

**MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

**CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARCH 13, 2013**

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Scherer, Schroeder, Potts, Kilberg, Cherkassy, Carr, Carpenter, Forrest, Grabel and Staunton

Absent from the Roll: Platteter

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Commissioner Carpenter moved approval of the agenda. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Forest moved approval of the February 27, 2013 meeting minutes. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

During "Community Comment," the Planning Commission will invite residents to share new issues or concerns that haven't been considered in the past 30 days by the Commission or which aren't slated for future consideration. Individuals must limit their comments to three minutes. The Chair may limit the number of speakers on the same issue in the interest of time and topic. Generally speaking, items that are elsewhere on this morning's agenda may not be addressed during Community Comment. Individuals should not expect the Chair or Commission Members to respond to their comments today. Instead, the Commission might refer the matter to staff for consideration at a future meeting.

No public comment.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Preliminary Rezoning to PUD, Preliminary Development Plan, and Preliminary Plat. Anderson-KM Builders, 7171 France Avenue South, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague reminded the Commission they continued this item at their last meeting. Teague reported that he and Chair Staunton met to clarify for the applicant the major concerns expressed by the Commission at that meeting. Those concerns were shared with both the applicant and Commissioners via e-mail. Suggestions from the Commission were to widen and expand the connections to the promenade, enhance the pedestrian crossings within the site, add windows to west and north elevation, address screening for the loading dock and work on enhancing the water feature. Sustainability was also an issue with the Commission expressing that they were looking for ways to ensure that sustainable standards implemented are measureable.

Appearing for the Applicant:

Jim Vos, Cresa, Greg Anderson, Anderson Builders, Maureen Michaliski, Schaefer Richardson

Applicant Presentations

Mr. Vos addressed the Commission and reported that sustainable standards would be measurable. Vos said Lund Holdings is committed to construct buildings that use materials that reduce energy consumption. These include low flow toilets, lighting, mechanicals, motion sensors and other measures. Vos said their goal is to achieve a measurable standard 5% better than the existing energy codes.

With graphics Vos pointed out the changes to the pedestrian flow to and from the promenade and internally (covered walkways, heated sidewalks). Vos noted the connection to the promenade has been widened and ties in directly to the Byerly's store. The internal crossings are stamped concrete clearly defining the crossings. Vos further added the water feature has been enhanced and includes an area for seating. Concluding, Vos said they also envision creating a "meeting area" with an art element. This area would be used by the apartment residents, Byerly's patrons and those walking along the promenade.

Discussion

Commissioner Grabiell noted the mention of LEED standards; and questioned who actually signs off on them. Grabiell says he understands they intend to follow LEED standards; however, someone must review the measures and sign off on them. Vos responded there is a judiciary review body that signs off.

Commissioner Potts acknowledged sustainability can be challenging to address, adding he wants to know how much “better the buildings will be” than just meeting the standard building codes. Potts noted the applicant indicated their goal is to be 5 percent better than state code; adding that’s a start, but more could be accomplished. Continuing, Potts asked if both the retail and housing component are working with EDA. Vos responded in the affirmative. With regard to storm water Potts questioned if the applicant heard anything from the Watershed District. Vos responded they are working with the District; however, the details haven’t been hammered out. Vos said there is the assumption that water runoff would be handled through underground storage, adding water quality should rise.

A discussion ensued on parking acknowledging that some Commissioners felt that parking could be reduced allowing for more green space. Mr. Vos said it was very important that the store provides adequate parking. Vos said measures could be implemented internally such as adding more cashiers, carry-outs that would move patrons through the store more efficiently. This would also free up parking at a faster rate of turnover. Vos concluded that it has been difficult addressing sustainability without formal criteria from the City.

Chair Staunton acknowledged the lack of City standards on sustainability and pointed out one of the obstacles the City faces is the building code. All building code standards must be met. Staunton said the Commission felt that adopting the PUD ordinance would be a way for the City to negotiate above those standards.

