



Town of Hamden

Planning and Zoning Department

Hamden Government Center
 2750 Dixwell Avenue
 Hamden, CT 06518
 Tel: (203) 287-7070
 Fax: (203) 287-7075

June 23, 2011

MINUTES: THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting on Thursday, June 16, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the 3rd Floor Conference Room, Hamden Government Center, 2750 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden, CT. and the following items were reviewed:

Commissioners in attendance:

Jeff Vita, Chair
 Wayne Chorney
 Fran Nelson
 Elaine Dove,
 Bill Reynolds

Staff in attendance:

Leslie Creane, Town Planner arrived at 9:00 p.m.
 Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner
 Holly Masi, Zoning Enforcement Officer
 Stacy Shellard, Commission Clerk
 Genevive Bertolini, Stenographer

A. Public Hearing

- 1) **11-6422** 1869 Dixwell Avenue, Requesting variances of Section 550.2.16.B (area and height) to allow a freestanding sign with a height of 32.5 feet where a maximum of 20 feet is allowed, creating an effective height of 28 feet, and an area of 189.20 square feet where 100 square feet is allowed. T-4 Zone. Poyant Signs, Applicant.

Mr. Mike Patenaude, Poyant Signs, addressed the Commission and reviewed the application. He stated that the hardship for this application is that the current sign sits low because of the lower grade of the site and that the fence located at the entrance to the plaza is required by the DOT. The wall blocks the tenant panels on the sign and they would like to raise the sign so that it can be seen from the grade of the road and add panels for all the tenants in the plaza.

Mr. Mike Amenabar, Property Manager, addressed the Commission and explained that it is not the policy of the plaza to allow banners on the fence. When banners are placed on the fence they are taken down, but the tenants puts them back up. He stated if the variances are approved there would be stricter enforcement regarding banners placed on the fence.

Mr. Vita asked if the request is to raise the sign and increase the size of the sign and Mr. Patenaude said it was. Mr. Amenabar said that they have lost two tenants recently and two new tenants are moving in and would like to be on the pylon sign.

Mr. Nelson asked if the request is to increase the square footage of the sign. Mr. Patenaude explained that the request is to increase the bottom of the sign by 37.91 square feet and also increase the header by 18.05 square feet. Mr. Nelson asked if the Home Depot sign would remain the same size and Mr. Patenaude said yes and reviewed the variance that had been previously approved and reviewed the changes that would be made if this variance is approved. Ms. Dove asked when the previous variance had been approved and Mr. Patenaude said August 17, 2006. Mr. Amenabar explained that the businesses did not open until 2007. Mr. Vita asked if the variance is requesting the least amount of signage needed. Mr. Patenaude explained that there will be two tenants added to the sign and there will be an extra panel with the management company's name and telephone number. He reviewed with the Commission the letter sizes necessary so that they are readable. Mr. Chorney asked if the address will be on the sign and Mr. Patenaude said it is important to have the address for drivers to locate the plaza. He also explained that because of the location of the fence the sign needs to be raised for it to be more visible and that he has worked with the Planning Office staff. Ms. Dove asked why the fence cannot be moved. Mr. Patenaude stated that there is a six foot drop and the placement of the fence is for pedestrian and vehicle safety. Ms. Holly Masi, Zoning Enforcement Officer said that the applicant would need to go to the State DOT for permission to move the fence.

Mr. Patenaude submitted and reviewed photos of the proposed signs. Mr. Chorney asked if they would be upgrading the wooden fence. Mr. Amenabar feels that the fence is in good condition, but he will inspect it for damage. Mr. Amenabar discussed with the Commission the location of the fence and explained that it was required by the State DOT for the safety of Pedestrians and traffic on Dixwell Avenue.

Mr. Patenaude reviewed with the Commission the need for additional space on the sign so that it can include all the tenants in the plaza. Ms. Masi said that she has received calls from prospective tenants regarding signage for the plaza and was told if they could not be added to it they would not rent the space. She noted that the applicants have worked with the Planning Staff extensively to find a reasonable solution.

Mr. Vita asked for public comments against and for the application. There was none.

Mr. Vita closed the Public Hearing.

