Chair Townsend called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Those members attending included David Townsend, Martha John, Sean Flanagan, Dennis Hazelrigg and Phil Clithero. Also attending were the City Clerk, Sheela Amin, Deputy City Clerk, Megan Eldridge, Community Development Department Director, Tim Teddy, Planner, Steve MacIntyre, Senior Plan Reviewer, John Simon, Engineering Supervisor, Richard Stone, and Assistant City Counselor, Rose Wibbenmeyer.

The minutes from the regular meeting of April 8, 2014 were approved as submitted on a motion by Mr. Flanagan and a second by Mr. Clithero.

The following cases, properly advertised, were considered. All persons testifying were duly sworn by the Deputy City Clerk.

**Case Number 1877 was a request by Nate Keller, attorney for TKG St. Peters Shopping Center L.L.C., for a conditional use permit to allow uncovered, surface off-street parking on property located at 201 S. Providence Road.**

Chair Townsend opened the public hearing.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, provided a handout of his PowerPoint presentation and explained he was present on behalf of the applicant, who was requesting a conditional use permit for parking. He noted McDonald’s was interested in the site at issue, and had learned a conditional use permit was needed when going through the permitting process. The property was zoned C-2 and located south of Lucky’s and Walgreens. He pointed out they were only requesting a conditional use permit for parking, and not for the McDonald’s as the McDonald’s was a permitted use. He offered a packet, which included the application and presentation along with other documents, into the record. He described the location of the subject property utilizing images of the aerial view and the zoning map. He noted the staff report contained a lot of information regarding policies and guidelines, and included suggestions, but he did not feel those standards were applicable to the decision of the Board in terms of the conditional use permit. He stated the Providence Road Corridor policy resolution had nothing to do with the Board approving the conditional use permit. He listed the standards the Board should consider and explained how he thought the standards were being or would be met. He commented that he was not sure how the parking use affected access in terms of the adequate access standard, and pointed out the current site plan did not propose any new access points. He stated the south access was a shared access point with Custom Muffler. In addition, a traffic impact study, which had not been required, had been completed, and had determined the proposed development, if developed per the site plan, was inconsequential with regard to traffic as the levels of service would not change. He commented that none of the recommendations made by staff were acceptable to the applicant, and reiterated this was a conditional use permit request for parking only. This property had open zoning and there were no provisions in the Code of Ordinances that obligated the applicant to provide for off-site improvements. The staff report also indicated the traffic engineer should be empowered to terminate the conditional use permit based upon the opinion of the traffic engineer, and he did not believe this was acceptable. He noted staff had also recommended restrictions as...
to the location of on-site parking spaces, and he did not believe this process allowed a mechanism for such restrictions.

Matthew Kriete, an engineer with offices at 1113 Fay Street, referred to the site plan and noted the driveway on the southern portion of the site was a shared access driveway, and the only shared driveway he was aware of along Providence Road between Park Avenue and Stewart Road. The other access was along a driveway on the north portion of the site that connected to a signalized access and provided internal circulation between properties. He displayed diagrams illustrated how the traffic would come in and out of the site from both access points. He noted the recommended sidewalk would be located within the MoDOT right-of-way and the applicant could construct it if permitted by MoDOT, but pointed out he did not believe the construction of the sidewalk should be a condition of the permit since it was regulated by another entity.

