

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

APRIL 12, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Khan
Mr. Garrison
Mr. Bolton
Mr. Petrick
Mr. Dodson
Mrs. Evans
Mr. Craft

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF

Doug Plachcinski
Lisa Jones
Clarke Whitfield

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Garrison at 3:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Special Use Permit Application PLSUP 2021-072, filed by Danville Tree Care LLC on behalf of Philip and Charles Winstead requests a Special Use Permit for a yard requirement waiver in accordance with Article 3.O Section C.25. of the Danville Zoning Ordinance at 1340 Goodyear Boulevard (Parcel ID# 23011). The applicant requests a Special Use Permit for a yard requirement waiver to replace a non-conforming building that a fire completely destroyed in the in the LED-I Light Economic Development – Industrial Zoning District.*

Mr. Garrison opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Philip Winstead, stated I am representing my brother Charles. Although he says that the fire completely destroyed our building, it left the concrete slab intact that left us with sewer, water and electric stub ready to put a building on. That represents a great big savings in starting a building from out of the ground. We had no insurance to cover that building, which that is obviously on us. We want to try to recoup as much as we can come out of the ground. So, any approval or help in this would certainly be appreciated.

Mr. Dodson stated how long do you think it will take you to rebuild?

Mr. Winstead stated from the time that City Council approves it and we get the people lined up to put the building up, it is only a four day process with a metal building to go right back on the slab. It will be a lot prettier. It is going to be a two-tone building with a red top and I think it will be very attractive for that end of the town. I think that it will be okay.

Mr. Garrison closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bolton made a motion to recommend approval for Special Use Permit Application PLSUP 2021-072 as submitted. Mr. Craft seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

2. *Special Use Permit Application PLSUP 2021-110, filed by Garrett Shifflett on behalf of Richmond Cedarworks LLC requests a Special Use Permit for a maximum density waiver in accordance with Article 3.L Section C.13. Of*

Danville Zoning Ordinance, at 411 Craghead Street (Parcel ID# 21479, 21480, 21481, 21482, and 24373). The applicant requests a Special Use Permit for a maximum density waiver in the TW-C Tobacco Warehouse Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. Garrison opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ron Ford stated, I am the project manager for AS Spencer's and this will be our 8th project in the River District. If you have any questions I will try to answer to the best of my ability. We don't have any problems with what zoning is asking us to do.

Ms. Evans stated do you think that two charging stations are enough considering the future?

Mr. Ford stated I can't really answer that question. I know we did two per the City's request on the parking stalls at the knitting mill lofts. At the City Park across the street there were two.

Mr. Craft stated how many off street parking spots are you talking? Down Craghead Street there are a lot of restaurants and etcetera. You are talking about a 115 apartments plus the retail part and you only have how many onsite parking spots?

Mr. Ford stated 70 and we are referencing the parking garage and the parking behind 401 Bridge Street, that back area that used to be a junkyard area.

Mr. Craft stated so you will have assigned parking?

Mr. Ford stated not assigned. There is public parking back there in those areas.

Mr. Craft stated people are going to park as close as they can to their building. If you have a family that has 2 cars per a unit, then again you are roughly talking about 230 cars. It is going to be tough on existing businesses.

Mr. Ford stated we taken some consideration, I know the back parking lot on any given day, if you ride in the back parking lot on the rear of the walk trail, there's multiple empty stalls back there.

Mr. Craft stated those people are not going to walk that far, you know that and I know that. They are just like me and you, they're going to park as close as they can to that building.

Ms. Courtney Johnson stated I live in the Burton condo, which is adjacent to that building. I don't have any beef at all. I think it is awesome; the more the merrier and bring it on in the River District. I am a huge fan and I am on the board. I have the same explicit concerns that you mentioned about the parking and how it will impact that local area. I just don't see how you can accommodate. It sounds like 200 cars in that area and no one is going to park down on the river. They don't do it now for the buildings that are on the river side. That is just a concern, but overall I am all for it and it sounds good. I will mention that is going to cause accidents, people coming out onto Craghead from lots. It is already getting pretty crazy down there and as a consumer and as a dweller and someone who is a big fan of all that you have worked on those amazing units all throughout that area, I think, sorry too much information, I think that area could use luxe apartments, the fewer the better. We're packed downtown right now with \$1,000 small units, I mean make it amazing do larger units and more expensive units. That's my thought anyway. Thank you for consideration and as I

mentioned, I'm a fan. I'm all for it but I am concerned about the parking issue for 200 cars and I just don't see it.