- 1) **11-6423** 53 Paramount Avenue. Requesting a variance of Table 2.4 to permit a pool with a side yard of three feet where a ten foot side yard is required. R-5 Zone. Clarence Jones, Jr, Applicant.

Mr. Vita explained to the Commission that the Public Hearing sign was not posted as required by the Zoning Regulations. However, he told the Commission and the Applicant that the application would still be heard. Mr. Vita stated that the Applicant understands that if the application is approved there is a 15 day appeal period and the appeal would be valid because the sign had not been posted.

Mr. Clarence Adams, Jr., Applicant, addressed the Commission and reviewed the application and the proposed location of the pool. He stated that if the pool were to be placed to the center of the yard there would be no place for his grandchildren to play. Mr. Adams said that there had been a shed in the yard that was removed because it had been damaged by the snow. Mr. Adams explained that he has a granddaughter with a disability and cannot be outside for long periods of time. It is difficult to go to beaches because of the disability and feels that having a pool in the yard would allow his granddaughter to have access to the pool and the house.

Mr. Chorney asked how the pool would be accessed. Mr. Adams advised there would be a deck and a safety ladder.

Ms. Lisa Adams addressed the Commission and stated that there will be a self locking gate on the ladder and on the deck. Mr. Chorney asked where the pool filter would be located and Mr. Clarence explained that it would be placed to the rear of the yard. Mr. Nelson said that the pool would not be encroaching into the side yard.

Ms. Dove asked if the lot is fenced in and Mr. Adams said yes. Mr. Chorney asked if Mr. Adams has spoken with the Building Department about the proposed pool. Mr. Adams said that he had not but will speak with them if the variance is approved.

Mr. Vita said that a letter was received from the RWA and that they had no comments.

Mr. Vita asked for public comments against and for the application. There was none.

Mr. Vita closed the Public Hearing.

- 3) **11-6424** 61 Central Avenue. Requesting a variance of Section 220, Table 2.3 to permit a three to five foot side yard where a twelve feet side yard is required, for an addition. R-4 Zone. Charles M. O'Connell, Applicant.

Mr. Charles O'Connell, Owner, addressed the Commission and reviewed the application. Mr. Nelson asked if the addition would be within the footprint of the house and Mr. O'Connell replied yes. Mr. O'Connell explained that the plan submitted is not to scale and that the porch would be built approximately one yard in from the end of the house. Mr. Vita asked if the addition would not encroach into the side yard and Mr. O'Connell said it would not. Mr. Chorney asked if the addition is a single story addition and Mr. O'Connell said yes.

Mr. Vita asked for public comments against and for the application. There was none.

Mr. Vita closed the public hearing.

- 4) **11-6425** 1349 Dixwell Avenue. Appeal of Cease & Desist Order dated April 25, 2011, per Connecticut General Statute. § 8-6. T-5 Zone. Phoenix Management Group One, LLC, dba The Point After, Applicant.

Mr. Vita stated that the Commission is waiting for Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney, to arrive before hearing this application.

Mr. Vita explained that Mr. Lee has had car trouble and should arrive shortly, so the Commission will go to the regular meeting for Items 1, 2 and 3 and then return to the Public Hearing for Item 4.

Mr. Thomas Crosby, Attorney, addressed the Commission, and stated that he represents Phoenix Management Group One which does business as Dean's Point After. He asked if the board had received the Application for appeal and the supporting paper work he had submitted and Mr. Vita stated that the Commission had received the information. Mr. Crosby explained that he is challenging the Cease & Desist order of April 25, 2011 which cites his clients for activities that are not defined in the regulations but he is accused of conducting and denies doing. Mr. Crosby explained that he would be reviewing the supporting documentation that he submitted with his Appeal of Decision Application.

Mr. Crosby stated that his client's business is neither a night club nor operating as a night club. He said that they are not conducting unpermitted activity, that they are not a night club and do not have a dance floor. He explained that the location is a sports bar. There have been occasional live events conducted which have totaled a number of 10 over the last three years since they received the original Special Permit. He said that the Special Permit does say commercial recreational use.

Mr. Crosby submitted the definition of Commercial, Recreation use located on page 165.

