

CITY OF MEDINA
PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday August 11, 2015

1. **Call to Order:** Acting Chairperson Reid called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners Todd Albers, Randy Foote, Kim Murrin, Victoria Reid, Janet White, and Kent Williams.

Absent: Planning Commissioner Charles Nolan.

Also Present: City Planner Dusty Finke

2. **Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda**

No comments made.

3. **Update from City Council Proceedings**

City Councilmember Anderson provided an update on the recent activity of the Council. He stated that at the Council meeting the previous week the Council had a lengthy discussion regarding the Stonegate request and voted unanimously to direct staff to prepare both a resolution of denial and a resolution of approval that would be contingent upon the applicant providing a revised plan that incorporates the comments made by the Planning Commission and City Council. He hoped that the applicant would bring back a revised plan. Williams asked if the resolutions worked in tandem or whether they would be mutually exclusive.

Anderson explained that the Council would only adopt one resolution and that would depend upon the action of the applicant. He stated that if the applicant does not revise their plan, the Council would adopt the resolution denying the request. He stated that the resolutions would come before the Council for consideration at their next meeting.

Williams asked if the applicant were to provide a revised plan, would the Planning Commission also review that plan before the Council.

Finke stated that there is not enough time within the review period and therefore the Council alone would review any new submissions from the applicant.

Williams asked if the resolution of approval would address the issue of density.

Finke stated that a reduction of density was one of the items the applicant was to consider. He stated that staff did receive a revised plan from the applicant today, which appears to have increased the conservation area to 36 percent of the buildable area, which is approximately another seven to eight acres; reduced the number of lots by two, removing one home lot and the pool lot; and increasing the amount of trails. He stated that the question will now be did the applicant go far enough.

Anderson reported that the Council also considered a preliminary approval of a draft ordinance regarding solar panels in the rural residential zoning districts, noting that staff is

now preparing a final draft of the ordinance; and the Council also approved the Town Line Road improvement project.

Murrin referenced the solar ordinance and questioned if the Council suggested any changes from what had been recommended by the Planning Commission.

Anderson stated that he did not believe any significant changes were suggested from what had been recommended by the Planning Commission.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update.

5. **Approval of the July 14, 2015 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Motion by Williams, seconded by White, to approve the July 14, 2015, Planning Commission minutes with the noted corrections. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: Nolan)

6. **Robert Buehler – Preliminary Plat and Variance to Divide a Single Lot into a Lot and an Outlot**

Finke stated that this request requires two action items, a Preliminary Plat to subdivide the parcel and a variance request related to the minimum lot size. He stated that the subdivision would create one buildable lot and one outlot. He stated that the variance is to reduce the minimum lot size requirements for the proposed lot. He noted that the subject property is actually a single parcel that encompasses the triangle and rectangular portions. He explained that originally there were two tax identifications issued for the parcel, one for the triangle and one for the rectangle, because the parcel lies within two taxing districts. He stated that it is not uncommon that a single parcel be issued two tax identification numbers for this reason. He stated that a previous owner then conveyed portions of the property to two different parties, which should not have been allowed as the single property is now under ownership of two parties. He stated that there was a home on the western portion of the property, which was demolished by the current owner and the applicant, with the intent of building a new home on the property. He stated that the property is zoned rural residential and displayed an aerial photograph of the property. He stated that the proposed split would be along the taxing line with the triangle portion to be used to construct a home, if the variance is approved, and the rectangular portion would become an outlot. He explained that the property owner to the south also owns the rectangle portion of this property.

Murrin questioned how the sale of one parcel was processed to two buyers through the County.

Finke stated that deeds were provided on each portion of the lot. He explained that the proposed triangle lot would be over four acres in size, which would contain 3.5 acres of contiguous suitable soils, noting that the rural residential district requires five acres of contiguous suitable soils, which is why the variance is requested. He stated that approximately one acre of the suitable soils lie within a driveway easement. He stated that if the request moves forward, staff recommends a condition that would require the applicant to address that issue and move the easement to the shared driveway rather than its current location.

Reid questioned who the existing unused easement is actually for.

Finke stated that the easement is for numerous properties to the east.

Williams asked if the purpose of that easement is to provide access to Willow Drive.

Finke confirmed that the purpose of the easement is to provide access to Willow Drive to the properties to the east.

Williams questioned how those properties receive access currently.

