

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

The Winchester Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, March 18, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall, 15 N. Cameron Street, Winchester, Virginia.

CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chairman Slaughter called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Vice Chairman Slaughter, Commissioner Beatley, Commissioner McKannan, Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Loring, Commissioner Shickle

ABSENT: Chairman Wiley

EX-OFICIO: Councilor Tagnesi

FREDERICK CO. LIAISON: Commissioner Kenney

STAFF: Tim Youmans, Will Moore, Aaron Grisdale, Carolyn Barrett

VISITORS: Mary Braun

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Vice Chairman Slaughter called for additions or corrections to the minutes of February 18, 2014. Hearing none, he called for a motion. Commissioner Shickle moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

None.

REPORT OF THE FREDERICK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:

Commissioner Kenney stated that the Frederick County Planning Commission held its last meeting on March 5, 2014. There was a capital improvement priority list that was approved and sent on to the board of supervisors, which they approved. There was discussion of public facilities in the Comprehensive Plan that is part of the CIP, which was also moved forward and will continue to be worked on. There was a flood plan overlay district discussion that's part of the state mandated to renew and stay in compliance. There was a report on the planning commission retreat summary. The planning commission created a mission statement and it was approved by all the board members.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TA-14-33 An ordinance amending article 14.1 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance pertaining to floodplain regulations

Mr. Grisdale presented the staff report and the text amendment which clarifies the appointment and duties of the Floodplain Administrator which is the City Engineer.

Vice Chairman Slaughter called for questions from the Commission.

Chairman Wiley Opened the Public Hearing

Chairman Wiley Closed the Public Hearing

Vice Chairman Slaughter called for discussion from the Commission.

Hearing none, Vice Chairman Slaughter called for a motion.

Commissioner McKannan moved that the Planning Commission forward TA-14-33 with a favorable recommendation because the amendment, as proposed, presents good planning practice by providing clear local ordinances for development and redevelopment within established floodplain districts in order to meet the requirements of FEMA and the National Flood Insurance Program.

Commissioner Beatley seconded the motion.

Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

RZ-14-35 An ordinance to rezone 2.57 acres of land at 1570 Commerce Street (Map Number 252-01-2) from Commercial Industrial (CM-1) District to Medium Density Residential (MR) District with Planned Unit Development (PUD) District overlay.

Mr. Youmans stated that the status of the project was discussed at the previous week's work session and it was indicated that they had not received the fiscal impact information that the commission had requested as is permitted in the zoning ordinance. The applicant indicated that they were going to request tabling for an additional month. On page 27 of the staff report from last Tuesday, there were some recommendations available for the board.

Vice Chairman Slaughter questioned if they had already asked for floor plans. Mr. Youmans replied that they had and they worded it to allow the applicant time to provide information on the floor plans but he didn't think they specifically required floor plans. Part of the potential impacts of the project the staff were considering was the number of school-aged children that might be generated by the three bedroom units, what happens if garages aren't included and the first floor of the three (3) story townhouses winds up being a fourth bedroom. The proffers that are included with the proposal by the developer preclude it being built as four (4) bedroom units. They are proposing that all 26 units be 3 bedroom units or could be 3 bedroom units. The concern is about later on, if there is additional space on the ground floor, how you deal with the possibility that there might be excess space for another bedroom.

The applicant asked for the case to be tabled again. He said he did not understand why there was an issue with three (3) bedrooms. When they come for building permits, the zoning administrator will look at it and see if it's three (3) bedrooms or not and if it isn't, will not issue the permit. Typically, they won't be able to get building permits if it's more than three (3). His client is not ready to go to that

depth of detailing with his architect until they've gotten a little further along. The building official will review it when it comes in.

