

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of Meeting of August 20, 2008

Commissioners Present: Bette Carter, Ralph Freeman (Chair), Barbara McCoy, John Ogletree, Larry Phillips, Brook Tate, Jo Tyler

Commissioners Absent: Staci Blatt, George Henry

Staff Present: Katrina Newton, Commissioner Coordinator; Lu Ann Welter, Administrative Assistant

I Call to Order. The Chair called the monthly meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m.

II Agenda. *On motion of Commissioner Tyler, seconded by Commissioner Carter, the Commission approved the agenda.*

III Minutes. *On motion of Commissioner McCoy, seconded by Commissioner Tyler, the minutes of July 16, 2008 were approved.*

IV William D. and Miller Medina (H08-28-COA) After swearing in potential witnesses for both hearings, the Chair opened this public hearing. At the request of Katrina Newton, Commission Coordinator, Commission File No. H08-28-COA was admitted into evidence, and the Commission took official notice of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Hendersonville and the Commission's Design Guidelines. Ms. Newton gave the following background on this application:

The Commission originally heard this application at its June 18, 2008 meeting and deferred decision on the matter to the next meeting and asked the applicant to revise their application to retain as much of the original detail of the porch as possible. At the July 16, 2008 meeting, the Commission continued the matter at the request of the applicant.

Since the June meeting, the applicant has submitted revised plans for the alterations to the enclosed porch. The applicant proposes to raise the floor of the porch by three to five inches to prevent water from entering the porch. The variation in height is due to the difference in the exterior grade of the yard. The frieze above the doors and windows and the copper roof will remain. The applicant has stated that if they find that the roof has sustained substantial water damage, they will need to replace it, and they would replace it in-kind. Replacement of a roof in-kind is considered a minor work and staff is able to issue a certificate of appropriateness for such work. The applicant intends to install copper downspouts on the porch to match the downspouts on the rest of the house.

West and East elevations:

The applicant has proposed the same doors that they proposed in their original application. The doors are aluminum clad wood French doors, 81-5/8"x 63-15/16, with a rectangular grill pattern. The transom above the doors will have the circle detailing placed behind the glass. The applicant has indicated that they will use as much of the original circle fret work as possible. The applicant

proposes casement windows on either side of the French doors with the diamond fret work to be placed behind the glass. The transom above the casement window will have the rectangular fret work. Again, the applicant has indicated that they will use as much of the original fret work as possible. Below the casement windows, there will be a wood base as there is currently.

Regarding the original columns, the casement windows will require the removal of two columns on both the west and east elevations. The applicant intends to use the original columns adjacent to the doors and at the corners of the porch adjacent to the casement windows. The columns have suffered some water damage and the applicant has indicated that they will use the original columns and only replace sections that are not usable due to water damage. The column height will need to be adjusted to accommodate the raising on the floor.

South elevation:

The applicant has not revised their original proposed application for the south elevation. The applicant proposes two sets of windows with a column in between. The center window will be a fixed window with two casement windows on either side. The windows will have the same grill pattern like the French doors. The transom above the windows will have the sunburst detail behind the glass of the transom. Please refer to the drawings for the dimensions. The applicant plans to use the original columns between the sets of windows and at the corners of the porch. There will be a wood base below the casement windows between the columns.

Ms. Newton reported the applicant met with the Design Review Advisory Committee at its July 2, 2008 meeting. The Committee recommended to the applicant that they retain all of the original fret work and install custom doors and windows to fit within the fret work and to install casement windows behind the diamond fret work.

Bill Medina of 1300 Pinecrest Drive explained this is a complicated project for a small room and has been a two year process. From a written narrative, Dr. Medina read the house was built in 1926 by Erle Stillwell. The house fell into poor repair but was extensively renovated in 1992-1993. The sunroom was designed as an open air porch that opened onto a terrace covered by an awning that ran the length of this side of the house. The latticework was intended at least in part as a trellis for climbing vines. The porch was enclosed years before they bought the house. The enclosure included an aluminum-clad double door facing the driveway and 3 pairs of sliding insulated windows in an aluminum frame. Since that time all of the trim is actually inside the house. They bought the house in 1995. They were asked to place the house on the Historic Registry and this was done in 2001. The house was 2400 square feet. There are 3 rooms on the first floor. The sunroom measures 10 feet by 14 feet and is not visible from the street. The house has a small area at the backdoor with a roof and open latticework that measures 3.5 feet by 5.5 feet and is visible from the street with the original latticework still there. Since there are only 3 rooms on the first floor they believe the enclosed sunroom provides important additional living space. It was certainly important to them when they bought the house.