Marie Tynan stated I also live in the Burton on Bridge Street and parking is an issue now. I think that the statement that Doug made which is parking is not required should be amended to parking is required of this project. I would also like to know if some of these units will be condominiums, or just apartments.

Mr. Garrison closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Garrison stated for those of you that are concerned about parking downtown we cannot change the parking requirement for the River District that has been established by City Council. So, if you have concerns about public parking when this comes up in May before City Council, you may appear before them and let them know of your concerns.

Mr. Bolton stated we knew going into this at some point parking was going to be an issue. Basically, what we are saying is that success is going to be an issue. This is just going to be where more people are going to invest and do this. What is the long-term staff's standpoint to solve it?

Mr. Plachcinski stated the City commissioned parking study we got a final draft in the past few months. That study made a series of short-term recommendations, but it also made some long-term recommendations. It talked about how to develop a parking management system throughout the River District. I think that parking management system is going to take on a different look and certainly a different feel for public parking in the River District, than what the city has contended with in the past. Whether it be an increase in enforcement or paid parking. There definitely is as you correctly stated a problem with success. When we had our downtown core between the tobacco warehouse and central business commercial districts, we didn't have parking requirements. We thought wouldn't it be great to have a parking problem, well now suddenly we do have a perception that parking is challenging and really the way to fix that is to have somebody with experience get the city up and running with parking management. We have worked with economic development on getting that document to have that kind of outside expertise and get the city set up to manage parking better. I think that one thing that we haven't talked about a whole lot let's assume for the sake of conversation is one parking space per unit of these 115 units, so we are still 55 parking spaces short. It costs a lot to build those parking spaces so for the 55 units that are going to be using public parking that is a great benefit and we are glad to be able to support the developer by providing that kind of benefit. We do that for multiple developers downtown but there is a public cost to offset their investment and additional parking. That parking management system should help us reconcile that and balance it out. I'm also a downtown resident and I do not park adjacent to my apartment because I park my vehicle in the vehicle charger that is next to the fire station. I walk a couple of blocks and I agree yes it is nice to park close sometimes like when I am unloading groceries but in general I think some people don't like walking on occasion either.

Mr. Bolton stated I think it is good that you are working on it. If you look at the larger cities that have done this people walk 3 or 4 blocks and it is just common. If you can walk to the units and they know they have to walk that far then that works.

Mr. Plachcinski stated one thing that I would like to find out that the 401 Bridge Street building which was immediately fully occupied. I would like to get an understanding of those

new residents what their needs of parking spaces are just to help with our discussions for the other developments like the one before you today.

Ms. Evans stated I have a comment. It doesn't affect this application, but we do need for future development larger apartments or condos downtown. We need more than two bedrooms and two baths. The senior people move out of their homes and they want to move downtown, and one bedroom and one bathroom is not going to do it with some of them that have a lot of stuff.

Mr. Plachcinski stated I think city wide we are facing a housing shortage of every different kind of unit. Whether it is something economical or supportive of those struggling through financial hardship or all the way up to executive level housing, we are at a shortage right now. I Agree we need these units and we need those units and more units, as many as we can because we have no inventory or places for people to go right now.

Mr. Bolton stated that is nationwide problem.

Mr. Plachcinski stated it is and it is very acute here because we are suddenly, where maybe Danville hasn't grown very quickly over the past generation, we are poised to grow very quickly right now.

Mr. Craft stated how long do you think it will take before you do your study as far as the parking?