Commissioner McKannan asked if it was something that was absolutely needed to move the process forward. Mr. Youmans said it's more in anticipation of the question arising when it gets to council where the fiscal impacts are needed from a policy standpoint. Page 25 of the staff report tried to flesh out the comparison of this project with other projects have come forward with three (3) bedrooms initially were a concern. While the project is only 26 units, the applicant has asked for 100 percent of the units to be 3 bedrooms. In the Cedar Creek Place development, which was 132 units, 0 percent of those were proposed as 3 bedrooms. A 3rd project, the Jubal Square project, of the 140 units there, 20 were requested to be 3 bedroom units and 8 of the 2 bedroom units be allowed with a den. For consistency's sake, there has been review of the number of bedrooms with PUD rezoning.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said that they were asking for additional material but it was ultimately up to the applicant to provide the information or not. If they decide not to provide it, the board can still base a decision on what was provided. Mr. Youmans said that unfortunately, the city has to look at the worst case scenario and say because it is not known exactly what is going to be built, they have to analyze what the worse case scenario is and make a decision based on that.

*Commissioner Smith made a motion to table **RZ-14-35**, an ordinance to rezone 2.57 acres of land at 1570 Commerce Street (Map Number 252-01-2) from Commercial Industrial (CM-1) District to Medium Density Residential (MR) District with Planned Unit Development (PUD) District overlay.*

Commissioner Loring seconded the motion.

Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Resolution to initiate: **TA-14-118** An ordinance to amend and reenact Articles 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15.1 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance pertaining to definitions, permitted uses, and uses requiring a conditional use permit for alternative financial institutions

Mr. Grisdale presented the staff report stating that this is a publicly sponsored text amendment requesting the Planning Commission initiate this month pertaining to several types of alternative financial institutions, modify existing provisions regarding short term loan establishments and set up some standards regarding permitting of those alternative financial institutions with the conditional use permit in several zoning districts. Mr. Grisdale gave a brief history of the amendment.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said they were not changing the intent of the ordinance at all, just bringing it up to speed and current to coincide with the state.

*Commissioner Beatley moved to initiate **TA-14-118** an ordinance to amend and reenact Articles 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15.1 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance pertaining to definitions, permitted uses, and uses requiring a conditional use permit for alternative financial institutions.*

Commissioner McKannan seconded the motion.

Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.

B. SV-14-94 An ordinance to conditionally vacate a portion of S. Indian Alley right-of-way adjoining the proposed Shenandoah Valley Discovery Museum at 19 W. Cork Street and conditionally convey it to the Shenandoah Valley Discovery Museum

Mr. Youmans presented the staff report regarding the request by the Shenandoah Valley Discovery Museum. The request has been reviewed by multiple departments and is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. There has been a lot of concern about relative safety. Shifting the traffic away from that corner of the building which has a blind view to the west is a safer situation for pedestrians. It is tempered with new concerns about the proposed use of that space. The board's role is fairly limited. It is not a public hearing in front of the commission, it is a recommendation. The council, after first reading, will appoint specific viewers and their task will be to go out and determine whether or not there is any inconvenience caused. The museum provided a rendering showing how they might create a dinosaur park that could be placed in that area and the alley would be shifted out into the parking lot. One option the commission could make is to forward it to city council with neither a favorable or unfavorable recommendation but to simply make a finding that it is or is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. That is the commission's role in this larger effort to evaluate it.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said that they were supposed to look at things in terms of the health, safety and welfare of the community. He asked what Mr. Youmans thought about how they were to apply that lens in what they were looking at. Mr. Youmans said it is a relative issue of the health, safety and welfare of persons using that sidewalk with the alley being left as is versus the health, safety and welfare of pedestrians if it is shifted away from there. There was some discussion about potential concerns about cars in the parking lot. The area where the relocation is proposed is not where there are parking spaces today. One is not coming out behind or in front of any parking spaces there. The volume of traffic that is on that particular section of Indian Alley as compared to the section north of Cork Street, it is almost like a driveway coming out. You have to watch for other people pulling out. Other parking lots are busier than what is here.

Vice Chairman Slaughter asked if there were any questions or comments from the commissioners.

