

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, October 1, 2018
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Haber, called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

ROLL CALL: Present: Larry Haber, Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Secretary
Tom Jones
Bill McKeever
Brian Parel
George Weber
Absent: Russ Schinzing, Vice Chairperson (excused)
Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Jay James, Engineer/Building Inspector
Mark Stacey, DDA Director

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Jones, supported by Winkler, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of October 1, 2018, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Jones, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of September 17, 2018, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- The ZBA had an agenda.
- We granted a variance for 2615 Union Lake Road to install a ground sign in the front yard setback.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- We have not had a Board meeting since our last Planning Commission meeting.
- Our next meeting is a week from Tuesday.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- The September 18th meeting was routine.
- Mark presented the 2019 Budget.

Mark Stacey – We presented the budget and sent that to the Township Board. In addition, I wanted to bring you up-to-date on a visit that I made to a development, just outside of Cleveland, Ohio, which is very similar to what Bruce Aikens is looking at putting in here. That development is Pinecrest, and it has a very similar store lineup. It is absolutely stunning. My wife and I spent about two hours down there looking at the facilities and enjoying the atmosphere. At one point, she said I'll bet this is what

downtown Birmingham felt like when it was brand new. That's exactly what we're looking for. The art they had on display, the public spaces, the stores - exceptional.

Chairperson Haber – It's up and functioning?

Mark Stacey – It's brand new, and it's about 80% up and functioning. They're doing a rollout development rather than all the stores at once. They have sign listings of what will open in the next 30, 60 and 90 days. They led with Whole Foods on one end, a Silver Spot Cinema on the other, and high-end boutique stores in between, along with a restaurant lineup that we truly enjoyed.

Jay James – Building Department

- We're working hard.
- Nothing of interest to report.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM H1: PCZ18-0001 – COMMERCE VILLAGE VETERINARY HOSPITAL – CONDITIONAL REZONING – PUBLIC HEARING

Dr. Andrea Putt of Commerce MI is requesting a Conditional Rezoning for a parcel of land consisting of 0.41 acres from R-1D (One Family Residential) to B-1 (Local Business) located at 613 Commerce Road, to expand the existing veterinary hospital located at 605 Commerce Road. Sidwell No.: 17-10-403-042

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review. Dr. Putt was before the Planning Commission on September 17th for a conceptual review, and she is now presenting a formal proposal. The request is for a new Conditional Rezoning agreement. She proposes to rezone the residential structure, at 613 Commerce Road, from R-1D to B-1 for the purpose of using that building as an expansion of the veterinary clinic. The building would be used for rehabilitation services, including a doggy treadmill and doggy acupuncture.

That property was zoned B-1 up until 2010, when the owner at that time wanted to use it as a residential structure and had it rezoned to R-1D.

One of the key conditions of Dr. Putt's petition, as spelled out in the draft Conditional Rezoning agreement in the packet, is that while it would be zoned B-1, it would only be zoned for office-type uses, medical, veterinary, dental, and then also general office, which could be insurance, an attorney, architect, engineer, or any type of professional office.

Per discussion at the last Planning Commission meeting, Dr. Putt has included in the terms of her agreement the installation of 60' of sidewalk along the frontage. This is one more step toward having sidewalks eventually connect from Huron Valley Hospital to Union Lake Road.

The Conditional Rezoning agreement was drafted by the Township Attorney. It went back and forth a couple of times, and Dr. Putt can speak to the form and whether it is final. The public hearing was published as required.

The Planning Department's cover letter of September 27th covers the background of the proposal, the criteria for rezoning, and criteria for the Conditional Rezoning in particular. Dave stressed that any condition offered in the agreement is meant to be voluntary by the petitioner in this process. The report also contains recommended motion language if the Planning Commission opts to make a formal recommendation this evening. The Township Board has the final authority on any rezoning.

