

**WAUKESHA COUNTY
MINUTES OF THE PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM AC 255/259
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2017, 1:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Morris, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Commission

Members Present: Richard Morris James Siepmann Robert Peregrine
 William Mitchell William Maslowski

Members Absent: None

Staff

Members Present: Jason Fruth, Planning and Zoning Manager
 Kathy Brady, Support Staff Supervisor
 Sandy Scherer, Senior Planner
 Amy Barrows, Senior Planner
 Kim Haines, Corporation Counsel

Guests Present: Tom Downing: Downing conceptual review
 Bill Zach: ZT-1858, Miller Marriott Construction and SCU-1628 Iron Pipe Dev.
 Chris Miller: ZT-1858
 Gary Lake: ZT-1859, ZT-1860 and The Corners of Brookfield
 Tom Hagie: ZT-1859, ZT-1860 and The Corners of Brookfield
 Robert Gould: The Corners of Brookfield
 Allen Walen: Member of the audience

CORRESPONDENCE: None.

MEETING APPROVAL: None.

MINUTES: Approval of the September 21, 2017, Minutes.

Mr. Mitchell moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine and carried unanimously for approval of the September 21, 2017, Minutes, as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

SCHEDULED MATTERS

- **1:00 p.m. Public Hearing for SZ-1459P (Waukesha County Park and Planning Commission)**
Proposed text amendments to the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance to incorporate a revised citation schedule and related ordinance text.

Ms. Barrows, Senior Planner, explained in 2016 both the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance (SFPO) and the Zoning Code (ZC) were amended. The Planning and Zoning Division Staff reviewed the existing citation schedule to see if there were any additional sections, which needed to be added. She referred to Exhibit “C” (SFPO Violation Forfeiture Schedule) of the “Staff Report and Recommendation.” At the Waukesha County Corporation Counsel’s request, the following sections were added or the forfeiture amounts amended:

- **Section 3, Noncompliance with General Provisions**: This section is a catch all for violations of specific sections of the code that are not specifically listed on the schedule.
- **Section 3(d)5.A., Floodplain fill violation**: Was \$1,000.00 per day fine, however, State Statutes do not allow a fee of greater than \$50.00 per day. At the bottom of the schedule, there is a note added referring to the Statute.
- **Sections 3(d)5.C. and 3(e)1., Retaining Wall Violation or Land Altering Violation and Failure to Obtain or Noncompliance with Approved Site Plan and/or Plan of Operation or Other Use Regulations**: Added wording to match the titles of the Code.
- **Section 3(g), Noncompliance with Water Performance Standards**: New section, where someone knowingly contaminates a waterway, illegal discharge, pollution, etc.
- **Section 3(j), Noncompliance with Area & Building Footprint Regulations**: Added wording “Building Footprint” to section title, which is a new provision in the Code.
- **Section 3(o), Noncompliance with Legal Nonconformity**: Combined three separate forfeitures into one category, regarding structures, uses and lots.
- **Sections 3(t), 3(u) and 3(v), Noncompliance with Impervious Surface Standards, Noncompliance with Mitigation Standards, Noncompliance with Protect Adult-Oriented Establishments**: New forfeitures. Mitigation requirements are recorded against the title of a property.
- **Sections 7-37, Noncompliance with Zoning District Regulations**: Replaced Section 6.

Mr. Siepmann asked why the different court costs, crime lab, justice information and jail assessment fees in addition to the base forfeiture are listed on the forfeiture schedule when they change regularly? Ms. Haines replied, that those fees are set by the Wisconsin Legislature and for a specific dollar amount. The State does not regularly go through and change the fee amounts. Mr. Siepmann asked, if the fees change does the schedule need to come back to the Commission for approval? Ms. Barrows responded, that normally a public hearing is not needed to amend the citation schedule. The reason the Planning and Zoning Division Staff is going through a public hearing process today is because the text on the schedule is also being amended. The Planning and Zoning Division Staff is proposing that the schedule needs County Board approval only if there are base forfeiture amount changes, not for other fee assessments set by the Wisconsin Legislature. She added that there is a note at the bottom of the schedule, which explains the process.