Commissioner Loring said that since the work session there were some changes that would increase the 235 to whatever it might be and asked if they should be concerned about that. Mr. Youmans said it does increase the amount of area of what they want to encumber but it does not change the square footage of the alley. This particular action is the ordinance to vacate and convey a public alley versus an ordinance or approval otherwise that council would consider allowing for encumbrance of the parking lot parcel. Commissioner Loring asked if they would have to have a second. Mr. Youmans replied that the latter issue would not come to the planning commission. It would just be an agreement between city council, the parking authority and the Discovery Museum to encumber part of a parcel of land. It does not change the square footage of the public alley that would be vacated. He reminded the commissioners that there would be a reversion clause so that later on if the city sells the parking lot or decides to build a parking garage there and can accommodate that movement, there would be a provision in the conveyance ordinance that will allow for reversion of the alley back to the city without having to pay any compensation to the museum. The proposal would be not to charge the museum for that conveyance to them. The city would still have underground utilities and other things there. It is

basically a conveyance with a reversion clause to that the liability to the City of Winchester goes away. If a child gets hurt climbing on the dinosaur, it is on land that the museum owns while the dinosaur is there.

Commissioner Smith noticed that in the staff report, there is only one staff recommendation and it is a more or less favorable recommendation and not one for a motion for an unfavorable or for any other reason especially in light of some of the questions and concerns expressed in the work session. One being the summary of use of the parking area, the parking authority sent him a letter that pertained to it and possibly the actual use of the alley. One of their biggest concerns is the safety of the children that are placed in that area where the dinosaur is going to be and the possible blind spot that buses may cause to cars in that parking lot and cars coming from Braddock Street down Cork Street. Those are some things that need to be addressed. He noted that there had been a meeting between Mr. Youmans and the museum during the previous week.

Mr. Youmans said that was more about the encumbrance of the parking authority property. There was not any change to this particular item which is the vacation of the alley itself. It was more in response to what was starting out in the draft development agreement Mr. Glaize had sent to the city attorney. It is beyond the purview of the planning commission with respect to a recommendation on the alley vacation. If they put “blindners” on and just focus on what the planning commission’s role is on this which, he is not saying they have to, but if they do, he cannot find anything in the Comprehensive Plan that would not lead them to forward it favorably or at least forward it saying that they do not see where there is a direct conflict with anything in the Comprehensive Plan. The reason he did not draft it is because he could not come up with anything to base it on. There are going to be other issues that other groups that do look at operational issues, maintenance issues and all of the others. BAR looks at the aesthetic issues, they may say in the end the alley vacation is fine but we do not want a dinosaur there, we do not think a dinosaur fits in the historic district. Again, that is beyond the planning commission’s role. That is specifically a task of the BAR to make those kinds of decisions.

Commissioner Smith said he had nothing against dinosaurs or anything like that but going back to the Comprehensive Plan where Mr. Youmans pointed out to identify and widen certain sidewalks, you can create certain social spaces. If they are looking at the alley right there, they are only given a picture of the potential spot of 235 feet but they do not have dimensions like they normally get. His concern is they are not getting enough information to move it forward to city council because if they do not do their job there and forward it to city council, they will just send it back or say “Why did they send this if they do not have enough information?” If they do not have enough information to go by than it would be difficult for them to make a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Youmans said he understood what Commissioner Smith was saying. A lot of those details including the specific layout, the radius of the curb, the bump out as depicted on the graphic of the crosswalk, all of that is going to be covered in a separate development agreement and all of that has to be approved before it can move forward as the improvement. The focus today is what the council’s decision on the ordinance is strictly from the standpoint of should a conditional conveyance of this alley be supported or not.