Mr. Medina said the programs took two years to figure out. First the primary problem is massive water leakage causing the wood to rot and promoting persistent and recurrent growth of highly visible mold on all surfaces inside the sunroom. This includes the back of the trim against the glass where it is impossible to clean. This has been a persistent problem during the 13 years they have lived in the house but it is getting worse and worse. Algae grow in some spots. Much of the water leakage comes up through the slate floor. The floor of the sunroom is slate over a concrete base

that slopes away from the house. When the house was first built the driveway was gravel and the terrace outside the porch was slate. Many years ago the driveway and terrace were paved with concrete. This changed the drainage patterns. The terrace is not higher than the concrete base and the slate and comes into the room between and through the slate. IN addition, water comes through the sill of the door, under the walls and, if the wind is blowing, under the sliding windows.

Mr. Medina said the secondary problems include condensation forming inside sliding double-pane windows, poor insulation caused by large areas of single-pane glass and widespread leaks of air. They cannot use the room in cold weather but even in warm weather the mold and the water leaks detract from what should be a pleasant space. Unpleasant clash of multiple architectural elements with diamonds, rectangles, arches, sunbursts, circles, larger rectangles, horizontal beams and vertical columns makes for a pretty busy space.

Mr. Median said the base of the previous door rotted. They rebuilt the sill and replaced the double door. For several years this stopped seepage through the sill but it did not prevent the other leaks. They replaced the insulated sliding windows twice but within several years the new windows were fogged and they have leakage under the windows. They repainted the room twice but the mold re-grew within a year.

Mr. Medina said in October, 2006 they asked Stuart Stepp for his help. Mr. Stepp is a local architect who has had experience with older homes and with the Historic Preservation Commission. In addition he began his career at Six Associates, Mr. Stillwell's architecture firm. They had 4 goals: eliminate the problems with water leakage and mold, improve insulation and add heat so that we can enjoy the room throughout the years, maintain the integrity of the sunroom and its relationship with the house and reasonable cost.

Mr. Medina said the current proposal is the ninth design for this small room. They have spent many hours with Mr. Stepp and countless additional hours discussing the pros and cons of various ideas. For example, they considered increasing the size of the sunroom by 50% to 100% which would give they considerably more useful space but decided against it because it would change the shape of the roof and we felt a larger sunroom would look out of proportion to the rest of the house.

Mr. Medina said they considered a "Glass box" design that would maintain the original trim but decided against this because they thought such a contemporary design would clash with the rest of the house. In addition when they realized they would have to raise the floor to solve the leakage problem, they know we would have to give up some of the trim. They were also worried about the cost of custom-designed, non-standard size insulated energy-efficient windows and doors. They considered retaining the narrow asymmetric vertical pans of glass flanking the doors but Mr. Stepp felt this was unwise because the custom-make windows would be considerably more expensive and such narrow windows would be less functional and this would be less attractive given the other elements.

Mr. Medina said the seventh design called for complete replacement of the sunroom – new roof, new walls, new woodwork. However, after talking with the 2 carpenters who will be doing the work, we believe we can keep the existing original copper roof and ceiling, mush of the existing

woodwork, and perhaps the slate floor. Their input has been extremely valuable. Heat is to be provided by heating elements underneath the floor.

Mr. Medina said the current proposal keeps the original footprint of the porch, has double doors on opposite sides of the sunroom which brings it a step closer to the original concept of an open-air porch, and calls for casement window. The casement windows will allow for air circulation, for cooling in the summer and were selected in part to match the casement windows in the rest of the house. They took into consideration sight lines from inside and outside the house. They believe these are much more attractive than the existing clouded sliding windows in aluminum frames. The current proposal retains 11 of the original 16 columns, retains the original copper roof and ceiling and much of the original trim. Because the floor will be raised 4 inches to eliminate water leakage one row of trim, of necessity, will be eliminated.