Mr. Plachcinski stated we have a good understanding of what the parking available is and what the available parking will say for this part of the River District is there is plenty of parking. It may not be the most convenient parking per building but there are several hundred parking spaces that go unused of this sector of the River District. As far as bringing a parking expert into and kind of manage and get us set up with a system and to go through the decision making process on paid parking or how parking will be funded that is probably a longer discussion. I would say several months after we get the expertise on board.

Mr. Craft stated my only concern is the new people that have moved downtown before this explosion of need for housing. They have put their life savings into the businesses and people can't park there, that is my concern.

Mr. Plachcinski stated particularly for business street parking we have a parking enforcement officer now to patrol that area and they are very diligent about handing out tickets. The goal of that is not to restrict parking, but to encourage parking turnover, so you do your business at that business, and you get in your car, and move on. So, you don't consume a parking space for more time than you need to.

Ms. Evans stated I know that Averett has made a comment in the past that they have plenty of parking it's just no one wants to park at the end of the parking lot. I'm the person that parks at the end of the parking lot to walk.

Mr. Garrison reopened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Lori Fuquay stated I also live in the Burton. One of the parking problems in the River District is that when people are parking on the street, they do try to park so they can get out their door and close. They are parking on both sides of the street if you are ever coming out of Newton onto Craghead or Craghead coming onto Newton two cars cannot come onto the

street with two cars parked on either side. There is a lot of illegal parking and we have put signs that say don't park too close to the corners because when you are coming out onto Bridge Street from Newton you can't see around cars. We still have cars that come up and park and we have cars that park in loading zones for days. The traffic issue worries me because I'm surprised there hasn't been an accident, especially Newton, only because that is our parking lot. I know coming out we have big vehicles that park over the lines and you can't see out and like I said even today when I left coming out of Newton onto Craghead and there is a car on either side and there is someone pulling in there is nowhere to go. I actually did a study before on the traffic and the parking that was one thing that I did suggest, and I don't know where you are with that but on street parking is a mess.

Mr. Garrison stated again this is a comment that City Council should hear. When this comes up in May come talk to City Council and they may actually designate the City Manager to look into it. If there is illegal parking, there again that is something that they have control over and could tell the City Manager to do things that we can't do.

Mr. Petrick stated Lori you say that you live at Burton and a lot is provided for the residents at Burton.

Ms. Fuquay stated we have a lot that we actually purchased.

Mr. Petrick stated is it being used?

Ms. Fuquay stated I use the lot more now and I don't know how many people actually use it. Some people like to park on the street. I have been to cities where one block over was nothing for me to walk. I think we are very lucky to have that lot and even the one at Newton Landing and nobody wants to park back there. It's not that far but as you were saying when they are not using it and they want to get on the street then we have a problem because we can't have traffic going through. I know that we have two cars and we rent another spot so both cars are on my lot.

Mr. Petrick stated it is human nature that people want to park as close as they can. My daughter used to rent at the Burton and she never used it. She said why when I can park right in the front but of course that was 5 or 6 years ago.

Ms. Fuquay stated we have Averett beside of us so a lot of times we have owners that would like to leave the spaces on there for their visitors, but they also have a lot across the street from them.

Mr. Petrick stated the last time that I drove by there I looked just out of curiosity because this issue has come up just recently and I noticed that you only had a half dozen in cars and probably had what forty spaces at least.

Ms. Fuquay stated we have like 33. When we used to have events the nice thing when people wanted to park on the street, we always had somewhere to go to get off the street because when you came home there were no spaces on the side.

Mr. Garrison closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick made a motion to approve Special Use Permit Application PLSUP2021-110 with the conditions per staff. Ms. Evans seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

3. *Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance" of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia, 1986 as amended. Specifically add a new article 3.V Casino Entertainment (C-E) District establishing zoning district purpose, permitted uses, uses permitted by special use permit, lot size requirements, bulk regulations, parking, exterior lighting, signs, noise, landscape and open space, and additional requirements.*

Mr. Doug Plachcinski, Director of Planning Division read the following:

DRAFT 04-12-2021

ARTICLE 3.V C-E CASINO ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT

A. Purpose.

1. The Casino Entertainment (C-E) Zoning District establishes standards and conditions for the development and operation of an entertainment and/or casino gaming establishment including accessory uses while promoting the public health, safety, and general welfare insuring development is compatible with existing and anticipated land uses.
2. Because of the special characteristics of a C-E district, in particular casino gaming establishments, development in this district requires flexibility in signage, exterior lighting, and other standards not typically permitted elsewhere in the City.

B. Permitted Uses.

Entertainment establishment and/or casino gaming establishment including accessory uses, buildings, and structures customarily subordinate, incidental, and on the premises of such entertainment and/or casino gaming establishment, such as but not limited to, a hotel and conference center.

C. Uses Permitted by Special Use Permit

1. Waiver of yard requirements.
2. Waiver of district size.
3. Waiver for increase of maximum building height above 250' feet.

D. Lot Size Requirements.

1. The minimum C-E district size is 75 acres.
2. The minimum lot area in a C-E district is 25 acres.

E. Bulk Regulations

1. Maximum building height: 250' feet.
2. Buildings 200' feet or taller must be set back from any non-building structures that are 200' feet or taller by at least 100' feet. Buildings under 200' feet tall must be set back from any non-building structures that are 200' feet or taller by at least 50' feet.
3. Minimum yard requirements:
 - a. Front yard: 60' feet.
 - b. Side yard: 40' feet.
 - c. Rear yard: 40' feet.

F. Parking:

1. Notwithstanding applicable provisions of Article 8, Parking and Loading Requirements, there are no minimum off-street parking space requirements for developments in the C-E zoning district.
2. Off-street parking areas and drives may encroach in to the front yard setback but must not extend into the required ten (10') foot landscape strip.
3. Electric Vehicle Parking

- a. At least ten (10) of the provided parking spaces must have electric vehicle charging stations.
- b. At least 20 of the provided parking spaces must be constructed to accommodate future electric vehicle charging stations.

G. Exterior Lighting

1. Development in the C-E district, in particular casino gaming establishments, has unique needs for exterior lighting that require flexibility and would not typically be permitted in other areas of the City.
2. Exterior lighting must comply with local, state, and federal regulations and must not interfere with any public roadways.
3. Exterior lighting must comply with *Code of Virginia Ch. 12, Title 33.2*.
4. All development in a C-E district must comply with *Chapter 41, Article 11* with the following exceptions:
 - a. Maximum illumination levels are measured at the exterior boundaries of the district and not at any property boundaries within the district.
 - b. Upwardly directed lighting may be used to illuminate buildings, structures, and landscaping in the district.
 - c. Awnings or canopies used for building accents over doors, windows, etc., may be internally illuminated (i.e. from underneath or behind the awning).
 - d. Searchlights operated within the C-E district must comply with the following regulations:
 - i. Searchlights must not be operated so as to constitute a traffic hazard or a nuisance.
 - ii. Searchlights must be so operated so as to avoid directing the beam at any building.
 - iii. Searchlight beams must not be displayed at an angle greater than forty-five (45) degrees from the perpendicular.
 - iv. Searchlights must not operate between 12 am midnight and 5 pm.

H. Signs

1. Each C-E district permits up to four (4) freestanding signs with a maximum sign area of 400 square feet each. An additional area not exceeding 200 square feet may be devoted to architectural elements that serve as support or base for such sign and are not part of the message portion of the sign. The maximum freestanding sign height is 40' feet.
2. Each C-E District may also permit up to four (4) off-site freestanding signs. Off-site freestanding signs are limited in area to seventy-five (75) square feet. An additional area not exceeding one hundred (100) square feet may be devoted to architectural elements that serve as support or base for such sign and are not part of the message portion of the sign. The maximum off-site freestanding sign height is 30' feet
3. The combined area of wall, projecting, awning, canopy or marquee signs must not exceed fifty (50%) percent of any building façade area. The Zoning Administrator must approve that the signage is of an appropriate scale, incorporated into the building's architectural features, and made of durable materials.
4. Entryway features that may include one monument/wayfinding sign up to 50 square feet are permitted at each driveway. An additional area not exceeding 25 square feet may be devoted to architectural elements that serve as support or base for such sign and are not part of the message portion of the sign. The maximum entryway sign height is eight (8') feet.
5. Electronic message boards may be permitted as a part of on-site freestanding and entryway monument signs.

I. Noise

1. The exterior noise limits for any source of noise in any C-E zone cannot exceed between 70 dBA between 9 am and 12 am midnight, when measured at the property line of a residential zone.

2. The exterior noise limits for any source of noise in any C-E zone must be reduced between 12:00 am midnight and 9 am so that when measured at the property line of a residential zone the noise does not exceed 50 dBA.

J. Landscape and Open Space Regulations

1. A minimum ten (10') foot landscaped buffer must be provided along any property line abutting a street right-of-way. Driveways, utility easements and sidewalks are allowed to encroach into the landscaped buffer.
2. A minimum 25' landscaped buffer must be provided along any property line abutting a residential zoning district.
3. Ten percent (10%) of each development must be open space. Open space does not include building footprints, parking and drive aisles, and any other areas not accessible to the public.
4. If a C-E district is within 300' of a City designated non-motorized trail, then the development must provide a ten (10') foot wide shared-use paved path from the development's buildings to the property line closest to the non-motorized trail.

K. Additional Requirements:

1. All building exteriors must be clad in durable materials. Vinyl siding/cladding is prohibited exterior building material.
2. All dumpsters that are visible from a public road must be fully screened. The screening structure must consist of a masonry unit design enclosure and/or materials to match the adjacent building and a metal gate(s) that screens the view of the dumpster.
3. No driveway may be located within 200' of another driveway.
4. On a corner lot, no curb cut may be closer than 300' feet of the right-of-way extended from the nearest intersecting street.

Mr. Garrison commented before I open the public hearing I want everyone to understand that all we are looking at today is changing the code to allow a (C-E) District it has nothing to do with the specific site. We will not have any comments or questions about the specific site until the rezoning requests has been submitted. We are only talking about the zoning change.

Mr. Garrison opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Garrison closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Evans stated what is the definition of a non-building structure?

Mr. Plachcinski stated any structure that is not a building.

Ms. Evans stated can you give an example?

Mr. Plachcinski stated in this particular case it's the smokestacks. All buildings are structures, but not all structures are buildings. The building must have supportive walls and a sort of covering. In this case the smokestacks are not a building because they are not covered. The goal of this is to specifically keep buildings from crowding smokestacks on site.

Ms. Evans stated and will the general public who are not attending this location be able to see the smokestacks. I think that is the public's concern they want the smokestacks to stay and I don't have a reference for 200 or 250 feet.

Mr. Plachcinski stated I believe the smokestacks are 206 to 208 feet tall.

Mr. Garrison stated what I had heard was 205. I don't know I haven't measured them but I heard 205 feet.

Mr. Plachcinski stated so if we can go take a field trip we can measure. It should be that all buildings basically will be set back 50 feet at least but if they are taller than 200 feet let's say that the hotel tower does exceed 200 feet tall then it would be an additional 50 feet on top of that to provide some space to respect the smoke stacks.

Ms. Evans stated but there is a chance that the general public will not be able to see the smokestacks.

Mr. Plachcinski stated the buildings will not be surrounding the smokestacks. They will be respected and buffered. The space is kind of like an architectural hyphen as you are viewing in the total site.

Mr. Whitfield stated Mr. Chairman I think we have got site specific because we've been talking about a number of places that could be zoned C-E.

Mr. Garrison stated we are on site specific, but she asked a question what is the difference between structures and buildings? In answering that the only answer was on that particular site it would be the smokestacks. That is something that we will address when Caesars brings us a request to rezone the property. They will have to bring with them drawings I'm assuming of the site and what it would look like.

Mr. Plachcinski stated that is correct.

Mr. Bolton stated are there any localities that you are able to discuss with that already had this and kind of fell in line with this or did you come up with this on your own?

Mr. Plachcinski stated I did research and tried to find some other example locations. You know a lot of them use unnecessary complicated plan unit development style processes. My goal with this was to make this fit into our existing process in the Danville Zoning Ordinance. Things like the noise ordinance standards, the search light standards those are all pirated from other zoning codes.

Mr. Bolton stated I don't really understand seventy decibels but if that is normal then I am okay if that is the general rule.

Mr. Plachcinski stated yeah that is the noise level that we worked out with Caesars and they said it would be appropriate.

Ms. Evans stated is it normal not to have minimum off-street parking requirement?

Mr. Plachcinski stated not necessary but given the attention and the detail that Caesars has given, and again this is site specific it could be any developer, we felt that this similarly to the Tobacco Warehouse District and the Central Business District would not be in a situation where they create a parking shortage within their zoning district.

Ms. Evans stated we just talked about a zoning shortage earlier.

Mr. Petrick stated I'm sure that the utmost concern is to have as much available convenient parking as possible.

Mr. Plachcinski stated because where this particular developer is with their site design we weren't sure what that parking was going to look like. They may be able to explain how they develop their parking program because I'm sure there will be thousands of spaces involved. I have heard surface lots and maybe a parking structure.

Mr. Craft stated parking structures I'm sure to accommodate the people.

Mr. Kahn stated they'll have to be.

Mr. Garrison stated and we will get that information when they request to rezone the site.

Mr. Bolton made a motion for recommendation of approval for the tax amendment. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

4. *Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance" of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia, 1986 as amended. Specifically amend Article 2.P. Accessory Uses and Structures to allow side yard mechanical units in residential zoning districts with appropriate screening and separation distance from neighboring dwelling windows and doors.*

Mr. Plachcinski stated that existing language within the zoning requires mechanical units like generators, HVAC condensers, and that sort of thing to be in the yard behind a principal dwelling unit. If you drive around town you will notice that this rule is not usually followed in a lot of cases. As we have kind of hit the spring rush to install replacement HVAC units and a lot of generators because we do have places in town that lose power more frequently than others. The plain language of the ordinance restricts such mechanical units on those accessory structures to the rear of the building and in a lot of places it's not practical for whatever reason to have those units in the back of the building. As an interim measure if there are existing mechanical units, we've allowed additional mechanical units to not go any closer to the neighbor's property line and that sort of situation. Trying to work with contractors to screen them as they come up and to just have a straightforward rule that everybody can follow. We're proposing to add new subsection under P under Article 2, that reads in all residential zoning districts mechanical appliances may be inside a yard if they are: (a) screened from view from the public right-of-way; (b) at least ten (10') feet from all neighboring dwellings' windows and doors, and (c) no closer than five (5') feet to any property line. Those are all straight forward, easy to meet and opportunities to remove any sort of judgement call or bias but to allow people the flexibility to put these units where they need to go on their property.

Mr. Craft stated are there any noise restrictions?

Mr. Plachcinski stated no but all the new manufactures residential units are going to be low. The distance between adjacent neighbors and doors are intended to help resolve any noise issues.

Mr. Garrison opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Garrison closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated what was this in response to just a clarification of an existing?

Mr. Plachcinski stated right, so the existing code says that all of these units should be in the rear of the home.

Mr. Petrick stated so this clears up that question that I had earlier.

Mr. Plachcinski stated exactly.

Mr. Craft made a made a motion for recommendation of approval to Amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance". Mr. Petrick seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- 1. Rezoning Application PLRZ 2021-50, filed by Jimmie L New, requests to conditionally rezone 109 Barter Street, Parcel ID #52948, from HR-C Highway Retail Commercial to M-I Industrial Manufacturing. The proposed rezoning allows the current building tenant to perform on-site heavy vehicle repair. Mr. Garrison opened the Public Hearing.*

Mr. Garrison opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Jimmie New, Owner of PTL Contractors and 109 Barter Street. Mr. New stated I appreciate you revisiting this hearing on this case in order for me to continue my business there. I'm just here to answer any questions that you may have from the last meeting.

Mr. Garrison closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bolton made a motion to approve Rezoning Application PLRZ2021-50 with the conditions per staff. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-1 vote.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 8, 2021.

The March 8, 2021 minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

APPROVED