Mr. Nelson asked what the 10 events consisted of. Mr. Crosby said that they consisted of live acoustic bands, sports figures that would come in and have live events. He explained he will demonstrate to the Commission that the activities conducted that were precisely and specifically licensed for with regard to liquor permit and other documents that the other departments within the Town had signed off. Mr. Vita asked if the definition of recreation, commercial is part of the permit that was issued or was it a subsequent document after the permit came into question. Mr. Crosby said that page 165 is part of the zoning regulations and the recreation, commercial definition contained in it is part of the Special Permit. Mr. Crosby said that the words contained in the definition are a series of words taken into a broad context. He said that the idea that some people who might dance when an acoustic band is playing is not contrary to the regulations because they do not have a dance floor and you cannot stop people from moving around. He reviewed the interior of the facility using pictures that had been submitted with the application. Mr. Crosby reviewed the events that have taken place, the plans and required permits that were necessary to hold the events in question.

Mr. Vita said that exhibit D says karaoke/DJ, but in Mr. Crosby's brief says exhibit d includes karaoke, acoustic bands and DJ's. Mr. Crosby said that exhibit E shows the legal notice published on a sign that was 8 feet by four feet outside the facility and also published in the newspaper absolutely and unequivocally states that the entertainment will consist of a DJ, karaoke and acoustic bands and done primarily with the focus of a sports bar theme. After the sign and legal notice were published they have been conducting business at this site for three years. Mr. Crosby said that his client was not approached until January of 2011 and was informed that a notice had been sent 2009 but was not received by his client. Mr. Crosby feels it may have been sent to the property owner and that the holder of the permit should have also received the notice.

Mr. Crosby reviewed the sporting events that occur seasonally and the activities that are offered. He said that for the last three years the sports bar is open on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights. He reviewed the permits and licenses that were received for the ten acoustic band events. The permits were signed off by the Police and Fire Departments. Mr. Crosby said that they are not a night club, but do have live events that include acoustic bands and have had no code violations and have a certificate of occupancy. Mr. Crosby said that since January or February of 2011 there have been multiple visits from multiple departments from the Town of Hamden checking to review the occupancy level. He said that they had received occupancy for 1200 people but now are only allowed 540 people because of constraints placed on them by the Town officials. Mr. Crosby said that as they have decreased the size and limit of the infrequent events, police presence has increased. He feels this has not been good for business and that they are being harassed with the aggressive enforcement actions. Mr. Crosby said that they are challenging the Cease & Desist because the amusement, café and legal notices ratified what is occurring on the premises and that they have received the proper authorization from the Town for the events. He asked the Commission to look at the regulations and determine what determines proper use. Mr. Crosby said that there are other establishments in the Town that do the same activities as Dean's Point After does and they have not received a Cease & Desist. Mr. Crosby had submitted a list of locations and submitted another list to the Commission at this meeting with the names of additional establishments and reviewed the events they have held.

Mr. Vita said that Commission would need to know what permits were granted for the establishments that Mr. Crosby has referred to. Mr. Crosby said that they would not be nightclubs because they are not allowed. Mr. Kops explained that there is no such thing as "nightclub" in the current zoning regulations, but that an establishment may have been approved under the old zoning regulations.

Mr. Crosby said that he included copies of flyers in his application of other activities that have occurred in the town at different establishments which are similar to the activities that are at Dean's Point After. Mr. Crosby summarized the activities that have occurred at his client's location and the asked the Commission to reverse the Cease and Desist so that they can continue to conduct their business and continue to have similar activities with the proper authorizations and permits necessary.

Mr. Dennis Dean, Owner, Dean's Point After, addressed the Commission and stated that the locations in Hamden that were submitted to the Commission were either cafes or restaurants. He said there are 64 sports bars in Connecticut that are classified as sports bars and not as nightclubs and they have the same entertainment every

weekend. Mr. Dean told the Commission his business could not survive as a nightclub because he only has an event every three weeks. He said people approach him to hold shows, he does not contact them. Mr. Dean reviewed the activities that occur at his establishment when there is not a specific event occurring.

Mr. Kops said that his memo dated June 16, 2011 outlines and provides the rationale for the N.O.V. and Cease & Desist order and why it is believed that Dean's Point After is a nightclub and why the appropriate actions have been taken.

Ms. Masi reviewed with the Commissions, Mr. Crosby and Mr. Dean a video that had been posted on "You Tube", December 11, 2010. Ms. Masi said that a CD is being submitted for the record as evidence which will show this video and others posted on "You Tube". She also submitted "Facebook" advertisements for events occurring every weekend at this location.

Mr. Kops said that it was stated that there are ten such events a year from Attorney Crosby and Mr. Dean indicated that there were more than ten. But if you go onto "Facebook" there are forty seven different events listed. Mr. Dean asked if this was when the business was opened seven days a week. Ms. Masi reviewed the Facebook page with Mr. Dean and Mr. Crosby. Mr. Dean said that where live entertainment was advertised he was required by the Town code 961 to take permits out and police are required. Ms. Masi showed a picture of an ad posted on Facebook. Mr. Dean said that only ten events required permits, several of the events never occurred. There was an event sponsored by WTXS that was for children.

Mr. Kops read his memo dated June 18, 2011.

Mr. Vita asked if nightclubs are permitted in the current zoning regulations. Mr. Kops replied that nightclubs are not permitted nor is there a definition of nightclubs in the zoning regulations. When the business had opened nightclubs were permitted in a CDD-1 zone, but the Special Permit that had been granted for this location would have needed to be amended to include a nightclub and there would have also been an issue with the amount of parking spaces. Mr. Vita said that Mr. Kops indicates in his memo in a foot note the definition of Commercial Recreation in the former zoning regulations and he asked for Clarification. Mr. Kops explained that Mr. Dean was told by the Planning staff that he would need a Special Permit to operate a nightclub which was allowed in the zoning regulations. Mr. Kops referred to a timeline that was submitted as part of the record which indicates the actions that had occurred prior to the Cease & Desist being issued and he continued to read his memo.

Mr. Dean stated that he has the original copy with Mr. Kops signature and a DJ on his original Liquor Permit. Mr. Kops said that when he signed the liquor permit the only entertainment listed was karaoke and they were going to operate as a café.

Mr. Crosby stated that the Cease and Desist order does not address parking and only addresses the issue of type of use. He said the only question before the Commission should be the allowed use and objects to other issues being addressed. Ms. Masi stated that the parking pertains to use. Mr. Crosby read a letter from Ms. Masi dated April 25, 2011 and he stated that the letter does not mention parking. Ms. Masi explained that the letter refers to a site plan, which includes approved parking. Mr. Crosby said that a site plan would show a DJ and a karaoke booth. Ms. Masi replied that a DJ and a karaoke booth would be on a floor plan. Mr. Crosby said that the issue is the use and not parking.

Ms. Masi reviewed the section of the letter referring to Section 718.6 of the zoning regulations and said there is a specific site plan with a noted limitation on occupancy and specific parking allotted to the occupant which is part of the Special Permit. Mr. Crosby said that for him to be adequately prepared for the N.O.V. he should have been apprised of the facts for which he is being challenged. The document he received specifically directs his attention to a nightclub and he has not properly prepared to address other issues. Mr. Vita said that the letter received dated June 16, 2011 from the owner of the property states his concerns regarding the allotted amount of parking for Dean's Point After and the allowed capacity.

Mr. Crosby says that N.O.V. says they are charged with a violation that illegal use is being conducted with regard to a night club. Mr. Vita said the issue is related to the use of the property and overcrowding and parking issues are part of the evidence. Mr. Crosby said there is now a claim being presented that they have too many people in the building.

Ms. Masi said that the violation being cited includes the Special Permit & Site Plan that only has an approval for 179 person occupancy.

Mr. Crosby stated that he is not prepared to address the parking or occupancy limits and feels it is unfair because he was not informed and this is first time he is hearing about it.

Mr. Vita stated that earlier in the meeting Mr. Crosby had mentioned that a document had the words DJ, karaoke. Mr. Dean said he was at a meeting in 2009 with the Planning Staff. In attendance was Ms. Creane, Mr. Natale, Mr. Pellegrino and Mr. Dean said he was at the meeting at the request of Mr. Pellegrino and Mr. Natale. Mr. Dean said he was not served the N.O.V., Mr. Natale had been served the N.O.V. Mr. Dean is sorry there was not a stenographer because Mr. Kops had signed the Liquor Permit and Mr. Dean had become upset and he walked out. Mr. Dean reviewed the series of events with regard to the liquor permit. Mr. Kops said that he signed the liquor permit and at the time a copy was placed in the file but it was not what Mr. Dean was presenting at this meeting. Mr. Crosby said that the copy he is presenting has the fire marshal signature and says DJ and karaoke. Mr. Kops said that when he signed the permit it only said karaoke and it was not signed by the Fire Marshall. He said that it was not approved by Planning & Zoning to allow a DJ. Mr. Crosby reviewed the document he has with the Commission and stated that his position is that it did have karaoke on it and he has the correct document and discussed it with the Commission. Ms. Dove stated that if the document had been signed by the Fire Marshal first and then brought to the Planning Office, they would have a copy with the Fire Marshal's signature. Ms. Dove asked Mr. Crosby if he would not have wanted to see what the Special Permit & Site Plan allowed when the Cease and Desist was received. Mr. Crosby stated that he maintains his position the Cease and Desist only addresses the use as a night club. Ms. Dove explained that if it had been approved as a night club that would have been allowed under the previous zoning regulations when the Special Permit & Site Plan were approved.

Mr. Crosby said that the letter received for the cease & desist order does not state they are charged with a parking violation but the order primarily focused on the usage and that is what he is prepared to discuss. He does not feel he received adequate notice for the other issues he is being cited for.

The Commission discussed with Mr. Dean what the permitted use, parking spaces and occupancy were when the Special Permit was issued and that he should have known this when purchasing a business. It was discussed that an application was before the ZBA that only had to do with the signs for the business. Mr. Dean said that Mr. Natale had stated to his client that the location had all the permits necessary and he would only need administrative approval.

Mr. Crosby said that when having events he goes to the proper departments and has received the proper permits and now they are being cited for violations related to the use. He feels it is not a nightclub and there is not a dance floor.

Mr. Vita asked for comments in favor of the application.

Ms. Berita Rowe-Lewis, 57 Warner Street, addressed the Commission and stated that she is in favor of the application to appeal. She said that she knows the difference between a nightclub and a sports bar. Ms. Rowe-Lewis said that a sports bar is where someone goes to watch a sporting event and perhaps it is a night club. She feels that the Commission should be invited to go to the site and make a decision based on what they see and not what they are told. If the applicant has fibbed then it is the responsibility of the Commission to deny the application. She said that the southern end of Hamden has a stake in the decision, because the community wants the same thing as everyone else in Hamden has. Ms. Lewis said that as a former Legislative Council member if there is a violation she would call Ms. Masi, Ms. Creane and the Mayor but at the same time would give the same

respect to the business in southern part of Hamden. This allows them to live and do as a community lives and not have to drive to get to things that they want and need. She asked the Commission to review all that was submitted and not hesitate or speculate, but to visit the site.

Mr. Vita asked for comments against the application and there were none.

Mr. Vita closed the Public Hearing.

B. Regular Meeting

11-6422

Mr. Nelson made the motion to approve Application 11-6422. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson stated that the applicant had worked with the Planning Office to give the least amount of square footage that would be needed for the sign. The applicant has in good faith promised to remove the banners from the fence. The Zoning Officer will contact the property owner if signs are placed on the fence and advise that they must be removed. Mr. Nelson said that the hardship is the property that belongs to the State and the slope behind the fence. The fence is required by the State and cannot be moved and the applicant wants to raise the sign for visibility and add the stores that have moved into the plaza to the sign. Mr. Chorney said that there is a safety factor for the sign to allow vehicle visibility and for accessibility to the site with the street address, which adds 38 square feet to the sign. Ms. Dove said the motion should be contingent on removing the signs placed on the face. She feels that this would make it easier for the property manager to have the tenants adhere because it is in the motion. Mr. Nelson does not agree that a condition of no signs on the fence because the zoning regulations say that the signs should not be on the fence. The Commission discussed the condition and Ms. Masi stated that having the condition would make it easier to enforce.

Mr. Nelson amended the motion to read: No more banners are to be place on the fences or the building. The amended motion passed unanimously.

