front porch. Wrapping front porch posts with aluminum. Replaced existing vinyl windows and aluminum storms with new vinyl windows.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Ken Morley for property located at 95 Trine Street. The applicant is requesting approval for work that was already done on the property. This includes new vinyl siding on the front elevation, new composite decking on the front porch, wrapping the front porch posts in aluminum, and replacing the existing windows with new white vinyl windows.

Staff discussed that the property owner was issued a violation letter for the work being done on the home without approval from the landmarks commission last month. The applicant is requesting approval for that work. Staff provided pictures of the existing façade condition, obtained from the Franklin County Auditor Website, and current photos noting the changes.

Staff recommends that the application be approved with the following conditions:

1. The aluminum siding be removed to expose the original wood siding. If the wood siding is damaged it should be replaced and painted as necessary.
2. The new 5" Trex Composite wood decking be approved with the condition that the skirting wrap around the porch base be replaced with new wood.
3. The vinyl windows be approved.
4. The porch posts be painted rather than wrapped in aluminum.

Ken Morley informed the commission that he was unaware that his property was in the historic district boundaries. The attempt however was to install a vinyl siding that matched the existing wood but creating something new and maintenance free.

Mr. Abbott asked if the existing wood was damaged. The applicants contractor stated that the wood had so many coats of paint it would have been more expensive to strip and repair the paint. Mr. Craycraft the optimal solution would have been to install new wood siding.

Mr. Abbott asked if there were any questions on the Trex Composite Decking.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that the vinyl skirting should be removed and replaced with wood. The applicant's contractor Tim Kimmle stated the original skirting was simple wood slats and this looks the same. Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that the vinyl isn't the same. Typically, the commission requires tongue and groove and the compromise to do the 5" boards is the remove and replace the wood skirting.

Mr. Abbott stated he is fine with the vinyl windows.

Mr. Abbott asked if the applicant is OK with the posts staying wood on the porch. Mr. Kimmle stated that the posts are in the same condition as the wood siding and they have too many coats of paint on them.

Mr. Kimmle stated they would like to wrap and decorate the posts. Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that sounds like a good alternative.

Mr. White asked the applicant to clarify the decorative posts.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that the decorative posts should be built out.

Mr. Abbott stated that the house is simple so the new posts should be too.

Mr. Morley discussed how he thought staff was going to show this property in comparison with the neighboring homes. Staff indicated that a house project should never be compared to neighboring properties to justify non-natural materials. Those neighboring conditions should not prompt the commission to allow something based on its neighbor.

Mr. Woodrow commented that the commission keeps historic features to protect property values.

Mr. Craycraft commented that the porch posts should have just a base and cap and no gingerbread due to the simple house design. The applicant affirmed.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the frame around the vinyl windows is wood. Mr. Kimmle stated that the window frame is a new aluminum wrap. Mr. Morley stated that they wrapped the wood in metal to make it look better than what it was before.

Mr. Kimmle asked if the aluminum siding on the sides could be replaced with aluminum. Mr. Abbott stated that would be worse.

Mr. Morley stated that someone approved the aluminum siding. Staff responded saying that the aluminum siding was added in the 1970's prior to the creation of the Historic District. Mr. Woodrow commented he would like to see the aluminum removed for wood in the future.

The applicant asked what they should do about the metal roof in the future. The commission discussed that it should be maintained or replaced with a new standing seam metal roof to match.

A motion was made by Member Joe Abbott, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- 1. The vinyl siding on the front elevation be removed to expose the original wood siding, to be repaired and painted as necessary;**
- 2. The Trex composite decking be approved with the removal of the vinyl skirting to be replaced with wood;**

3. The front porch columns are to be wrapped with decorative wood trim;
4. And allow the vinyl windows as installed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

CA-17-044

Property Owner: Morley Properties

Applicant: Ken Morley

Location: 100 West Waterloo Street

Request: Replace tongue and groove decking with 5" Trex Composite decking. Remove vinyl from front porch posts and wrap in wood.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Ken Morley for property located at 100 West Waterloo Street. The applicant is requesting approval to remove the vinyl siding from the front porch columns to wrap them in new decorative wood and to replace the tongue and groove decking on the front porch with 5" Trex composite decking. Mr. Moore shared photographs of the property and the current front porch. The applicant wishes that the columns match what was done at 125 West Waterloo for reference.

Staff discussed that the tongue and groove decking on a commercial property and one along Waterloo is important feature to keep. Historically this type of decking profile would have been the one used and replacing it with a 5" board would not be appropriate. Staff suggested a composite tongue and groove decking be used, similar to what was done at 35 North High Street.

Staff recommends that the application be approved with the following recommendations:

1. The front porch decking must remain a tongue and groove design. The applicant should explore alternative materials, such as what was used with 35 North High Street. This would accomplish the "rot resistant" material, while keeping a historic profile.
2. The alterations to the front porch posts be approved with the condition that the posts have caps on the ends to match the supplied photograph and the beam that runs across the top be exposed to wood.

Mr. Abbott confirmed with the applicant that the vertical vinyl returns be removed.

Mr. White asked if the porch is required to have railings. Staff stated that it does not need railings.

A motion was made by Member Patrick Lynch, seconded by Member Ronnie Woodrow, to approve this Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

- 1. The front porch decking can be a composite decking but must remain a tongue and groove design;**
- 2. And that the front porch posts have caps on the ends to match the supplied photograph and the header have the vinyl removed as well to expose the wood.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

CA-17-045

Property Owner: John & Janie Kantner

Applicant: Travis Ketron

Location: 42 West Columbus Street

Request: Re-use existing foundation stone for rear patio. New wood fence.

Mr. Moore presented the application for Travis Ketron for property located at 42 West Columbus Street. The applicant is requesting approval to re-use the existing foundation stone from the previous home for a rear patio retaining wall and a new wood fence around the yard. Staff presented the history of this particular project with the commission and discussed the previous conditions of approval for the construction of the new home. It was discussed that the old foundation was previously presented by the applicants to remain on site to show the history of the property and the location of the old structure.

Staff further discussed the fence proposal from the applicant and noted that it would be a 4 foot fence facing Columbus Street and along Liberty it would transition from a 4 foot fence to a 6 foot fence by the time it reached the alley, then it would be 6 foot tying into the neighbor's fence.

Staff recommends that location change for the sandstone foundation be denied as presented. The applicant made specific commitments with the demolition of the existing homes. One of the most important commitments was about "keeping the history" of the property with retaining the foundation wall in its existing location to be used as a landscape feature.

Staff recommends that the application for the fence be approved with the condition that the 6 foot section of fence along the alley be relocated to line up with the neighboring fence to the west to avoid site line issues along the alley.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked if the suggestion to move the fence is to create a better view down the alley. Staff affirmed.

Mr. Wood asked staff where the original foundation wall location was. Staff indicated that the applicants showed that they would keep the foundation in the same location to pay homage to the prior building. As part of that approval, staff did not feel the applicant was clear that the foundation would have to be removed and reassembled at a later date, causing initial controversy to the commission. Now at this time they wish to not put it in that location at all rather wrap a rear yard patio where you cannot see it. Mr. Wood stated he knows he was not on the commission during the original approval of the project but as long as the stone is used he does not care.

Mr. White commented that he thinks that the foundation wall being kept would look off now. The intention was good but it was not practical.

Mr. Abbott stated he is glad the applicant is reusing the old material.

Mr. Craycraft asked what is the reason for moving it. Mr. Ketron stated that when the house was reoriented on the lot the wall no longer fits the front yard profile.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated that he thinks the stone will look great around the back at the patio but the original wall could be placed in the front and look great. The wall does not have to be tall but if it was recreated in a similar way it would save a bit of history.

Mr. Abbott agrees that it would not have to be in the exact location of where it was but some notion of the old foundation would be good to keep.

Mr. Craycraft agrees with Patrick Lynch's comments.

Mr. Woodrow commented he thinks a compromise would be to put something in that location so that the rest of the stone can be used in the back patio.

The owner Mr. Kantner commented that the house was required to be relocated closer to the street and closer to the Locks house. That requirement changed the way the wall was designed and it no longer fit. Staff clarified for the owner that the variance request to have the house 11 feet away from the property line was denied. Requiring it to be located 0-4.5 feet away from the property line. The shift towards the locks house was a suggestion from the contractor and staff indicated that they felt it was a positive change. Not required at all. Mr. Kanter stated he felt differently and that the city pushed to move it closer to the neighboring house.

Mr. Patrick Lynch asked the home owner if he was OK with a wall in the front. Mr. Kanter stated if that is what the commission knows best.

Mr. Ketrone stated there is not any landscape architect that would keep the wall in the original location. Staff stated that the rendering for the original design was that the area behind the wall would be filled up with landscaping.

Mr. Patrick Lynch stated the wall can be moved a little any direction to get it to work with the new house design.

Mr. Craycraft affirmed that it could be a small leg on one side and the other to play down the wall but keep something up front.

The commission discussed the wall further amongst themselves.

Mr. Abbott asked staff if there is an easement on the alley that dictates the fence location.

Mr. Ketrone stated that the fence location provides plenty of visibility and they do not think it needs to be located in the same offset as the neighbor.

Mr. White commented that he likes the step down feature on the fence.

Staff stated the recommendation was to keep the fence in line with the neighbor property line to keep things visually consistent.

Staff asked the applicant if they wish to get approval for the patio during this meeting as well. A patio on this property has not yet been approved by the commission.

Mr. Ketrone stated that the patio will be in the approximate location as in the rendering and that it will be a buff washed concrete with the sandstone foundation wrapping around it.

The commission decided to break the application into three separate votes.

A motion was made by Member Ronnie Woodrow, seconded by Member David Craycraft, that the Certificate of Appropriateness for request for a new fence be approved as proposed by the applicant.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

A motion was made by Member David Craycraft, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that the Certificate of Appropriateness for the request to reuse the existing foundation stone be approved with the condition that the stone be used to mimic the location of the pre-existing house with a minimum of 6'-8' leg on both sides and a minimum 8"-12" in height.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

A motion was made by Member David Craycraft, seconded by Member Patrick Lynch, that the Certificate of Appropriateness for the request to install a rear yard patio be approved as presented at the meeting with a buff washed patio with a stone foundation around the perimeter, either using existing stone or new stone to match.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

Old Business

Staff discussed the possibility of updated the Historic Inventory Sheets or possibly creating a Plaque for the larger dollar projects in the Old Town District to acknowledge those who put in the extra effort into maintaining properties.

Mr. White discussed possible locals who would be beneficial to help provide background info on homes and update the Historic Inventory Sheets.

New Business

Adjournment

Time Out: 9:42pm

A motion was made by Patrick Lynch, seconded by Joe Abbott, that this Meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Joe Abbott, Patrick Lynch, Roger White, Ronnie Woodrow, David Craycraft & Bob Wood II

Date

Joe Abbott, Landmarks Chairman