Commissioner Grabiell stated one issue of concern raised at the last meeting was the driveway encroachment between the Byerly’s site and the Wolfson site to the east at 3655 Hazelton Road. Grabiell asked if that issue was resolved. Vos responded in the affirmative, adding the Byerly’s driveway no longer encroaches. Chair Grabiell commented that at the last meeting the applicant indicated the difficulty in redeveloping the site while the present store was open. Grabiell asked if that’s still the case. Vos responded in the affirmative. He stated that was mandated from the start.

Commissioner Forrest said in reviewing the site plan that she believes bike racks should be located closer to the patio area. Vos agreed, adding that can be reviewed. Forrest also encouraged more landscaping especially along the east elevation, adding that wall still appears a bit tall and blank.

Chair Staunton said he was curious if the applicant views the PUD process as a benefit to them. Vos responded that the PUD process is a benefit and provides the development team with the chance to do something different from what could be done through straight rezoning. Mr. Vos said the added density and setback variances allow this area to be created as part of the community at large. It can address the promenade and invite “people in” and become a destination.

Commissioner Schroeder said he appreciates the sustainability goal of 5% above code; however, he believes that doesn’t go far enough. Continuing, Schroeder said he also appreciates the statement that water would be handled through underground storage systems; however, storing the water that way probably is the result of the site itself. Concluding, Schroeder said he doesn’t see any extra effort made to go above and beyond what would normally be done.

Commissioner Carr stated that overall she believes the project was well done, adding she has a few questions. One is the seating capacity of the patio area(s). Mr. Vos responded that the at grade patio seats between 20 & 30 visitors and the mezzanine level seats roughly 15. Carr asked if trees are proposed for the parking lot, adding she thinks that would be a nice touch. Vos responded that can be reconsidered, however, if trees are added islands need to be created and islands are difficult for maintenance (plowing, etc.). Carr also asked Vos to explain the exterior building materials for the store and apartment buildings and their compatibility. Vos indicated the materials that would be used and concluded that their intent was to coordinate the finishes and color type. He also added Byerly's and the residential component won't match, however would be completely compatible. Commissioner Carr concluded that she does have a concern with the north elevation of the building, adding she would like to see windows placed along that building wall.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

The following gave testimony:

Robert Rofidal, 7125 Bristol Boulevard, Edina, MN

R. Wolfson, 3655 Hazelton Road, Edina, MN

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to the issue; being none; Commissioner Carpenter moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; public hearing closed.

Discussion

Chair Staunton asked Mr. Houle to speak to traffic. Mr. Houle gave a brief report on the traffic analysis.

Chair Staunton noted the traffic measures referred to; signalization or roundabout, and asked Mr. Houle his preference. Houle responded because of the disruption a traffic signal creates; not only to the site but City streets he believes a roundabout is the way to go. Houle reported there is a roundabout design that can accommodate semi delivery trucks. Houle also noted that signalization at this point doesn't meet the State and County requirements, adding it is possible those requirements will be met sometime in the future, but for now the State and County won't sign off on signalization at this location. Houle concluded pointing out this situation isn't too much different from the Westin and Target issue; adding a roundabout was placed in that area over signalization.

Commissioner Carpenter said he continues to have problems with this project and would vote against it, adding in his opinion it's an uninspired development and the lack of pedestrian integration between the promenade, residential element of the site and the retail component is troubling. With regard to parking Carpenter said he would rather see more parking than less, adding he doesn't want to see cars waiting for parking spaces, concluding he would rather error on the side of sufficient parking.

Commissioner Forrest stressed that at final she would like to see the materials board, adding she wants assurance that the exterior buildings materials are compatible.

Commissioner Grabiell commented that in his opinion he believes City ordinance tends to over park. Grabiell said what he is having difficulty with this evening is “negotiating” with the applicant over specific issues. Grabiell said he doesn’t feel the City has a good enough tool to negotiate during the PUD process. He pointed out according to State Statute the City needs to act on a submittal within a specific timeframe, reiterating in his opinion it’s difficult to negotiate at a public forum. He pointed out the last time the Commission met specific items were listed; the applicant came back with some of those issues addressed ; and if the Commission continues to have further issues this could go on and on. Grabiell acknowledged the mention of forming a subcommittee that would negotiate with the developer during the PUD process, which could work; however, again the City has time limit.

Commissioner Scherer stated she is likely to vote in favor of this project. She said she continues to have issues; especially the long north facing brick wall, adding to her it looks like a prison with two guard towers at the end. She said she was also concerned with the height of the retaining wall for the community element, adding she would like it softened because she doesn’t want the appearance of a tunnel from the promenade. Scherer stated she understands this is a balancing act, adding she will be very interested in viewing the covered walkway because to her it could look “cheesy”. Concluding, Scherer said this has been a strange process and she appreciates everyone’s input.

Commissioner Potts stated that this request is asking for a significant increase in density, adding he was expecting more “coming out of the gate”. Concluding, Potts said he doesn’t see a community benefit to grant the PUD.

Commissioner Forrest stated she agrees with Commissioner Scherer’s and Carr’s comments on the north building wall. With regard to the PUD process Forrest acknowledged it’s a balancing act that may need to be revisited further down the line.

Further discussion continued on the PUD process itself and the project’s pluses and minuses. Chair Staunton asked for a motion.

Motion

Commissioner Grabiell moved to recommend preliminary rezoning approval to PUD and preliminary development plan approval based on staff findings found on pages 14 & 15 of the staff report and subject to staff conditions found on pages 15 & 16 of the staff report. Preliminary plat approval is also recommended based on staff conditions on page 16 of the staff report; noting the payment of a Parkland Dedication fee of \$1,230,000 is to be paid prior to release of the final plat. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion.

Commissioner Carr asked to amend the motion to include the addition of architectural features along the north building wall. Commissioners Grabiell and Forrest accepted that amendment. Ayes; Scherer, Carr, Forrest, Grabiell. Nays; Schroeder, Potts, Carpenter and Staunton. Motion failed.

B. Preliminary Rezoning to PUD, Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat. Edina Fifty-Five LLC. 5125 49th Street West and 5118-5109 49th Street West

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission Hunt Associates is requesting redevelopment of three lots, 5109-5125 West 49th Street. The applicant is proposing to tear down the existing two apartments and single family home on the site (10 units' total) and build a new 17-unit attached housing development. The subject properties total 1.43 acres in size; therefore, the proposed density of the project would be 12 units per acre.

The existing property is zoned PRD-2, Planned Residential District-2, which allows residential building containing six or fewer dwelling units. The existing apartments contain four and five units each. The applicant is seeking a rezoning of the property to PUD, Planned Unit Development. The site is guided LDAR, Low Density Attached Residential (4-8 units per acre), therefore, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to MDR, Medium Density Residential would be required to allow a density of 5-12 units per acre. The applicant narrative indicates why they believe that a PUD rezoning is justified for this proposed development.

Planner Teague stated that staff recommends that the City Council approve the request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from LDAR, Low Density Attached Residential to MDR, Medium Density Residential (5-12 units per acre) for the subject property based on the following findings:

1. The subject property is a transition area, and serves as a buffer from single-family homes to the north to Vernon Avenue and the GrandView Commercial area to the south.
2. The proposal would be an improvement over the current two existing apartment buildings and single-family home (10 units) on the site. Seven townhomes would face 49th Street and eight townhomes would face Vernon Avenue with the garages and drive aisle internal to the site.
3. The proposed two/three story buildings are generally consistent with existing height in the area.
4. The existing roadways would support the project. Wenck and Associates conducted a traffic impact study, and concluded that the proposed development could be supported by the existing roads.

5. The proposed project would meet the following goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:
 - a. Increase pedestrian and bicycling opportunities and connections between neighborhoods, and with other communities, to improve transportation infrastructure and reduce dependence on the car.
 - b. Locate and orient buildings to fit with their existing and/or planned context by framing and complementing adjacent streets, parks and open spaces.
 - c. Locate and orient vehicle parking, vehicular access, service areas and utilities to minimize their visual impact on the property and on adjacent/surrounding properties, without compromising the safety and attractiveness of adjacent streets, parks, and open spaces.
 - d. Regulate scale, massing, and height to provide complementary transitions to adjacent sites and nearby neighborhoods and areas.
 - e. Encourage infill/redevelopment opportunities that optimize use of city infrastructure and that complement area, neighborhood, and/or corridor context and character.

Teague added that staff recommends that the City Council approve the Preliminary Rezoning from PRD-2, Planned Residential District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District and Preliminary Development Plan to build 17 new townhomes on the subject 1.43 acre parcel based on the following findings:

1. The proposal would create a more efficient and creative use of the property. Currently the site does not engage Vernon Avenue. Today it is clearly the back of the site, and contains mature trees. The proposed site plan turns and faces Vernon Avenue with a row of two-story townhomes.
2. Parking areas and garages are internal to the site, and not visible from 49th street or Vernon Avenue.
3. The project would enhance pedestrian connections. The plan provides for a public sidewalk through the site from 49th to Vernon, that would connect, not only this development, but the entire area to the north to the GrandView District.
4. Landscaping would be enhanced. Extensive Landscaping is proposed around the perimeter of the site and adjacent to the proposed townhomes. The number of over story trees is over double the number required by City Code. The mature trees along Vernon Avenue would be preserved.

Approval is also subject to the following Conditions:

1. The Final Development Plans must be generally consistent with the Preliminary Development Plans dated February 13, 2013 and the final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Section 850.04 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Compliance with all of the conditions outlined in the city engineer's memo dated March 7, 2013.
3. Final Rezoning is subject to a Zoning Ordinance Amendment creating the PUD, Planned Unit Development for this site.

Concluding, Teague recommended that the City Council approve the Preliminary Plat to create a new 17-lot townhome plat for the subject property based on the following findings:

1. The proposed plat meets all Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance requirements.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the Final Rezoning of the subject property to Planned Unit Development, PUD.
2. The Final Plat must be considered within one-year after approval of the Preliminary Plat, or the Preliminary Plat shall be deemed null and void.
3. A shared parking and access agreement must be established across the Plat.
4. The Park Dedication fee of \$35,000 shall be paid prior to release of the mylars approving the Final Plat.

Appearing for the Applicant

David Motzenbecker, Chris Palkowitsch, BKV Group, Ed Terhaar, Wenck

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Motzenbecker delivered a power point presentation. He further informed the Commission BKV adjusted the development to better fit the site and meet the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Motzenbecker further explained the topography of the property played a large role in building design. Motzenbecker explained that they are putting in a plinth to minimize stairs, adding the plinth moves along the property line and raises it about two feet. Continuing, along the front the development team wanted to open the units up to the street. Small patios will be added on the top of the plinth. With graphics Motzenbecker explained the internal circulation, parking and guest parking. He pointed out there will be bike and pedestrian access and the site would be open creating a more welcoming space; this also creates a space that is public; not private.

Motzenbecker introduced Chris Palkowitsch, project architect.

Chris Palkowitsch told Commissioners that each unit would have their own entry and the exterior building materials have been chosen and will be cast stone, fiber-cement panels, and stained wood to warm the exterior palate. Palkowitsch said the project would promote energy efficiency and the conservation of natural resources. Continuing, Palkowitsch said general sustainability principles for the buildings and the site will be applied as follows:

- It is possible the existing buildings will be relocated.
- If the buildings are demolished many of the materials will be recycled.
- Use of low VOC paints.
- Energy Star appliance.
- High –efficiency HVAC will be standard.
- Stone and cement board with recycled contents will be incorporated
- Skylights will add additional daylight to each unit reducing energy consumption; and
- Storm water infiltration and a variety of native plants.

Motzenbecker also asked the Commission to note that along Vernon Avenue the units are two-story with a gathering space in the front. Motzenbecker also pointed out that the front doors are “sunken”, providing each unit with privacy from Vernon Avenue and passersby.

Discussion

Commissioner Forrest questioned accessibility and asked if any units are without stairs. Forrest also stated parking concerns her; especially guest parking or lack thereof. Mr. Palkowitsch responded any unit could be retro-fitted for an elevator.

Commissioner Carr commented that she observed that some garages have windows and questioned this reasoning. Mr. Palkowitsch explained that the windows proposed for the garages are frosted; letting light in and providing a degree of privacy.

Commissioner Forrest asked how building height is measured. Planner Teague explained that building height is measured from the existing grade.

Chair Staunton stated the roofs of the proposed townhouses are flat and pointed out Edina’s Comprehensive Plan suggests pitched roofs; not flat as proposed. Mr. Motzenbecker explained that the reason they went with the flat roof was to ensure that the buildings “tie” into the neighborhood. He noted that the majority of the roofs (single family homes) in the neighborhood are hip; adding the proposed flat roof “ties” in better while minimizing the impact of building height.

Ed Terhaar addressed the Commission and gave a brief overview of traffic highlighting the following:

- Proposed development is expected to generate 1 net trip during the weekday peak period, 2 net trips during the weekday pm and 29 weekday daily trips.
- Intersections have adequate capacity; no improvements would be required.

- It should be noted that the entire neighborhood area has only one access point and if a train was stopped on the tracks for an extended period of time, additional steps would be needed to access this neighborhood; however, this exists with or without the proposed townhomes.

Terhaar told the Commission townhouses tend to generate fewer trips than single family homes. He also acknowledged that the intersection of Vernon/Brookview and Interlachen Boulevard can pose problems. Commissioners agreed with that statement. A discussion ensued on the ramifications of this development on neighborhood traffic, acknowledging the unique one way in and out and railroad tracks.

Chair Staunton acknowledged that this proposal is located in a unique setting with a one way in and out, agreeing if you go up the hill and try to turn left onto Interlachen Boulevard one can “sit” there for some time before there is an opening to turn. Mr. Terhaar agreed, adding he believes that movement is at service level D which isn’t good; however, is acceptable in an urban setting.

Commissioner Forrest questioned how often the figures used for the traffic analysis report are updated. Mr. Terhaar responded they are updated on a regular basis, adding it was recently updated and the most current information was used in this analysis.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

The following spoke to the proposal:

Michelle Anderson, 5112 49th Street West
Steve Russ, 5040 Hankerson Avenue
Tony Wagner, 5120 West 49th Street
Leslie Losey, 5105 West 49th Street
Gail Helbereot, 5116 West 49th Street
Mrs. Wagner, 5120 West 49th Street

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to this issue; being none Commissioner Potts moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Chair Staunton questioned how storm water and snow removal would be handled. Mr. Motzenbecker said they have a civil engineer on board that between now and final will work out the storm water management issues, adding he believes at this time runoff storage will be contained underground. Continuing, Motzenbecker said with regard to snow removal the excess snow will be moved off site.

Chair Staunton said he observed on the schematics there are units with roof top decks and asked if that is an option. He pointed out neighbors privacy would be compromised. Mr. Motzenbecker said there is an interest in roof top decks, adding they would be an amenity on some of the units.

Commissioner Carr discussed density and setbacks and asked the developers if they ever considered removing the last townhouse unit on the east. She pointed out this unit directly abuts a residential home and if that unit were removed that area could be used for guest parking. Mr. Motzenbecker responded they hadn't considered that option.

Chair Staunton directed the discussion back to the Comprehensive Plan and the requested amendment to increase density and have flat roofs.

Commissioner Carpenter said he doesn't have a problem with increasing the density in this location.

Commissioner Forrest said she struggles with an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan noting the Comprehensive Plan is the City's development guide.

Commissioner Schroeder commented that his struggle would be leaving the site low density, adding the step from low density to medium density may actually encourage redevelopment, and in this instance seems reasonable. Schroeder said this project could be considered one of the first steps in the GrandView Plan, noting the increase in density isn't at the upper end of what's permitted in medium density. Chair Staunton stated he agrees with Commissioner Schroeder. Continuing, Schroeder said in his opinion(from a site plan perspective) that he doesn't mind the intensity, and in fact, would slide the entire development over; closer to Vernon Avenue, narrow the driveway and squeeze the site together from all sides. Schroeder said if this is done the impact of the building height from 49th street would be minimized.

Commissioner Forrest said she wasn't adverse to the project; however does have concerns. She said she doesn't want this site to appear claustrophobic and negatively impact the neighbors. The neighbors do have legitimate concerns.

Chair Staunton said he agrees the neighbors have legitimate issues; however change in this location makes sense. Continuing, Staunton said he really likes the look of the project from Vernon Avenue, adding he also believes the use of PUD in this instance is correct. Staunton said he also likes that the site provides a pathway to Vernon Avenue for not only residents of the townhouses but area residents as well. He also stated he thinks the bike curb is another plus. Continuing, Staunton said the trick of this project is to make the transition from residential to the commercial area off Vernon Avenue friendly. Concluding, Staunton said he does have a concern with the overall building height and the flat roof (especially from West 49th Street). Commissioner Forrest questioned who would maintain the Vernon Avenue access. Mr. Motzenbecker responded that the association for the townhomes would maintain the access.

Commissioner Carr stated the use appears reasonable, adding that she somewhat likes the contemporary nature of the architecture; however in her opinion the site is too dense, adding removal of that end unit may be important to her support.

Commissioner Carpenter asked the development team their feelings about Commissioner Schroeder's suggestion of pulling the buildings back from the property lines. Mr. Motzenbecker responded that can be looked at, adding they did not consider it. Commissioner Schroeder pointed out they could slide the townhouses 6-feet closer to Vernon Avenue and narrow the driveway squeezing the entire project.

Commissioner Scherer said she doesn't know if she would be a fan of living that close to Vernon Avenue, pointing out this stretch of Vernon is very busy, noting the exit ramp for Hwy 100.

Commissioner Forrest reiterated that her concern is parking; adding she doesn't think it's adequate. She concluded that this project may just be too much for this site and neighborhood.

Commissioner Carpenter commented this site will be redeveloped at some point in the future and at this time the Commission needs to determine if they can support this project as presented.

Commissioner Forrest reiterated in her opinion the density is too much and parking could become an issue.

Motion

Commissioner Carpenter moved approval of the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, Rezoning approval, and Development Plan approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions with the additional condition that the housing units be modified as expressed by Commissioner Schroeder. Commissioner Schroeder seconded the motion. Schroeder clarified that the interior drive is to be narrowed by at least 6-feet, the front yard setback on West 49th Street increased by 6-feet, and the entire project would technically be shifted south by 6-feet creating a 37-foot setback from West 49th Street, a 10-foot setback from Vernon Avenue and a 21-foot setback on the east side

Chair Staunton asked if Commissioners Carpenter and Schroeder would accept an amendment to their motion that would prohibit roof top decks. Commissioners Schroeder and Carpenter agreed with that amendment.

Commissioner Scherer stated this project in her opinion is too tall and too dense. Commissioner Potts said before the City Council hears this issue that the developer needs to provide a better representation of building height and elevation from West 49th Street.

Chair Staunton called for the vote: Ayes; Schroeder, Potts, Carpenter, Grabiell and Staunton. Nays; Scherer, Carr, Forrest. Motion carried 5-3

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Chair Staunton acknowledged back of packet materials.

VIII. CHAIR AND COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Chair Staunton gave a brief follow up of the work session between the council and commission. Staunton said there were two topics of discussion; the Ordinance and Construction Management Plan. Staunton said staff is considering a work session on April 10th to further discuss these issues. Staunton asked the Commission how they would like the work session handled; formal or informal. Commissioners stated they would support a more informal process; possibly meeting in the Community Room. Commissioner Carr commented that she has a special interest in lighting, adding she would be interested in studying that topic further.

Chair Staunton officially welcomed Claudia Carr to the Planning Commission.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Carr moved adjournment at 10:40 PM. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Jackie Hoogenakker

Respectfully submitted