

PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES

The Winchester Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at 3:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street, Winchester, Virginia.

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

**PRESENT:** Chairman Dave Shore, Vice-Chairman William Wiley, and Commissioners Jennifer Beatley, Carroll “Beau” Correll, Jr., Stephen Slaughter, and John David Smith (6)

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Kevin McKannan (1)

**EX-OFFICIO:** Councilor John Tagnesi

**FREDERICK CO LIAISON:** Commissioner Chris Mohn

**STAFF:** Planning Director Tim Youmans, Planner Will Moore, Acting Zoning & Inspections Administrator Aaron Grisdale and Secretary Paula Le Duigou

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Commissioner Slaughter moved to approve the March 20, 2012 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smith.*

*Motion passed 6-0.*

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Youmans stated that there was a revised agenda with the addition of a site plan for consideration for administrative authorization.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

None

**REPORT OF FREDERICK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON**

Commissioner Mohn stated that there had not been a meeting recently. The Commission will be meeting the next evening that includes two items: a rezoning and proffer revisions for a project in the Stephenson area and a staff presentation of the draft Senseny/Eastern Frederick Land Use Area Plan.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- A. CU-12-96** Request of the Economic Development Authority for a conditional use permit for a two-family dwelling at 513 North Loudoun Street (*Map Number 153-01-D-11*) zoned Limited High Density Residential (HR-1) District.

Mr. Youmans reviewed the request by the City's Economic Development Authority for a conditional use permit to allow conversion of an existing dwelling to a two-family dwelling. A potential purchaser would propose living in the ground-level unit and lease out the upper-level unit. There are some exterior changes proposed to the structure including some immediate changes such as window replacement which would help restore the historically correct appearance of the dwelling. The purchaser is also requesting approval of future alterations to the dwelling, including new porches and balconies, as well as approval of a future wood shop in the rear yard.

The subject property is located on the west side of North Loudoun Street and is zoned HR-1. The surrounding properties are similarly zoned. It is not situated within the historic district. The lot is surrounded by a mixture of housing types within a residential neighborhood and is served by driveway along the south property line and an alley to the rear.

The current property owner intends to transfer ownership of the property to an interested purchaser, who wishes to change the use and occupancy from a nonconforming boardinghouse to a two-family dwelling. In recent years, the property has been the subject of zoning and code enforcement efforts by the city. In an effort to resolve some of the problems associated with the property, the EDA purchased the foreclosed property and immediately entered an indefinite deed restriction barring it from ever again being used as a boardinghouse.

At its March 14, 2012 meeting, the Board of Zoning Appeals granted a variance to the Economic Development Authority (EDA), pertaining to lot width for the specific purpose of accommodating the use and occupancy of the existing structure as a two-family dwelling. The variance was requested on the assumption that the lot was only 39 feet wide when, in fact, it was compliant with the two-family standard of 40 feet in width. The BZA will be considering additional variances in April for deficient side yard along the north side of the dwelling and for relief of the 15-foot parking offset to the adjoining properties to the north and south at the rear where the parking is proposed.

The submitted site plan sketch, photos and sketch floor plans show what the contract purchaser intends to do with the property once purchased from the EDA. A sketch site plan depicts three (3) proposed off-street parking spaces to the rear of the dwelling which can be accessed by the existing public alley. The spaces would be gravel, but defined by concrete curbing. The existing driveway connecting from N. Loudoun Street out front would remain, but a proposed gate along the south side of the dwelling would preclude traffic using the driveway to connect to the alley. The purchaser would propose driveway pavers treads with grass between the treads.

Immediate improvements to the site include perimeter fencing in the rear and south side yard. The three parking spaces would be situated outside of the rear yard fenced area and have access via a gate in the fence. Five foot wide landscaped areas would be provided to the north and south on each side of the rear parking area. Future improvements include an accessory wood shop in the northwest area of the rear yard. Future alterations to the dwelling include an expanded front porch with second-story balcony extending north from the existing front porch. To the rear, a two-story deck is proposed with a cantilevered walkway attached to the south side of the upper level. Since the property is not within the historic district, no BAR approval is required for the alterations. The purchaser, however, is employed with a local architecture firm.