Dr. Putt provided a letter, where she speaks to some of the criteria that a Conditional Rezoning is meant to address, along with the draft agreement and the Conditional Rezoning plan. The plan is essentially the same site plan that Dr. Putt submitted when she occupied the building at 605 Commerce Road. That plan shows the building at 613 Commerce Road in its current configuration, and she is not proposing to change it; therefore, staff felt that the plan was sufficient to serve as the exhibit in the Conditional Rezoning plan.

At the September 17th meeting, it was suggested that the existing Conditional Rezoning agreement could be amended; however, the Township Attorney recommended a new agreement be drafted separately to govern the property at 613 Commerce. That way, if and when the property is sold, the agreements are separate for each of the parcels.

Dr. Putt, 613 Commerce Road, Commerce Township, was present to address the request.

Commission Comments:

Chairperson Haber inquired about the placement and length of the sidewalk. Dave Campbell reviewed the proposed sidewalk on the overhead, and explained the curvature, tapering and connection to the existing sidewalk. Dave recommended that staff work Administratively with Dr. Putt and the Township Engineer to finalize this.

Dr. Putt – I agree with the sidewalk as suggested and I'm not opposed to that.

Weber – You're good with the way things are setup in the Conditional Rezoning?

Dr. Putt – Yes. One item; we talked about touch-ups. Down the road, I want to be able to put in new windows, put on a new roof, clean it up and make it look professional.

Dave Campbell – The Attorney included language for painting, landscaping, roof repairs, and general maintenance as permitted. In my mind, general maintenance includes new windows, a new roof, new siding, and the kind of things anybody should be allowed to do on a structure such as this.

Parel, Jones, Winkler and Haber had no additional questions or comments.

Chairperson Haber opened the public hearing.

No comments.

Chairperson Haber closed the public hearing.

Dave Campbell – As part of your motion, if you were to recommend approval and forward this onto the Township Board, I'd like it stated in the finding that; *The Planning Commission further finds that most general office uses are similar in nature to medical and dental office uses.* Therefore, general office would be allowable in the future. If Dr. Putt were to sell this building, it wouldn't necessarily have to be strictly for medical office. It could be, as I said, a professional office for insurance, an architect, an engineer, et cetera. The recommended motion language on Page 6 of the report includes this reference, in the second to the last line of the paragraph before the listed conditions.

MOTION by Weber, supported by Jones, that the Planning Commission **recommends approval, with conditions**, to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PCZ18-0001, Commerce Village Veterinary Hospital, Conditional Rezoning, the request by Dr. Andrea Putt of Commerce MI for a Conditional Rezoning for a parcel of land consisting of 0.41 acres from R-1D (One Family Residential) to B-1 (Local Business) located at 613 Commerce Road, to expand the existing veterinary hospital located at 605 Commerce Road. Sidwell No.: 17-10-403-042

Move to recommend the Commerce Township Board **approve** PCZ #18-0001, a conditional rezoning application by Dr. Andrea Putt to rezone the property at 613 W. Commerce Road from R-1D (One Family Neighborhood Residential) to B-1 (Local Business) for the purpose of expanding the Commerce Village Veterinary Hospital into the existing structure on the property.

This recommendation to approve is based on a finding by the Planning Commission that the conditional rezoning application meets the applicable standards of Articles 3 and 36 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance, and meets the intent of the Commerce Township Master Plan. The Planning Commission further finds that most general office uses are similar in nature to medical & dental office uses.

This recommendation of approval is conditional upon the following:

1. The applicant enter into a Conditional Rezoning Agreement with conditions volunteered by the applicant and acceptable to the Planning Commission and Township Board;
2. The Conditional Rezoning Agreement be revised to incorporate changes discussed with the Planning Commission and the petitioner, and reviewed by the Planning Director and the Township Attorney prior to consideration by the Township Board;
3. The executed Conditional Rezoning Agreement be recorded with the Oakland County Register of Deeds.