Finke stated that those properties use the existing driveway. He stated that staff has had numerous conversations with the applicant as they bought the property with the home on it and believed that after the home was demolished they would be able to construct a home in its place. He stated that this information came to light after the home was demolished.

Williams asked when the applicant purchased the property.

Robert Buehler stated that they closed on the property in February of 2011 from a bank, as the property was in foreclosure.

Finke stated that the property was owned by multiple parties after the "subdivision" was done. He explained that the variance would have to be considered first because if the variance is not received the Preliminary Plat could not be approved. He stated that if the Commission finds the criteria for the variance to be met, a recommendation of approval would be in order and staff has included potential conditions for approval in the staff report.

White questioned if there are any other lots in a similar situation, as this could set precedent.

Finke clarified similar properties to mean properties in which portions have been conveyed rather than subdivided and the home demolished with the intent to build a new home. He stated that he was not aware of any other properties of that nature and noted that each variance request would stand on its own merit.

White asked if there were any other lot size variances in the rural residential zoning district.

Finke stated that there were some variances issued when the five-acre minimum was enacted, but noted that there have not been any recent variances issued for that purpose.

Foote questioned when the minimum lot size was changed.

Finke stated that in 1999 the change was enacted which required all rural residential lots to have five acres of contiguous suitable soils, and noted that previous to that there were different soil groupings allowed.

Murrin received confirmation that the house that previously existing on the site predated the 1984 conveyance and therefore met the requirements of the district. She asked if the applicant was aware that there would be an issue rebuilding a home.

Finke stated that there were conversations when the applicant received a demolition permit and noted that City staff was not aware that there would be any issue rebuilding at that time and therefore the applicant was not made aware that there would be any issue rebuilding a home on the lot.

Robert Buehler, the applicant, stated that they purchased the property in early 2011 and during 2011 worked with staff for demolition permits and building permits. He stated that they were under the impression, as was City staff, that there would be no issues with that. He stated that for reasons not related to this application they did not move forward at that time. He stated that in late 2012 they discovered that the property was not properly subdivided and in 2013 and 2014 worked with the neighboring parcel owner to gain their signature on the application. He stated that the application was then submitted this spring to get to this point. He stated that their desire is to get the property properly subdivided, as they believed it to have been when they purchased it.

Murrin asked when the home was demolished.

Buehler stated that the home was demolished in 2011.

Murrin asked how the property owner was made aware of the improper division of the property.

Buehler stated that they were made aware of the issue by a real estate representative of the other property owner in late 2012.

Finke agreed that the issue became known through a property appraisal that was done by the owner of the outlot.

Reid stated that the staff report provides the possibility of attempting to purchase additional land that would then make the variance not needed and asked if the applicant had considered that option.

Buehler stated that there was a property to the south of the triangle that offered to sell additional land, but noted that option was not economically viable and therefore they would proceed with this approach rather than purchasing additional land that they do not need.

Williams stated that it appears that there are two septic systems shown near the wetlands.

Buehler stated that he believed there to only be two delineated wetlands and noted that the septic is next to where the original house had been placed and the soil testing had been done to validate that could be a viable septic site.

Finke stated that is not a wetland near the septic sites, noting that the wetland is on the southeast corner of the property.

Reid opened the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Kristen Chapman, 1910 Iroquois Drive, stated that she was doing research recently and noted that in 1998, there was a property similar to this that requested to subdivide the property and one of those lots would be nonconforming. She stated that the City did approve that under a hardship clause.

Reid stated that the law concerning variances has changed since that time.

Steve Scherer, 2622 Willow Drive, stated that his brother and sister are also in attendance representing his parent's property at 2672 Willow Drive. He stated that they came before the City in 2008 to discuss splitting the Scherer farm into two lots as the property had been assessed for two lots through the road project. He stated this is a planned estate from his

parents and his family has owned the property since the turn of the 19th century. He stated that in 1983 or 1984 he split off 5.2 acres from his dad's property and in the 1990's, prior to 1999 he purchased additional property from his parents, but still leaving enough for the remaining property of his parents to be split into two lots. He stated that his concern is that they came to the City and because of the rule change, they were short of the contiguous soils requirement by $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre, which did not take into account the road right-of-way. He stated that this case has considerably less area and believed there to be a hardship in both cases. He stated that the estate planning in his case had been done with the intent of creating two lots and the property was assessed for the road project as two lots. He stated that his mother is in a nursing home and they would like to be able to sell his parents property as two lots to maximize the sale. He believed that there were similar hardships in both cases. He noted that the original home on the applicant's lot was 800 square feet and was more of a cabin than a home. He stated that they did offer to sell a parcel of property to the applicant which would make the applicant's lot conforming and would also leave his family with a parcel of suitable size to be sold. He stated that the applicant responded that he was not interested although this would solve the problem for both cases. He stated that they are attempting to play by the rules and believed that this would set a precedent.