Mr. Medina said at the June meeting this commission requested that more of the original trim be retained. Accordingly this design differs from the previous design in that the rectangular panes have been removed from the casement windows flanking the doors and replaced with the diamonds. An alternative would be to keep the flanking windows free of diamonds or rectangular panes. This design also retains some of the rectangular trim and the sunburst/arches.

Mr. Medina said they bought this house because they think it is a beautiful house with features not found in many newer homes. They asked Mr. Stepp to help design the repair/renovation so that it would remain attractive and ideally enhance the beauty and utility of the house. Is it a perfect solution? No. But they think it is a good solution.

Mr. Medina discussed the original and proposed elevations given to the Commission in their packets. Commissioner Tate asked about keeping the circles on the south. Dr. Medina said yes.

The Chair asked if anyone else would like to speak. Ron Williams said he lives at Blythe and Pinecrest and is familiar with the house. He said he is in favor of the changes and can speak for other neighbors who are also in favor. He added the Medinas have done a grand job on the house.

The Chair closed the public hearing. The Chair polled the Commissioners.

Commissioner Phillips said it is confusing with all of the diamonds and such but felt it is a good project. Commissioner Tate said they are trying to replicate the details but the proportions are not the same. Commissioner Ogletree said the Medinas are working with good faith and are getting it as close as possible. Short of ripping it all out and rebuilding it all, these changes work. He is in favor of the project. Commissioner Tyler asked if one elevation had the circles and the others do not. Commissioner Carter said she has been through what the Medinas are going through and she feels they have made every effort by keeping the circles and sunburst as the commission wanted. She is in favor of the project. Commissioner McCoy said she agrees with Commissioner Carter, they have made an effort and she can live with this. The Chair said the Medinas have made every effort and they need to rectify their water problem.

Commissioner Carter moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness, as identified in file number H08-28-COA

and revised plans on this date of August 20, 2008, if constructed according to the information reviewed at this hearing and any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the local landmark property for the following reasons: 2.4.1 Retain and preserve the topography, patterns, configurations, features, dimensions and materials of existing walkways, driveways, and off street parking areas that contribute to the overall historic character of individual building sites, the streetscape, and the historic district, if applicable, 2.4.2 Protect and maintain existing walkways, driveways, and off street parking areas through routine inspection and appropriate maintenance and repair procedures, 2.4.3 If replacement of a deteriorated section or element of an existing walkway, driveway, or off street parking area is necessary, replace only the deteriorated portion in kind rather than the entire feature. Match the original section or element in design, dimension, texture, color, and material, 2.4.4 If a walkway or a driveway is completely missing, replace it with a new feature based on accurate documentation of the original design or a new design compatible in location, configuration, dimension, scale and materials with the historic building site, streetscape, and district, if applicable, 2.4.5 Design new walkways, driveways, and off street parking areas to be compatible in location, patterns, spacing, configurations, dimensions and materials with existing walkways, driveways, and off street parking areas that contribute to the overall historic character of the streetscape and the district, if applicable, 2.4.6 Locate new walkways, driveways, and off street parking areas so that the topography of the building site and significant site features, including mature trees, are retained, 2.4.7 It is not appropriate to locate a new off street parking area in a district with residential character where it is visible from the street, where it will significantly alter the proportion of built area to green area on the individual site, or where it will directly abut the principal structure, 2.4.8 Maintain the continuity of sidewalks in the public-right-of-way when introducing new driveways, 2.4.9 Protect large trees and other significant site features from immediate damage during construction and from delayed damage due to construction activities, such as loss of root area or compaction of the soil by equipment, 2.4.10 Introduce perimeter plantings, hedges, fences, or walls to screen and buffer new off street parking areas from adjacent properties. Subdivide new large parking areas with interior planting islands to break up any large paved area, 2.4.11 In lighting walkways, driveways, and off street parking areas, follow the guidelines for lighting, 3.7.1 Retain and preserve windows that contribute to the overall historic character of a building, including their functional and decorative features, such as frames, sash, muntins, sills, heads, moldings, surrounds, hardware, shutters, and blinds, 3.7.2 Retain and preserve doors that contribute to the overall historic character of a building, including their functional and decorative features, such as frames, glazing, panels, sidelights, fanlights, surrounds, thresholds, and hardware, 3.7.3 protect and maintain the wooden and architectural elements of historic windows and doors through appropriate methods: Inspect regularly for deterioration, moisture damage, air infiltration, paint failure, and corrosion, Clean the surface using the gentlest methods possible., Limit paint removal and reapply protective coatings as necessary, Reglaze sash as necessary to prevent moisture and air infiltration, Weatherstrip windows and doors to increase energy efficiency, 3.7.4 Repair historic windows and doors and their distinctive features through recognized preservation methods for patching, consolidating, splicing, and reinforcing, 3.7.5 If replacement of a deteriorated window or door feature or detail is necessary, replace only the deteriorated feature in kind rather than