AYES: Weber, Jones, McKeever, Parel, Haber, Winkler

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Schinzing

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

I. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM I1: 8450 BOULDER CT – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Brian Tomina with the Tomina Group LLC of Bloomfield Township MI is requesting a conceptual review of a new multi-tenant building to be anchored by Aqua Tots Swim School located at 8450 Boulder Court. Sidwell No.: 17-13-300-097

Dave Campbell gave a review. Mr. Tomina's business is Aqua Tots, and he owns several franchises in Southeast Michigan. His proposal is to take a vacant piece of property and build a multi-tenant building. Sample renderings were presented on the overhead. The main tenant would be Aqua Tots, and then there would be 3-4 inline tenants that would be limited to uses that are allowed in the TLM zoning district. Mr. Tomina was originally thinking general retail, such as a coffee shop, Coney Island, or a cell phone store, those types of uses usually seen in a multi-tenant retail building; however, because this property is zoned Technology and Light Manufacturing, those types of uses are not typically allowed. Medical office is allowable in TLM, so Mr. Tomina was comfortable with limiting his tenants to medical office, or uses otherwise allowed in the TLM zoning district.

The main tenant, Aqua Tots, is an indoor swim school for younger kids. Mr. Tomina submitted some marketing materials in the agenda packets, and he has additional information to pass out this evening.

The conceptual rendering showed that Mr. Tomina has every intention of satisfying the building material requirements of the TLM zoning district, with a lot of brick, stone and glass windows.

Dave wanted to ensure that he and Mr. Tomina were on the right path with the land use for a swim school. In the TLM zoning district, preschool uses are allowable. In addition, indoor recreational type uses and athletic rehab uses are also allowed in TLM.

Therefore, it may not be too much of a stretch to allow a swim school as it falls into those realms, but Dave wanted the Planning Commissions' input.

Mr. Tomina, 31221 W. 14 Mile Road, Farmington Hills, MI, was present to address the proposal. He approached and distributed additional materials and information.

Mr. Tomina – Initially, I met with David and he asked us to put together some preliminary information. As he mentioned, the site plan you're looking at could change, but it would be consistent with the building materials. In the package, you'll see we're currently working on a project in Woodhaven. There's also a rendering of a school that we did in Auburn Hills, which was an old Applebee's that we converted to our use. That rendering is not completely correct, as I did continue glazing along the entire building, along the back side, to bring light into the pool area. The higher building on the right side of the page is the addition we put on that Applebee's, which was higher to satisfy our requirements for the pool, HVAC system, et cetera.

We started this retail development in Woodhaven. We bought the property in February. We had it under contract for about 6 months. We broke ground in July, and we actually just finished all the masonry work today, so the steel is going up and the rest of the site work. The pictures show we're using all brick and very little EIFS. We are at full speed to open that store around February or March.

The swim school is a franchise based out of Arizona. We started our first store in Troy in 2012. That's in the shopping center at Big Beaver and Rochester. We then moved on to open all these other stores. The reason you'll see some California stores is because we have family there and they wanted to be in the business with us.

Currently, we have a store in Novi, which would be the closest to the families in Commerce. We have an unbelievable number of families from Commerce, about 200, that are driving to Novi weekly, if not more often. The Novi location is next to Buddy's Pizza and Dick's Sporting Goods in Fountain Walk. As you can see, the pool is completely enclosed. That store has three sides of glass. The pools are anywhere between 60' – 70' long, by 25' – 30' wide. We are open year-round, with 92-degree heated air and a 90-degree heated pool. Our lessons are convenient for kids who are usually shivering in a colder environment. Kids seem to love it, and that's being proven by our success and growth.

I'm happy to be in a business that saves kids' lives. We heard a story where a small child fell into a pool, and she did exactly as she was taught; she turned on her back and floated until someone saw her and saved her. That's what we're looking to do everywhere we go. With the way Commerce is growing as a family community, this seems to be a perfect fit. With your guidance and help, we'd love to get this project done. We'd like to be your first store in Commerce.

Commission Comments:

Chairperson Haber – Is that your place on Northwestern?

Mr. Tomina – Yes. That opened last April and it's doing very well.

Winkler – This is a very attractive project and development that's appropriate for that site. I have no objections.

I'm sure David will inform the petitioner in the future that a dumpster enclosure would be required on the site, and they may require more barrier-free parking, depending upon the ratio.