Dale Considine, 2265 Chestnut Road, identified her property on the aerial photograph. She asked for additional information on the outlot and whether it is owned by the applicant or another party.

Reid stated that the outlot is currently owned by another party, but the two parcels are one lot. The proposal would be to split the lots, but the variance would be needed.

Considine asked if the outlot is a buildable lot as she believed it to be only wetland.

Reid confirmed that the outlot would not be buildable.

Murrin confirmed the location of the Scherer property and that the Scherers offered to sell a portion of their property to the applicant. She questioned if the applicant's lot would then be conforming if they were to purchase that parcel.

Finke stated that the land would need to be surveyed just to verify, but it appears that the property could then be contiguous and therefore conforming.

Murrin questioned what the current owner is using the wetland as.

Finke stated that it is just open land and wetland. He stated that the upland portion of the outlot is mostly occupied by driveway easements.

Murrin questioned how the parcel was originally conveyed, whether the land was given to family members or sold.

Finke stated that the land was sold.

Buehler stated that while one viable solution would be to add some additional property the offered price to them was equal to what they had paid for the entire original parcel they have which did not seem to make sense financially. He stated that when they purchased the property they believed it to be subdivided and buildable, as the City did.

Foote questioned where the original house had been and questioned if the intent would be to build a similar size home or larger home.

Buehler stated that he believed the home would be about twice the size of the original home that had been on the lot. He stated that he was unsure of the size of the original home, although it had been mentioned that the home was 800 square feet. He stated that they would be mindful of the appearance of the home to ensure that it would be appropriate with the neighboring homes.

Reid closed the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

Reid stated that if it had been known before the home was demolished that this issue existed, could the property owner then have lived in the home and/or remodeled the home or added onto the home.

Finke stated that the options had not been reviewed at that time. He stated that perhaps a permit to expand the existing home could have been issued, but noted that he could not provide an exact answer.

Williams asked if the property had been properly subdivided in the past, could the applicant then have demolished the home and constructed a larger home on the site.

Finke replied that if the lot was a conforming lot of record, the existing house could be demolished and a new home could be constructed.

White stated that she believed that the request meets the criteria for a variance as the situation was not created by the landowner and would be a reasonable use of the property and would not affect the character of the neighborhood. She stated that while she would not necessarily be in favor of approving a lot that would not meet the minimum lot size for the rural residential zoning district; the request appears to meet the variance criteria.

Albers agreed, as the situation was not created by the applicant and therefore would be in favor of granting the variance.

Williams stated that he has a different take on the variance criteria as he was not sure that this request would be in harmony with the intent of the zoning district requirements, as this parcel would be half of the acreage that is required; he did not find this to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as the Plan has this zoned as rural residential; and while there is a practical difficulty in this situation, economic considerations alone do not constitute a practical difficulty, and there is additional land to the south that could be purchased, but the applicant did not do so because they did not find it economical. He stated that in reference to the reasonable use of the land, the applicant wants to build a house on the property and reasonable use would depend on the size of the home. He noted that perhaps this variance would be granted and the applicant will come back with additional variance requests because of the size of the home they wish to construct and the setbacks that would be required. He stated that while the property is unique and would not appear to be caused by the landowner, it seems that additional work such as a title search would have been done at the time of purchase and this improper subdivision would have been discovered at that time. He stated that it is unfortunate that the landowner is in this situation, but a title search and title insurance would have provided that clarity. He stated that if a large home is going to be built in place of a small log cabin that would be very different than what existed and therefore he is not persuaded that the criteria for a variance would be met, although he is sympathetic to the landowner.

Foote referenced the reasonable use of the property and stated that if a similar home was going to be constructed to what had been there before he would probably not have a problem

with that, but noted that if a large home is going to be built he did not believe that would be a reasonable use.

Finke stated that the cleanest fix would be for one of the property owners to purchase the other half of the lot, as the sole property owner could then build a home of their choice on the lot, as the two halves together would be a buildable lot. He stated that if the Plat were approved, the outlot would then be specified as unbuildable. He stated that if the property remains in its current form staff could not approve a building permit for either property owner.