Shawn White, a traffic engineer with offices at 12400 Olive Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri, explained a traffic study had been prepared by Crawford Bunte and Brammaier in order to address the impacts of the proposed development, and was based upon parameters discussed with the City and MoDOT at commencement of the study. The study included an analysis of the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods in terms of existing or baseline conditions, forecasted conditions, which included the development, and 20-year projections. She pointed out the baseline conditions assumed an approximate 30 percent higher traffic volumes on Providence Road than what had been collected over the past three years based on counts they had done for other entities. As a result, they expected the conditions would be more favorable than indicated until such time the higher volumes materialized. The uses considered were higher traffic generators, but the traffic impact was minimal and the level of service stayed the same. The study did not recommend any physical roadway widening, but did recommend striping the eastbound approach of Locust Street to designate a left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane for clarity purposes as it was being used in that manner. She also suggested minor signal timing adjustments at the intersections of Locust Street and Elm Street. She believed the driveway with Custom Muffler was intended to be a shared access with this development and explained they had looked at making that drive a right-in/right-out, which would have shifted the traffic to the signal at Locust, and found more signal timing adjustments would be needed at Locust Street to add time for a northbound left turn. She suggested the protected and permitted phasing of the north and south left-turn lanes on Providence Road at Locust Street as it would improve the operation of the intersection. She felt leaving the shared drive a full access drive provided relief so all of the traffic was not forced to Locust Street. She understood there was concern with regard to the limited distance between Elm Street and the shared access drive, but did not feel there was an issue during the p.m. peak hour. The southbound left-turn lane on Providence at Elm was heavier during the a.m. peak hour as the queues backed up to about 130 feet, which only left another 30-40 feet before reaching the shared access drive. In those situations, the vehicle could go to the signal at Locust and make a left turn there. She pointed out this was not expected to occur more than five percent of the time.

There being no further comment, Chair Townsend closed the public hearing.

Mr. MacIntyre commented that the rationale behind the recommendation involving the location of the parking spaces was due to the fact several downtown plans had addressed the desire for limiting parking within the C-2 zoning district and due to the Providence Road Corridor policy resolution that had been adopted by Council approximately ten years ago, which called for parking to be located behind buildings and for the buildings to be oriented toward the street front. He pointed out that Lucky’s and most of the surrounding uses were either in the M-1 zoning district or
had been grandfathered as the parking had been in place prior to the City requiring conditional use permits for surface parking for C-2 zoned property. He noted the one exception was Walgreens, which had not been caught by staff when approval had been provided.

Mr. Clithero asked for clarification on the requirement. Mr. MacIntyre replied the requirement was that surface parking lots within the C-2 zoning district to be subject to a conditional use permit prior to approval. He thought this had been the result of a series of buildings that had been demolished and replaced with surface parking lots as there was a sense surface parking lots would erode the solid street frontage that gave the downtown district its character. He understood the purpose was to maintain the existing zero setback and for buildings to be on the street frontage. Mr. Clithero understood the building to the street frontage was not a requirement and was only a recommendation. Mr. MacIntyre clarified the Providence Road Corridor policy resolution was a recommendation intended to apply along the Providence Road corridor, and noted staff had invoked that recommendation in several planned district rezonings and developments over the past decade or so.

Mr. MacIntyre commented that the sidewalk along Providence Road was either nonexistent or in terrible shape, and he did not believe MoDOT approval was an obstacle in terms of reconstructing the sidewalk as they were not against pedestrian connectivity. In terms of the standard requiring access to be designed to prevent traffic hazards and minimize traffic congestion, he noted staff did not believe the traffic study had thoroughly addressed the pedestrian situation. The site plan did not include any pedestrian accommodations, and was purely auto-oriented. This was a concern because this would be adjacent to the downtown and people would be coming to this location from the downtown core area, which was east of Providence. Staff felt there was a clear need to adequately provide safe and non-hazardous traffic situations for pedestrians.

Mr. Hazelrigg understood a sidewalk from Broadway to this area already existed, and that it continued to Taco Bell and Rollins Street. He also understood there was a crosswalk at Locust Street. Mr. Stone stated there were marked crosswalks at Locust Street, but noted there were no pedestrian signals at Locust Street or Elm Street.

Chair Townsend asked if there was a reason why the City did not require pedestrian accommodations when the grocery store was developed. Mr. Stone replied he thought it would be a project the City pursued at some point in the future. Chair Townsend understood the pedestrian signals were not an issue at this time. Mr. Stone explained he would consider them an issue as pedestrian accommodations were not in place and because adequate ADA accommodations did not exist at Elm Street.

Mr. Stone pointed out the Public Works Department would not be able to terminate a conditional use permit.

