

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
September 15, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Approval of Minutes.

Chair Gonzalez called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Pearson, Gonzalez, Ramy, Tyacke, Vanderheyden, Gnos, and Iverson. City Planner Gadow was also present.

Chair Gonzalez stated the minutes to be reviewed are from the September 3, 2014 workshop.

Commissioner Tyacke stated on page 2, line 18, the fifth word should be "development."

Commissioner Pearson made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Tyacke, to approve the September 3, 2014 minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Regular Agenda Public Hearing Items:

a. 151 Westwood Lane – White Birch Properties and Development Group

i. Concurrent Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision for a three (3) lot residential Subdivision

City Planner Gadow stated White Birch Properties and Development Group has submitted a Development Application requesting concurrent preliminary and final plat subdivision approval for a new three (3) lot subdivision of 5.06 acres. The project would require the removal of the existing structure on the property and a subdivision of the parcel. Access to the Project would be thru a public road with a cul-de-sac design to protect as many of the existing trees coverage as possible. The cul-de-sac is designed to allow one-way access around the turnaround and to preserve the existing rows of spruce trees that are at the entrance to the Property. The Applicant and the City would enter into an easement agreement to allow the homeowner's association to maintain the existing spruce trees and rain garden on the public right of way. Further discussion with the Applicant will be necessary regarding an agreement for the on-going maintenance of the roadway. Building plans for the new structures are not available at this time, so any approval recommendation should include a condition requiring the future owners to provide building plans for review by the Planning Commission. The subdivision consists of three (3) single-family homes and would yield a total project density of one (1) dwelling unit per 1.68 acres, which meets the density requirements of the One Acre Single Family Residential guidance in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed subdivision would result in three (3) buildable parcels that would meet minimum standards for the R-1 District and therefore would be conforming lots. It had been brought to Staff's attention that there potentially is or was a burial site on the Property. Staff contacted the State Archeologist's Office to gather additional information. The State Archeologist indicated that all of the objects were excavated during the 1964 construction and

1 there is no recorded burial mound at the Property. The State Archeologist went to the site today
2 and let Staff know that it may have been a burial site previously but based on the current
3 conditions and the materials that had been removed in the 1960's he could not certify it as a
4 burial site today.

5
6 Commissioner Pearson asked what the Planning Commission had approved for tree removal with
7 the subdivision that was reviewed in 2010.

8
9 City Planner Gadow stated he did not have this specific information. The 2010 proposal had
10 been a four (4) lot subdivision that included the 151 Westwood Lane and 190 Westwood Lane
11 properties. He showed the trees that would have been impacted with the 2010 application.

12
13 Commissioner Pearson asked if the Staff had gotten information about the Property being a
14 burial site with the 2010 application.

15
16 City Planner Gadow stated he could contact the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

17
18 Commissioner Pearson asked if the proposed street is 20-feet wide.

19
20 City Planner Gadow stated there would be 50-feet of right of way. The pavement width would
21 be 40-feet but this is separated by the line of spruce trees they are preserving.

22
23 Commissioner Pearson asked if there was enough room to have a single street rather than two (2)
24 streets.

25
26 City Planner Gadow stated this could be discussed with the Applicant.

27
28 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Section 2.4 of the Staff report states "further discussion with
29 the Applicant will be necessary regarding an agreement for the on-going maintenance of the
30 roadway."

31
32 City Planner Gadow explained this would be a small roadway and Public Works has expressed
33 concerns that this would be an additional street they would need to plow and maintain. If the
34 Application moves forward, Staff and Public Works would like to discuss with them the
35 possibility of having the homeowner's association be responsible for the plowing and
36 maintenance of the road.

37
38 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the City had other public roads that were maintained
39 privately.

40
41 City Planner Gadow stated the City does have a couple of public roads that are maintained
42 privately.

43
44 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if this roadway would meet the definition of a cul-de-sac.

45

1 City Planner Gadow stated it meets the required right of way space and radius that is needed for
2 turnaround.

3
4 Commissioner Tyacke asked if the City would get an official report stating the property is not a
5 burial ground.

