

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
NOVEMBER 18, 2003**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on November 18, 2003, at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Town Hall, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Earle Munroe, Chairman
Richard Roberts
Theresa Forsdick, Clerk
George Oickle
John Hallisey
Scott Murphy
Philip Knecht
Matthew Cholewa

Members absent:

Joseph L. Hammer, Vice Chairman
Robert Jurasin
John Adamian

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner

Chairman Munroe called the public hearing to order at 7:30 p.m.

APPLICATION NO. 1412-03-Z. Leo J. Veilleux seeking Site Plan and Design Review approval under Article XXXI, §167-137 of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations for the change of use from retail to office located on the west side of Main Street in a Business No.2 Zone at 133 Main Street.

Clerk Forsdick read a description of the application as well as 3 letters. The first letter (dated November 12, 2003 - on file) to Peter Gillespie from the Central Connecticut Health District advised him to contact them prior to approval if MDC water service and sewage disposal was not being utilized or commercial refuse service was not being proposed. The second letter (dated November 7, 2003 - on file) was from the applicant and it stated his purpose for the application was to receive approval to change the use of his building to general office space from a retail use. The 3rd letter (dated November 14, 2003 -on file) was from Peter Gillespie to the applicant explaining that the application would be heard at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Leo Veilleux 133 Main Street appeared before the Commission and described the changes that were proposed in order to change the current retail space to one of general office use. The current front bay window would be replaced by 2 double hung windows, the front door would be replaced and a side door would be moved in order to accommodate the handicapped accessible bathroom that would be installed inside. He added that the front door and window had already received approval from the Historic District Commission.

Commissioner Forsdick noted that the Christmas Barn that had operated at the site had been very successful and commented that people still went there looking for it. She wondered why the applicant was choosing to change the use for the location. Mr. Veilleux answered that his late mother had owned the store and when she passed away the store went with her. However he asked that the approval for office space not preclude a future use for retail again.

Commissioner Oickle asked if the parking shown on the site plan was adequate and if it included the parking for the residence as well. Mr. Veilleux said there were 6 parking spaces and a handicapped space and that there was a garage which would accommodate 1 car and another on the side, although it was currently not being used for that purpose.

Mr. Gillespie read from the 167-126 of the regulations Off Street Parking and Loading Requirements and said that for professional office use the requirement called for 1 space for every 150 sq. ft. of floor area, retail and office usage having the same requirement. The space was approximately 850 sq. ft. now and would be even less when the bathroom was installed. There were no specific parking requirements for a private single family residence. He said that he and the zoning official had found the parking to be adequate.

Commissioner Oickle asked how many parking spaces were typically allotted for a residence and was told 2.

Mr. Gillespie suggested that if the application were to be approved that there be a stipulation as to the maximum number of employees that would be allowed for the number of parking spaces provided.

Commissioner Oickle recognized that this was a sensitive area and they needed to be careful in regards to the parking situation then went on to ask about the side porch. He thought it looked like it was in need of repair and wondered if it would be removed. He said that although he was probably getting more into code areas it bothered him to see things like the roof which appeared to be bowing. Mr. Veilleux said that it was an unheated space and that it would be cleaned up a bit, but not torn down.

Commissioner Oickle pointed out that some large trees had been removed and asked if there was any intention of doing any landscaping, Mr. Veilleux commented that in the spring he would be replacing trees that had been removed as part of the residence.

Commissioner Oickle commented on the size of the property and wondered if the applicant had any plans for developing it. He also asked if the applicant had plans to get a dumpster. Mr. Veilleux said that the lot was narrow but very deep and had no plans at this time to develop it. He also said that there was room in the garage for garbage barrels and that was what he planned to use.

Mr. Gillespie said that the Health Department had also questioned the use of a dumpster, or whether or not it would be residential pick up and suggested that the applicant should communicate with them.

Commissioner Cholewa asked about the garage, and was told that it had space for 2 inside with double swinging doors but one could park inside with space on the side for an additional car. He commented that under the current regulations since the use is going from retail to office use and there is no change in the parking requirement whether or not it complies was not an issue although he supported the suggestion of limiting the number of employees. He asked how many employees the applicant envisioned for the space. Mr. Veilleux said he did not have an exact number but certainly less than 10.

Commissioner Forsdick commented that if there were 10 people working there and only parking spaces for 6 and 2 of those spots were taken up by the residence then there would certainly not be enough parking.

Commissioner Cholewa clarified that there would be 6 parking spaces and 1 handicapped for a total of 7, but still a shortage of parking spaces.

Commissioner Munroe asked if the applicant was suggesting 10 people for the 700 sq. ft. location.

Mr. Veilleux said he had suggested less than 10, and it was actually more like 800 sq. ft. Commissioner Munroe asked if he wanted to give a maximum number of employees. Mr. Veilleux said certainly less than 10 or 10 maximum.

Commissioner Munroe asked if the drawings had been prepared by the applicant and was told that they had been. He then said that ADA requirements were 1 handicapped space per 25, and that the minimum amount of width for a parking space was 8 1/2 'and 14' for handicapped to accommodate a van. He didn't see how a person could get out of parking space #6, because of its 90 degree angle and the garage directly behind it. Mr. Veilleux said that he had allowed 9' for the standard spots and 14 for the handicapped. Additionally there was approximately 51' with 18' for the width of a full car and the remainder for backing up and turning around.

Commissioner Munroe asked for the width of the doors shown and wondered if they were the proper width for a handicapped exit. He was told that they were 3' wide and the width had been provided by the building department.

Commissioner Oickle thought that the stairway on the current driveway side created constriction and a possible visibility problem that would be eliminated if the driveway were to be relocated. He asked the applicant had considered putting a driveway on the other side of the house. Mr. Veilleux said that he would prefer not to disrupt the other side of the house.

Chairman Munroe asked if the applicant intended to require all employees to use the parking lot. Mr. Veilleux said that he would be leasing out the space and that the lot would be there for their use, but he did not intend to place any restrictions on where they parked.

Commissioner Roberts wanted to say that the current regulations require a specific number of parking spaces per sq. ft. of floor space however they would be still be required to have the same number regardless of the number of employees.

Commissioner Knecht commented that if he understood correctly it seemed that according to the regulations there was sufficient parking for this project. Mr. Gillespie said that while it was true that the requirements were technically being satisfied since they did not know the end use of the space he felt it would be an appropriate safeguard to establish some limits so that the mistakes of the past did not repeat themselves here.

Chairman Munroe felt that although the required parking was being based upon the ITE requirements of 150 sq. ft. he thought it was kind of tight for an office. He sighted 167-141 of the regulations; the Commission to be reasonable or to protect or promote the rights of individuals, property values, and the environment, in the area as a whole the public health safety or welfare, sound planning and zoning principals, improve land use, site planning and land development of better overall neighborhood compatibility, such restrictions may concern without limitations, the components of the site plan and layout, distribution of and relationship between the uses, and structures, vehicle and pedestrian circulation, parking, open space landscaping, screening, signs, lighting and buildings, architectural design and massing. He felt that in this case the ITE manual was being used for a very small building. He did not feel the minimum requirement would cover it.

Commissioner Cholewa said that the obvious problem and seemingly only objection here was the parking problem. He suggested that rather than try to solve the problem by committee that the applicant and Mr. Gillespie should discuss it and perhaps might be able to work something out.

The Commissioners agreed that they would like to continue and here all comments before possibly taking that route.

Chairman Munroe asked the applicant if he could live with a stipulation limiting the number of employees. Mr. Veilleux said that it depended on the number.

Commissioner Knecht asked how many offices the applicant intended to get from the space. He was told that there would be 1 office, with 3 rooms.

Chairman Monroe invited the public to speak at this time.

Mr. Veilleux presented a letter from Michael Kay, president of Temple Beth Torah across the street from 133 Main Street dated November 17, 2003, which was read by Clerk Forsdick, and which stated that they had no objection to the application.

Mr. Charles Hughes 24 Center Street stepped forward and said that he had no problem with the change of use however he had a problem with the parking. He said that while the applicant indicated that there would 2 more on-street spaces available he didn't know where they would come from. He said that his driveway was approximately 200 feet from Main Street and at any given time cars were parked on either side of his driveway and all the up the street. He indicated that they had a serious parking problem and he was concerned for safety that during an emergency, fire vehicles would be unable to negotiate the turn. He had spoken to the Fire Marshall who agreed that there was bottle

neck in this location and the first 3 houses on Center Street would not be able to be serviced. He thought that the applicant had a lot of room on his property and if he wished to provide parking for 100 employees then God bless him let him do it. However the area could not handle any more on street parking as it is.

Mr. Neil Walsh 49 Woodland Street and the adjoining property owner at 125 Main Street stepped up and said that he had spoken with the Veilleuxs recently. He was not in opposition to the commercial use of the property next door since he uses his property in a similar manner; the lower floor is a business while the upper floor has an occupant living there. He said that he had spoken to the Commission and other committees before about the problem of parking in the area although he viewed this current situation largely as an issue of economic development. He said that between Garden and Center Streets they had 8 B-2 properties which could be used for appropriate use. But he pointed out the problem of having have businesses there that place cars on the street, full time, every day. He said that this denied current or future users the types of property usages described as appropriate for the area in the Town's own Conservation and Development Plan which are such things as restaurants, antique stores, arts and crafts, and retail. He pointed out that this did not preclude other forms of business but in that section 65% of the parking at any given time was taken up by all day, every day use vehicles. He said that another business that had come before the Commission had responded that any employees not finding parking on the premises would find appropriate parking off premises and felt that this was the appropriate response to any business coming into the area. In this application there was parking provided for a minimum of 7 of the possible 10 employees leaving at least 3 to find all day parking on the street somewhere. The Shopkeepers Organization had held meetings with the Mayor, Town staff, residents and business leaders in Town concerning the parking situation and everyone tended to agree that businesses that have locations on Main Street should not allow employees to use parking areas that are nominally designed for customers and clients. At these meetings they had discussed with the law office up the street the opportunity of having all the customers and clients compete for those parking spaces, however if they had a voluntary agreement with everyone then they would not be here right now. Although short of building more parking, the Town had identified public parking at the fire station and the Keeney Center. He also pointed out the Veilleux property was quite large and had plenty of room to put in more parking if they chose. He mentioned that although Commissioner Oickle had suggested building a driveway on the side yard of the Veilleux property he felt it was best served as a play yard for the Veilleux children. There was currently a fence between the Veilleux property and his own which afforded a certain amount of privacy and that the removal of the trees which he had understood to have been infested, did not bother him in fact he enjoyed the openness created by their removal. In conclusion he said that as a property owner the applicant was free to do what he wished with his property, however he thought that retail was a more appropriate use for the location. He felt that 10 or 14 more all day cars on the street was going to cause major issues on the street. The shopkeepers association had spoken to the Town about ways to limit on street parking and provide a means of enforcement as a way to encourage appropriate tourist economy with shops, restaurants and retail.

Commissioner Cholewa asked if a 2 hour parking limit would help the situation. Mr. Walsh said that as a policy it was not very welcoming to have to force people to get up move their cars every 2 hours. He felt that it would be more appropriate to make sure that the # of employees be provided an appropriate # of parking spaces.

Ms. Theodosia Fitzgerald 160 Main Street stepped forward to say that she was not here to speak for or against the application but she would like to see more parking on his property. She said that the shops and businesses are using more of the parking on the residential side of the street which she didn't think was fair. She was primarily concerned with the parking and would like to see more off street parking and certainly sufficient parking provided for the amount of employees.

Mr. Larry Powers 126 Main Street stepped up and said that he lived across the street from the property and asked how long the Red Barn had been out of business. He was told that it had been about 2 years.

Mr. Powers wondered if it would be considered a change of use from residential to commercial since it had been abandoned for at least 2 years. Chairman Munroe said he was unaware of any caveat which would convert the usage to residential if it had been unused.

Mr. Powers said that he would have no problem if there were 5 parking spaces and they proposed 5 employees, but that was not the case and obviously parking was a major issue. He said that the businesses were now parking on the

residential side of the street from 7:30 am until 5:30 pm. He said that there was sporadic parking available on the business side depending how much business was going on that day. He did have an occasion when he had trouble receiving a delivery because the truck could not find a place to park. He would like to see a number specified that was written into the approval. 10 people seemed like way to many to him. He wondered if the hours of use could be specified. He mentioned that last year the law office had evening parties at least 1 Friday a month for 6 or 7 months, filling both sides of the street and of course Friday nights are a busy night for the synagogue. He felt that the proposed change in no way corresponds to the proposed usage for the area. He asked rhetorically how this use impacted the quality of life in the area and pointed out that none of the office space that has gone in has contributed positively to the quality of life in the area. From Center Street to Garden Street 3 houses are in conformance, 3 houses are not and he asked how that could be called a residential zone, and wondered what was being done to protect it.

Mr. Charles Ford 249 Ridge Road and business owner at 147 Main Street stepped forward and said that he also was not opposed to the change of use. He pointed out that Mr. Veilleux's mother had been instrumental in helping him get the property for his business at 147 Main Street years ago. However he was concerned about the parking being impacted along this section of Main Street. He said that for about 2 years there has been a major parking problem not caused by the clients and customers who come and go all day long, but by employees who come and park along the street all day long. He had heard speculation that this proposed office might be used as part of an expansion of the office park next door at 137-141 Main Street. This is because the business at 137-141 has grown exponentially and also because the owners of these 2 properties are close relatives. There was discussion about the zoning requirements for a certain number of parking spaces per sq. foot but he felt that that didn't necessarily reflect the number of employees. When the regulations were made things were different and now modern technology in the form of computers and equipment has made it possible to fit a larger number of people into a smaller space. He mentioned the business on the Silas Deane Highway, Absolute Mortgage Solutions and described the rows and rows of desks and rows of cubicles located inside as an example of how many employees could be fit into a space. He felt that the Veilleux property had more than enough room to provide parking for as many employees as they wanted, and there would never be any reason to require on street parking, and this application must take the number of employees into account.

Commissioner Oickle pointed out that at every other location in Town the parking was based upon the sq. footage and the usage. It is not based upon the number of employees. He then asked if Mr. Ford or any one else present was looking for the Commission to change the zoning regulations to eliminate office operations from the Village zone. Mr. Ford said that while he was not looking to eliminate the use he was asking that there be proper protections for the residents and the other businesses from the additional parking could be forced onto the street.

Ms. Anne Kuckro 471 Main Street stepped forward and said that she was not speaking for or against this application but from the point of view of the Tourism Commission whose goal which is included in the Strategic Plan for the Town is to encourage tourism. She pointed out that experts say that tourists come with the idea of eating and shopping and not solely the historic attractions but that these are the 3 reasons tourists come to Town. She said that there have been several occasions over the last 2-3 years when retail space has shifted over to office space and she wondered if there were some suggestions as to how the new regulations could be worded to encourage retail.

Commissioner Oickle asked if she favored eliminating office operations from the Village. Ms. Kuckro said that she favored encouraging professional office usage on the Silas Deane Highway, and concentrating retail usage for the Village. She thought that if the Silas Deane Highway were made attractive enough then architects and realtors etc. would choose to locate their offices there.

Commissioner Oickle said that he would hope that if Ms. Kuckro or anyone else had any suggestions they would please bring them to the public hearing on the new regulations. Ms. Kuckro replied that she was hoping the new Town Planner would have some magic solution to this problem.

A brief recess was called while Mr. Gillespie conferred with Mr. Veilleux.

When Mr. Gillespie returned he said that there were 2 scenarios which would be acceptable to the applicant. The first and preferred would be that more parking spaces could be added either by reorientation or construction of additional

spaces for a maximum of 9 spaces not including the garage or its side space. He would then agree to a 1-1 employee ratio per parking space. The other option would be to keep the public hearing open while he comes back with a modified plan.

Commissioner Cholewa asked how the 1-1 ratio was defined. Mr. Gillespie said that there would also be a condition that the garage and the side space would be for resident use the other parking would be employee parking.

Commissioner Roberts wondered if it was implied that there would be at least the number of spaces shown or could the applicant provide 2 parking spaces for 2 employees. He pointed out that what is shown on the site plan is close to current regulations, while a 1-1 ratio has a lower limit of what is shown on the plan. Mr. Gillespie said that the objective of the applicant was to come as close as possible to the 10 employees.

Commissioner Cholewa said that he would like to be clear exactly what they would be approving. Mr. Gillespie said that his specific conversation was that there wouldn't be a specific number spelled out but would be per staff approval.

Commissioner Forsdick said that she would like to see the actual plan before approving anything. She said that it could become a case of maybe we wanted this, or maybe we wanted that. She said that the applicant had the land and it was up to him to decide how he wanted to use it.

Commissioner Roberts said that while he saw her point he wondered if she would feel comfortable approving the 6 shown here, with additional parking possible as approved by Staff. Commissioner Forsdick did not feel comfortable with that.

Chairman Munroe said that the parking was secondary issue. He felt that the small size and odd shape for the space was a safety concern and he wondered if the Fire Marshall had seen it. While it was a store there might be 10 or 15 people in it especially during the holidays, but they would come and go, not stay all day. Mr. Gillespie mentioned that at a meeting last week the Fire Marshall did have concerns about the building being in such proximity to the barn, and the lack of fire walls, and the whether or not there was egress and access and handicap accessibility however he does not get into the number of employees.

Commissioner Murphy asked if the section of the regulations that had been read earlier would govern the number of people. Chairman Munroe said that while he didn't think it did it certainly did say they needed to consider the parking

Commissioner Cholewa said that while he felt the Commission should see what it approves, but he felt that the applicant had been very cooperative he didn't want to take too much advantage. He agreed that they could approve 6 parking spaces, and employees with a maximum of 10 per staff review and Commission consultation.

There being no one else who wished to speak in favor or in opposition to this application, this portion of the hearing was declared closed.

There being no one else who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Theresa Forsdick, Clerk

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
NOVEMBER 18, 2003**

APPLICATION NO. 1412-03-Z. Leo J. Veilleux seeking Site Plan and Design Review approval under Article XXXI, §167-137 of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations for the change of use from retail to office located on the west side of Main Street in a Business No.2 Zone at 133 Main Street.

Commissioner Oickle thought that perhaps they should not assume that all employees drive their own car or even drive

a car to work at all.

Commissioner Murphy thought that since they were not requiring any visitor parking any possible commuters or bicycle riders would be taken into consideration by offering visitors the use of their parking spaces. Additionally they were recognizing the parking crunch in the area.

Commissioner Roberts said that while the application technically meets the zoning requirements, there is a possibility of providing more off street parking and an applicant willing supply to it and this is perhaps a good solution to problem which is not his creation.

The Commissioners wondered if the parking lot could be seen from the street, and if it could it would require Historic District Commission approval. Mr. Veilleux said that the Historic District Commission Coordinator, Robert Cook had not felt it could be seen and so did not require their approval when he spoke to him on November 14, 2003.

Upon motion by Commissioner Roberts, seconded by Commissioner Oickle and a poll of the Commission it was unanimously voted to APPROVE Application No. 1412-03-Z. Leo J. Veilleux seeking Site Plan and Design Review approval under Article XXXI, §167-137 of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations for the change of use from retail to office located on the west side of Main Street in a Business No.2 Zone at 133 Main Street with the following stipulations:

1. The # of employees permitted in the office at this time is limited to 6 based upon the parking plan submitted.
2. The applicant may request permission to add additional employees up to a maximum of 10 upon submission of a revised parking plan indicating additional parking spaces. The number of additional employees will be limited to one employee for every additional parking space provided. Permission will not be granted until such time as Staff and the Commission have reviewed and approved the revised plans.
3. The applicant shall maintain the existing fence as a screen along the property line of N/F Walsh in lieu of planting a landscape buffer.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Larry Powers 126 Main Street asked if he understood the plan to be that the B-2 side of Main Street would remain in the Village Business District but the residential zone would remain up until the Old Academy. He said that he would rather see it extended up to garden Street. Mr. Gillespie said that he had a list of all the properties that would be affected by the change and could provide it for him.

Mr. Powers said that he did not want to remain a resident on the street if it all became the Village Business District, he certainly wouldn't want to raise kids with that kind of traffic. He thought that the quality of life had definitely declined and in a few years he would be probably be seeking a zoning variance and do what Howard Willard did with his property. He said that Mr. Willard made his money and ruined the neighborhood in the process. He felt that it was now very difficult to have a residence on the street now, and the only way that anyone will be able to get value out of their property will be to have a business on their property.

Mr. Gillespie said that there would be a meeting probably during the first week of December so that all the affected property owners will be able to take a good hard at the plan and take a knowledgeable position on it

Ms. Theodosia Fitzgerald 160 Main Street said that her house is right on the dividing line next to the Old Academy Museum. She said that the property is so non-conforming on that side of the street that she is thinking of getting a variance on her property so it will be considered business because the quality of life has become very poor for residents on that side of the street and her property value has decreased because of it.

Ms. Billye Logan 318 Hartford Avenue said she was concerned about the wording of the stipulation on the Veilleux application. She said that the stipulation had to be very clear about the number of parking spaces correlating with the number of employees. She pointed out that when Mr. Willard had been approved for his barn they had stipulated 4 parking spaces because he said that he would have 4 employees, but he has 30 employees in his barn now and the approval had simply recommended the employees use off site parking.

Commissioners explained that the approval was granted with the understanding that 6 was the minimum number of parking spaces required by the regulations even if no one was working in the office but was worded to say that he needed to supply additional parking spaces for any and all employees for a maximum of 10.

APPROVAL OF [MINUTES OF: November 5, 2003](#)

Commissioners had not received copies of the minutes and so the approval of the minutes was Tabled.

MANDATORY REFERRAL in accordance with C.G.S. 8-24 referred by the Town Council to the Planning and Zoning Commission a request by Steven Kelly to exchange Town owned land with an abutting piece of property on Columbus Street owned by Mr. Kelly if the exchange is of equal land size and the property has no buildable lots.

Commissioner Cholewa asked if there was someone from the Town who could speak to them as to why this would advantageous or not for the Town. Mr. Gillespie said that there was no Town advocate but since Michael Turner Town Engineer had been involved with it for some time, he could be asked to prepare some sort of report. This referral had been initialed during the previous Council and it was his understanding that any business left unsettled remained Tabled until removed from the Table, so where this currently stands is the question. However he had spoken to the Town manager about contacting the neighbors and she didn't think it was appropriate for the Commission to send notice to the abutters about this especially since it had been discussed already.

Commissioner Oickle said that he wanted to see more information and asked if Mr. Gillespie was intending to get more for them and was told that he did.

Commissioner Roberts pointed out that they needed to act on it in 3 days or it would automatically become a positive referral from the Commission. Mr. Gillespie said that according to his quick math deduction they received it on Halloween and they would have until their December meeting to decide.

Commissioner Forsdick suggested that they issue a negative referral until they receive more comprehensive information.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cholewa, seconded by Commissioner Oickle and a poll of the Commission it was unanimously voted to REMOVE the Mandatory referral from the TABLE.

Upon motion by Commissioner Roberts, seconded by Commissioner Murphy and a poll of the Commission, it was unanimously voted to Issue a NEGATIVE REFERRAL to Town Council for the request by Steven Kelly to exchange Town owned land with an abutting piece of property on Columbus Street owned by Mr. Kelly. Reason for Negative Referral: A lack of sufficient information including but not limited to a comprehensive plan for the Town property on Columbus Street and a lack of advocacy.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Munroe mentioned that at the Town Council meeting Commissioner Cholewa had been nominated to become a full Commissioner, and a new Commissioner David Edwards, had been nominated to fill the place left by Frank Chuang.

Commissioner Oickle asked what was going on at the Hughes property. Mr. Gillespie said that there had been some issues with the transfer of property there and apparently the property and its attached House on Jordan Lane were on the list for Town foreclosures due to unpaid taxes. He had been playing telephone tag with Mercury Fuel the firm that was to be responsible for the development of the property.

Mr. Gillespie then talked about the Steven Frechette horse barn approval which had been challenged by the neighbor Murphy. He said that he had received a slightly modified plan than the one which had been approved and was waiting for the building plans, but all indications were that it would be worked out without legal actions.

The Commission had a short discussion on the Willard property that had been brought up earlier by Ms. Billye Logan.

Mr. Gillespie concluded the conversation by saying that it was under investigation.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Theresa Forsdick, Clerk