the entire unit. Match the original in design, dimension, and material. Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible, 3.7.6 If replacement of a deteriorated window or door unit is necessary, replace the unit in kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original sash or panels, pane configuration, architectural trim, detailing, and materials. Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible, 3.7.7 If a window or door is completely missing, replace it with a new unit based on accurate documentation of the original or a new design compatible with the original opening and the historic character of the building, 3.7.8 Replace deteriorated or missing wooden shutters with wooden shutters sized to fit the opening and mounted as the originals were. Early hardware should be retained. It is not appropriate to introduce shutters on a historic building if no evidence of earlier shutters exists, 3.7.9 If additional windows or doors are necessary for a new use, install them on a rear or non-character-defining elevation of the building, but only if they do not compromise the architectural integrity of the building. Design such units to be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not to duplicate the original, 3.7.10 If desired, introduce narrow-profile exterior or interior storm windows so that they do not obscure or damage the existing sash and frame. Select exterior storm windows with a painted or baked-enamel finish color that is compatible with the sash color. For double-hung windows, select operable storm windows with dividers that align with existing sash, 3.7.11 If desired, introduce full-light storm doors constructed of wood or aluminum with a baked-enamel finish that do not obscure or damage the existing door and frame. Select storm doors with a painted, stained, or baked-enamel finish color that is compatible with the color of the existing door. Bare aluminum storm doors are not appropriate, 3.7.12 If desired and where historically appropriate, install fabric awnings over window, door, storefront, or porch openings with care to ensure that historic features are not damaged or obscured, 3.7.13 It is not appropriate to remove original doors, windows, shutters, hardware, and trim from a character-defining façade, 3.7.13 It is not appropriate to remove any detail material associated with windows and doors, such as stained glass, beveled glass, textured glass, or tracery, unless an accurate restoration requires it, 3.7.14 It is not appropriate to use snap-in muntins to create a false divided-light appearance, 3.7.15 It is not appropriate to replace clear glazing with tinted or opaque glazing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Phillips and passed six in favor and one opposed.

V **Michael–David Carpenter** (H08-44-COA) The Chair opened the public hearing. At the request of Ms. Newton, Commission Coordinator, Commission File No. H08-44-COA was admitted into evidence, and the Commission took official notice of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Hendersonville and the Commission’s Design Guidelines. Ms. Newton gave the following background on this application:

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness from Michael-David Carpenter to undertake the following work at 225 N. Main Street;

1. Reface existing sign and add illumination to sign.

Since the proposed project will include installation of a sign greater than nine square feet, it is considered “major work.” An application for a certificate of appropriateness for a major work must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

The subject property is listed as **contributing** in the *Main Street Local Designation Report*. The property is described as:

225-231 N. Main Street. People’s National Bank Building. ca. 1910. Contributing.

Two-story Neoclassical Revival style building of cream colored brick has a recessed central entrance beneath an entablature carried by ionic columns with egg and dart motif and dentil blocks. The building has a stepped parapet, with a high point in the center. Storefronts are located to either side of the entrance bay, with original configurations but some replacement modern materials. The second story windows are located to either side of the entrance bay, and are grouped in pairs with a common sill and a limestone lintel above each. Limestone trim is visible on the parapet cap, the lower part of entablature, over the second story windows, on the sills, and on columns.