Mr. Fruth added, that the Environmental Health Division is also creating a citation schedule for on-site septic since they have not had one previously. In addition, he noted that citations are issued sparingly by the Planning and Zoning Division. He said there have been approximately seven (7) citations issued out of the 150 violations in 2016.

Mr. Mitchell added that the Planning and Zoning Division Staff always works for compliance vs. citations. Mr. Peregrine asked who signs the citations? Ms. Barrows replied, that the Planner signs the citation after reviewing it with the Planning and Zoning Division Manager and Corporation Counsel.

Chairperson Morris asked if there were any other comments from the audience, Committee or Commission, there being none, he closed the public hearing at 1:10 p.m.

- **Public Hearing for CZ-1459Q (Waukesha County Park and Planning Commission)**

Proposed text amendments to the Waukesha County Zoning Code to incorporate a revised citation schedule and related ordinance text.

Chairperson Morris opened the public hearing at 1:11 p.m.

Ms. Barrows said the amendments to the ZC are very similar to the SFPO, She explained that the ZC had a maximum citation per day of \$200.00, which did not match the actual citation schedule. The text has now been amended to be \$1,000.00 as the maximum citation amount.

Chairperson Morris asked if there were any other comments from the audience, Committee or Commission, there being none, he closed the public hearing at 1:13 p.m.

- **SZ-1459P (Waukesha County Park and Planning Commission)**

Mr. Fruth pointed out that the request is for text amendments to the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance to incorporate a revised citation schedule and related ordinance text.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Mitchell moved, seconded by Mr. Maslowski and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”.

- **CZ-1459Q (Waukesha County Park and Planning Commission)**

Mr. Fruth pointed out that the request is for text amendments to the Waukesha County Zoning Code to incorporate a revised citation schedule and related ordinance text.

Mr. Mitchell thanked the Planning and Zoning Division Staff for their hard work on the citation schedule.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Siepmann moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”.

- **ZT-1854 (A & R Investment Realty, LLC) Town of Vernon, Section 1**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at S65 W22175 National Avenue in the Town of Vernon on the aerial photograph. He indicated the request is to rezone the property from the A-5 Mini Farm District to the B-3 General Business District.

Mr. Fruth indicated the property is located south of I-43 and north of C.T.H. “ES” and contains approximately 6 acres. Adjacent properties include an implement dealer to the east and a septic tank cleaning business to northwest. The septic tank cleaning business is interested in relocating to the subject property. A large storage building is being proposed to be constructed on the northeast corner of the property and three (3) in-ground septic storage tanks are proposed to be located south of the storage building. In addition, there is currently a residence on the property, which would be converted to an office for the business. The Planning and Zoning Division Staff contacted the Environmental Health Division (EHD) regarding the in-ground tanks and they indicated they are commonplace in the industry. The EHD was asked about odors associated with tankers discharging waste into the tanks, to which they

indicated, yes, there would be odors when the pumping is occurring. However, a couple hundred feet should mitigate any odors.

Mr. Fruth indicated the property owners to the east are aware of the proposal and were in support of the business and a shared driveway connection for light vehicle usage only. The property owner to the west (a family member) expressed concerns regarding the future resale value of his property.

Mr. Fruth noted that the Town of Vernon initially submitted an ordinance with two (2) conditions, however, the Town minutes contained five (5) different conditions. The Town Clerk placed the matter on the Town Board agenda for clarification and the Board indicated they would bring forward a total of seven (7) conditions.

Mr. Peregrine asked how often the tankers would be pumped into the in-ground storage tanks? Mr. Fruth replied that he was not provided the specifics of the plan. He explained that the EHD has speculated it might be at the end of each day. Chairperson Morris asked how large the in-ground storage tanks were, to which Mr. Fruth replied approximately 8,000 gallons.

After discussion, Mr. Maslowski moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **ZT-1858 (Miller Marriott Construction Co./Meissner Family Farm, LLC) Town of Lisbon, Section 29**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at W274 N6942 Lake Five Road in the Town of Lisbon on the aerial photograph. He indicated the request is to rezone the property from the A-10 Agricultural District to the R-1 Suburban Single Family Residential District for future residential subdivision lots.

Mr. Fruth indicated the property is located on the north side of Silver Spring Drive and east of Lake Five Road. The proposed development would be a combination of conventional and conservation design. He noted the property contains 78 acres. He presented Exhibit “A” (Concept Plan) of the “Staff Report and Recommendation” and noted that one (1) acre conventional lots are being proposed to abut the existing subdivision development to the east and a PUD layout is being proposed for the remainder of the lots with substantial open space. In addition, pedestrian facilities are being proposed along Lake Five Road and in the open space areas of the interior of the development. Mr. Fruth further explained that at the public hearing, neighbors objected to the smaller lot sizes initially proposed. The developers revised the layout so that the one-acre lots abut the existing subdivision located to the east. In addition, there is a boundary agreement, which has stipulations relative to lot size, which was identified to the developer in earlier discussions. The boundary agreement requires lots of one acre or more. The Village of Merton would need to approve the concept plan before the development can move forward.

Chairperson Morris asked if any additional road work was proposed at the corner of C.T.H. “VV” and Lake Five Road, which is a dangerous intersection? The Developer, replied that they were not asked to do any improvements. Mr. Mitchell mentioned that during public comment, there was discussion that a Planned Unit Development does not benefit the Town. He wondered if the proposal had to show a positive benefit for the Town? Mr. Fruth said that the general statements in most Town Codes call for there to be some benefit to the community. Most times, open space provides that benefit but some

PUD's bring forth other amenities. He explained that the comments at the public hearing were about the initial concept plan presented not the revised plan being presented today. Mr. Siepmann, added that sometimes there is confusion between density and lot size.

After discussion, Mr. Siepmann moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **ZT-1859 (Town of Brookfield Board)**

Mr. Fruth pointed out that the request is for text amendments to the Town of Brookfield Zoning Code relating to adult daycare facilities.

Mr. Fruth indicated that the Town of Brookfield received an inquiry for an adult daycare facility to be located in a multi-tenant building. The Town did not have accommodations for the adult daycare as a new use, however, ultimately decided it would be appropriate. The Town brought forward the proposal to allow the use as a Conditional Use in the B-3 District.

After discussion, Mr. Maslowski moved, seconded by Mr. Siepmann and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation".

- **ZT-1860 (Goerkes Park LLP) Town of Brookfield, Section 30**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at 20711 Watertown Road in the Town of Brookfield on the aerial photograph. He indicated the request is to rezone the property from the B-3 Office and Professional Business District to the B-2 Limited General Business District.

Mr. Fruth indicated that the western portion of the property is being proposed to be rezoned while the majority of the property will remain in the B-3 District. He noted that the proposed B-2 district allows hotels. There is an existing office building located on the property which has been vacant for a number of years and the request is to replace the office building with a new hotel (Tru by Hilton). The Town has given careful consideration to the transition of this area to slightly more commercial uses. He referred to Exhibit "A" of the Staff Report and Recommendation showing the site plan for the proposed hotel.

After discussion, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Maslowski and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **SCU-1494T (Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use/Town of Ottawa) Town of Ottawa, Section 10**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at S30 W36550 C.T.H. "D" in the Town of Ottawa on the aerial photograph. He indicated the request is for the termination of an existing commercial truck parking Conditional Use Permit.

Ms. Scherer, Senior Planner, indicated the property is owned by William and Judy Gapp and the operator of the commercial truck parking conditional use is their son, Steve Gapp. She further explained that Steve Gapp operates an asphalt business and stores vehicles and equipment related to the business

on his parent's property. Over the years there have been complaints received from neighbors regarding junk vehicles, habitation of an accessory structure and non-compliance of the conditional use issued in 2008. The site would be cleaned up, then fall back into violation. Several neighbors attended the public hearing on October 2, 2017 for the conditional use termination, and spoke in favor of terminating the conditional use. They indicated that there were more than the allowed number of commercial vehicles located on the site, commercial activities occurring, dumping of business related materials, loud noises, junk and disabled vehicles, cars in and out of the property all day (employees), items being delivered by semi's and unloaded with skid loaders which were trespassing on neighboring properties and ripping up their grass, gunfire, all of which is decreasing their property values. There is also a question of whether the operator lives on the property, which is a requirement/condition of the conditional use.

Ms. Scherer explained the original conditional use permit was issued for the petitioner to store one (1) asphalt paver and one (1) trailer on the property in a particular area. When a complaint was made and the Planning and Zoning Division Staff would visit the property, there was always more commercial related items, junk and other miscellaneous junk on the property. The property would be cleaned up but then fall back into violation. After numerous chances over the years, the Town decided to terminate the conditional use. The public hearing was held on October 2, 2017 and the Town Plan Commission voted unanimously to terminate the conditional use.

Mr. Mitchell asked, that once the property would be cleaned up it would revert back, to which Ms. Scherer replied, "Yes, several times." Every time the site would be inspected by Staff, a Sheriff's deputy would need to be present for a number of reasons. Mr. Peregrine asked if they are aware of the proposed action today? Ms. Scherer replied, that Mr. Gapp (son) came to the meeting at the Town, however, missed the public hearing portion (he was sent a public hearing notice and agenda from the Town), but was aware of the Town's action. He was also sent an agenda for today's Commission meeting. Mr. Peregrine asked what is the next step? Ms. Scherer indicated the Planning and Zoning Division Staff is recommending that the conditional use be terminated, removal of all offensive and non-compliant items from the property no later than January 17, 2017 (ordinance requires giving 90 days to get this done), it is being recommended that the cleanup process be started prior to inclement weather as no extensions will be granted. Mr. Peregrine stated that the Town and County seems to have been very patient with the operator over the years. Mr. Mitchell commented that the Planning and Zoning Staff has worked with the operator over the years to try and get the property into compliance. Mr. Siepmann stated he could not remember the last time a conditional use was terminated. Ms. Scherer said it is rare to have this happen.

After discussion, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and carried unanimously for approval to terminate the Conditional Use, in accordance with the "Staff Report and recommendation".

• **SCU-1628 (Iron Pipe Development, LLC) Town of Delafield, Section 31**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property, on the north side of Summit Avenue, east of Cushing Park Road in the Town of Delafield on the aerial photograph. He indicated the request is for a thirty (30) lot, single-family residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) subdivision.

Mr. Fruth indicated that 60% of the site would remain in open space and no lots would abut Cushing Park Road. He explained that the developer has worked hard to refine the proposal by preserving an Isolated Natural Resource Area on the central part of the site and working around a steep slope that is wooded. Oak and maple trees would be planted within outlots between lots and Cushing Park Road.

Lot sizes would be generally a minimum of 36,000 sq. ft., an average width of 150' and offsets of 20' and a plan for the open space areas is being required. Chairperson Morris asked if there is a temporary cul-de-sac at the property line? Mr. Siepmann stated the road is in and connected to the property. Chairperson Morris asked what the grade is on the slope, to which Mr. Fruth replied that he was unsure, but he thought it was in excess of 10%. Mr. Maslowski asked the number of entrances into the development? Mr. Fruth replied three (3), one off of Cushing Park Road, one off of an interior road network to an adjacent subdivision and one off of Abitz Road. Mr. Peregrine asked why the number of lots was reduced from 36 to 30? Mr. Fruth said the Town was looking for separation between the road and lots and other design issues, possibly stormwater.

After discussion, Mr. Maslowski moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **(The Corners of Brookfield) Town of Brookfield, Section 29**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at 20111 West Bluemound Road in the Town of Brookfield on the aerial photograph. He indicated the petitioner is requesting a concept discussion on The Corners of Brookfield - Building D expansion proposal.

Mr. Fruth indicated the item is on the agenda to inform the Commission of a significant proposed change to The Corners of Brookfield development. The County is involved because there is a small amount of County Shoreland jurisdiction west of Poplar Creek. A proposal has been presented to add a theater use to the project, which would not expand the building footprint. An updated traffic and parking analysis has been prepared. He pointed out on the site plan, the easterly most building (Building D) in which the theater is being proposed. Originally the building was proposed to be first floor retail with store fronts, parking facilities and residential units above. The east side of Building D has a hallway corridor, which serves the residential units and overlooks the easement to the east and driveways leading to Bluemound Road. Another building, Building K, is proposed to be eliminated and its place there will be 16 additional parking stalls.

Mr. Gould explained that the retail market is going through significant changes with internet shopping and market conditions. He indicated that people want to spend their disposable income on food, entertainment and at restaurants. Some shopping malls are adding restaurants and stores to the outside of their malls. He stated the vision for The Corners of Brookfield is for it to be a vibrant town center. To make it more sustainable, they need another anchor, an entertainment attraction. He added that they have been careful in selecting an operator that was right for the demographic of the town center. He stated they have selected a theater company that is going to attract a well-educated, discerning customer base. This particular theater market targets an educated customer base, higher demographic that appreciates educational films, live operas from the New York Met, operas from Rome or London, theater from the National Theater of London, etc. The proposed theater would have a cocktail lounge rather than traditional concessions. This particular theater has other locations in Florida and attracts a similar demographic and if people want a more exclusive offering and environment they will be willing to pay for it.

Mr. Peregrine asked about the location of the theater on the property and if residences were going to be removed? Mr. Lake, Town of Planner/Administrator, introduced himself and pointed out on the plan submitted where the theater would be located, on the east side of the development, west of the

residences. Mr. Peregrine asked why would someone choose to go to the theater at “The Corners of Brookfield” (finding parking within the development) vs. the Majestic Theater located a mile away. Mr. Gould replied that there is covered parking available at “The Corners of Brookfield” town center and the image they want to create is a gathering place with a sense of community not a box in a parking lot as with the other theater. In addition, you could see a movie and go out for dinner all at the same location. Mr. Peregrine expressed concerns regarding existing traffic and additional traffic from the theater. Mr. Hagie said he has not seen any additional traffic issues, the signals are operating/timed well and the system operates flawlessly. Mr. Maslowski said if he would vote in favor of the theaters being added it would only be for one reason, to save the initial investment of the development and the tax base for the Town of Brookfield. He mentioned that he voted against “The Corners of Brookfield” development a few years ago based upon traffic issues near a very busy Goerkes Corners intersection. He added that the traffic on Bluemound Road near the development is a disaster, and adding a movie theater will not improve the traffic situation. He also expressed concerns with this new theater affecting the business at the existing theater in Brookfield. In closing, a good point is that the footprint of the development is not going to increase, only be reconfigured. Mr. Siepman said the shopping experience is going away because many people use the internet and the development direction is for an entertainment and restaurant experiences.

Mr. Fruth said the Planning and Zoning Division Staff considered one of the largest concerns of the initial project to be traffic and parking. A detailed revised traffic analysis was submitted. He suggested that the DOT review and approve the revised traffic and parking study. He felt the current traffic at the development seems to be functioning well. The Planning Staff is seeking any input, direction from the Commission and felt the addition of a theater could be handled through a Site Plan/Plan of Operation.

Chairperson Morris asked if there were any other comments from the audience or Commission, there being none, he moved on to the next item on the agenda.

- **(Thomas Downing) Town of Merton, Section 14**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at W293 N7882 Camp Whitcomb Road in the Town of Merton on the aerial photograph. He indicated the request is for a conceptual review of a proposed land use plan and zoning amendment for a lot not abutting a public road.

Mr. Fruth indicated the proposal was unique to the Planning and Zoning Division Staff. Mr. Downing indicated that the first survey of the property showed it contained 10.98 acres. He explained that his daughter would like to live on the lake and he would like to split his property into two (2) different parcels. The Town and County asked him to have a Certified Survey Map drawn up. It was then discovered that the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission put an Environmental Corridor Overlay on this property. Mr. Fruth brought up the aerial photo from 1963, showing that the property was not heavily wooded at that time. Mr. Downing pointed out that it was zoned agricultural at that time. The original owner then built three (3) cottages and rented them out for week or weekend use. There was also a two-story garage. A single turn around driveway accessed the residence and the three (3) cottages. Mr. Downing said that over time, the cottages were eliminated. The two-story garage was converted into their current residence and he has lived there ever since. Now his daughter and her husband would like to build a house at the east end of the driveway and turn around. He needs to divide his parcel and create two (2) lots. Since the Environmental Corridor has been identified on the property, he is not able to create two (2), five (5) acre lots as required.

Mr. Fruth added, in addition, there would be a lot not abutting a public road approval needed, secondary to the Environmental Corridor issue on the property. He pointed out on the aerial photograph, a large wetland complex on the property (considered lowland). With the Environmental Corridor identification, only one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) upland acres is allowed. He is just short of the five (5) acres per lot. Mr. Downing said he hired a Naturalist who identified and confirmed the Environmental Corridor on the property. Mr. Fruth said another option to get two (2) lots is to change the designation of Environmental Corridor to something else, or at least a small building envelope and rezoning the area out of the Environmental Corridor. There is also the question, if the Commission feels from a policy perspective that it is appropriate to take into account the unique circumstances on the property. There is wetland at the shore of the lake. The Planning and Zoning Division Staff expressed concerns that someone is likely to want to obtain another pier on a property that really is not set up for more than one pier access area. Mr. Downing and his daughter were open to having one (1) shared pier and placing a conservation easement on the rest of the Environmental Corridor that is wooded or wetland. Mr. Downing added that when he initially purchased the property it was a junkyard. The cottages were rented to alcoholics and there were eleven (11) junk vehicles on the property. During the first two years he lived there, he hauled off 22,000 lbs. of scrap steel, which allowed the trees to grow and they also planted a few trees encouraging the Environmental Corridor.

Mr. Maslowski said if the two (2) lots are created, there would only be pier/lake access from your daughter's property to the one pier that they would share. Mr. Downing said he would create an easement to the pier. Mr. Maslowski expressed concerns that when Mr. Downing decides to sell his property, the next property owner would want to put in another pier without lake access. Mr. Mitchell said there would be an easement and lake access to whoever would purchase the property. Mr. Downing said he planned to give all of his property to his daughter at some point in the future. Mr. Siepmann asked if the Commission has historically (during the last 5 years) granted any approvals for lots not abutting a public road? Mr. Fruth replied, there have been some approvals, but the Planning and Zoning Division Staff recommends such arrangements sparingly, and only if it is logical arrangement. Mr. Fruth said this is an unconventional request. The Town of Merton conceptually approved the lot not abutting a public road. Mr. Siepmann suggested that Mr. Downing research the marketability of the two (2) lots in the future. He suggested the house would be more marketable if it had ownership all of the way out to the street rather than adding an easement over another property. He sketched an alternative layout and described how it might work.

Mr. Peregrine asked why couldn't this be a two-unit condominium, which would remove of all of the issues? Mr. Fruth replied it might be possible and he did not think it was a bad option. The Commission agreed that this would be a good solution. Mr. Fruth said the property would still need a Land Use Plan amendment, to which Mr. Downing agreed.

Chairperson Morris asked if there were any other comments from the audience or Commission, there being none, he asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Maslowski to adjourn at 2:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Mitchell

William Mitchell
Secretary

WM:kb