Jones – I concur with Brian.

Parel – No comments, other than with regard to the materials. I would like to see materials similar to those shown in this rendering.

Mr. Tomina – My intention is to use brick glazing. Hopefully, at the next meeting I can show you what I did in Woodhaven. I'm absolutely onboard with that. I have no problem spending extra to beautify the building.

Weber – No questions. I support the project.

McKeever – I have no comments. I don't see any issues.

Chairperson Haber – Make it look like that.

Mr. Tomina – Absolutely. I know this is a preliminary discussion, but as we move forward, investing resources, money, time and energy into the project, I'd like to ask a question. Mr. Campbell, could you pull up the aerial of the project?

I have two concerns. Although I understand that this is not a traditional retail building, I still would like to have traditional retail visibility. I think, based on what I've heard tonight, and my own research, the allowable uses are office or medical. I think you said that office and medical is kind of interchangeable as long as the interior is similar to an office use. Then you said something along the lines of physical therapy, possibly. Would that be considered? That's kind of a hybrid, office/medical, but a lot of the new physical therapies have a certain retail component, and are placing themselves in retail buildings. Would that be an allowable use?

Chairperson Haber – There's a therapist right down the block.

Dave Campbell – What's allowed in TLM; sports medicine, medical wellness, physical therapy, and similar facilities.

Chairperson Haber – So the answer is yes.

Mr. Tomina – My next concern was, if you look at that building, that's a traditional office building. They don't have any visibility from the road. I don't know if that was by design, or if the board wanted them to not have any visibility to keep that neighborhood looking green. My concern is that the board will say, you have to do something similar to that. Don't misunderstand me; I'm looking to landscape the property any way you guys want, I just want to make sure I have visibility because although it's a permitted use, it still is a quasi-retail use, our swim school business. That's one of our goals. Obviously we don't want to be in an industrial park.

Dave Campbell – We like trees in Commerce Township, and you will be required to landscape the site. We see a lot of developers preserve vegetation wherever they can, in lieu of clearing out old trees just to plant new ones.

The property to the south is well before my time, but my understanding is that the developer who did Boulder Court wanted to keep the trees because the type of office users he was going to have in the small industrial park. They wanted to have privacy and seclusion with a natural feel. It's understandable that you, being more of a customer-driven type use, are going to want more visibility.

I think my answer is, we're going to hope that we can work together to preserve as much of the natural features as we can, to the benefit of both you and the Township. Look at Gilden Woods. The front of this was a relatively vegetated site, but by the time you build a building and a parking lot, it takes out a lot of that, but they did work with us to preserve, especially around the perimeter, as much as they could.

Mr. Tomina – We'll definitely try value engineering as much as we can, but to rephrase, based upon the rendering I gave you, where you said, "Make it look like this.", if I make it look like this, I have visibility from the road.

Chairperson Haber – I think Dave answered that very well. I don't want to see you clear cut it. We also understand that you have to have exposure. We will try to work with you the best we can when you come in with a plan. We can't give you the total answer now. We're not going to. This is not that kind of a meeting.

Mr. Tomina – I understand entirely. I just wanted you guys to know, we're going to invest a significant amount of money into this project, and I want to be sure we're all on the same side, such that you want the project here, we'll make it look nice, and we'll have the visibility we need to succeed.

Chairperson Haber – There are certain things we'd like to see. That is a heavily travelled area. You'll get a lot of exposure there. Landscaping is going to help that. That's the best we'll be able to tell you today. We'll work with you the best we can, within the parameters that we're all comfortable with.

Dave Campbell – Your engineer can help with that too, figuring out ways to grade and pitch the site, to keep as much existing vegetation as possible.

Mr. Tomina – How do you guys feel about a monument sign? Would that violate any TLM zoning?

Dave Campbell – You're allowed to have a monument sign, but I'm glad you brought that up.

Chairperson Haber – I would prefer not to have one here. That's just my opinion, and that doesn't mean it will happen that way.