6
7 City Planner Gadow explained the State Archeologist had informed him that if the project were
8 to move forward and while digging remains were found then digging would have to stop and the
9 Police Department and State Archeologist would need to be informed. He would ask the State
10 Archeologist if has provided written reports in the past. The State Archeologist cannot certify
11 this as an existing burial site because of the impacts that occurred in the 1960s. All he could say
12 was there had been a number of artifacts removed in the 1960s.

13
14 Commissioner Tyacke stated the home for Lot 3 would be in the backyard of the homes to the
15 south. He stated it did not match the setbacks for the other houses and he asked if there were any
16 restrictions to building homes this close. The homes located at 159 and 157 would be looking at
17 these homes in their backyards if the trees are thinned out as proposed.

18
19 City Planner Gadow stated the side yard setback would be reviewed when a home design is
20 brought forward.

21
22 Commissioner Iverson suggested the City get written documentation regarding the site being a
23 burial site. She would like to ensure the Utility Superintendent's comments and concerns are
24 addressed in the terms and conditions if approved.

25
26 Commissioner Ramy asked if anything had changed with the burial grounds since 1964 that
27 would require more preservation if something were discovered.

28
29 City Planner Gadow stated if anything were found then the police and State Archeologist would
30 need to be notified. He asked if the rain garden was being included in the project due to the size
31 and scope of the roadway for the project.

32
33 City Planner Gadow stated it is an opportunity to address storm water runoff from the roadway.

34
35 Chair Gonzalez stated if this were a public road would the lots created meet the frontage
36 requirement.

37
38 City Planner Gadow stated the requirement for the R1 District is 150-feet of frontage from the
39 front set back, which is 45-feet, and this is being met by all three (3) lots.

40
41 Chair Gonzalez asked if the plans included enough rain gardens and storm water treatment
42 systems.

43
44 City Planner Gadow stated if the Application moves forward then the City would spend more
45 time on how the rain gardens are designed to ensure they would meet the requirements.

46

1 Chair Gonzalez asked if there was a way to accommodate one main street, as defined in the code,
2 into the development without impacting the trees.

3
4 City Planner Gadow stated the road is shown at 20-feet wide and to have one road it would need
5 to be a minimum of 6-feet wider. This would impact one side of the trees. This would have to
6 be looked at more closely if this were the guidance of the Planning Commission.

7
8 Mr. Mark Gronberg, Gronberg & Associates, Inc., 445 Willow Drive North, Long Lake, stated
9 they had looked at a single road cul-de-sac design. Having a second access would be beneficial
10 for emergency vehicles and also the sewer needed to be put into the southern portion. The City
11 prefers to have manhole access points in blacktop so they can access the sewer. Putting the road
12 on the southern side does make it difficult to save the trees. The proposed house pad for Lot 3
13 was moved about 80-feet so there would be trees between it and the other homes. The Owner
14 would be agreeable to additional berming or other plantings the Commission would like done for
15 Lot 3. Lot 1 and Lot 2 would be natural walkouts. There would be very little grading in the
16 subdivision and this allows them to save a number of trees.

17
18 Scott Roe, S. Minneapolis, is the current owner of the parcel. He would be living on Lot 3 and a
19 resident of the subdivision. He would be cognizant of things such as light, noise, and trees. The
20 idea of maintaining the roadway with an association in order to maintain the park like setting
21 would be desirable. He wanted to honor the history of the property by keeping the name of the
22 previous owner and naming the development "MacMillan Place."

23
24 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the sound barrier was a private or public structure and
25 what the foundation size would be for the three (3) house pads.

26
27 Mr. Roe stated this was a private structure built by Ms. MacMillan about 20-years ago along
28 with about 10,000 mature trees. He stated he did not have any plans for the fence at this time.

29
30 Mr. Gronberg stated the home pads were approximately 90x50 or 100x50 or 4,500-5,000 square
31 feet but the homes will probably not be this large but this does take patios into consideration.

32
33 Chair Gonzalez asked if Mr. Gronberg was aware of the existing well on the property.

34
35 Mr. Gronberg stated he was not aware of the well but he would accept taking care of this well as
36 a recommendation.

37
38 City Planner Gadow stated the City would have to do some field verification and Staff would
39 recommend addressing the well and the concerns of the Utility Superintendent as part of the
40 conditions for approval.

41
42 Chair Gonzalez asked if the "pan handle" would become dedicated to the public and if this was
43 in lieu of the Park Dedication Fee.

44
45 City Planner Gadow stated if the project were to move forward the entire "pan handle" would be
46 dedicated to the City. The City has not gotten in depth with the Applicant regarding Park

1 Dedication Fees. They would like to determine if the project would move forward before these
2 calculations were done.

3
4 Commissioner Tyacke stated Mr. Gronberg had brought up moving the home pad for Lot 3 over
5 80-feet and adding berming. He asked what this would look like.

6
7 Mr. Roe stated with the cul-de-sac the concern would be lights and berming and additional
8 spruce trees would provide a good barrier. The powder coated chain link fence that runs the
9 length of the property would be removed.

10
11 Chair Gonzalez stated Wayzata has a Heritage Preservation Board and when older homes with
12 historical significance are taken down they would like an opportunity to photograph the property
13 and buildings for their records.

14
15 Mr. Roe stated he would encourage this and he would get the information from City Planner
16 Gadow.

17
18 Chair Gonzalez opened the public hearing at 7:39 p.m.

19
20 Mr. Bob Muffleman, 172 Birch Lane West, Wayzata, stated the subdivision meets all the
21 requirements for the R-1 District but it was his understanding that because it was a subdivision
22 there were additional criteria that would need to be met. The proposed development creates a
23 forced cluster of homes that is not consistent with the massing, character and sizing of the
24 neighborhood. This subdivision would have a significant change to the neighborhood; it would
25 change the neighborhood from a quiet neighborhood to a fairly busy neighborhood and decreases
26 the property value of all the homes in the existing neighborhoods. One of the goals of the
27 Comprehensive Plan was the first tier priority, which is the most important in the Plan, and these
28 subdivisions enhance the individual character and elements of residential neighborhoods and it
29 reinforce and enhance neighborhoods and this subdivision does not enhance the individual
30 character of this neighborhood and it would weaken the existing neighborhood.

31
32 Commissioner Pearson asked what Mr. Muffleman's basis was for the assumption that this
33 development would lower the property values for all the homes in the neighborhood.

34
35 Mr. Muffleman stated he would clarify this during his presentation. He stated the addition of a
36 public road opens the potential for the property just north of this parcel to fit three (3) more lots
37 if it were subdivided in the future.

38
39 City Planner Gadow stated for the purposes of the Planning Commission's discussion if there is
40 concern about spurring additional development to the north, the right-of-way could be adjusted
41 so that there is a line of private property so that there is not direct access. The City would need
42 to evaluate this further. Another option that could be reviewed would be putting in an easement
43 or covenant on the public road that would prevent access to the properties to the north. He
44 would need to look into this option further with the City Attorney.

45
46 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if this could be a private roadway with a public easement.

1
2 City Planner Gadow stated in order to do a private roadway a variance would need to be
3 considered but that would be an option.

4
5 Mr. Gronberg stated they could consider a 5-foot to 10-foot outlot along the north line of the
6 road and this could be owned by the homeowners association rather than a homeowner.

7
8 Commissioner Iverson asked how legally binding would these steps be in keeping another road
9 from being proposed for an additional development.

10
11 City Planner Gadow stated the measures the Planning Commission takes would be recorded
12 against the property and if an outlot were created this would be recorded with Hennepin County
13 and would not be connected with this area. He would need to discuss this further with the City
14 Attorney.

15
16 Chair Gonzalez stated the homeowners association could give access to the outlot or sell the
17 outlot.

18
19 City Planner Gadow stated if this was a concern then the Planning Commission could consider a
20 restrictive easement that it could not be sold to an adjacent homeowners association or used as
21 access.

22
23 Chair Gonzalez asked if it made sense to put restrictions on future development

24
25 Mr. Muffleman expressed concerns that by approving the anomaly of the road configuration the
26 City will be changing the way roads work and the people in this subdivision would have to go
27 around the entire cul-de-sac before they could get out. If there were a two-lane road then he
28 would have concerns with the access and the number of trees that would be impacted. He also
29 stated that the notable increased traffic this would bring to the neighborhood would impact the
30 general health and welfare of the residents and should be addressed. Another goal of the Comp
31 Plan the City would limit social, environmental and aesthetic impacts and this development has a
32 negative effect on all of those items. The lights from the additional cars and the noise would
33 impact his home directly no matter where the access road goes. The access road also limits the
34 development opportunities of his property, which decreases the value of his home. He expressed
35 additional concerns about the pad placement for Lot 3 and if this home is moved as far left as
36 possible it would create a "flag pole lot" and this is not how the neighborhood is designed. The
37 neighborhood does not have these kinds of house, homes this close together, and homeowners
38 associations.

39
40 Commissioner Pearson stated he was unclear how this development would limit Mr. Muffleman
41 from developing his property.

42
43 Mr. Muffleman stated if the road remains where it is positioned then the headlights from the
44 vehicles would point directly into the four (4) bedrooms at the front of his home. Based on
45 information he found on the internet the average trips per home were about 10 and with six (6)

1 homes that would be 60 trips per day resulting in all those lights being directed at his home.
2 This impacts the value of his home.

3
4 Chair Gonzalez stated the application is for three (3) homes and the Planning Commission would
5 make their recommendation on the application being presented not what may or may not ever
6 happen.

7
8 Mr. Muffleman stated the City should be aware of what they are potentially opening up and that
9 would be future development for an additional three (3) lots and this would further impact the
10 neighborhood.

11
12 Commissioner Tyacke asked what Mr. Muffleman's basis was for there being an additional three
13 (3) homes.

14
15 Mr. Muffleman stated as soon as there is a road this would provide the necessary road and
16 frontage for the northern parcel to subdivide into three (3) R-1 lots.

17
18 Mr. Steve Poling, 159 Westwood Lane, Wayzata, stated he had talked with Mr. Roe and his
19 proposal is better than the one that had been proposed in 2010. We had told him that our
20 preference would be to have a family purchase the property and renovate the existing home. One
21 of the bidders on the property had proposed to do this. He would like to see the neighborhood
22 kept intact. He stated they are impacted more than anyone else with this project. After reading
23 the Subdivision Ordinance and the Planning Commission criteria the scale, pattern, and character
24 of this development are not consistent with the existing neighborhood.

25
26 Mr. Ken McAuliffe, 172 Westwood Lane, Wayzata, stated the proposed driveway would not exit
27 where the current driveway exits and one of the big features of this area is the hedge and in order
28 to have visibility from the road the hedge would have to be cut down. He stated it makes no
29 sense that Mr. Roe would pay \$1.2 million for this property and choose to live on the worst lot.
30 This makes him suspicious. This is a fine piece of property and they would be happy to have
31 Mr. Roe as a neighbor but the development shows all he wants to do is make money and he does
32 not believe he would live on Lot 3. He is against this development. There will be three times
33 the lights shining in his neighbors home and the development does not fit the character of the
34 neighborhood. He is also concerned about this being an Indian Burial site and there being more
35 graves on the property. He asked who would be responsible for monitoring this. He was
36 surprised the City had not contacted him in regards to this development.

37
38 Ms. Corey Muffleman, 172 Birch Lane West, Wayzata, stated this is a historic home and is
39 important to the neighborhood and the community. She talked with the State Archeologist.
40 There were two (2) burial sites found in 1964. She stated the reason there was no actual burial
41 mound found was because the remains had been found over 30-years after the original home had
42 been built and it is believed that the mound was destroyed at that time. Mr. Roe can take the risk
43 of digging at the site but it would need to be monitored closely. She suggested the City
44 recommend having core samples done by an archeologist.

45
46 Chair Gonzalez closed the public hearing at 8:11 p.m.

1
2 Commissioner Gnos asked if Mr. Roe would be willing to do some tree replacement in other
3 places on the property.

4
5 Mr. Roe stated there are areas that more trees could be added.

6
7 Chair Gonzalez asked Mr. Roe to consider building two (2) homes instead of three (3) in order to
8 better match the existing neighborhood.

9
10 Mr. Roe stated the economics would be more challenging for him with that scenario.

11
12 Mr. Ramy asked if it were possible to reconfigure the entrance so that it does not point directly at
13 Mr. Muffleman's home. As a Commission they should consider the possibility of the roadway
14 being used as frontage for additional development and be sure there is language that addresses
15 this.

16
17 Commissioner Iverson expressed concerns about density and change of character. These are
18 things that have been brought up several times. She asked how as a community they could save
19 small town character in neighborhoods. She is concerned about the density of the neighborhood.
20 She recommended Mr. Roe look at doing some economic feasibility studies to see if there was a
21 way he could reduce the density of this development so that it is more in character of the
22 neighborhood. The project on Central Avenue is working to put seven (7) homes on a parcel that
23 previously had three (3) homes. She asked where it would stop with developers increasing the
24 density of parcels.

25
26 Commissioner Tyacke stated the resident comments were compelling. This development is
27 different in that it is building right behind other homes. He does see an impact on the character
28 of the neighborhood and he would not like to see this happen. He asked what would happen if
29 the Heritage Preservation Board did not authorize Mr. Roe to tear down the home.

30
31 Chair Gonzalez stated they do not have that authority. The Heritage Preservation Board would
32 document the home and property as it is now. This is private property.

33
34 Commissioner Pearson stated he has concerns about the roadway. This is a lot of pavement for
35 only three (3) homes and it seems unnecessary. He asked Mr. Roe to look at options for a two-
36 lane road that would not require as much pavement. He explained several of the comments
37 received are about policy and go beyond the charge of the Planning Commission. He stated
38 anytime there is development in an older neighborhood there would be a difference in character
39 and the homes would not be the same.

40
41 Ms. Muffleman stated there is a lot in the neighborhood of varying ages and styles and this is the
42 character of the neighborhood. When this project happens she is concerned that it would start to
43 look like Medina or Plymouth. She knew people that were interested in remodeling the home
44 and had made two offers on the property. There were twelve offers on the property and she
45 believes there were others that would have been interested in restoring the home. Remodeling
46 the existing home is doable.

1
2 Commissioner Pearson stated Mr. Roe is the property owner and he has the development
3 application in front of them at this time. He has concerns about the road but would otherwise
4 lean towards approving the application.

5
6 Commissioner Vanderheyden agreed with Commissioner Pearson regarding the roadway. He
7 requested the applicant look at other options for this. He stated the median size of the properties
8 in this area is 54,000 square feet and these three properties average 49,900 square feet so they fit
9 the character of the average lot.

10
11 Chair Gonzalez explained this is private property and the Planning Commission needs to
12 consider the application that is presented. The Planning does have the ability to make some
13 recommendations but the City Council would have the final approval. The Planning
14 Commission needs to make sure that what they recommend to the City Council meets the
15 requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and City Code. She stated she would not be able to
16 make a recommendation on this application tonight because there was information missing such
17 as information on the burial site. The proposed street does present concerns and she would like
18 to know if the current driveway could be widened enough to provide access and be used as a
19 street. She would also like to know how the hedge would be impacted because these are
20 significant as well. The City's Code allows homes on properties that are at least 40,000 square
21 feet in the R1 District. The City's policy makers have to balance the concerns of neighborhoods
22 and the rights of property owners to be able to develop their property. She asked Staff to look at
23 the potential for an outlot and if the well can be located and safety measures taken.

24
25 Commissioner Pearson stated he would support it but would like to see more information on
26 what they would be approving as far as the roadway goes. There is no basis for the Commission
27 to create an outlot. The Planning Commission should not restrict the use of property for
28 something that is not even being presented for consideration.

29
30 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he would be in favor of recommending approval with the
31 conditions along with a request for additional information. He stated the list of concerns as: 1.)
32 future building plans approved and these need to be reviewed; 2.) one more affirmation
33 concerning the burial site including practices, certifications, and monitoring suggestions; 3.) the
34 utilities terminated per the Utility Superintendents request; 4.) acceptable storm water treatment
35 based on the final requirements of the road; 5.) marked discussions regarding park dedication
36 fees and dedicating the proposed road acreage to the City; 6.) Heritage Preservation Board
37 access to the property and existing home prior to its removal; 7.) potential for the use of an outlot
38 to preclude any lots to the north from use of the private/public road that would be installed as
39 part of this project; 7.1) a more acceptable street design.

40
41 Chair Gonzalez stated based on this list the Planning Commission needs to have more
42 information. She suggested the Planning Commission table the discussion and request additional
43 information from the Applicant.

44
45 Commissioner Pearson asked if they had a different road configuration if this would be an
46 amended application.

1
2 City Planner Gadow stated the Applicant could provide an alternative for how the roadway
3 would look and if the Planning Commission finds the alternative acceptable the Applicant could
4 formally amend the application to include the alternative to supersede the roadway design
5 presented at this time. The Planning Commission would then vote on the amended application.
6

7 Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by Commission Pearson to continue the
8 discussions for the preliminary and final plat of subdivision for a three (3) lot residential
9 subdivision at 151 Westwood Lane and direct Staff to work with the Applicant to provide the
10 requested information and an alternative to the access street. The motion carried unanimously.
11

12 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Other Items:**

13 14 **a. Review of Development Activities**

15
16 City Planner Gadow stated Staff is reviewing options for the Central Avenue project. There had
17 been a workshop in August and the Council provided some feedback on the project. The
18 Applicant had put together another concept based on this feedback and is looking for additional
19 feedback and comments before they officially amend their application. There would be access
20 off Byrondale and be a cul-de-sac. The City Council would be meeting regarding this project on
21 September 16 at 8:30 a.m. The Applicant is also considering having this be reviewed as a
22 Planned Unit Development (PUD) so that the question of the roadway being private or public
23 could be reviewed.
24

25 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he liked this design from an aesthetic standpoint but it only
26 has one access point for emergency vehicles.
27

28 Commissioner Tyacke stated he liked that there was no thru road but has concerns about the
29 density because there are now seven (7) homes where there was only five (5). It is better than
30 previous versions.
31

32 Commissioner Iverson stated this design does address the concerns of the neighborhood
33 regarding cut through traffic. She clarified the pad sites shown were not actual because they do
34 not seem to meet the setback requirements.
35

36 City Planner Gadow stated they would need to meet the 10-foot side yard setbacks but this
37 would be looked at more closely if it moves forward. She would rather see only five (5) homes
38 in this development because of the density.
39

40 Commissioner Ramy stated this would be a challenge with the County to provide access for this
41 property.
42

43 Commissioner Gnos agreed that this was an improvement over previous versions.
44

45 Chair Gonzalez stated what the Applicant is proposing matches the existing density. She did
46 stated that a PUD should not be used as a way to obtain variances. These make sense when it

1 makes sense to the City. If a PUD is approved they are only maximizing the profits of the
2 Applicant because if they were required to meet the requirements of the Code they could not put
3 seven (7) houses in this location. She would like to know what the frontage of the homes would
4 be because Lot 4 would not meet the frontage requirement. She is not satisfied that this would
5 be good for the City. She would not recommend a PUD for this project.

6
7 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he did not believe a PUD would be entirely development
8 driven because the City is getting a design that provides access without a cut through road.

9
10 City Planner Gadow stated he did not have a schedule for the October meetings. There may be
11 an application for expansion of an outdoor café.

12
13 Commissioner Tyacke stated the Heritage Preservation Board meeting had been budgetary
14 focused. They have completed the moving of the Shaver building. There may be additional
15 improvements that need to be done on this structure. They approved the tear down at 520
16 Ferndale and they talked about going to review the MacMillan home and also nominees for the
17 Board.

18
19 Commissioner Pearson stated there is a City Ordinance that requires a developer to allow the
20 HPB access so this should not have to be a condition of approval.

21
22 City Planner Gadow on the demo request checklist there is a section regarding contacting the
23 HPB prior to a permit being issued. The developer receives this checklist and it must be signed
24 off on.

25
26 Commissioner Gnos volunteered to attend the next HPB meeting the second Tuesday in October.

27
28 **b. Other Items**

29
30 There were no other items.

31
32 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**

33
34 There being no further business, Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by
35 Commissioner Pearson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

36
37 The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

38
39 Respectfully submitted,

40
41 Tina Borg
42 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*