Mr. Clithero understood the concerns of staff involved pedestrian traffic and parking in front of the building. Mr. Stone pointed out his other concern was that the traffic impact study did not indicate what would actually occur as the shared access drive would be right-in/right-out only at the time of construction or soon thereafter as had been indicated by MoDOT. When that occurred, the transfer of left-turns would go to Locust Street and something would need to be done. In addition, there would be issues with northbound traffic on Providence Road.
Chair Townsend commented that the issue before the Board of Adjustment was whether or not to allow parking on the site, and felt anything after that would be addressed by the site plan at which point the City could talk to the developers with regard to any other expectations. He did not believe the Board was determining the number of parking spaces and the locations of those parking spaces as those items were governed by other regulations. He thought they were only determining whether to allow a conditional use permit for on-site surface parking. Mr. Stone explained he was responsible for determining if the condition in Section 29-23(c)(3)(e) of the Code of Ordinances had been met, and in his opinion it had not been met. It was up to the Board to decide whether or not they agreed.

Ms. Wibbenmeyer explained Section 29-23 of the Code of Ordinances set forth the legal standard, and noted the Board could grant a conditional use permit stipulating any conditions deemed necessary to carry out the provisions and intent of the zoning code. She listed the standards identified in Section 29-23(c)(3).

Ms. John stated she did not have any problem with this proposal, and noted the only condition she thought the Board could include involved the sidewalk, but even that was really a site condition and had nothing to do with the parking. Mr. Clithero thought the applicant had agreed to install the sidewalk if MoDOT required it.

Ms. John made a motion to approve the conditional use permit as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hazelrigg.

Ms. Wibbenmeyer asked if any conditions were included in the motion. Chair Townsend replied no. Ms. John explained the Board would not require the sidewalk because it was not related to parking, and thought staff could require it. Mr. Stone explained he did not believe City staff would be able to require the sidewalk. Mr. Hazelrigg commented that he was not sure the Board had that ability either since they were dealing parking. Chair Townsend stated his concern with it being required by the Board was that it would impact the conditional use permit if MoDOT did not allow it. Ms. John pointed out the Board could only recommend it be done, which did not have any effect.

CASE NO. 1877 VOTE RECORDED AS FOLLOWS: VOTING YES: TOWNSEND, JOHN, FLANAGAN, HAZELRIGG, CLITHERO. VOTING NO: NO ONE. The conditional use permit was approved as requested.

Case Number 1879 was a request by Ernest Rigdon, III, for variances to the side yard setback requirement and the rear yard setback requirement by allowing the existing structure and an addition to encroach into the required side yard and the required rear yard on property located at 213 W. Forest Avenue.

Ms. Eldridge explained the City Clerk’s Office received a phone call from Kathy Loomis of Davenport, Iowa, who owned property at 1012 Jefferson Street and indicated she did not object to the applicant’s request.

Chair Townsend opened the public hearing.

Ernest Rigdon, III, 213 W. Forest Avenue, provided a handout, which listed the reasons he felt the variances should be approved. He stated his request was supported by his neighbors as evidenced by the signatures of support he had obtained and included as part of the application. It
would bring the existing house into compliance with the minimum size ordinance of a one-family home as a one-family home was not to be less than 650 square feet and the house was currently only 540 square feet. He believed approval of the variances was in line with recommendations of the recent Affordable Housing Committee report and Columbia Imagined Plan in terms of emphasizing infill development, suggesting zero lot line setbacks, and modifying regulations to allow non-conforming lots. He noted he would upgrade the house so it would be more efficient than the average new house when construction was completed. In addition, the stop work order was issued after they had already spent more than $8,000. He explained they had relied on the building permit that had been issued, so he felt the granting of the variances was the right thing to do. He pointed out the addition would add value to the neighborhood and bring in more tax revenue to the City of Columbia, and noted the granting of the variances would not have any detrimental effect on the neighborhood as the addition followed the existing lines of the house, which had existed since 1940.

There being no further comment, Chair Townsend closed the public hearing.

Mr. Simon noted the addition did not extend into the required rear yard or side yard any more than the original building, but it did exceed the 25 percent extension limit in the ordinance.

Ms. Amin explained the application form had indicated a request of three feet for the rear yard setback, but the description in the packet stated six feet. She asked for clarification when the Board made its motion.

Mr. Rigdon stated the house was at a slight angle, and the current existing corner was six feet from the property line, but with the extension, the new corner would be within three feet. While the addition followed the property line, it brought the house closer to the rear yard.

Mr. Hazelrigg understood the motion for the variance to the rear yard setback needed to be three feet.

