

**Montpelier Development Review Board**  
**May 7, 2007**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Jack Lindley, Acting Chair; Guy Teschmacher; Jeremy Hoff, Roger Cranse, Alan Blakeman, and Ylian Snyder.  
Staff: Kathleen Swigon.

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Lindley, acting Chair.

**Minutes:**

Mr. Blakeman moved approval of the April 16, 2007 minutes of the Development Review Board. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The minutes of the April 16, 2007 DRB meeting were adopted unanimously.

**I.     Design Review – CB-1/DCD**  
2 Cliff Street  
Applicant: David Diamantis  
Dormer addition and building renovations  
**To be continued to May 21, 2007.**

**II.    Design Review – HDR/DCD**  
2 Liberty Street  
Applicant: Daniel Richardson  
Landscaping and building renovations

Mr. Lindley asked Mr. Richardson if he had any questions regarding the staff findings and recommendations of the Design Review Committee. Mr. Richardson said he was in agreement with them.

Mr. Cranse moved approval of the design review application at 2 Liberty Street with the Design Review Committee's recommendations and options. Mr. Hoff seconded the motion. The application for 2 Liberty Street was approved unanimously 6-0.

**III.   Sketch Plan Review of planned development – MDR/LDR**  
303 Berlin Street  
Applicant: William Doelger  
Construction of a three unit dwelling

Mr. Lindley explained that a sketch plan review is an informal process which the applicant will present his ideas and comments to the Board.

Mr. Doelger said they had thought about subdividing the lot and sell it at some point in the future. While they are still owners of the property they would like to build what they would like to look at coming up and down the driveway. He said he is retired and has a concern about income. They thought if they built a three unit dwelling it would be economically feasible. It would be set back on the lot so it would take full advantage of the view to the southeast. He wants to have radiant floors on both the upper and lower floor. This is a very efficient way of heating.

There is a correction to the plan. The entire driveway is paved.

Mr. Lindley asked if Mr. Doelger had received the staff recommendations, and he replied he had.

Mr. Teschmacher says there are two dwellings existing on the lot. Mr. Doelger said their main house isn't shown on the lot. There is a shed which they converted into a rental cottage. Because they added a dwelling on the property they had to change their driveway into a private way. It is now known as "Stretch's Way." Their address for the house is 115 Stretch's Way. They didn't change the footprint.

Mr. Cranse said he had a question about the streets. He clarified the driveway is all paved and appears to be 10 to 12 feet wide. It says in the staff report pursuant to 702.B, access for more than three dwelling units, whether on or the same or separate parcels, shall be reviewed as a public street unless the DRB determines it is private. The DRB can determine the street is private only if there is a suitable homeowners' association or similar entity to take care of the street.

Mr. Doelger said presently they plow the street themselves because it is their driveway.

Mr. Cranse said the ordinance says they must meet the standards of a public street, even if it remains private. He asked if he would be coming back in his subsequent application with specifications for that. Mr. Doelger said he wasn't sure who he would be talking with to accomplish that.

Ms. Swigon said there is a provision that follows which says the board, after considering input from Public Works and Fire Department, can waive normal street standards for width. The comments listed reflect the current comments they have from the Department of Public Works and the Fire Department, and they are recommending the 20 foot width. They need turnaround areas and to be able to get their equipment up the driveway.

Ms. Normandeau said with regard to smoke they have had several burning permits and they have sent big trucks to give them the permit. There is a huge turnaround at the top, and they have more than an acre to turn around in.

Mr. Lindley suggested when they come with their final plan they will work with the Department of Public Works to get their input so they will be here for testimony addressing this specific issue.

Mr. Doelger said there were several challenges he has. One is the engineering situation having to do with water and he has consulted with DPW about that.

Mr. Hoff said it doesn't look like there is a provision to waive the maintenance requirement. Perhaps that could be accomplished through the rental for the three units, or whether that could be built into the lease as to who will maintain the road from Berlin Street up. Ms. Normandeau said they are the owners and will maintain it. Mr. Hoff said the requirement kicks in after a certain amount of dwelling units.

Mr. Cranse said when they come back with the subsequent application the section on pedestrian access and circulation that should be addressed as well. They need to detail how they will make pedestrian access safe. Mr. Doelger replied on the front of the property facing Berlin Street there is a flat walking space which is grass. There are no sidewalks on that end of Berlin Street, but it would be very easy to put in a sidewalk if that were the issue. He said they would have to read the zoning regulations for a full explanation of what is needed. That needs to be addressed in a subsequent application.

Mr. Blakeman asked Mr. Doelger if he would be connected to the city sewer and water, and he replied yes.

Mr. Lindley said they could address this under final review and preliminary site plan review at the same time. Mr. Hoff said that some of the access might be altered, and as long as it is not significantly different there shouldn't be a problem.

Ms. Swigon said this application is coming to the Development Review Board as a planned development. There are five units and the subdivision that is anticipated in the future might be subdivide off the three unit building. There is a little strip of medium density zoning that runs out and is not highly useable if the subdivision line were to follow the zoning line. Mr. Doelger was contemplating the potential of creating a future subdivision line. That

would create a lot that is slightly smaller than the minimum for the MDR zone. There is a provision in the ordinance under planned development that provides that the board may consider lots which vary from the minimum lot area if it seems to make sense. Mr. Doelger is interested in feedback from the DRB on this issue.

Mr. Lindley said it is hard to anticipate what future boards might do with that. We don't know what the zoning will be in five years.

**III. Site Plan Review – GB**

51 Berlin Street

Applicant: Damartin Quadros

Creation of a drive-through lane, removal of parking spaces and associated changes

Interested parties: Jon Anderson

Mr. Lindley administered the oath to interested parties who testified before the board.

Mr. Hoff disclosed he had interned for the law firm representing the abutter in the past. In accordance with ethical rules the board is governed by, he feels he can objectively serve in his capacity on the board in hearing the case.

Ms. Swigon said this has been on the board's agenda for some time. There was an initial submission of a site plan and a great deal of the comments related to the prior site plan. There is a subsequent site plan included, and that is what the applicant is going forward with. There are also comments from the Technical Review Committee.

The application is for site plan approval of the drive-through lane at the existing Dunkin Donuts at 51 Berlin Street. That will involve modifying the circulation pattern, widening the curb cut at the site exit and entrance, adding a speaker and drive-through window and signs, and eliminating seven parking spaces to accommodate the drive-through lane. There was a threshold question that was raised by a neighbor regarding the fact that the original Dunkin Donuts on the site had prior approval from the Planning Commission. A zoning permit was issued. Cumberland Farms, the adjoining property owner, filed an appeal with the Environmental Court. There was a stipulation and order for issuance of site plan approval and dismissal of the appeal that was issued March 13, 2003. Question was raised regarding whether the filing of a subsequent application for a drive-through window ran afoul of the statutory provision that successive applications cannot be submitted on appeal to appeal a board action.

At the point that comment was issued there was a different site plan. It did look very similar to the site plan that the Planning Commission acted upon. The current site plan is considerably different and the board may want to take up that question before it goes on to the actual substantive review of the project.

Mr. Lindley said how the other board members feel about this is critical. Mr. Anderson's memorandum of December 27, 2006 is what is at stake. Mr. Lindley asked Mr. Anderson if the new configuration made his letter dated and not relevant.

Mr. Anderson from his perspective, Cumberland Farm and Dunkin Donuts had been, and may still be, discussing this proposal. Their primary concern is simply the parking. They think there is a certain amount of parking required on the site.

Mr. Hoff said when this originally came up it was referred to the City Attorney. Ms. Swigon said she requested some information from the City Attorney and received an e-mail response:

*I don't believe there is a legal impediment to the board hearing the application, but there may be a preliminary issue that the board should address regarding whether there has been a substantial change in the circumstances such that the board can approve the application. It is the applicant's burden to demonstrate that there has*

*been a substantial change and that this is not a successive application.*

Mr. Lindley asked if the applicant thought there had been a change in the application.

Mr. Halpert said they absolutely do. This matter has been on and off the agenda since last August, and they submitted that even last August there were some substantial changes. Even if one disagreed with that characterization, take a look at what is presented this evening they will see there are a number of changes. They understand the legal issue, but the legal issue needs to be looked at from a common sense standpoint, which if you look at the application too narrowly you would never have a situation where an existing permitted business could come in with an application amendment. There are amendments to site plans all of the time, and they are perfectly legal. In this particular case they have changed the area of the ingress and egress. They have changed the configuration of the parking lot, added a drive-through window, and changed pedestrian access. Those are substantial changes on all of the major issues that the DRB has to look at in this application.

Mr. Anderson said the one thing that has not changed is the size of the building, and the size of the building previously led to a requirement of a certain number of parking spaces. As he understands it, the applicant now comes forward and wants to reduce the number of parking spaces. They are proposing to reduce it below the number they previously agreed to first of all, but, second of all, below what we understand to be the number that is required by the city zoning ordinance which was previously interpreted in the previous case leading to the settlement. On the relevant issue of the required parking, they think there has been no change in circumstances and that they do not meet the parking requirement.

Mr. Halpert said he would respond to that by saying any suggestion they are bound at this moment by something that was the result of a stipulated agreement to basically get rid of an appeal to allow them to develop this property, there was a dispute at the first site plan application in which the zoning administrator at the time looked at this issue at least four or five times and came up with his determinations as to what was required for parking. Cumberland Farms disagreed with that. That's their right. We now have a situation where Cumberland Farms is coming forward having sent a letter saying they were not so concerned they were even showing up tonight, what they agreed to in order to get rid of a court case without any ruling or decision from a court, but simply by agreement to buy peace with Cumberland Farms they agreed to put in however many spaces were there.

Mr. Halpert said if they look at their staff report the amount of parking that is required for this application is four. Four parking spaces are required. This issue has again been looked at, and it has been determined we need four spaces. Dunkin Donuts is coming before the board tonight with 10.

Any argument that this doesn't comply with the earlier court case, once you find that this is a substantial change to the earlier application, the earlier findings and earlier agreements are out the window with regard to that. The Board's job is simply to determine whether this proposal before you tonight complies with the requirements of the zoning ordinance. We don't look at what happened before unless they find there hasn't been a substantial change, in which case the applicant can't even appear before the board tonight. You can't have it both ways. He said he wasn't suggesting the Board is trying to do this. He suggests that Cumberland Farms is trying to do that.

Mr. Anderson said the zoning administrator who looked at the parking issue previously said that a certain number of parking spaces were required. Cumberland Farms disagreed with him on the reading of the ordinance and took an appeal, and on appeal the zoning administrator agreed with Cumberland Farms that 15 parking spaces were required under the interpretation of the ordinance. The ordinance has not changed since then. Secondly, Dunkin Donuts reduced in the previous case the seating they required such that you could make an argument that under the zoning ordinance as then written, and as it is written today, that they only needed 14 spaces. One key issue is you have previous litigated cases that resulted in a determination of a parking requirement. Secondly, there is an ordinance that has not changed, and if the previous interpretation of the ordinance is accurate then this applicant's application does not have the required amount of parking. Under either interpretation, whether we are looking back at what happened previously and bound by because there has been no relevant change, or under the interpretation of the zoning ordinance, the applicant does not have adequate parking.

Mr. Lindley said they know what they have to do as a board and will sort through that issue. The board will sort through all of the legalese they heard and make a judgment accordingly. In fairness to the applicant, the board will move on with taking testimony on the proposal they have.

Abby Lisius, a consulting engineer with Trudell Associates, walked the Development Board through the highlights of the plan. Ms. Lisius said the existing site now has two separate ingress and egress points, and they eliminated the western most ingress and moved it over towards where the existing egress is. The drive-through lane is 20 feet wide in front of the building and 18 feet wide on the side of the building, which will be a bypass lane in addition to the drive-through lane. The pedestrian access has improved in that most of the patrons will be coming from the west, and now they don't have to cross the ingress before they get to the site. They do cross the drive-through lane, where there is a lot less traffic.

There are 10 parking spaces on the site. They did move the dumpster to make better circulation in the back. At the request of the city, they have added directional arrows on the site to help with any confusion for site circulation. The egress has a left turn lane and a right turn lane. They have done some landscaping improvements to comply with the zoning requirements of the minimum construction costs. There is a larger green space along Berlin Street, which is pleasing to the eye. There is a more direct route to the parking area so if somebody entering the site didn't want to go around the back of the building they could directly to park.

Right now as the site exists the delivery truck in the morning has to back into the site off of Berlin Street, and with this configuration the truck can pull straight in and do any maneuvering on the street without getting in the way of Berlin Street traffic flow.

Overall, the circulation has improved for both cars and people. There is less confusion at the entrance.

Mr. Halpert asked Ms. Lisius on the details of the amount of traffic if she looked at the issue of traffic that is currently accessing Dunkin Donuts now versus what traffic will be like once the drive-through is in place. Ms. Lisius said there is a small increase. The percent increase on Berlin Street in overall traffic looks like 3 percent with the drive-through in the morning and a 1 ½ percent increase in traffic overall during the evening peak hour. There are 37 additional a.m. trips and 27 additional p.m. peak hour trips with the addition of the drive-through.

Mr. Cranse said there is the traffic impact report prepared by Trudell Associates, and then there is another traffic study. Did both of these speak to the current plan?

Ms. Lisius said the August 2006 traffic report was prepared for the previous application. None of the calculations would have changed using the configuration they are proposing. The level of service and calculations are the same.

Mr. Cranse said the other traffic report prepared for Mr. Anderson seems to be in conflict with the report from Trudell Associates.

Ms. Lisius said the calculations don't conflict with each other. In the morning peak hour the line of traffic has the potential to extend beyond what is existing. It is just based on the numbers. They think that based on this design the option is there to go directly to the parking area and bypass the store.

Mr. Halpert said there was something in the RSG study that suggested if we are off by 10 seconds there could be a 50 car. Those numbers are absolutely correct. What they disagree with is that the RSG study was done at a time before they made significant changes to the site plan. For example, as Abby mentioned, if the numbers are skewed above average in terms of waiting in the line they have provided for an escape route. There is an additional lane. If people get impatient, they will pull around and come back later. There is another option for them. If they see that the line entering into the property is approaching that maximum of 10 cars, there is still sufficient space for that entering driver. If they are totally wedded to a drive-through experience, they could be disappointed. He said he believed Damartin Quadros could tell the board from his personal experience on the site

that if you compare the amount of increase in customers he might expect from a drive-through it isn't that great an increase.

Mr. Lindley asked how long Dunkin Donuts had been in business. Mr. Quadros replied three years.

Mr. Lindley asked if there had been any serious accidents at that site. Mr. Quadros said not that he knew of.

Mr. McArdle from the Department of Public Works appeared before the board. Tom McArdle said one thing they need to clarify what site plan the board is reviewing. There is no revision date on the plan. It is dated January 2006. Ms. Lisius said it was printed on April 2, 2007. He said he had provided some comments to Kathy dated April 11<sup>th</sup>, which are attached to the board's packet information. What he concluded in reviewing the proposal that while there are still some questions he would applaud Trudell for coming up with a plan for meeting minimum requirements for a drive-through. However, it is still a very small site and they are trying to put a lot on it. It is somewhat self-regulating as Rob Halpert explained because how long line is you willing to wait in for a cup of coffee and a donut. There are certain safety issues which could be very detrimental to Berlin Street, which is a very high volume traffic being Route 2. The Department of Public Works would strongly recommend that the Board consider a return to this site plan, should they approve it, in one year from the date of the opening of the drive-through window to follow up the traffic plan to see if any of those conditions exist. The line length storage area on this site depends on where you measure it. He's not sure if it is from the order window or from the actual pick-up window. From the order window it is about 6 or 7 spaces before that line obstructs the entry. The entry obstruction is the beginning of a problem where a vehicle is already committed to make the turn. Possibly, there may be a small gap turning off Berlin Street where a car approaching decides to make the turn and suddenly the entrance is obstructed, that could be detrimental from a public safety perspective. The plan provides for the minimum.

If things proceed as they are proposing, six spaces should be adequate. He has looked at the Dunkin Donuts on the Barre-Montpelier Road, and he hasn't seen more than four or five vehicles in the line. The information provided by Mr. Quadros as provided to Trudell Associates is reasonably accurate.

Mr. McArdle said there is some merit in the RSG report. He thinks the engineering on both sides is correct, that it meets the requirements and has the bypass and stacking for the expected amount of vehicles projected to visit the site.

Some of the other issues are more technical details, such as the line marking, the crosswalk, and striping. He wants to talk a little more with the engineer about the entry radius. Maybe we can improve that on the sidewalk side. They would like to see the vehicle not have to come to 5 miles per hour to make the turn into Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. McArdle said regarding the accident history, he had a memory in response to that. There were two accidents within a tenth of a mile of the site. Two accidents within three years is not a big rate in terms of total volume of vehicle miles driven, and he couldn't directly connect them to Dunkin Donuts.

Ms. Snyder inquired about deliveries. Where is the drop-off and delivery parking intended to be located?

Mr. Quadros said they have two deliveries a week. They open for business at 6:00 a.m., and the deliveries happen normally at 5:00 a.m. when there is little or no traffic on Berlin Street. Mr. Halpert said they are currently restricted from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. They would be happy with a restriction that says deliveries between 5:00 and 6:00 a.m. because that is when 99 percent of the deliveries occur.

Mr. Halpert said as far as all of the additional questions which were raised by Tom McArdle and the staff report they have adequately responded to. There was a question as to whether their material is going to meet VTrans standards. They are planning on that, so they would accept a condition with respect to that. When Dunkin Donuts was here for the first round of permitting without the drive-through the same deficiencies were noted. They agreed with most of the deficiencies that are site specific and road specific.

Mr. Halpert said the issue with respect to the additional traffic that the drive-through will create they have modified the site to handle that. He said Mr. Anderson will say there is not enough parking. City staff says they need four spaces, and they have six extra to handle any potential overload if anyone has miscalculated the line by any degree. He asked the Board to understand they have existing customers accessing the store at the present time. He doesn't expect that the addition of a drive-through window is going to create so much extra customer demand for Dunkin Donuts. It will increase the amount of traffic to the extent discussed in the traffic study. If they are making do with the amount of parking they have now that a lot of folks who used to come in and park that a vast majority of them are not going to utilize those parking spaces but the drive-through window. They now have three escape routes. The three escape routes are around the drive-through, straight into the parking lot or not accessing the site. It is true that these decisions will have to be made by the traveler passing on Berlin Street.

Ms. Swigon said the staff report recommended the Board might want to hear about is the noise levels. There will be an outside speaker. On a nearby property the noise levels from the speaker did come up as an issue after construction. There wasn't any noise information included in the application materials.

Mr. Halpert said the speaker unit has a control and they can set that to whatever the city's requirements are. If they are complying with city requirements and the neighbors are upset, they can turn it a little lower. There is a way to set the speaker to comply with the performance specifications in the ordinance.

Ms. Swigon said there is a provision in the ordinance for requesting technical assistance on any of the issues relating to the site plan.

Ms. Snyder said in looking at the information that Mr. Anderson presented to the Board in some of the summaries they have the eating and drinking establishment as one per every seat, which comes up to 10 seats – 4 parking spaces, but there is also a break down for other commercial uses. In the staff report nothing is listed for other commercial uses. Is that something that is not applicable at this building?

Ms. Swigon said the staff report didn't address the aspect of the take-out part of this business.

Ms. Snyder inquired if there was also office space in this establishment. Ms. Swigon said not to her knowledge.

Ms. Swigon said there is a question about the take-out part of it and whether additional parking should be provided for the take-out component of this business. There isn't a parking standard for take-out. There is a provision in the parking standards that say for any use that isn't listed in the parking standards it is one space per 250 square feet of floor area could be assessed. There is also a provision that the Board can increase or decrease the number of parking spaces required as appropriate based on the specifics of the use. She said her report only did address the parking required for the seated aspect of the business.

Mr. Lindley said there are only 10 seats for people. Mr. Quadros said that was correct.

Mr. Anderson said he understood they had been proceeding along towards a resolution, and when they received the final plans they believed there is inadequate parking on the site. Cumberland Farms has always been concerned about parking at this site, and it is an issue they have considered and studied very carefully. In the case on the appeal they had previously there were worksheets as to how the city calculated the parking requirement. He has included that calculation on page 4 of the memo they prepared three years ago when this case was in litigation and when the applicant made the decision to build the building they have there now. They submitted this to the Environmental Court and a copy of it came to the city because it was a party to the case.

Of course, there hasn't been traffic problems by the site because the applicant originally proposed a drive-in lane, and because there was such a concern for safety the applicant was not allowed to build a drive-in lane. The Board at that time cut the applicant back to a level which has resulted in a relatively safe operation at the site. Cumberland Farms said unless they make the changes by cutting them back there will be a problem.

In the case they worked on before the applicant built exactly the building they promised to build and they did a calculation on page 4 of the memo indicating the required parking according to the city's ordinance at that time, which has not changed. First of all, there is an eating and drinking establishment. They have 10 indoor seats and they are required to have a parking space for each of three seats. That gives you a parking requirement for that usage of 3.3. However, because you are preparing the donuts for both takeout and drive-through, there is another commercial use which is different from an eating and drinking establishment. The other commercial use is in the category of other commercial use. There are a number of categories that are listed. In that case, they are required to have two spaces, plus 250 per square feet of net floor area.

In the previous case Cumberland Farms hired an engineer from DuBois and King to review the plans that were used to build the site, and the engineer calculated the net floor area of the building. You need to start with a net floor area, and then you need to take out the space devoted to eating and drinking, when you do that you have 2,005 square feet which requires 8 spaces plus the 2 for employees. If you only look at those uses you are at 13.3, which you have to go to the next higher number which would be 14 spaces.

They said they aren't using the second floor space. If they were using the second floor it would require another 3 spaces. The end result is they need at least 14 parking spaces, and they don't have them. The question is whether the board would waive them down. Cumberland Farms did a parking utilization study that is mentioned in the footnote to the memo, and that study indicated they need about 20 spaces which was more than was required by the zoning ordinance in Montpelier. Rather than waiving them down, if you look at the parking utilization study you would waive them up and require more parking. When they built, Cumberland Farms made the arrangement that they would have something approach 18 or 19 parking spaces on the site.

The question is, why do we care? The reason Cumberland Farms cares is because they are the next door neighbor and if they need parking on this site they are going to park on Cumberland Farms' site. They are very concerned and have been for a number of years, and have made no secret of it that they ought to have adequate parking on the site. This proposal does not have adequate parking; therefore, they are opposing it.

Mr. Lindley asked Mr. Anderson if he had any evidence that customers from Dunkin Donuts are parking at Cumberland Farms. In the three years they have been open, is there any evidence that Cumberland Farms can present to the Board tonight that would reflect their customers are parking in your parking area?

Mr. Anderson said he hasn't asked for that information. He suspects there is no problem because of their participation in the previous case they have had something approaching 20 parking spaces at their site. Because they have had adequate parking at their site, Cumberland Farms' fear has not been realized. Cumberland Farms has over 700 locations. They are located near each other in many locations, and it is a problem they are aware of and seek to prevent it from happening. In Cumberland Farms' judgment it will occur if you allow them to have as few spaces as they propose.

Mr. Teschmacher asked if their objection was solely based on a lack of parking. Mr. Anderson said at various times they have looked at the car line issue. They thought they were working towards a resolution that included Dunkin Donuts having adequate parking on their site. Cumberland Farms asked him to come and raise a serious concern about the parking. As to whether there are no other issues, he doesn't know. They were proceeding in a direction where they thought everything was going to be resolved by the inclusion of what they would consider to be an adequate number of parking spaces. If there are other issues, they will certainly call them to the Board's attention or it may go to the Environmental Court.

Mr. Lindley told Mr. Anderson his points had been well taken. He asked Mr. Anderson if his calculation on square foot was wrong.

Mr. Anderson said they hired a competent civil engineer who did very careful calculations following the definitions in the Montpelier zoning ordinance. He believes there is 2,000 square feet of space. Dunkin Donuts has not opposed that in the Environmental Court case three years ago and they haven't opposed it tonight. They

have said it may only be 500 square feet used for sales. He would ask the Board to take a look at the floor plans and calculate out the net floor area. Cumberland Farms provided an affidavit to the fact that it was 2,000 square feet.

Mr. Lindley said it is moot on the second floor because it isn't used. Mr. Anderson said on the first floor there was 2,005 net square feet outside of the area that was used for seating.

Mr. Hoff said with the inclusion of the drive-through it takes the business out of the definition of an eating and drinking establishment. Mr. Halpert said that is true, and it is not an engineering judgment but a legal judgment.

Mr. Lindley said he believed the Board members have enough information at this point to go into a deliberative session. He thanked Mr. Halpert and Mr. Anderson for coming before the Board with the application. He said they would have a decision for them.

**Adjournment:**

Mr. Lindley said he would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Blakeman moved adjournment of the meeting, with Mr. Teschmacher seconding the motion. The motion was voted unanimously 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Swigon  
Administrative Office

*Transcribed and Prepared by:  
Joan Clack  
City Clerk & Treasurer's Office*