Dave Campbell – We ran into this recently. Mr. McKeever mentioned that we had a new medical office building on Union Lake Road that came to the ZBA. They couldn't meet the front setback requirements for their monument sign. When they got their site plan approved, they didn't show the monument sign so it didn't jump out at us that it wasn't going to fit.

My point is, when you're looking at how you're going to layout this site, where the building will fall, setbacks, parking, et cetera, if the intent is to have a monument sign, you're going to want to look at a spot where it can meet the front setback requirement, which is 15' off of the 60' half right-of-way, or 75' off the centerline of the road.

Chairperson Haber – Let's make this easy. We'll have to go back and look at it. I wasn't paying attention to signage when I went by there. Let's see what's there.

Dave Campbell and Jay James both stated that there are several monument signs in that area.

Dave Campbell – It's not the intent tonight to do site plan review, but as we progress, that's one of the things we will look at obviously, is your building setbacks, parking lot setbacks, et cetera. There is also a setback requirement for the monument sign too. We

want to avoid having someone go to the ZBA for a brand new site plan. The idea is, let's make it fit at site plan approval.

Mr. Tomina – I think with the right mix of visibility; a monument sign is not absolutely crucial.

Chairperson Haber – You've got a lot of work to do with this, making it an exceptional plan. Anything we've said here today doesn't hold any water. Have we answered your questions?

Mr. Tomina – You did, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Chairperson Haber – We look forward to seeing you. What is your time frame?

Mr. Tomina – The property is under contract to purchase. We would break ground probably around May or June if financing was proper. Our building time is about 5 months, and then some of that overlaps with our tenant improvements on the interior portion, so I assume it's going to take about 8 or 9 months from May.

Chairperson Haber – Just to reiterate, you are fully aware of the uses for the other offices that are going to be there. I don't want any problems with that.

Dave Campbell – One of the questions that came up a couple times is retrofitting. So, if for whatever reason the swim school doesn't work, is the building relatively easy to retrofit to put a different land use in there?

Mr. Tomina – In terms of office/medical, by the time you build the improvements out, it would look a lot like the shell for the remaining portion of the 7,500 square feet. Depending on how big this building actually is, I might have 8,000 of what's going to look like a retail shell, but once we improve it, it will look like medical office buildings. We could bring it back to a shell.

Chairperson Haber – In case it failed, we have to know where we stand.

Dave Campbell – Having an indoor pool doesn't render the building obsolete for any reason?

Mr. Tomina – No. We've actually had that discussion with our pool builder before. It's a \$25,000 to \$45,000 rip out job. You're not going to abandon a \$3 million building for that.

ITEM 12: USE DETERMINATION – HAGGERTY ROAD

Pete Abro & Alex Shamas of West Bloomfield MI are requesting a use determination of the permitted uses in the HRC Haggerty Road Corridor Overlay District for property located on the west side Haggerty between Oakley Park and Pontiac Trail to be developed as a drive through car wash. Sidwell No.: 17-24-200-052

Chairperson Haber – Is someone here about Item I2?

Dave Campbell – I was hoping they were going to be, but I don't see anybody. I would like to discuss it, and if we need to discuss it when the potential developer is here to answer questions ...

Chairperson Haber – What is the difference between determination and conceptual?

Dave Campbell – The property in question is currently owned by the DDA, Parcel L. This property was at one time envisioned to be a Haggerty Road entrance into the residential development, Merrill Park. Hunter Pasteur, the original developer for that site, decided they only wanted access off Martin Parkway and they eliminated the Haggerty Road access. In the process of acquiring the property from the DDA, they structured the agreement to exclude Parcel L.

The interested buyer is a drive-through car wash. This property is in the Haggerty Road Corridor Overlay, or the HRC. The zoning is TLM, but additional uses are allowable with the HRC Overlay. Within the HRC, drive-through uses are allowed, but only when they are an accessory to a principal permitted use, such as a restaurant, bank or pharmacy. In the case of the drive-through car wash, arguably the drive-through is the use and it's not accessory to anything. I was hoping to get your determination as to whether or not we would allow a drive-through use that does not have a principal use. I wanted your take on this before the developer moves forward.

Weber – I think this is more of a commercial question, and it may not be fair, but there's a bunch of car washes in close proximity. You've got the Super Car Wash on Richardson; you've got the Volcano Car Wash just down the road, which is zoned the same. I don't see from a use standard ...

Dave Campbell – That's relevant because if you were to say, yes, a drive-through car wash is a use we can allow in the HRC Overlay, it would still only be allowed as a Special Land Use, because drive-throughs in the HRC are a Special Land Use. As you know, Special Land Use has a higher standard for approval. One of those higher standards is that they have to demonstrate a need for the use. In theory, if you as a Planning Commission were to say, yes, we allow drive-through uses, but we don't see a demonstrated need for another drive-through car wash in this neighborhood, then that might make it tough for them to get their Special Land Use approval. It would be good for them to hear that earlier rather than later.

Weber – It's their job to determine if it's worthwhile, and I get that, but I think I counted 5 or 6 within a mile radius. Does it make sense to have another car wash there?

Dave Campbell – Part of their burden as a Special Land Use proposal would be to show that there is a demonstrated need. That might be difficult to prove.

Mark Stacey – I think one of their positions would be that there are really only two car wash operators within that mile radius. If you don't like one of them, that takes out 5 of

the 6 car washes, if you're not happy with their service. It's my assumption that their position is to offer a 3rd option.

Weber – That's assuming the general public realizes it's the same ownership.

Mark Stacey – We weren't able to answer the question, is this even a permitted use, being that it's primary, rather than ancillary. We were looking for direction or clarification.

Weber – It was approved obviously for Volcano which is a half mile away.

Jay James – I think that was before the zoning district.

Dave Campbell – Before we had TLM.

Jay James – It might have been before the HRC as well.

Weber – My opinion is that the use makes sense based on the intent. It's an integral part of the primary business. If there was no drive-through, then it would be a hand-wash business only.

McKeever – I feel the same.

Parel – Good.

Jones – I'm in agreement with George. How many more car washes do we need? I can't see the Township Board going along with this.

Winkler – I agree with what's been said.

Chairperson Haber – I agree with that too. We don't need another car wash there.

McKeever – I think the use makes sense, the drive-through component. I don't have a problem with that. I'm sure they'll quote industry standards and data as we saw with gas stations previously. I think they will be hard pressed to prove the need exists for a car wash.

Discussion continued regarding the adjacent site that is for sale, the former Affairs to Remember, and how this has been looked at by interested buyers to potentially combine with Parcel L, offering more options for developers.

Director Stacey – Certainly, to address your comments, I'm not concerned to sell this one as much as we are looking for the right fit in Commerce. I was concerned with answering the question as to whether or not a drive-through as a primary use was allowable. I understand you don't want the car wash, but it does actually fit into the TLM.

Dave Campbell – Let me make sure I summarize adequately so I can talk to these gentlemen this week. I want to repeat your sentiments correctly. The drive-through use is something that we could allow in the TLM zoning district, but where you think they're going to struggle is getting Special Land Use approval for the car wash, specifically, showing that a documented need exists for the proposed use. It's not necessarily the drive-through. It's what you think is a saturation of this particular use in this particular area.

Chairperson Haber – I think you've summed it up.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

Weber – Jay, on the monthly permit list, what is the Circus Tricks?

Jay James – That's the trampoline place.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dave Campbell – We've had some conversations with Aikens over the past week. He is proposing changes to the Five & Main development plan. It will almost certainly be coming back to you for review.

Previously, he had a hotel in Phase 2, but he is now looking to move that to Phase 1. It will be a 4-story hotel in the corner of the development, in place of what was originally a drive-through restaurant, such as a Starbucks.

Open discussions ensued regarding the type of hotel proposed, the need for the hotel economically for financing, revisions to the PUD and the re-approval process.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2018 @ 7PM

Chairperson Haber – There are two meetings left this year, November 5th and December 3rd. If anyone will be unable to attend, please let us know.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Jones, supported by Winkler, to adjourn the meeting at 8:01pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary