CITY OF DOVER PLANNING COMMISSION
May 16, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the City of Dover Planning Commission was held on Monday May 16, 2011 at 7:00 PM with Chairman Hemmig presiding. Members present were Mr. Hemmig, Mr. Tolbert, Colonel Welsh, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Holt, and Mr. Ambruso. Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo were absent.

Staff members present were Mrs. Townshend, Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mr. Koenig, Ms. Cornwell, Mr. Albert and Ms. Metsch. Also present were Mr. Frank Everett, Mr. Garth Jones, Mr. Joseph Petrosky, Mr. Kevin Minnich, and Mr. Tom Kramedas. Also speaking from the public was Mr. Greg Jackson, Mrs. Thelma Johnson, and Mrs. Virginia Bedwell.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Ambruso moved to approve the agenda as submitted, seconded by Colonel Welsh and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo absent.

APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2011

Mr. Nichols moved to approve the regular Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 18, 2011, seconded by Colonel Welsh and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo absent.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Mrs. Townshend stated that the next Planning Commission Quarterly Workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, May 17, 2011 at 4:00 PM in the City Hall Conference Room. The meeting will need to be cancelled because this is when City Council will start Budget Hearings. Staff will be attending those hearings as our budgets are moving forward.

Mrs. Townshend stated that you have two options. We can wait until August which would be the next scheduled meeting or we can schedule one sooner than that. She would defer to the Commission. *Note: All Planning Commission members were in agreement with holding the next scheduled Quarterly Workshop on August 16, 2011.*

The 2011 Planning Law Review which is the APA Audio Web Conference will be held on June 29, 2011 at 4:00 PM in the Kent County Administration building, Room 220. The Law Review is interesting in that it wraps up the case law from the previous year.

Mrs. Townshend provided an update on the regular City Council and Utility Committee meetings of April 25, 2011, the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee meeting of April 27, 2011, and the Annual Meeting of City Council on May 9, 2011.

Mrs. Townshend further stated that she has mentioned before that Staff has been working on some proposed changes to Article 10 which is the section that deals with all of our application processes. Staff has held one meeting with the development community, realtors, Chamber of Commerce, and consulting engineers. Staff will be meeting again next week with the Kent County realtors and we will be meeting with the consulting engineers this Thursday. We are

trying to iron out any problems before bringing it forward to the Planning Commission and City Council so what you will see is a draft with some comments so that you can see where things have gone. The City is also working with the Delaware State Housing Authority, the City of Wilmington, and New Castle County on a statewide Analysis of Impediments for Fair Housing Choice document that will include an Action Plan for each of the jurisdictions involved. There may be some Zoning Text Amendments brought forward as part of the implementation of that document as well.

OPENING REMARKS CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Mrs. Townshend presented the audience information on policies and procedures for the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business Items to discuss.

NEW DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Z-11-04 Lands of Frank Everett at 1151-1155 Walker Road - Public Hearing and Review for Recommendation to City Council of rezoning application consisting of one parcel of land totaling of 1.904 acres ±. The property is currently zoned C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Development District). The proposed zoning is IO (Institutional and Office Zone). The subject property is located on the north side of Walker Road and west of McKee Road. The owner of record is Walker Rd, LLC c/o Franklin Everett, Jr. Property Addresses: 1151-1155 Walker Road. Tax Parcel: ED05-067.18-01-79.00-000. Council District 4. Ordinance #2011-13.

Representatives: Mr. Frank Everett, Property Owner.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the subject parcel is developed with two (2) office buildings on the site currently as professional offices. In terms of the surrounding land uses, there are a variety of uses and zoning surrounding the site. To the east is the townhouse section of the Hamlet which is zoned RG-3. There are two (2) properties immediately adjacent to the west along Walker Road that are zoned CPO along with this project. The property that lies to the north wraps to the west of the neighboring properties is zoned R-8 and is developed as the Heritage Assisted Living facility. Capitol Rehabilitation is west of that and is zoned I/O (Institutional and Office Zone.) The property south of the subject property across Walker Road includes Bicentennial Village which is zoned R-8 (One Family Residence) and the St. John's Lutheran School which is zoned I/O (Institutional and Office).

Mrs. Townshend further stated that the Comprehensive Plan shows this area as intended for office uses. Both the requested I/O zoning and the current CPO zoning are consistent with this. The primary difference between the CPO zone and the I/O zone are the allowance of the Institutional uses and a number of bulk standards particularly the building height, floor area ratio, and lot coverage.

Mrs. Townshend further stated that in theory, the I/O zoning would allow for a much taller building than the CPO zone allows; however, on the current site, the size of the site including the existing improvements would limit the ability to expand the building footprint or size of the

building in terms of height. We do have comments from the other agencies which is essentially no comment.

Mr. Nichols questioned what type of shelter they are planning? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Everett stated that he will be the leaser and he has a tentative client that would like to run a transitional home for children who are 18 and older who have been put out of foster care. In the State of Delaware they are not provided for by the State in anyway after they are 18 years old and a lot of times they go homeless, on the streets, or in some cases back to their abusing parents. The organization is planning on using it for those children to help transition them to permanent housing, jobs, schooling, provide counseling, and job skills.

Mr. Nichols further questioned if it would be for both buildings? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Everett stated that currently, they are just talking about one. The other building will continue to be a mental health counseling facility.

Mr. Holt questioned how long would a child be housed there? Responding to Mr. Holt, Mr. Everett stated that they are not sure; however, would like them to be there as short as possible so that they could get standard housing or in some other facility somewhere else. This would be transitional for them as there is no facility in Kent County or Sussex County. There are 126 kids a year that get put out on the streets in Delaware.

Mr. Tolbert questioned that you do refer to them as children and can it go from 18 years of age and up? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Everett stated that they are young adults. We are thinking along the lines of 18-20 years of age.

Mr. Tolbert further questioned if they would be restricting it to that age limit? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Everett stated that no, they are not that far into the program planning; however, there are so many kids that come out and need to go to appropriate places that we would see if we could do that as soon as we could.

Mr. Tolbert further stated that according to his information Transitional Housing is funded by the State. Would you have a limit on the amount of time that person could stay in those types of facilities? Is such limitation applicable to your program? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Everett stated that he is unsure whether he can answer that as he is not sure if they know yet. We are not sure how long it would be.

Mr. Tolbert further questioned if they would be going after funding? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Everett stated that they have not gone after it yet; however, they would like to get people in the churches to sponsor a young adult for a period of time. We are not sure how much money is available through the State yet.

Mr. Tolbert further questioned how many young adults would be housed there? Responding to Mr. Tolbert, Mr. Everett stated that they have not looked at that yet. Once we get it rezoned then we can look at what we can do in working with the City.

Mr. Hemmig opened the public hearing and after seeing no one wishing to speak closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ambruso moved to forward to City Council approval of Z-11-04 Lands of Frank Everett located at 1151-1155 Walker Road in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan from CPO (Commercial Professional Office) to I/O (Industrial Office), seconded by Colonel Welsh and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo absent.

S-11-06 Woodbrook Development: Building Addition at 1060 South Governors Avenue – Public Hearing and Review of a Site Plan for the construction of a 2,100 SF addition to the existing 6,280 S.F. office building and other associated site improvements at 1060 South Governors Avenue. The property is 7.08 acres ± and is zoned C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Development District). The property is located on the west side of South Governors Avenue north of Lynnhaven Drive. The owner of record is Woodbrook Development, LLC. Property Addresses: 1052-1060 South Governors Avenue. Tax Parcel: ED05-086.05-01-01.00-000. Council District 2. *Waiver Requested: Reduction of Parking.*

Representative – Mr. Garth Jones, Becker Morgan Group, Inc.; and Mr. Joseph Petrosky Woodbrook Development.

Mrs. Melson-Williams provided an overview of the application.

Mr. Jones stated that they read the comments in the report and are in agreement with them. He would; however, like to point out more with regards to the parking. We went out to the site on two (2) occasions to verify the parking. The parking is somewhere between 30% and 35% used. There is a significant amount of parking that is available. Also, with the CPO zone it does require 1/200 SF where most office zones require 1/300 SF so this facility is significantly over parked.

There were no questions raised from any Planning Commission members at this time.

Mr. Hemmig opened a public hearing.

Mr. Greg Jackson – 132 Crescent Drive (Woodbrook) – Stated that he is opposed to any expansion for that property of the commercial buildings simply because they were never notified of the rezoning request the first time when it went through. He called the Planning Commission when they found out they were going to build an office complex here and he was advised that the adjacent property owners were notified. He thinks that they may be right on the border line of the 200 feet and they missed us last time. He has lived here since January 1972 and it used to be a peach orchard. He would have liked to have seen it stay that way; however, he realized with it being a landlocked parcel like that, it was going to get developed. Living in Woodbrook it is just not in the character of the neighborhood to have a commercial office complex that close to us. If this property was to be developed, it should have been developed with houses similar in size, lot size, and square footage like quarter to third of an acre lots with 2,500 to 3,500 square foot residential houses where they could have gotten four (4) to six (6) on there. That would have been acceptable. We missed all of that the first time around so he is opposed to any expansion of the property at this time. The other thing that he is afraid of is if you allow them to expand there and then the tenant in the back which is Progressive's building wants to expand, they would be expanding towards the pond the next time around. He is not sure if they would want to put more parking somewhere in the future. They say that they have more space to put in parking; however, we don't want to see that expand either.

Mr. Hemmig closed the public hearing after seeing no one else wishing to speak.

Colonel Welsh stated that you did state that you have sufficiently more parking spaces than what is presently being used correct? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mr. Petrosky stated that this was correct. The reason is because of in the current zoning of CPO a typical office building may be required to have 100 parking spaces.

Colonel Welsh further questioned that you do not anticipate any further encroachment towards the residential area? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mr. Petrosky stated that they would have to come back here; however, he does not anticipate any at this time.

Mr. Hemmig stated that two (2) of their buildings, the corners touch the hundred foot floodplain and are very restricted by that.

Colonel Welsh moved to approve S-11-06 Woodbrook Development: Building Addition at 1060 South Governors Avenue with the reduction of the required parking from 167 spaces to 158 spaces and to confirm that the one loading space that currently exists is sufficient, seconded by Mr. Tolbert and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo absent.

S-11-07 Weston Drive Property: Mini-Storage Facility – Public Hearing and Review of a Site Plan for the construction of three mini-storage buildings for a total of 16,800 S.F. of new buildings and other associated site improvements at 200 Weston Drive. The property is 5.36 acres ± and is zoned IPM (Industrial Park/Manufacturing Zone). The property is located at the north end of Weston Drive. The owner of record is Stoltzfus Mast, LLC. Property Address: 200 Weston Drive. Tax Parcel: ED05-076.08-01-11.01-000. Council District 4. *Previous Application: S-05-36 Weston Drive Properties was reviewed in December 2005 and only a portion of the plan was constructed. Waiver Request: Elimination of Curbing.*

Representative – Mr. Kevin Minnich, Minnich Engineering.

Mr. Albert provided an overview of the application.

Mr. Minnich stated that they are in agreement with the Staff Report and can make any changes that have been requested in the report. He feels that Mr. Mast would be agreeable for the proposal of the curb request.

Mr. Nichols questioned the area that you have in the roadway between your property and the building at the front that is an automotive garage there is a stretch in there of about a couple hundred feet that is in very bad shape. Who is going to repair that? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Minnich stated that he is not sure if this is a private or public roadway.

Mr. Koenig stated that Weston Drive is a public street up to a point. There is a strike in the road from the change in pavement that stops at the property line. The City paved Weston Drive in the neighborhood of seven (7) to ten (10) years ago and there is a joint there that distinguishes where the public right-of-way stops versus private property. If it is between the joint and Route 8, it will be the City's problem.

Mr. Nichols further stated that he is beyond that north of it and would be considered private maintenance. This will have to be repaired before the place can be operational. It is full of pot holes now.

Mrs. Townshend stated that for anything that is a Code issue in order to get the Certificate of Occupancy any pot holes in that area on his property would need to be repaired. Responding to Mrs. Townshend, Mr. Minnich stated that he did not see this as a problem as he would be doing some paving back there anyway.

Mr. Nichols further stated for the additional traffic according to the State report it states that you might be required to have a traffic signal there. Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Minnich stated that he is not in agreement with fifty-six (56) trips; there is no way in one day. He will need to talk further with Julio from DelDOT. This was brought up at the DAC meeting and the question he asked Julio from DelDOT was how many people were in this signal agreement and he stated that we would be the only one.

Mrs. Townshend stated that it would be this project and the school district that would be in the signal agreement. The school district would be the other party to this because their trip generation is significantly higher. The William Henry Middle School and Booker T. Washington School improvement plans that you looked at several months ago include in one of their future phases a connection to Weston Drive. In order for that connection to Weston Drive to happen that signal needs to be in place. The school district would be a party to that signal agreement.

Mr. Hemmig opened a public hearing and after seeing no one wishing to speak closed the public hearing.

Colonel Welsh moved to approve S-11-07 Weston Drive Property: Mini-Storage Facility with the requirement that curbing be installed on the west side of the property as described in the presentation and that the repair of the access drive on the private property be repaired prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, seconded by Mr. Baldwin and the motion was unanimously carried 7-0 with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo absent.

S-11-08 Loockerman East: Lands of Hub Associates, LLC – Public Hearing and Review of a Site Plan for the redevelopment of four parcels of land (to be consolidated) in order to construct a 92 room hotel, an 11,230 S.F. retail building, and other associated site improvements (with the existing 17,200 S.F. T.G.I. Friday's building to remain). The subject property is a total of 4.29 acres ± and is zoned C-4 (Highway Commercial Zone) and C-PO (Commercial/Professional Office Development District). The property is located at the southwest corner of South DuPont Highway and Loockerman Street. The owners of record are Hub Associates, LLC and A&G Kramedas Associates. Property Addresses: 514 East Loockerman Street, 516 East Loockerman Street, 554 East Loockerman Street, and 222 South DuPont Highway. Tax Parcels: ED05-077.06-01-62.00-000. ED05-077.06-01-63.00-000, ED05-077.06-01-64.00-000, and ED05-077.06-01-87.00-000. Council District 2. *Waivers Requested: Reduction of Arterial Street Buffer, Elimination of Loading Space. Consideration of Campus Parking Plan.*

Representatives – Mr. Garth Jones, Becker Morgan Group, Inc.; and Mr. Tom Kramedas, A&G Kramedas.

Ms. Cornwell provided an overview of the application. In the DelDOT requirements they have stated that a T.I.S. (Traffic Impact Study) is required. Upon further review and discussion between the applicant, Staff, and DelDOT a T.I.S. (Traffic Impact Study) is no longer required.

Mr. Jones stated that they have no comments regarding the Staff Report and agree with the recommendations. It is important to note; however, as many of you know, there are many entrances into this site and as part of this application, we are closing all of them except two (2). We are significantly improving vehicle safety patterns in and out of the site. We are also installing sidewalk across the frontage of the T.G.I. Friday's property at the request of DelDOT. We requested a waiver for the two loading spaces and also of the arterial buffer and requested acceptance of our Campus Parking Plan.

Mr. Holt stated that he has some concerns regarding parking. T.G.I. Friday's is difficult now with parking and is something to consider for the new hotel.

Mr. Hemmig questioned if the parking calculations include T.G.I. Friday's? Responding to Mr. Hemmig, Ms. Cornwell stated that yes, the overall site requires 254 parking spaces and that includes the existing retail which includes the restaurant and also the new retail and hotel.

Mrs. Townshend stated that regarding the 254 parking spaces, if you look at each use exclusively, there is no overlap. The section of the Code that deals with the Campus Plan is specifically setup for things like this where if you were staying in the hotel you may walk to the retail shops or restaurant rather than all coming in through traffic. There are also different peaks for the different uses and it is the purpose of the Campus Parking Plan to account for those.