11-6423

Mr. Nelson made the motion to approve Application 11-6423, Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson stated that the hardship is due to the size of the lots in the neighborhood, because they are narrow and deep. To add anything into the yards would encroach into the side yards. Mr. Chorney said that the motion should include the required 15 day appeal period. There is also a requirement in the zoning regulations that an applicant must post a sign that informs the public about the public hearing and this had not been done by the applicant. Mr. Chorney said that the condition should also include that the applicant will take responsibility if he does not wait for the appeal period to end. Ms. Masi reviewed the process for the placement of the legal ad in the newspaper. Mr. Kops explained that the applicant does not need to wait for the appeal period to end before constructing the pool. He did advise the applicant that if the pool is constructed before the appeal period is over and if there was an appeal that was upheld then the pool would need to be removed. Ms. O'Connell asked if the abutters that she had submitted were mailed out and Ms. Masi said yes. She reviewed the zoning regulation that requires the posting of the public hearing sign and she reviewed the appeal process.

Mr. Nelson's motion was amended to read: The zoning regulation requires a sign to be posted on the property for all public hearings. The applicant assumes all responsibility if they do not wait the 15 day appeal period. The amended motion passed unanimously

11-6424

Mr. Nelson made the motion to approve Application 11-6424. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson said that the addition is on the back of the house and not encroaching into the side yards. **The variance is restricted to the drawing and size of the addition on the drawings submitted. The motion passed unanimously.**

11-6425

Mr. Nelson asked if the Cease & Desist states that the applicant is not in compliance with the Special Permit. Ms. Masi said that it was stated in the Cease & Desist letter noted the Planning Staff had also met with Mr. Dean twice. He was told about the occupancy load and the site plan was reviewed at both these meetings. She said that there are standards that apply to each use and the approved site plan was part of the Special Permit and Mr. Dean had said that he dealt with the Administrative Permit which is a continuation of the Special Permit. Ms. Masi said that the question is if the site is operating as a night club.

Mr. Vita asked whether the Fire Marshal goes out if the capacity exceeds the load capacity. Mr. Kops said that the former Fire Marshal approved occupant of 1200 and then it was reduced by approximately half by the Deputy Fire Marshal after review. Ms. Masi explained that the site plan permitted for 179 people and 60 parking spaces which is in the violation the applicant is being cited for.

The Commission discussed further with Mr. Kops and Ms. Masi and Ms. Creane the Special Permit approval, parking and occupancy load. They discussed the use as it was originally approved under the prior zoning regulations and the uses that have been shown at this meeting.

Ms. Dove made the motion to deny the Appeal of the Cease & Desist. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The decision was based on the information contained in Mr. Kops memo which included the summary of history, justification of the Cease and Desist Order, the timeliness of the Cease and Desist order, Specifics of the approvals and the relevance of the Estoppel in light of other municipal agencies approvals, legality of the Cease & Desist order.

The Commission discussed with the Planning Office if the use is a night club and the justifications of the Cease & Desist Order based on previous approvals. **It was determined that the motion should include the dates of the approvals. Ms. Masi said that the original site plan was approved on November 23, 2004. The Zoning Permit was issued by Mr. Rich Stoecker on December 16, 2004. Ms. Masi said that the parking layout with the original permit was approved by Planning & Zoning and the only thing that was changed was the arch outside for one sign and was a minor amendment that was approved with plans z1 and z1a and the approved zoning permit was November 16, 2005. The motion passed unanimously as amended.**

C. Old Business/New Business

- 1) Review minutes of May 19, 2011

Mr. Chorney stated that on page 2, 1st sentence should read: "Mr. Lockwood said the Automobile Auction House is diagonally across the street." On page 2, 1st sentence should read: "Mr. Reynolds endorsed the listed conditions as amended as the seconder of the motion."

Ms. Dove stated that on page 2, 6th paragraph, 1st sentence should read: "Mr. Reynolds asked if the applicant needs ZBA approval prior to going for state approval."

Ms. Dove would like the condition of approval for regarding hours of operation for Application 11-6421 to include: "closed on Sundays". The Commission had a discussion and Mr. Vita stated that "owner indicated his business is not open on Sundays" should be added to the condition for hours of operation.

Mr. Nelson made the motion to amend the minutes of the May 19, 2011 as stated. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Adjournment

Mr. Nelson made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Reynolds seconded the approval. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Stacy Shellard, Clerk of the Commission