Commissioner Shickle asked if the dinosaur were not in play and the request were simply to vacate the same dimensions of the area, would the same request be before them? Mr. Youmans said he could not

answer that but perhaps one of the representatives could. Commissioner Shickle said she meant procedurally, is it required to tell them what is going to go in that area once it is vacated. Mr. Youmans said no, a good example of that or an analogy of it would be later in their agenda, they will be looking at the Winchester Marketplace site plan down near Spring Street. In conjunction with that site plan, at some point the vacation of the existing Spring Street is going to come back to them, actually to City Council, to decide how to convey that along. Mr. Dwight Allen wants property along the existing north side of Spring Street. He does not have to tell City Council that he intends to put a children's trampoline right up along the edge of that vacated area where Spring Street is going to be otherwise diverted. If they knew ahead of time they might say "We knew you were going to put a trampoline there and with kids bouncing up and down so close to the street, we will turn you down." That's the best analogy he could make. The focus is not land use as much as it is on the vacation of that for public street purpose or in this case public alley purpose is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Shickle said she was a very vocal participant in the conversation from the previous week. She said they are not being asked to say, even though her preference would be that it not be a climbing structure that is not what they are being asked to evaluate. They are being asked to evaluate whether or not they should grant the vacation of, they should recommend granting the vacation of the property. That is the distinction as she is reading back through the staff report and the materials, it seems as though the agreement that will be in place is perhaps even above and beyond what might happen in most requests like this so hopefully the other checks and balances will evaluate all sides the structure and the use and the aesthetics and those things that other bodies are charged with.

Mr. Youmans said that was the key. There are other groups that are going to focus in on safety, aesthetics and emergency access. All of those things are going to be looked at by a multitude of agencies and other boards and commissions and that is why he is going to back to encourage them to take the narrow scope on this in terms of what the planning commission's mission is in this particular alley. Commissioner Shickle said the option he suggested that they could forward a determination of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is probably more comfortable for her. It allows it to go forward to those other bodies to negotiate all the other details of what's being proposed.

Commissioner McKannan said if it was submitted to them without the triceratops in the side yard, chances are they would give up. Given the purview that what they are looking at pertaining to their limited role, he thinks it falls into the realm of approving it. There are other checks and balances in place outside of what they are looking to do which is essentially approve the vacation and conveyance.

Commissioner Smith said then it gets to the point where every other project they have looked at, whether it has been a development or what have you, in very few instances are they told to just put blinders on and just look at this particular thing. He said to go back and look at what they just tabled on Commerce Street. Whereas it is a smaller residential area and they are asking for a lot of information from them as they would if it were a bigger development but their concern that they stated earlier was how it is going to look which is in the purview of the BAR and the square footage and what is going to be on the inside. So they started asking for more information but they were not told that it was not in their scope even though some of those things may have fallen under their scope. He would be remiss to just take a narrow view on certain things, which might be public safety, falling into place here. He is very supportive of what the Discovery Museum is doing but he is also looking at public safety. It was mentioned that cars turning on Cork Street from Braddock Street, that they could not gather a lot of

speed. It does not take a lot of speed to hit a kid. It can be 15 miles an hour or 10 miles an hour. Last week after the work session, he saw a mother and her daughter get out of a car, going to ballet. The mother got out and was talking on a cell phone. The kid got out and was already in the middle of the parking lot. The mother turns around to go back and close her door and is not paying attention to what the kid is doing. That is only one kid. Now there is going to be a bunch of kids getting off buses in a 235 square foot area not knowing what type of boundary there is going to be there. That is what he is concerned about.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said he was trying to think back to some other vacations they have had. He was thinking of one, an alleyway over off of Berryville Avenue that was across the block from the post office, where someone had put a fence up. When they considered that, were they solely looking at whether it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? That, to him, was a similar situation to what they are looking at here. Mr. Youmans said yes, they did not look at what was going to be the land use if that alley was vacated. It was a situation where the adjacent property owner did not know he had created a barrier there. The scope of that was there was an alley that allowed for public passage through from point A to point B and he wanted to barricade it so you could only come in from point A and then you would hit a dead-end and have to back out. In terms of good public planning and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan as far as movement between two points, that is what they looked at there. This was a very unusual request. This was one where he was trying to decide if they should even come before the planning commission. A better example is Spring Street where Spring Street used to be platted as an alley west of Greystone Terrace and it went back to the railroad tracks. The Comprehensive Plan never called for that street to extend back into there or to cross over the railroad and connect with Glaise Avenue or somewhere on South Loudoun Street. That is typically their purview. They are looking to advise the council as to whether or not an alley should be discontinued or a request where somebody wants to eliminate it altogether versus just converting what amounts to less than 100 feet in length here. This is a unique alley.

Commissioner Beatley asked if the details would be in a separate development agreement. Mr. Youmans replied yes. Commissioner Beatley asked if they were to approve the vacation and conveyance, all of what they are proposing could change anyway in that agreement such as the dinosaur and the fence and the other things. Mr. Youmans said that was correct. Commissioner Beatley said it was not binding at all, they were just showing them an idea. Mr. Youmans said it was strictly a recommendation from the commission. They are not making the decision yay or nay, that is the council's decision on both the vacation ordinance as well as that separate agreement that the city attorney is working up. The idea being that if a year from now, the Discovery Museum says "You know what; we don't want the dinosaur there anymore. We just want to have a green area or something like that." That can be handled in an agreement between the city and the museum but it doesn't have to go back through the whole three and a half (3 ½), four (4) month process. But it would still require council to say yes or no to the provisions they might have for that agreement.

Vice Chairman Slaughter asked if they forward it with those conditions, if they wanted to add conditions, that it is Council's discretion as to whether they were going to impose it. By the same token, they could forward it to council subject to the following conditions without a recommendation or a recommendation to disapprove. Mr. Youmans said in the example he crafted, if they do not want to recommend approval, or if they want to recommend disapproval, the two (2) conditions listed there are only relevant if council thereafter does approve the vacation. Vice Chairman Slaughter said that in

general, in his opinion, clearly that having the access moved further down away from the front of the building is favorable for the plan. He thought it was very consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He looked at the Bank of Clarke County, when you exit the drive through and you are exiting right at the corner where the sidewalk comes out and they have a mirror there and it is dangerous. If you were to exit 50 feet to the right of that, you would be able to see oncoming pedestrians and so forth and that makes a lot of sense to him. But they still have not seen what the future plan is. There are still some things that are not full spelled out and not fully vetted and if he is hearing everyone correctly, it gives them a little sense of heartache to say yes this totally goes with the Comprehensive Plan but they are not sure about some of those things. One condition that he would like to see added is something that says they recommend a condition that a submittal of an operational plan that adequately addresses all safety concerns that may arise from this vacation or something to that effect. That would make him feel better just knowing they have a condition number two (2) in there but as he reads that it really only speaks to the reversion and not to any future safety issues. He thought that as a body it would be good for them to have that condition in there that says we think this needs to be addressed. We know that it is not under their purview to address but they feel like it needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Shickle asked what the group thinks about the idea of forming consistency with the Comprehensive Plan rather than a recommendation for approval because of so many of the unknowns. Essentially it sends a favorable message but there is a distinction in her mind as Vice Chairman Slaughter said as far as the details that they do not have that still need to be worked by the appropriate bodies that are responsible for the those things.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said that he sees what they are doing as one and the same but what Mr. Youmans is saying to them is that they are basing their approval on whether it fits with the Comprehensive Plan or not and if they are recommending approval than that is what they are saying. But if they feel more comfortable changing the wording of the recommendation to say clearly state that they are only doing so and he thinks that's well within their purview.

Commissioner Shickle said it is six of one and half dozen of the other because when you read the language in the packet, the staff report, the ordinance is not going to mention a dinosaur or plantings or any of the other details they talked about last week. The ordinance is going to talk about the vacation of the area footage.

Vice Chairman Slaughter asked if she would feel more comfortable if they put in there and said that the commission requests **SV-14-94** city council recommend approval because it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan subject to the following... Just to clarify that they are basing it off the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Smith said he could see where she is coming from because his point would probably have been to table it until they get more information. The suggestion that she is making as opposed to tabling would be recommending to move it forward to city council and he did not think she mentioned anything about a favorable motion.

Commissioner Shickle said to reiterate what she said earlier as she reviewed the information; this is a case of having more information than is necessary to make the decision and that is what causing the challenges for them. When she reads the language on the top of page 48, they are not being asked to

approve the plan for what is happening on that piece. If the public understands that those decisions will be made at a later date by the appropriate parties then she is okay with the way the motion is proposed as long as that is the motion that everybody understands. That is how she is interpreting the motion that is proposed.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said they are just recommending the vacation and conveyance, they are not recommending the future of what goes in there. Commissioner Shickle agreed that they do not have that information, they are not evaluating that information, and they do not even know if it is going to end up being something like what is in the drawing. Vice Chairman Slaughter asked Commissioner Shickle if she did not feel it was necessary to specify the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. She said that as long as everyone understands that is what a favorable motion means.

Commissioner Smith asked if it actually does, maybe they should put that in there, that it is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Vice Chairman Slaughter asked Mr. Youmans if he had any thoughts, if they were getting close. Mr. Youmans said he thought they were getting very close. There is a subtle difference between saying based on the finding that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Another option would be to base it on a finding that it is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It is a little bit less than you are not saying I have found where it is consistent but have not found where it is inconsistent. Maybe that is an easier position to take.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said just so they could make progress, he was going to take the liberty to change it with any changes the commissioners wanted to make. Vice Chairman Slaughter read the motion with the changes he had made. "We move that the commission forward the Vacation and Conveyance request **SV-14-94** to City Council recommending approval because it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Establishment of utility easements for existing utilities situated within the existing public right-of-way; and,
2. An agreement between the City and the Discovery Museum spelling out the terms and conditions of any possible reversion of ownership back to the City.
3. Submittal of an operational plan that adequately addresses the safety concerns arising from this vacation."

Vice Chairman Slaughter asked if there were any changes.

Vice Chairman Slaughter asked for a motion.

*Commissioner Shickle motioned to forward the Vacation and Conveyance request **SV-14-94** to City Council recommending approval because it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan subject to the following conditions:*

1. *Establishment of utility easements for existing utilities situated within the existing public right-of-way; and,*
2. *An agreement between the City and the Discovery Museum spelling out the terms and conditions of any possible reversion of ownership back to the City.*
3. *Submittal of an operational plan that adequately addresses the safety concerns arising from this vacation.*

Commissioner Loring seconded the motion.

Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0-1. Commissioner Smith abstained.

Vice Chairman Slaughter said it is sometimes kind of ugly when they do that but in general they came to a good solution and that at the end of the day, they were giving council good feedback on what their thought process is and so forth.

C. Administrative Approval(s) (Mr. Moore):

1. **SP-14-84** 1523 S. Pleasant Valley Rd./222 Spring St., Winc. Marketplace, Painter-Lewis

Mr. Moore presented the project and said this is a request for authorization of the site plan.

Commissioner Loring made a motion to permit administrative approval with one condition that the traffic pattern be adjusted to one lane around the window. There was no second therefore the motion died.

*Commissioner McKannan motioned to authorize **SV-14-84** for approval.*

Commissioner Shickle seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Slaughter asked if there was any discussion and there were some comments from the members.

Vice Chairman Slaughter repeated the motion that they grant administrative approval, that they support staff recommendation that the two-way traffic be addressed.

Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0. Commissioner Smith had departed at 4:05pm.

2. **SP-14-86** 300 Westminster Canterbury Dr., Vitality Ctr. Additions, Greenway Engineering

Mr. Moore presented the project and said this is a request for authorization of the site plan.

Vice Chairman Slaughter called for a motion.

*Commissioner McKannan moved to approve **SV-14-86** for approval.*

Commissioner Beatley seconded the motion.

Voice vote was taken and the motion to approve passed 5-0.

3. **SP-14-110** 1665 S. Pleasant Valley Rd., Taco Bell revision, Rosa Gaddy

Mr. Moore presented the project and said this is a request for authorization of the site plan.

*Commissioner Loring moved to approve **SV-14-110** for approval.*

Commissioner McKannan seconded the motion

Voice vote was taken and the motion to approve passed 5-0.

OTHER DISCUSSION

None.

ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.