Mr. Nichols questioned if the footprint of the new building will be about the same as the existing? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Jones stated that the footprint of the hotel is a little larger than the hotel building that is existing. The footprint of the retail is a little bit smaller than the existing.

Colonel Welsh questioned that if campus signage was also recommended? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Ms. Cornwell stated that yes this site would qualify for a Unified Comprehensive Sign Plan. Staff would recommend that they come through at a later date to address all signage issues for the multiple buildings; that would be a Planning Commission application.

Mr. Hemmig opened a public hearing.

Mrs. Thelma Johnson – 512 E. Loockerman Street – Stated that she lives next to the proposed shopping center. This was the only notice that she got. Her side lot is next to their property and the back of her lot is also on two sides. The only notice that she got was the letter that the other people got in the area and what was in the newspaper. There was nothing to lead you to believe that the stores were going to be built to face Loockerman Street because it gives a DuPont Highway address. She came into the Planning Office and saw the blue print as best as she could understand it. She and her husband bought their house fourteen (14) years ago knowing that the

motel was there and she has never had any problem with them. She does not object to the motel at all. She lost her husband eight (8) years ago and she is all by herself. She has thyroid cancer, and has had four (4) surgeries in the last (2) years and is on radioactive iodine. She does not know how long she has; however, she feels that she loves her little home and she loves Loockerman Street and is proud to live there. Her understanding is that they are going to tear the house down next door to her and will build six (6) stores facing Loockerman Street. When they come in that driveway from Loockerman Street that is also the driveway for T.G.I. Friday's and the motel. When they come in, they will turn to the right and come and head towards her lot. From the proposal that she saw, they are going to put a six (6) foot fence right to the sidewalk all the way out the whole length of her lot which is about one hundred and twenty feet (120). That line is about fifteen (15) feet from her kitchen door, her living room window, and her kitchen window. She never uses her front door; she uses the kitchen door. Across the back her lot is seventy-five (75) feet and her understanding is there will be a stockade fence and that there will be cars parked along her fence all the way from the street all the way back and across the back. The back of her lot will be a parking lot for the overflow of the cars from the motel and from the stores plus the trucks will be coming in at all hours to deliver to those stores. We do not know who will be renting those stores and how late they are going to be staying open at night. She loves Loockerman Street and everyone takes good care of their homes. We have a lot of traffic and the fire trucks come out on our street and it comes right into Downtown Dover. There are a lot of empty stores in Downtown Dover. She wishes that Mr. Kramedas had come to talk to her first.

Mrs. Virginia Bedwell – 519 E. Loockerman Street – Stated that she is here to oppose the construction of this shopping center. She has had no problem with the hotel at all except there have been times where there have been tractor trailers parked there all night long that were refrigerated trucks. She is sure there will be parking issues no matter how many parking spaces are allotted for this. She is sure that there will be cars that will still spill over onto the streets. It is hard enough to get out of our driveways now lots of times. To build something like this, she just cannot see it when there are plenty of empty spaces Downtown. To build another shopping center, she just does not understand it.

Mr. Hemmig closed the public hearing after seeing no one else wishing to speak.

Mrs. Townshend stated that she wanted to specifically address Mrs. Johnson's comments regarding the landscape buffer and the opaque barrier fence component. The way that the Code reads is that when non-residential commercial uses abut residential use, the opaque barrier which in this case would be the fence, is required. However, the landscaping is on the residential side of that so there will be a fence and on your side of the fence is where the landscaping would go. All of this is on their (the developer's) property so the fence is not on the property line. It is in a little bit so that they would have to landscape on their property on your side of the fence. In the required front yard, fence height reduces to four (4) feet because you cannot have a six (6) foot fence in a front yard. These are two things that were not very clear on the plan that would make it a little less intrusive.

Mr. Hemmig stated that although the retail is proposed to face Loockerman Street, the loading zone for that is located on the back side of the building which would put it between the retail and the hotel. So any trucks that are in there will be between the two buildings.

Mr. Ambruso stated that he was concerned with the retail stores in that they compromise the integrity of this whole area and he has a problem with that. Facing the highway is one thing; however, facing Loockerman Street is too much of a cultural shock for the residents in that area.

Colonel Welsh questioned at the present time, do you have any indication as to who the tenants are going to be or what percentage of that would be office space and what percentage would be retail? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mr. Kramedas stated that no they have not gotten that far. The intent for the entire complex, as he lives here too and is very proud of living in Dover, and looks at the Loockerman Street entrance as the gateway to Downtown, is to bring back the colonial feel back through the retail building similar to what you see Downtown. With regards to the fence, they would like to see what was done at Compass Point with the black fence and brick to bring that type of atmosphere into this corner. We will also be redoing the front building that will match the retail with stone, brick and EFIS. We are not trying to modernize this corner; however, we are trying to make it look like a new modern gateway better than it looks today. They are trying to make it a boutique type of retail such as a hair salon or coffee shop and not something like a dollar store.

Colonel Welsh further questioned if this would be open for office space as well? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mr. Kramedas stated that yes, it would they would love to have an insurance company or a bank there.

Colonel Welsh further stated that he wishes that we had more definitive answers. In talking about the four (4) foot fence, how many of the parking spaces will face in toward the four (4) foot fence? Responding to Colonel Welsh, Mrs. Townshend stated that there would be two (2) and there will be landscaping.

Colonel Welsh stated that there would be landscaping; however, there would still be the lights from the vehicles as they are pulling in that could be offensive to Mrs. Johnson and a six (6) foot fence he feels would block it. Where he was going with this was as he sees it, if you terminate the six (6) foot fence at the side of the house where it starts in the corner of the front and the east side of the house, it looks like if you eliminated the last parking space and put in more landscaping, it may be more attractive and a little less offensive to Mrs. Johnson.

Mr. Hemmig stated that the fence would drop to four (4) feet in height even with the front of Mrs. Johnson's house out to Loockerman Street. This is per Code and would require going to the Board of Adjustment to change that to extend to six (6) feet in height.

Mrs. Townshend stated that if you accept the Campus Parking Plan it would require 229 parking spaces and they are providing 238 parking spaces. If you eliminate the one parking space to total 237, they are still over what the analysis would bring them to.

Mrs. Johnson stated that when you turn right to come in off of Loockerman Street in front to come to the parking spaces those headlights would be right into her living room window. Responding to Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Hemmig stated that it is very irregular to have further public testimony at this time; however, he understands her concern. When they turn right off of Loockerman Street into this property the only reason that they would turn right again is to go to

that specific retail property. Other than that, they will be going past that area to go to the hotel or T.G.I. Friday's. There will be a six (6) foot high fence and evergreen plantings on the other side of the fence that should totally block any headlight intrusion onto your property and particularly if we eliminate the one parking space at the corner.

Colonel Welsh stated that he would like to see that one parking space eliminated and landscaped.

Mr. Nichols questioned how many existing shops were there now facing Loockerman Street? Responding to Mr. Nichols, Mr. Kramedas stated that they have two (2) tenants plus T.G.I. Friday's, a bank and a travel agency.

Mr. Tolbert moved to approve S-11-08 Loockerman East: Lands of Hub Associates, LLC to include the waiver request for a loading space and the elimination of a thirty (30) foot wide arterial street buffer and the proposed parking spaces to be reduced to 237 as suggested by Colonel Welsh and accepting the Campus Parking Plan, seconded by Colonel Welsh.

Colonel Welsh stated that he would like to amend the motion to allow Planning Staff's review of where the four (4) foot fence would begin and if it is determined that the second parking space would interfere with it as well, that we eliminate the second parking space.

Mr. Tolbert moved to accept the amended motion, seconded by Colonel Welsh and the motion was carried 6-1 with Mr. Ambruso opposed and Mr. Friedman and Mr. Shomo absent.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:04 PM

Sincerely,

Diane Metsch
Secretary