Designed by notable Asheville architect Richard Sharp Smith, this two-story Neoclassical Style building is built of cream color brick and was the earliest use of the Neoclassical style and a reinforced concrete construction technique for a commercial structure in Hendersonville. There is a recessed central entrance beneath an entablature carried by Ionic columns. “People’s National Bank” is incised into the entablature. Façade extends upward into a stepped parapet wall, with the high point in the center. Storefronts are located to either side of the entry bay. Each retains its original configuration, with modern replacement materials. Sanborn maps note that this building was of fireproof construction which included steel framing and reinforced concrete. Balconies have been added onto the front of the building.

Windows on the second story are grouped in pairs with a common sill and a limestone lintel above each. Window sash on the south side are fixed pane; sash on the north side are also fixed with transoms. Balconies have been added over the north portion of the building. Limestone trims the parapet, the lower part of the entablature, above the second story windows, the sills, and the columns.

Concrete made its splashy debut as a building material in 1910, when W. F. Edwards, the most active builder in Hendersonville at the time, decided to try out this material for a new bank. Edwards had previously served as contractor for the town’s water and sewer systems, and the courthouse. For the People’s National Bank, he worked closely with a Mr. Blythe. The project clearly caught the fancy of the local citizens. The following reports came from the French Broad Hustler (1/27/1910):

“Messrs. Edwards and Blythe have returned from Atlanta, where they purchased the latest improved machinery for reinforced concrete construction. This machinery will be used for the first time in the construction of the People’s National Bank.”

The subject property is listed as **contributing** on the National Register and described as:

227-231 N. Main. (Former) People's National Bank. Ca. 1910. Two story Neo-classical structure of cream colored brick. Recessed central entrance beneath entablature carried by ionic columns. Stepped parapet, with high point at center. Storefront to either side of entrance bay; south side unaltered, north side modern. Four 2nd story windows to either side of entrance bay, grouped in pairs with a common sill and a limestone lintel above each. Limestone trim on the parapet cap,

lower part of entablature, over 2nd story windows, sills, columns, and bases of columns and piers. 2nd story windows in flanks and flanking storefronts altered.

Earliest use of the Neo-Classical style and reinforced concrete construction for a commercial structure in Hendersonville.

Concrete made its splashy debut as a building form in 1910, when W. F. Edwards, the most active builder in Hendersonville during this period, decided to tryout this material for a new bank. Mr. Edwards had already been the contractor responsible for much of the town water and sewer system, the present Court House and the Hendersonville Town Hall.

The applicant is proposing to reface the existing sign, which currently is a legal non-conforming sign. In this case, the applicant is allowed per Section 13-4 of the Zoning Ordinance to reface the sign as long as he does not increase the square footage of the sign, which he is not proposing to do. The existing sign is 11' wide by 4'- 4-1/2" tall with a small protrusion at the top of the sign that is approximately one square foot.

The applicant proposes to reface the sign with acrylic that will be covered in black vinyl except where the name of the business, "Delton & David", will be exposed. The name of the business will also be outlined in grey vinyl. The applicant is proposing to internally illuminate the sign so that only "Delton & David" will be illuminated, not the entire sign or the word "Interiors". Additionally, the sign will contain a burgundy star above the lettering that the applicant proposes to outline with white, exposed tube neon. The burgundy star is intended to match the existing awnings on the building.

The applicant intends to paint the wood storefront grey with white trim to match the sign. The applicant has removed the purple awning on the building and will leave the upper storefront windows exposed.

The sign was originally erected for Scotties Jewelry and was illuminated with exposed tube neon. In 2004, Kolorful Kitchen refaced the existing sign. I have provided pictures of both of the previous signs. Other illuminated signs within the Main Street Historic District are the apothecary sign above Mike's On Main, which has working neon on one sign, the RBC Centura Bank, Scotties Jewelry, La Riserva, the Blue Ridge Performing Arts Center and the Jane Asher's blade sign.

Ms. Newton said the applicant did not meet with the Design Review Advisory Committee.

Michael-David Carpenter, the applicant, said his business is adding this new location on Main Street. He said the awning has been removed and the windows beneath are gorgeous. He said the sign is 27 or so years old and he wants to add some neon, which was original to the sign, but not be too flashy. The Chair asked where the neon would go. Mr. Carpenter said just around the star in white. The Chair asked what would be internally lit. Mr. Carpenter said the words Delton & David. Commissioner Carter said she remembers when the sign went up originally and trees do block the sign from the street. Mr. Carpenter said their store hours will be 10:00 am to 9:00 pm so the sign will be lit when they are open.

Lee Henderson-Hill, Executive Director of Downtown Hendersonville Inc, said the sign has obviously gone through an evolution and DHI gives a big hooray for this classy, beautiful sign replacing one that was not always highly thought of.

With no other comments from the audience, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Phillips said he liked the sign. Commissioner Tate asked if the Commission had approved any other lit signs adding this would set a precedent. Ms. Newton said no. Commissioner Ogletree said he thinks the sign is attractive and added he likes neon when it is done well. Commissioner Tyler said it looks fine. Commissioner Carter said it is tasteful and while she doesn't understand everything about internal and external lighting, it seems internal would be better than lights on the outside. Commissioner McCoy said it is very nice and classy and she can live with a little neon. The Chair agreed and said with internal lighting there would be less glare.

Commissioner Phillips moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness, as identified in file number H08-44-COA, if constructed according to the information reviewed at this hearing and any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Main Street Historic District for the following reasons; 2.1.1 Retain and preserve signage that is original or is important in defining the overall historic character of a building, 2.1.3 Use traditional materials commonly found on turn-of-the century commercial buildings such as wood, metal, or stone or use modern materials that have the appearance of traditional, 2.1.4 Whether they are wall-mounted, freestanding, affixed to awnings, or placed on the sidewalk, signs should be placed in locations that do not obscure any historic architectural features of the building or obstruct any views or vistas of Hendersonville's historic downtown and 2.1.9 Signs illuminated from within are generally not appropriate. Lighting for externally illuminated signs should be simple and unobtrusive and should not obscure the content of the sign or the building façade. Commissioner Ogletree seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI Vinyl Policy. The Chair reviewed that the Commission has had many conversations on the subject of vinyl and asked that a committee be formed to review the data presented and report back to the Commission in 60 to 90 days. After discussion, ***Commissioners Tate, Carter and Phillips agreed to serve.***

VII Design Review Advisory Committee. After discussion, ***Commissioner Carter moved the Commission accept the proposed change to Section 3 Article IX of the City of Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission rules of Procedure. Commissioner Tyler seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

VIII Committee Reports –

- Designation Committee – Ms. Newton said the Committee did meet and asked her to check out how National Register listings are paid for here and in other jurisdictions. She said other jurisdictions did not pay for individual listings, leaving it up to the property owner. She said Hendersonville did pay for the Stillwell homes which are also local landmarks. The Chair said it will be left up to the property owners.
- Community Affairs – Ms. Welter reported a newsletter would be coming out in November if any of the Commissioners had any ideas for it and the Holiday Tour of Historic Inns and

Cooker Caper would be on December 14 from 1:00 – 5:00.

- District Improvements – Ms. Welter said the District Improvements Committee did meet to discuss projects as outlined in the memo. Ms. Newton showed photos of possible locations of the historic markers in the West Side District. The Chair suggested the Committee decide on locations and bring them before the Commission for final approval.

IX Commissioners Comments. Commissioner Carter brought up the fact that people buying homes in the districts do not know they are buying in the district and therefore don't know the COA process. The Chair said this has come up before and one thought is to have it known when property owners switch the water tap. It would be nice to have it on the disclosure statement at the closing.

X Staff Comments. Ms. Newton distributed packets of the Cold Springs Park National Register report. *The Commission decided by consensus to hold the public information session on September 17, 2008 at 6:30 pm here in the Assembly Room.*

The Chair asked if anyone would like to attend the Community Foundation Annual Luncheon on August 27. Commissioners Tyler, Ogletree, Phillips and McCoy said they would go. The Chair said he would go with his wife but pay for her separately.

XI Financial Report. *The Commission approved the financial report by consensus.*

XII Adjournment. *The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.*