Mr. Youmans stated that staff was in support of the request.

**Chairman Shore opened the public hearing**

No one spoke regarding the request.

**Chairman Shore closed the public hearing.**

Commissioner Slaughter said that the request made sense and asked why the applicant was seeking the waiver for the paved parking.

Mr. Youmans said because the parking area is small and gravel is common and similar to other parking areas accessed off of the alley.

Commissioner Slaughter asked if the alley was gravel or paved.

Mr. Youmans said that it may be both.

Vice-Chairman Wiley said that he did not know if a final approval had been given on the house, in terms of the EDA's term restrictions, but he wanted to be sure that it had the boarding restrictions on it.

Mr. Youmans said that he had asked Mr. Deskins about that and when the deed was drafted there would be language prohibiting that use.

*Commissioner Slaughter moved to forward CU-12-96 to City Council recommending approval of the two-family dwelling because the use, as proposed, should not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood nor be detrimental to public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood. The approval is subject to:*

- 1. Deed restrictions associated with the sale of the property by the City's EDA;*
- 2. Conditions, if any, associated with the variances approved by the BZA;*
- 3. Approval of the related site plan, including a waiver of paving requirements to allow gravel for the off-street parking area; and,*
- 4. Phased improvements to the dwelling and the site as depicted on the sketch site plan.*

*The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beatley.*

Commissioner Smith asked if condition number 2 had been met yet.

Mr. Youmans said that it had been and the conditions were included dealing with the offset.

*Motion passed 6-0.*

**B. CU-12-151** Request of Mark C. Green for a conditional use permit for a two-family dwelling at 542 Gray Avenue (Map Number 174-03-9) zoned Limited High Density Residential (HR-1) District.

Mr. Moore reviewed the request for a conditional use permit to allow for the rehabilitation and conversion of the subject property from a single-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling.

The subject property and all immediately surrounding properties are zoned HR-1. Land further to the east is zoned HR. Properties to the north, east and south consist of single-family detached dwellings. Properties directly to the west on the opposite side of Gray Ave consist of a series of two-unit townhouses. Multi-family units are located further to the southwest and east.

The applicant desires to rehabilitate the existing, vacant single-family dwelling and convert it into a two-family dwelling. Submitted floor plans propose a four-bedroom unit on the main level and a two-bedroom unit in the finished basement. Within his letter of intent, the applicant correctly identifies the existing building as the largest single-unit dwelling in the immediate vicinity and estimates the size at approximately 4030 square feet. This includes an attached garage and breezeway on the main level and the existing finished basement. Dimensional information from the City assessment records indicates that the livable space in the proposed units would be approximately 1500-1600 square feet each.

The intent of the HR-1 District is to stabilize and protect the traditional single-family characteristics of the district and to promote and encourage a suitable environment for family life composed of an adult population with some children. A limited number of other uses are permitted with CUP approval so long as the character of the district is not altered by levels of traffic, vehicular parking, lighting, noise, and visual displays that are incompatible with the residential development. No exterior modifications to the structure are proposed and the two required off-street parking spaces are provided in the existing attached garage. Space for additional vehicles is available in the driveway as well as on-street. The applicant also notes the presence of an existing 6' board fence at the rear of the property that will further confine rear yard activity and noise.

The request is dependent upon a variance being granted for required off-street parking area buffer. The variance request was scheduled to be heard by the Board of Zoning Appeals on April 11, 2012. The applicant proposes surfacing the existing gravel drive. Should the use be granted, staff would support a waiver of the curbing requirement that would otherwise be applicable to an off-street parking area serving a use other than single family. The applicant is already in communication with inspections staff regarding the requisite permits that would need to be obtained for any work in conjunction with the interior renovations.

Mr. Moore stated that this single family dwelling has been identified as disproportionate in size, both lot and structure, to the others in the neighborhood and that no other variances are required.

**Chairman Shore opened the public hearing**

No one spoke regarding the request.

**Chairman Shore closed the public hearing.**

Commissioner Slaughter asked if a condition should be added that states that the applicant must comply with the building code regulations at all times.

Mr. Moore stated that if the Commission felt that it was important, they could add it; however it may be redundant as it would not be unlike other conditions and regulations that are part of the building code.

Chairman Shore asked Mr. Moore if he had been in the property.

Mr. Moore stated that he has not been inside the structure but has been to the property and seen it from the outside.

Chairman Shore asked the applicant, Mr. Mark Green, if the lower level was completely below grade.

Mr. Green stated that it is not completely below grade and that the Building Official, John Knight, had been in the home and has seen the rooms.

Commissioner Slaughter said that he would feel better if conditions were stipulated and Mr. Green agreed.

Councilor Tagnesi stated that Commissioner Slaughter's main concern seemed to be with egress. He said that complying with the City regulations concerning egress seemed to be a given.

Commissioner Slaughter said he would be happy with whatever language was given; it just seemed that with the nature of this building, with so much of it being below ground, it made sense to have a reminder concerning egress.

Commissioner Correll asked if a condition concerning egress is inserted in to homes with multiple floors.

Mr. Moore stated that the only time he could recall specifically talking about a condition pertaining to building code was when it was discovered with work done prior. He gave examples of work being completed without permit.

Commissioner Smith said that he felt more comfortable knowing that the BZA has taken a look at the property, and he felt that if there were any concerns with Building Code that Mr. Knight would address them at that level

Mr. Green said that there would be a proper fire barrier between floors and all work would require inspections and approvals from the building official before a Certificate of Occupancy could be given.

Mr. Moore said that regardless of the approval of the conditional use permit, the structure still cannot be occupied as a two family dwelling without also receiving the Certificate of Occupancy from the Building Official.

*Commissioner Beatley moved to forward CU-12-151 to City Council recommending approval because the use, as proposed, should not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood nor be detrimental to public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood. The approval is subject to:*

- 1. Conditions, if any, associated with the variance approved by the BZA; and,*
- 2. Approval of the related site plan, including a waiver of curbing requirements for the off-street parking area.*

*The motion was seconded by Commissioner Smith.*

*Motion passed 6-0.*

## OLD BUSINESS

- A. SV-12-40** AN ORDINANCE TO VACATE A 50' LONG PORTION OF A PUBLIC ALLEY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF A VACANT LOT AT 424 WEST CLIFFORD STREET AND CONVEY IT TO THE OWNER OF THE ADJACENT PROPERTY (**tabled at 3/20/12 meeting until April**)

Mr. Moore announced that the applicant has withdrawn the application. No further action is needed.

## NEW BUSINESS

- A. SV-12-154** AN ORDINANCE TO VACATE A PORTION OF VALLEY AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY ADJACENT TO 1000 VALLEY AVENUE AND CONVEY IT TO THE OWNER OF THE ADJACENT PROPERTY

Commissioner Slaughter stated that he would be abstaining from this item.

Mr. Youmans reviewed the request from Mr. Jack Schutte, who owns the property directly across from Handley High School on Valley Avenue. He is currently renovating his property and has worked with the City to construct a new entrance into his property as part of the Valley Avenue Sidewalk Project. As shown on the previously approved site plan, part of the existing asphalt has been removed in the subject right-of-way area and grass has been planted. Mr. Schutte would like to install and maintain some enhanced landscaping in this area, but only if he can own the property. Mr. Schutte has requested that the City vacate and convey approx. 4,500 sq. feet of the right-of-way to him to assemble in with his property at 1000 Valley Avenue.

The subject section of Valley Ave is zoned B-1, consistent with the zoning on Mr. Schutte's commercial property that he would be assembling it in with. Properties in the triangle to the north bounded by Valley Ave, S. Braddock St and W. Gerrard St are also zoned B-1. The Handley High School property across Valley Ave is zoned EIP. Land to the south includes B-1 and HR-1 zoned property which is in high density residential use.

If the right-of-way is not abandoned, the City would be responsible for mowing the new grass on this small parcel. By conveying the property to Mr. Schutte, he would be responsible for maintaining the property. If the right-of-way is abandoned, there would still be easements on the property for below and above ground utilities and for the placement of a historical marker sign. In addition, staff would recommend that restrictions be placed on the property so that it cannot be used for parking other than the driveway aisles as shown on the approved site plan.

Staff recommends approval of the request subject to the establishment of easements and a restriction of use for landscaping other than the driveway aisles already approved on the site plan. The vacation of this portion of Valley Ave is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, particularly as depicted in the redevelopment concept included on Page 11-41 of the Plan. Mr. Schutte is the only adjoining property owner to logically consider conveying the vacated right-of-way.

Chairman Shore stated that this request made a lot of sense due to the open expanse that had always been there and was a white elephant of sorts.

Mr. Youmans stated that this did particularly since the City had all ready undertaken the revisions to narrowing the travel lane in that area.

Commissioner Correll, referring to page 11-41 of the Winchester Comprehensive Plan, in reference to the language of the first paragraph, noted that this particular site due to its proximity to downtown, gives this site substantial development potential, and envisioned what was the development scheme, rising seven stories from Valley Avenue, taking advantage of the City economic development bonuses. He further read that this could include one hundred residential units on the 98,000 square foot site. He asked how this request consistent with the vision that incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Youmans said that the Schutte family owned a large portion of the block between James Street, Valley Avenue, Bond Street and Loudoun Street, but they do not own all of it. He said that the Comp Plan anticipated that the Schuttes or another developer would be able to assemble the lots and redevelop it in the fashion that was proposed in the Comp Plan. He that the Plan calls out a vision that has not yet been realized in terms of land acquisition. He said that this is part of that of that vision, but the other necessary parts that would be part of that vision are future steps that have not been taken.

Commissioner Correll asked whether the City should wait for a developer to come in so that it can be conveyed to them. He said that if it is fragmented at this time, why would the City want it in the hands of one individual when a developer is needed to implement the vision.

Mr. Youmans stated that this was a fair question and that the feeling of City staff and officials, the sentiment was that if the Schutte family were willing to undertake landscape improvements if they owned it, the City would not have that responsibility and cost.

Commissioner Correll said that it is always good to see owners step up and take responsibility, but questioned how much of a cost the landscaping and maintenance would be.

Mr. Youmans said that it would be a City expense and since there is a property owner who is willing to undertake it, and where there is no good public purpose for retaining the property, it made sense to sell it.

Chairman Shore said that ultimately if someone later decides to undertake this project as depicted in the Comp Plan, they will get this portion of land when they purchase the other properties.

Commissioner Correll asked if there had been any discussion with the applicant with regard to helping the plan to get there.

Mr. Youmans said that there has been extensive discussion and the outcome was while they are interested in that future vision, they do not feel that the market is there today or even in the near future. He said that they still want to retain ownership of it, and are interested in purchasing more; however, they do not feel that there is a market for a redevelopment of this type. He said, in summary, that this request does nothing that is contrary to the Comp Plan.

Commissioner Correll stated that he agreed that it appeared consistent.

Chairman Shore stated that it looked much better than it had in the past.

*Commissioner Smith moved forward SV-12-154 to City Council recommending approval because the request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The recommendation is subject to:*

- 1. Establishment of utility easements for existing utilities situated within the existing public right-of-way including City utilities such as water and sewer, as well as private service utilities including electric, telephone, gas, and CATV, and easements for needed drainage and the existing historic marker;*
- 2. Use of the vacated area for landscaping, signage, and driveway access; and,*

3. *Submission and approval of a Minor Subdivision and recordation of a plat depicting the vacated right-of-way being assembled in with the adjoining property at 1000 Valley Avenue.*

*The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Wiley.*

*The motion passed 5-0-1 (Commissioner Slaughter abstained).*

**B. Resolution to initiate: TA-12-187 AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT ARTICLES 1, 8, 9, 10, 11 AND 18 OF THE WINCHESTER ZONING ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO DEFINITIONS, USE PROVISIONS AND PARKING PROVISIONS FOR ARENAS, AMPHITHEATERS, AND STADIUMS**

Mr. Youmans stated that on page 10 of the staff report was a draft resolution to initiate the text amendment which identified four recitals and specifically called attention to the third and fourth recitals where the Comprehensive Plan states the goals of City Council including the focus on economic development for purposes of sustainability. He said the fourth recital mentions the specific provisions of the arena, amphitheater and stadium use within certain districts, which would be the central business district – B-1, Highway Commercial District, B-2, Commercial Industrial District, CM-1, and the Limited Industrial District, M-1.

Mr. Youmans referred to pages 11-14, which contain the draft of the ordinance and includes the proposed definitions for the three terms, the enumeration of the uses as conditional uses within the various districts, with the remaining focusing on the parking standards. He said that this is not a public hearing today, but if the Commission is receptive to initiating the resolution, then this could be advertised for a public hearing at the May Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Smith said that he was still attempting to wrap his head around the distances, which were discussed at the work session. He said that the first thing that came to mind was the existing stadium in Hagerstown. He asked if it was a mixed B-1 area.

Mr. Youmans said that he had seen the aerial photograph of the area and it appeared to be mostly by itself, somewhat near an elementary school.

Councilor Tagnesi said that he and his wife had recently been to the stadium and that it is in a residential area with houses on the street right next to the stadium.

Commissioner Smith said that the reason he brought it up was that he wondered about the level of uses of different arenas and the noise level and lighting, especially if you have a mixed district and are within 200 feet of businesses and homes. He felt that was very close.

Chairman Wiley asked if the distance was 200 feet from the end of the parking lot or from the structure.

Mr. Youmans said that the way that it is drafted, the spacing standard is from the structure to the closest MR or LR District. He stated that this was just suggested language and that if the Commission would rather have it come forward without these spacing standards, or with different ones, it could be considered. He said that it builds on what is already in the ordinance for other uses, for instance kennels.

Commissioner Slaughter said that the way this is written, this would just allow consideration of a Conditional Use Permit; it would not allow it by right. He said that it could still be considered and be turned down if it did not fit with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Mr. Youmans said that even if it were 1000 feet away from the adjoining residential district, Council could still turn it down. He said that this was a first level filter that said that if you are looking to build an amphitheater or arena in Winchester, they should look at a site that had a decent amount of separation from residential areas.

Vice-Chairman Wiley said that at the same time you do not want to adversely affect the developer that wants to come in and purchase the property.

Mr. Youmans said that with a larger project proposal, you will most likely have a 200 foot parking area, so there will probably not be a concern for distance.

Commissioner Smith said that he felt that this was a good step toward getting ahead of the game. He said that he had been in stadiums where he had no idea that there were residences adjacent to the ballpark and he assumed that their community had addressed all the concerns that may have been part of the process of approval.

Commissioner Correll asked if staff had the opportunity to view other jurisdictions' Ordinances concerning stadiums.

Mr. Youmans said that he had not.

Vice-Chairman Wiley said that he had visited a stadium that was in a park setting and separated from a residential area.

Commissioner Correll said that he had spoken with someone in another jurisdiction and he said that some of the houses are close to the stadium and he felt that it was very important to take the distance to homes into consideration when developing a spacing and noise plan.

Commissioner Smith said that the amphitheater at the Taylor Hotel is a perfect example of how this could work.

Mr. Youmans referred to the overhead zoning map to discuss the some of the distances and how they would affect the neighboring residences.

Chairman Shore asked what other scenarios the text amendment would affect.

Mr. Youmans said that it could affect Shenandoah University if they ever moved a sports stadium into the City limits.

Councilor Tagnesi asked about the amphitheater in the park and whether it was outside 300 feet.

Mr. Youmans said that even though it is existing, its surrounded by EIP zoning and would be well over 300 feet.

Commissioner Slaughter said that this was setting guidelines. Regardless, any proposal would have to go through the Conditional Use process with Council deciding based on the Planning Commission recommendation.

Mr. Youmans said that that was correct.

Commissioner Correll asked if there was anything happening at the current time that created a sense of urgency in defining what an arena was.

Mr. Youmans said no, but they were trying to be proactive and while they are discussing category uses, staff felt that it was good to have an Ordinance defining such.

Commissioner Correll asked if it was necessary to define what constituted an arena now.

Mr. Youmans said that perhaps it was not, but one of the advantages of advertising an Ordinance with all of the options is that as you go through the public hearing process, you could remove parts but not add.

*Vice-Chairman Wiley moved to adopt the resolution initiating TA-12-187.*

*The motion was seconded by Commissioner Slaughter.*

Commissioner Smith asked if the motion was for all the changes or each change. It was determined to be for all.

Mr. Moore said that this would just be to initiate the amendment and that, if passed, the amendment would be advertised for public hearing at the Planning Commission next month.

Commissioner Correll said that it seemed to him that they could be placing themselves in a corner based on the arena issue because they are proactively defining what it is. He stated that it is a great idea to keep discussions open if someone wants to do an arena down the road. He said that because there is no real urgency now in defining arena, he sees no reason to forward it to Council.

Chairman Shore said that in the past, the Commission and staff have sent to City Council a wide array of choices because that is what they are looking for from the Commission, which allows them make the final decision.

Commissioner Correll asked if this would go to public hearing at the Commission level.

Chairman Shore said yes, and that ultimately it would go to City Council for a public hearing also.

Mr. Youmans stated that staff has not been asked to specifically include arenas at this time and does not have a strong opinion one way or the other.

*Motion passed 6-0.*

#### C. Administrative Authorizations:

- 1) **SP-12-176** OWPR, Inc. 1313-1415 Amherst St JWMS Parking Lot improvements

Chairman Shore read the following into the minutes: *At the April 10, 2012 work session, Vice-Chairman Wiley moved to grant administrative authorization for SP-12-176. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Slaughter. Motion passed 6-0 (Commissioner Beatley absent).*

2) **SP-12-190** Greenway Eng 601-625 E Jubal Early Dr AB Convenience Center revision

Chairman Shore read the following into the minutes: *At the April 10, 2012 work session, Commissioner Slaughter moved to grant administrative authorization for SP-12-190. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Wiley. Motion passed 6-0 (Commissioner Beatley absent).*

3) **SP-12-186** PHR+A 1705 Amherst St Gateway Office Building

Mr. Moore reviewed the site plan. He stated that the project was reviewed through public hearing processes late last year for the related rezonings and conditional use permit. The CUP included a preliminary site plan and this detailed plan is consistent with that plan.

*Vice-Chairman Wiley moved to grant administrative authorization for SP-12-186. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beatley. Motion passed 6-0.*

4) **SP-12-220** PHR&A 1625-1655 Apple Blossom Drive Allen & Alizzi revision

Commissioner Beatley stated that she would be abstaining from this item.

Mr. Moore reviewed the site plan calculations. The project is to subdivide the existing developed site into two parcels. The applicant proposes no physical improvements at this time. While the site meets parking and landscaping requirements today, the subdivision will create deficient parking and landscaping on the proposed motel site. Parking will be accommodated through a shared parking easement. The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow for 12% landscaping on the motel site, as opposed to the required 15%.

Mr. Moore pointed out that there is an opportunity for more green area on the motel site. The existing approved plan calls for a striped end island that could be curbed and landscaped. It appears that the striped island was actually removed at one point, creating a violation of travel aisle spacing.

Mr. Youmans stated that at some point in the future there may be a right-in, right-out access from the hotel property onto Jubal Early and that this could further reduce the green area.

Commissioner Slaughter asked if it would be appropriate to grant a waiver at this time and defer constructing the landscaped island until such time that there is a revision to the motel property.

Mr. Youmans stated that staff would be agreeable to that as a condition.

Mr. Moore agreed, but pointed out that the striped island still needed to be provided per the existing approved plan.

*Commissioner Slaughter moved to grant administrative authorization for SP-12-22, including a waiver of landscaping percentage on the motel site and deferral of requirement to curb and landscape the existing approved striped island until such time of a future site revision. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Wiley.*

Commissioner Correll stated that he is abstaining from this item.

*Motion passed 4-0-2 (Commissioners Beatley and Correll abstained).*

**ADJOURN**

Mr. Youmans announced that an orientation session for Commissioners Correll, Smith and the new City Manager will be held Thursday, April 26 at 10:00am. Any others that wish to attend are welcome.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

---

Dave Shore, Chairman