Ms. Wibbenmeyer commented that the applicant had the burden to establish practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships existed for the variance to be granted. In determining practical difficulties and justifying a non-use variance, relevant factors should include how substantial the variation would be in relationship to the requirement, the effect any increase in population density would have on available government facilities, whether substantial change in the character of the neighborhood or substantial detriment to adjoining properties would be created, whether the difficulty could be prevented by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than the variance, and whether interest of justice would be served by allowing the variance in view of the manner in which the difficulty rose and in considering all of the factors.

Chair Townsend noted the applicant had requested a refund of fees, and pointed out the Board could not grant that as it was not within their purview.

Ms. John made a motion to approve the variances as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clithero.

CASE NO. 1879 VOTE RECORDDED AS FOLLOWS: VOTING YES: TOWNSEND, JOHN, FLANAGAN, HAZELRIGG, CLITHERO. VOTING NO: NO ONE. The variances were approved as requested.
Case Number 1880 was a request by Phebe LaMar, attorney for Columbia Properties II, LLC for a variance to the requirement that canopies or open porches not have a roof area exceeding sixty (60) square feet by allowing the roof areas of the proposed canopies to be greater than sixty (60) square feet on property located at 410 Conley Avenue (Parcel No. 16-608-00-05-003.00 01), which is along the south side of Conley Avenue between Fourth Street and Fifth Street.

Chair Townsend opened the public hearing.

Phebe LaMar, an attorney with offices at 111 S. Ninth Street, displayed an image of the proposed awnings and explained she was representing Columbia Properties II, LLC, who was developing the PUD-90 zoned property located at 410 Conley Avenue. She stated variances were needed for two proposed canopies designed to provide weather and other protection for people entering the building through the parking structure or the front door on the Fifth Street side of the building. The developer was seeking to provide convenience to patrons while adding visual interest to the building. The expanse of the building along the sidewalk would be substantial without these canopies and awnings, and the added visual effects of the canopies would improve the appearance of the building allowing it to fit in better with the downtown buildings a couple of blocks away. She noted the ordinance being applied with regard to the canopies was a residential ordinance, and application of this ordinance to a project of this size imposed an unnecessary hardship and practical difficulty because the size of canopies allowed would not look right on a building this size. She did not believe this was self-imposed as the zoning for this project was correct, but the ordinance the City was applying to the canopies did not make a great deal of sense due to the scope of the project. She pointed out the surrounding properties would not be subject to the same conditions as they were all zoned R-3 and/or were operated by the University of Missouri. She commented that the granting of the variance would not result in substantial injustice as the visual effect would be beneficial to the project and the citizens who would look at it. In addition, she felt public safety and welfare would be preserved as it would allow weather protection for people as they entered the parking garage and the building, and the viability of the zoning ordinances would be preserved as there were few projects of this size that would be subject to the residential canopy requirement where this would be an issue.

There being no further comment, Chair Townsend closed the public hearing.

Mr. Simon stated he believed this ordinance was intended for a more residential application.

Ms. Wibbenmeyer explained the legal standard was one of practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

Mr. Clithero made a motion to approve the variance as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hazelrigg.

CASE NO. 1880 VOTE RECORDED AS follows: VOTING YES: TOWNSEND, JOHN, FLANAGAN, HAZELRIGG, CLITHERO. VOTING NO: NO ONE. The variance was approved as requested.

Case Number 1881 was a request by Robert Hollis, attorney for Roth Properties LLP, Mary M. Hackett Trust #1, and CVS, to determine a conditional use permit is not required for the
drive-up facility and to recognize same as a permitted use under the C-2 zoning district on property located at 308 E. Broadway, which is also known as 32 S. Providence Road, 19 S. Providence Road, 320 E. Broadway, 300 E. Broadway, 1 S. Fourth Street, 11 S. Fourth Street, 15 S. Fourth Street, 17 S. Fourth Street, 19 S. Fourth Street, 23 S. Fourth Street, and 25 S. Fourth Street.

Chair Townsend opened the public hearing.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, provided a handout of his PowerPoint presentation and explained his clients were appealing the decision of City staff to require a conditional use permit for a drive-through. He pointed out this was not a request for a conditional use permit. It was a request that the Board determine the requirement for a conditional use permit was incorrect, and that there was no requirement for a conditional use permit to be issued for a drive-through in C-2 zoning.

Chair Townsend understood this appeal did not include parking. Mr. Hollis stated that was correct.

Mr. Hollis offered a packet, which included the application and presentation along with other documents, into the record, and referred to the site plan of the proposed CVS development. He pointed out the site included both M-1 and C-2 zoned property and described the locations of the properties. He noted all of the parking was on the M-1 zoned side and no parking was located on the C-2 zoned side. A portion of the drive-through, however, was located on the C-2 zoned side. He understood staff had determined a conditional use permit would be required for the drive-through on the C-2 zoned portion of the site, and they felt that determination was incorrect and that the Board should reverse that decision. He referred to the C-2 ordinances, and pointed out it listed “accessory uses, including drive-up facilities” as a permitted use. He believed a drive-up facility was the same as a drive-through, and stated every pharmacy he was aware of in Columbia had a drive-through. He understood staff did not support the configuration of the drive-through, but did not believe that was relevant to the decision of the Board.

Chair Townsend asked if accessory use was defined anywhere. Ms. Wibbenmeyer replied accessory building or use was defined in Section 29-2 of the Code of Ordinances as a detached subordinate building having a use customarily incident to and located on a lot occupied by the main building, or a use customarily incident to the main use of the property.

Mr. Hollis commented that he had come across 2010 City Council Meeting minutes that had used drive-up facilities and drive-through facilities interchangeably, and whereby staff had indicated a drive-through could be considered an accessory use for a bank or pharmacy. He stated he believed the Board could rely on Section 29-31(6)(a) of the Code of Ordinances in that there was an error in the determination of staff, or on Section 29-31(6)(c) of the Code of Ordinances as there were practical difficulties and unnecessary hardship if the Board decided the strict letter of the ordinances was not consistent with the request of the applicant. If there was uncertainty, he thought the Board could classify this use, and specifically state a drive-through was part of a drive-up facility. He stated they were specifically asking the Board to reverse, wholly or in part, the determination made by staff that a drive-through could only be approved if there was a conditional use permit for parking and drive-through facilities. He pointed out there were several drive-through facilities on C-2 zoned property without conditional use permits, and listed Walgreens, City Hall, Tiger Dry Cleaning, several banks, and Taco Bell as some examples.
Chair Townsend asked for clarification from staff. Mr. Teddy explained Mr. Simon had relied on his determination in the plan review letter that this area was part of the parking area that required a conditional use permit. He agreed there were two zoning classifications on the property, and both M-1 and C-2 allowed retail stores and pharmacies. In addition, M-1 allowed surface parking areas. Staff felt the drive-through and parking lot aisle on the C-2 zoned portion of the property required a conditional use permit. He pointed out the term used was “parking area,” and his thought was it included any drive that led to or from an area where parking spaces were located. He explained the C-2 ordinances were amended in 1998, and prior to then, there were no restrictions on parking lots in the C-2 zoning district. In August of 1998, the Council added two conditional uses. One was for uncovered surface commercial parking for automobiles and light trucks, except for publicly-owned parking facilities, and the other was for uncovered surface off-street parking areas, except for publicly-owned parking facilities. Already allowed at that time was the category of customary accessory uses, including drive-up facilities. He felt that was a contradiction or conflict within the ordinance itself, and noted they typically resolved conflicts by deciding in favor of the more restrictive standard. He urged the Board to think of this drive-through lane as a part of the parking area since it served individuals that parked cars, vehicles exiting the area, and service vehicles that might empty dumpsters. He explained this was a procedural argument in terms of how this component of the site plan was classified, and staff felt the part of the parking area within the C-2 district was subject to a conditional use permit hearing.

Chair Townsend understood the drive-through was considered parking simply because it was next to parking. Mr. Teddy explained it was interconnected with the parking lot, and pointed out all of it produced impacts. He understood part of the reason for the 1998 amendment was the desire for compact construction with fewer driveway cuts intruding onto public streets and the avoidance of large flat expanses of parking lots. He agreed there were a lot of parking areas and parking areas with parking spaces and drive-through facilities in the immediate vicinity, but those were constructed prior to the 1998 ordinance going into effect. Surface parking was no longer allowed without a conditional use permit being obtained.

Mr. Clithero asked what “customary accessory uses, including drive-up facilities” was a part of in the C-2 ordinance. Ms. John replied it was a part of the list of permitted C-2 uses. Mr. Teddy explained it was included in the list of items allowed by right, and it was typical format to include any accessory uses at the end.

Mr. Hazelrigg stated this was a unique situation where part of the property was zoned one way. Ms. John agreed, but noted there could not be a drive-up facility without a driveway. If a drive-up facility was permitted, she wondered how the driveway could also not be permitted. Mr. Teddy pointed out that language preceded the 1998 change to the Code.

Chair Townsend understood staff felt “but for” the adjacent parking, this would not be a problem. Mr. Teddy stated he would not go that far. Chair Townsend understood it would be a permitted use without any objection from staff if that were the situation. Mr. Teddy believed if this was a dedicated drive-through that served no other purpose, it would be covered under the list of uses as accessory to the building. He pointed out that parking lots consisted of parking stalls, aisles, driveways, etc., and this was a multi-function drive as it provided access to the building and to parking, and was striped for exit only so he assumed people would leave the site through it. He explained drive-through facilities were sometimes converted to parking. Chair Townsend did not believe that was to be addressed by the Board. He noted the drive-through appeared to be about 12 feet wide. Mr. Teddy stated it was a 24-foot width as there was a 12-foot lane for the drive-
through and a 12-foot lane for exiting. Chair Townsend understood there was a dedicated lane for the drive-up facility, and another lane for ingress and egress for other purposes. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Ms. John noted the parking lot also had two other ways in and out. Mr. Hazelrigg agreed there were entrances on Providence Road and on Fourth Street.

Ms. Wibbenmeyer stated it was for the Board to determine if there was competent, substantial evidence to support the decision of the code official, and that the decision of the code official was not arbitrary or capricious.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated she was a neighborhood representative of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council and noted she had been involved with the discussion of CVS project and public hearings since it had come before the Planning and Zoning Commission last fall. She commented that she did not believe these things happened in a vacuum. She pointed out the parcel immediately south of this property was a delightful park she and her neighbors most frequented since it was adjacent to where they lived and hosted a variety of pedestrian-friendly and kid-friendly activities. She asked the Board to follow the recommendation of staff to require a conditional use permit because it would provide for a more complete conversation about the traffic impacts on Fourth Street, Broadway, and the park. She noted the park had been renovated from industrial and other uses at a cost of $1.6 million of which $300,000 were from citizen donations. She stated she supported the applicant being required to obtain a conditional use permit and being subjected to traffic studies and the other items discussed earlier for other conditional use permits.

Chair Townsend understood the traffic study would solely be on the C-2 portion and not the parking, so the traffic study would most likely only address the effect of a drive-through on Fourth Street. Ms. Fowler stated the park fronted on Fourth Street, so those impacts along Fourth Street were a concern. She understood the staff report addressed some of the other impacts the applicant would have to comply with that also negatively affected the park.

There being no further comment, Chair Townsend closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hazelrigg understood the applicant was asking that a conditional use permit not be required. Chair Townsend explained the City had denied approval of the site plan, and had indicated a conditional use permit was needed for the drive-through, which he believed was an accessory use as a drive-up facility. He understood the argument of the applicant was that it was an approved use under C-2 so a conditional use permit was not necessary, and that the requirement of City staff was not proper and was arbitrary and capricious.

Ms. John made a motion to grant the appeal by determining the conditional use permit was not required for the drive-up facility and to recognize the same as a permitted use under the C-2 zoning district. The motion was seconded by Mr. Flanagan.

CASE NO. 1881 VOTE RECORDED AS FOLLOWS: VOTING YES: TOWNSEND, JOHN, FLANAGAN, HAZELRIGG, CLITHERO. VOTING NO: NO ONE. The appeal was granted as requested.

Chair Townsend asked if they could elect the Chair and Vice Chair for the upcoming year today. Ms. Amin stated it had not been listed on the agenda, but she did not know why they could not do so if they wanted.
Chair Townsend made a motion to elect Ms. John as Chair and to elect Mr. Clithero as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Mr. Flanagan and approved unanimously by voice vote.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk