

1 Frank Lambert of KDN Signs stated they planned to patch the wall and confirmed the word “Harris”
2 would be removed.

3
4 Chairperson Moor described the request as straightforward and asked for a motion to approve the
5 request as presented. A motion to approve the request as presented was made by Mr. Ritter. The
6 motion was seconded by Duda. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

7 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter

8 NAYS: None

9

10 **b. Case No. 23-23-DR: 561 Lincoln Avenue - Bahn Mi: Sign Permit to allow fabric replacement on**
11 **an existing awning frame and installation of window sign and awning valance sign with their business**
12 **name.**

13 Ms. Kirincic identified the sign’s location, the view from Lincoln Avenue, and the storefront. She stated
14 there is a previous business valance and wall sign, which would be replaced with the proposed signage.
15 Ms. Kirincic also identified the temporary window signage and stated it would be replaced with a black
16 valance and include the business name. She then described the die-cut individual window signage
17 lettering, which would be clear in color. Ms. Kirincic stated the awning and valance would be in
18 compliance with code and window signage requirements.

19

20 Kevin Diep, the business owner, stated the request is for an awning and window sign and clarified the
21 correct spelling of the business name for the Board.

22

23 Chairperson Moor questioned why the application could not receive administrative approval since it
24 complied with requirements. Ms. Kirincic responded the request included an awning change, which did
25 not allow for administrative approval.

26

27 Chairperson Moor then asked for a motion to approve the request. A motion was made by Ms. Meiners
28 to approve the request as presented. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion
29 unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

30 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter

31 NAYS: None

32

33 **c. Case No. 23-24-DR: 906 Green Bay Road - Sarah Dippold Design: Sign Permit to allow the**
34 **existing storefront window signs with minor changes to remain and the installation of a new**
35 **projecting sign.**

36 Ms. Kirincic described the request, including projecting signs with the existing window signs to remain as
37 well as the minor changes in the application. She noted the only new portion included the addition of a
38 QR code in two locations. Ms. Kirincic then identified the projecting sign’s location, noting the window
39 signs met administrative approval requirements except for their application to the window’s exterior,
40 which required Board approval. She also stated that the proposed projecting signs complied with code
41 requirements.

42

43 Rhonda Pearson spoke on behalf of the applicant and stated the new projecting signs would be installed
44 in the same location as the previous signs. She also confirmed there would be only two QR codes on the
45 window.

46

1 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions or for a motion to approve the request as
2 presented. Mr. Konstant moved to approve the request as presented. The motion was seconded by
3 Duda. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

4 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter

5 NAYS: None

6
7 **d. Case No. 23-25-DR: 558 Green Bay Road - Elizabeth Stamos Design: Sign Permit to allow the**
8 **installation of a new wall sign for their business on the Green Bay Road frontage.**

9 Chairperson Moor stated this agenda item will not be considered this evening as the Applicant has
10 withdrawn its request at this time.

11
12 **e. Case No. 23-26-DR: 507 Chestnut Street - Tocco Italian Restaurant: Sign Permit to allow two**
13 **existing window signs to remain at the storefront of the Tocco Italian Restaurant along the Chestnut**
14 **Street elevation and a Sign Code Variation to allow two existing window signs that (i) exceed 10% of**
15 **their respective window area; and (ii) are not die-cut and are not limited to individual letters and**
16 **logos.**

17 Ms. Kirincic stated the request is to bring the existing sign into compliance with the applicant seeking a
18 sign variation to allow two existing store windows with photographic features to remain. She referred to
19 the restaurant's illustration from Chestnut Street and Chestnut Court. Ms. Kirincic then described the
20 requested sign code variation and noted the request did not meet administrative approval requirements
21 due to its size and required Board approval, although the signage complied with the street exposure
22 area.

23
24 Bruno Abati commented the signage is beautiful. Chairperson Moor agreed with Mr. Abati's comments
25 and referred to the length of time they have been there. Mr. Duda agreed with the comments made and
26 stated his concern related to consistency in connection with other businesses and could set a precedent.
27 Mr. Abati stated you can see through the signage inside the restaurant. Ms. Meiners agreed with the
28 comments and that the signs have been there for a long time. She stated it had worked since they
29 existed. Mr. Ritter agreed with the precedent-setting comment, although the signs are attractive, and
30 since the other windows are clear, it would be okay to remain. He stated he was fine with the request.
31 Ms. Niehoff agreed she was also fine with the request.

32
33 Chairperson Moor then asked for a motion to approve the request as presented. A motion was made by
34 Mr. Konstant to approve the request as presented and seconded by Mr. Duda. A vote was taken and the
35 motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

36 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter

37 NAYS: None

38
39 **f. Case No. 23-27-DR: 566 Chestnut Street - Soupicurean Sandwich Shop: Sign Permit to allow**
40 **existing window signs to remain at the storefront of the Soupicurean Sandwich Shop and a Sign Code**
41 **Variation to allow existing window signs that (i) exceed 10% of their respective window area; and (ii)**
42 **are not die-cut and are not limited to individual letters and logos.**

43 Ms. Kirincic explained the reasoning for the request that businesses installed signs during the pandemic
44 that were not approved, and amendments were drafted to address window signage requirements. She
45 stated the Village staff has been working with applicants to submit sign permit applications to bring
46 signage into compliance. Ms. Kirincic described the request to allow the existing storefront window signs
47 to remain as well as a sign code variation to allow window signs, which she outlined. She then identified
48 the existing signage locations and further explained the requested variation.

1 Mary Jo Vlahos, one of the owners, informed the Board the signs were installed during COVID-19 to help
2 alleviate visibility issues and stated she would like to keep as many of the signs as possible. She then
3 identified an area similar to that of the previous tenant.
4

5 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions. Mr. Konstant asked if the second phone number
6 was listed twice. Ms. Vlahos responded it was helpful during COVID-19 and could be removed and
7 identified other portions of the sign that were removed. Chairperson Moor commented it would be
8 more upscale without the phone number. Ms. Meiners and Chairperson Moor suggested alternative
9 wording for the signage relating to the soup.
10

11 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the request with the condition that the phone
12 numbers be removed along with the top portion of the entrance signage. A motion to approve the
13 request, as stated by Chairperson Moor was made by Mr. Duda and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was
14 taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

15 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter

16 NAYS: None
17

18 **Continued Application:**

19 a. **Case No. 23-13-TX: 808 Oak Street - New Multifamily Residential Building: An application**
20 **submitted by 808 Oak Street, LLC, seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the**
21 **construction of a new four-story multifamily building. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this**
22 **request. This item was continued from the September 21, 2023, Design Review Board Meeting.**

23 Chairperson Moor noted Ms. Niehoff and Mr. Konstant will be recusing themselves from the discussion.
24 Ms. Niehoff and Mr. Konstant both left the room. Ms. Klaassen stated the Board first reviewed the
25 project at the September Board meeting with the finding that the building design is more contemporary
26 in nature, is attractive and compatible with buildings in the area, with one exception. She stated the
27 members found the vertical slats at the street level incompatible with the desire to have a pedestrian-
28 focused building orientation at the street level, recognizing that the building would be purely residential,
29 the Board found that the street level treatment could be more compatible with storefronts in the
30 commercial district.
31

32 Ms. Klaassen stated the applicant provided a written explanation in response to the Board's comments
33 describing the design approach along with updated renderings reflecting the vertical slats are spaced
34 further apart than illustrated in the previous renderings. She then referred to the proposed additional
35 renderings. Ms. Klaassen stated, as mentioned at the September meeting, the applicant has also
36 submitted applications for a text amendment and special use permit to be considered by the Plan
37 Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals following the Board's review. She noted the staff report also
38 included the factors the Board should consider when reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness as well
39 as the Design Guidelines that should be considered.
40

41 Ms. Klaassen summarized the steps for the meeting this evening, explaining that the applicant would
42 provide their presentation followed by public comment, and applicant response if necessary, and then
43 Board deliberation. She stated the Board can then either consider the draft motion on page 15 of the
44 agenda materials or continue the application to a date certain. Ms. Klaassen then asked if there were
45 any questions.
46

47 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. She
48 then asked for the applicant's presentation.

1 Sonia Arminio of Konstant Architecture described the building as being site specific and meant to bridge
2 the gap between two different building types with the vertical slats providing that bridge. She stated
3 following the Board's comments, the ownership did not want a design overhaul and revised renderings
4 were provided to the Board showing the vertical slat's appeal from the street. Ms. Arminio noted they
5 would not be located against the building to provide relief and described how the slats give way to the
6 planting bed and front windows while providing visual interest. She described depth as an important
7 part of the design with the slat depth and texture making it a cohesive design. Ms. Arminio described
8 the slats as an example of modern ornamentation which would enhance the building's overall aesthetic.
9 She then asked if there were any questions.

10
11 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Meiners referred to page 12 of 316 and
12 asked if the updated vertical slats were removed from the revised rendering. Ms. Arminio confirmed the
13 window frame remained the same and described how it appeared with the slats spacing changed. She
14 explained that the slats are used as a railing on the second floor so they have to be a certain distance to
15 meet code. Chairperson Moor commented it married the neighboring building and described the lot as
16 challenging. She commented a good job was done given the conditions. Ms. Meiners and Mr. Ritter
17 agreed with the comments made. Mr. Ritter added a great job was done given the severe footprint
18 constraints and he appreciated the attempts to alleviate the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Duda also agreed
19 with the comments made noting that the design is much more understandable with the updated
20 renderings.

21
22 Chairperson Moor then asked for public comments.

23
24 Dan Schermerhorn of 800 and 812 Oak Management stated the Village's theme is mirrored by the
25 Design Guidelines including Tudor, pitched roofs, etc. with the proposed design not found elsewhere in
26 the Village. He commented on how the proposed design did not marry the two neighboring buildings
27 and suggested the use of brick or another material consistent with the Design Guidelines with little
28 accommodation given to 800 Oak. He also described the proposed building as going 100% in the
29 opposite direction and would not be a great melding of the two facades.

30
31 Karen Adams, 812 Oak, thanked the Board and referred to the comments relating to further studying
32 the first floor rendering. She asked the Village staff if the criteria of a street wall would be approached at
33 a different meeting. Ms. Adams then stated her concerns are twofold, the first of which related to
34 access off Oak Street which is incorporated into the Elm Street masterplan and outlined her concerns
35 relating to vehicular and pedestrian traffic with a driveway in the middle of Oak. She then stated the 808
36 Oak design did not reflect many of the comments presented in the charter with the Village masterplan
37 being used as a guideline. Ms. Adams also stated while the proposed design is remarkable, she hoped
38 the Board could encourage them to incorporate some of the architectural desires on the building's
39 façade. She also referenced quotes from the Village's masterplan and the architect's involvement in
40 helping draft it. Ms. Adams concluded by stating her comments are personal and identified her
41 community planning background.

42
43 Richard Meyer stated he lives next door to the subject property and referred to four questions relating
44 to the aesthetic and site improvement. He referred to issues in connection with the Village's ability to
45 uphold the community character and stated they are missing the opportunity for collaboration and
46 community problem solving while agreeing the lot is complicated. Mr. Meyer referred to the public
47 interest outcome and the developer's ability to build on the lot which would help increase density and
48 the number of Village residents.

1 Rick Adams, 812 Oak, stated following his additional research, he determined the lot is a buildable lot
2 and referred to the connection with the 800 Oak building. He then referred to the design aesthetics and
3 commented the aluminum slats are not needed to transition to the neighboring building. Mr. Adams
4 suggested the building should be more consistent with the Design Guidelines and although it is a
5 challenging lot, a lot of the criteria to build on the lot can be met. He commented the building face did
6 not agree with the Design Guidelines and it should not have a 1.5 story picket fence as its building face.

7
8 Raymond George, 812 Oak, stated they were encouraged to provide comments on the project and
9 identified his concerns which he provided to Trustee Dearborn. He stated his main concern related to
10 the midblock ingress on Oak and amount of traffic on the busy street. Mr. George then referred to the
11 property line dispute from years ago and identified his concerns relating to the prior proposal for having
12 underground parking and its effect on trees. He stated they spoke with Mr. Konstant several times to
13 discuss their concerns. No additional comments were made at this time.

14
15 Chairperson Moor asked the applicant to address the safety concerns. Ms. Arminio described the one
16 way traffic and ingress/egress on the site with the garage door being recessed on the property.
17 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any other questions. She stated the proposal addressed the lot's
18 challenges and referred to the comments made with regard to the brick buildings on either side. She
19 added the proposal would add airiness to the lot.

20
21 Ms. Meiners agreed with Chairperson Moor's comments and stated the proposed materials, although
22 not historic in nature, would be easier to maintain in terms of its longevity. She commented the
23 proposal is well designed given the lot and spoke to a younger generation who would like to see a more
24 contemporary building although she understood the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Duda stated with regard
25 to safety, he referred to the limited number of vehicles on the site and described the design as elegant.
26 He also referred to the increased space between the slat's visibility while accommodated on a narrow
27 lot. He concluded he is in favor of the proposal. Mr. Ritter stated he understood the concerns relating to
28 it being a modern building and would not be in favor of it in another location. He stated it fit the location
29 and that another brick building would be too much brick. Mr. Ritter added the neighboring buildings are
30 not similar architecturally or consistent with older builds in town. He concluded it is appropriate and
31 commented on the amount of work done by the owners and architect while preserving the trees. He
32 added it is a good solution.

33
34 Chairperson Moor then asked for a motion. Mr. Duda moved to approve the request as submitted. An
35 audience member referred to the proposed materials being noted in the design guidelines as
36 unacceptable. Ms. Klaassen confirmed the materials listed in the Design Guidelines are simply guidelines
37 not standards or regulations. Mr. Ritter seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion
38 unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

39 AYES: Duda, Meiners, Moor, Ritter

40 NAYS: None

41 RECUSED: Konstant, Niehoff

42
43 **New Applications:**

44 **g. Case No. 23-05-PD: 791 Elm Street - Chase Bank Preliminary Planned Development: Certificate**
45 **of Appropriateness to allow construction of a new three-story commercial building as part of a**
46 **planned development. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

47 Ms. Klaassen outlined the planned development process, the Village Council's, the general site
48 information, the zoning relief being requested, the Village Council's comments on the concept plan and

1 the Board's role on the application. She informed the Board no public comments were received relating
2 to the application and following the applicant's presentation, public comment, the applicant's response
3 to comment if necessary, the Board may deliberate and either continue the request to a date certain or
4 make a motion as indicated on page nos. 206-207. Ms. Klaassen then asked if there were any questions.
5 No questions were raised at this time.

6
7 Chairperson Moor asked for the applicant's presentation. Farzad Boroumand, Head of JPMorgan Chase
8 Global Design, introduced himself and the team to the Board who would present the request. He
9 identified the building's location, age and noted that the demand for banking service increased
10 drastically requiring them to increase staff size. He also stated the request is due to the building's age
11 and infrastructure. Mr. Boroumand described the building's materials, mechanical systems, solar panels,
12 etc. while stating they would respect the Village's architecture. He noted they hired award winning
13 architects, Gensler & Associates, and introduced the team to the Board.

14
15 Scott Hurst of Gensler & Associates began by explaining that they always look for ways to keep buildings
16 intact where possible but that was not possible in this instance due to the building's age and
17 infrastructure, lack of available parking, the impossibility of vertical and horizontal expansion, among
18 other issues. He stated the site has changed over time to meet the community's needs and did not
19 appear to be a bank from its exterior impression. Mr. Hurst described the new three story building as
20 having 34,000 square feet of retail bank and office space, 32 parking spaces mostly below grade and
21 building efficiency improvements.

22
23 Mr. Hurst described the site as unique noting they paid attention to the street's building rhythm and the
24 new building would be considerate and step down and provide visual interest. He also described the
25 corner as a Village gateway site with the new design relating to the community fabric. Mr. Hurst then
26 identified stepped down heights which would be lower than the 45 foot height limitation and described
27 how the train line affected the site's inspiration. He described the primary features as containing a
28 limestone base and heavier piers on the façade with corner entrances that called out on the corner
29 element.

30
31 Mr. Hurst then referred to the proposed building's illustration along Green Bay Road with the corner
32 representing the highest point at 54 feet 5 inches which is shorter than the existing cupola. He noted the
33 heights would step down gradually to the buildings to the west and north and would be heavily detailed
34 and articulated. Mr. Hurst described the ground floor height at 17 feet and second and third floor
35 heights reaching the total 45 feet height limit as well as the main entrance. He then identified the
36 northern elevation's illustration.

37
38 Mr. Hurst stated with regard to the building heights, he referred to an illustration noting most of the
39 building is well within the 45 foot height limitation with two elements deliberately extending beyond the
40 45 foot height. He then described the various building elements and parking noting they planned to
41 meet the setback on the upper floors. Mr. Hurst also identified the concealed parking ramp. He then
42 stated they planned to meet design guidelines and identified that pavers would be used as well as trees
43 and an ornamental screen wall. Mr. Hurst noted the upper floors would contain office space and
44 explained the roof plan. Mr. Hurst also identified the façade materials, cornice and lighting scheme. He
45 then identified the north elevation and its elements as well as the southwest corner which stepped
46 down. Mr. Hurst also described in detail the sustainable strategies they planned to implement as part of
47 the project and then asked if there were any questions.

48

1 Mr. Konstant questioned the building base. Mr. Hurst responded it would be limestone and described
2 the terracotta material to be used on the upper floors and provided a material sample board to the
3 Board for its review. Ms. Meiners referred to underground parking and questioned the need for so many
4 underground parking spaces. Mr. Hurst responded it is due to the Village's parking requirements and
5 noted they planned to incorporate water retention onsite. Mr. Boroumand identified the number of
6 employees as 72 with the upper floors being other office uses. Chairperson Moor then asked how many
7 existing employees are on site. Mr. Boroumand responded about half of the proposed number of
8 employees. Chairperson Moor then questioned the amount of retail banking space. Mr. Hurst
9 responded it would be similar to the existing retail banking space. Mr. Duda questioned how art deco
10 was incorporated in the design. Mr. Hurst explained its use to the Board. He also explained how the
11 tower feature was addressed.

12
13 Chairperson Moor thanked the applicant for addressing the concerns previously raised and described
14 the site as one of the most important sites in the Village. She further commented on the building's effect
15 on the Village as well as on its massing. Chairperson Moor explained that it feels very big and corporate
16 and that scale is a big part of it. She stated that dwarfs buildings to the west. Chairperson Moor then
17 provided comments on her preference for the use of traditional materials due to its prominent location.
18 She noted that she liked the limestone, but not the terracotta and that she would prefer brick, maybe
19 with a chevron patterns in places. Chairperson Moor stated that she preferred for the clock being
20 included. Mr. Konstant agreed with Chairperson Moor's comments relating to the materials, but not the
21 clock. Ms. Meiners agreed with the comments made and commented the building is beautiful. She also
22 agreed with the use of brick as opposed to terracotta and stated she appreciated the applicant's use of
23 sustainable practices. Ms. Meiners stated the scale and terracotta are off for her. Mr. Duda agreed with
24 the comments made and stated he struggled with the appearance of the top two floors.

25
26 Mr. Boroumand provided a response relating to the building's scale which is similar to a neighboring
27 building noting most of the building would still be within the 45 foot height limitation. He referred to the
28 amount of time spent reconfiguring the building and their consideration of the use of brick noting they
29 are entering a new era with the use of a modern construction system in terms of respecting the past and
30 future.

31
32 Ms. Niehoff stated her issue related to scale more so than height, particularly on the ground floor and
33 referred to the ground floor having a 17 foot ceiling height. She commented that height felt out of
34 character although she is fine with the use of terracotta. Ms. Niehoff also complimented the applicant
35 on the changes made from the June 2023 presentation and suggested the height be brought down
36 especially on the ground floor.

37
38 Mr. Hurst stated the 17 foot ground floor can be brought down and indicated the modulation brought
39 down the building's scale. He then stated if they were to maintain a 45 foot height across the entire
40 building, it would appear more massive with a 17 foot ceiling height being standard for ground floor
41 retail. The Board Members stated that is not typical in Winnetka. Mr. Hurst added they went to great
42 lengths to break down with building's modulation to mirror the business district's individual storefronts.

43
44 Mr. Ritter commented it is a good looking building and he would prefer the use of brick instead of
45 terracotta. He also agreed with Ms. Niehoff's comments relating to the first floor height. Chairperson
46 Moor added the drama could work against them and minimizing the shock of the change would be
47 better for the community. Mr. Konstant suggested the use of a timber frame which could add to the
48 building's historical aspect. Mr. Hurst responded they are investigating it. Ms. Meiners commented she

1 liked the modulations with the corner piece being the most important part. She referred to discussions
2 relating to One Winnetka and how to make it feel more inviting. Ms. Meiners added the material and
3 some of the building's elements are not right for this corner. Ms. Niehoff asked for additional
4 information relating to glass. Mr. Hurst responded while it is too early in the process to make a definite
5 decision, he described some of the options they are considering. He confirmed they planned to make
6 sure the corner is an active space meant to serve the community which he described as a forward way
7 of thinking in terms of its architecture. Ms. Niehoff asked the applicant to consider how the building
8 would appear at night in terms of lighting intensity.
9

10 Chairperson Moor described the request as a significant departure in terms of what has been there and
11 they need to tread carefully with regard to how it communicates. Ms. Meiners added that warmth
12 should be retained. Chairperson Moor stated they do not want the building to appear to be a big
13 downtown corporate feeling office building which would not be appropriate for the Village and
14 reiterated the use of brick would contribute to its warmth. Mr. Hurst asked the Board if they would
15 prefer more transparency. Ms. Niehoff referred to the amount of glass and suggested less glass be used
16 and to adjust the limestone spandrel.
17

18 Mr. Boroumand stated the limestone treatment use for the building base has been used as a feature in
19 the Village and bringing new material to the community would be positive for the community. He
20 indicated it would otherwise be more difficult to maintain the building in the future and with regard to
21 17 foot ground floor height, it would only be 13-14 feet inside due to the mechanicals. Mr. Boroumand
22 then stated the building height can be lowered by a couple of feet and the glass scale reduced and the
23 spandrel increased. He also stated lighting would be controlled and would be dimmed at night. Mr.
24 Boroumand stated they wanted the building to appear as a lantern at night for the community but
25 modifications can be made in that regard. He confirmed they planned to take the Board's comments
26 into consideration. He added they felt the terracotta would have been a nice option over the use of
27 brick.
28

29 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any comments from the public. No comments were made at this
30 time. She then called the matter in for discussion.
31

32 Chairperson Moor then asked for a motion to continue the matter with the condition the applicant take
33 into consideration a limestone and brick façade versus terracotta, minimizing the first floor height and
34 minimize the amount of glass. She also stated the Board's consensus is that while they want to move
35 forward into the future, the Village is not downtown Chicago, etc. A motion as stated by Chairperson
36 Moor was made by Mr. Duda. Mr. Schoon noted the matter would need to be continued to a date
37 certain with the Board's next meeting being November 16, 2023, and to discuss a quorum for that
38 meeting. The Board Members confirmed their availability. Ms. Niehoff seconded the motion.
39

40 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter

41 NAYS: None
42

Other Business.

a. November 16, 2023, Meeting – Quorum Check.

44 The Board Members previously discussed their availability.
45

Adjournment:

47 A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Meiners and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the
48 motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

- 1 AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Ritter
- 2 NAYS: None
- 3 The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.
- 4
- 5 Respectfully submitted,
- 6
- 7 Antionette Johnson
- 8 Recording Secretary