Murrin stated that there are alternate options, as the applicant could purchase additional land from the Scherer property or the two landowners of this parcel could work together under common ownership. She stated that she would prefer those options be investigated before a variance is considered.

Williams stated that Scherer had been shut down in the past for his request to subdivide and if this variance is approved then that could set precedent.

Reid stated that the applicant bought property with a house on it with the belief that a new home could be built on that lot. She stated that although a title search and additional measures could have been taken, not everyone goes through those steps. She stated that if the property were one lot, the property would be conforming. She noted that the outlot will never be built on and therefore the net impact is the same even though there are two owners. She stated that if there had not been a house on the property in the past she would not be willing to grant a variance, but because the property did have a house and the property was priced in a manner which conveyed that a home could be built on it, she would be in favor of granting a variance. She stated that while it would be great if an alternate option could be worked out, she did not believe it is the business of the Planning Commission to get into that business.

Williams received confirmation that if the landowner was able to purchase the outlot, the lot could then be built upon.

Finke explained that the property was joined together prior to 1984 and therefore the lot is one lot which is conforming, but is currently under the ownership of two parties.

Murrin stated that the applicant should be able to go back through to the title company with their title insurance to receive possible reimbursement.

Williams stated that a homeowner should review the issue further if their plan is to purchase the property with the intent of demolishing the home and building a new home and did not believe that this would justify a variance.

Motion by Williams, seconded by Murrin, to recommend denial of the variance request for the reasons stated. Motion failed 3-3 (Reid, White and Albers opposed). (Absent: Nolan)

Motion by White, seconded by Albers, to recommend approval of the variance request subject to the conditions noted in the staff report. Motion fails 3-3 (Murrin, Williams and Foote opposed). (Absent: Nolan)

Williams asked if the Commission should still provide input on the Preliminary Plat, absent the variance.

Finke stated that staff thought about that as well, but ultimately it was determined that the Preliminary Plat could not move forward without the variance.

Foote stated that his biggest complaint is the size, as it is unknown what would be built by the applicant. He stated that if the applicant were going to keep the same footprint as the former home he would not have a problem with that.

Williams stated that the Preliminary Plat was within the packet that shows the subdivision of the lot. He reviewed the criteria for a Preliminary Plat and stated that some of those criteria are still not met even if a variance were issued.

Murrin stated that the size is the sticking point. She stated that if the item were approved by the Council she would think that a size limit would need to be placed on the footprint of the home as the lot size would be smaller than a typical rural residential lot.

Foote stated that if there is an existing house that burns down you are always allowed to rebuild within the same footprint.

Williams asked if this is a premature Preliminary Plat as the size of the home is not known.

Finke stated that is not necessarily true and noted that a maximum size of the home could be specified.

Murrin stated that it is difficult to determine if this would change the character as it is unknown what the size of the home would be compared to the home that previously existed.

Reid noted that any house would change the character of the area simply because you built.

Williams questioned if Foote would be willing to change his vote on the variance if a size limit was placed on the new home equal to what the original home had been.

Reid noted that would be very small.

Foote stated that this lot is half the size of a conforming lot.

Albers stated that as long as the home meets the setback requirements he did not think the size of the home would make a difference. He received confirmation that there were multiple structures on the lot at one time and perhaps those sizes could be combined for a total footprint.

White agreed that if the setback requirements and no further variance requests were needed she would not necessarily care about the size of the home.

Foote stated that he would support the variance if the footprint of the new house is no bigger than the footprint of the previous house, excluding the out buildings.

Reid stated that she would not necessarily be in favor of that because of the small size limitation.

Motion by Reid, seconded by Albers, to recommend approval of the variance request subject to the conditions noted in the staff report and with the added condition limiting the footprint of the house to the size of the structures previously on the property. Motion fails 3-3 (Murrin, Williams and Foote opposed). (Absent: Nolan)

7. **Brian Etzel – 2942 Lakeshore Avenue – Variance from Required 30 foot Setback to Expand Deck**

White recused herself from this discussion as the property owner is her neighbor. Finke presented a request from the applicant for a variance from the required 30-foot setback to expand an existing deck. He displayed an aerial photograph of the property and described the applicant's plan to extend the deck to meet with the existing portion of the deck. He explained that this would be a variance from the side setback to Balsam from 30 feet to 12 feet. He stated that none of the current features meet the 30-foot setback. He stated that the lot is also nonconforming and explained that the existing street, Balsam, is off center to the north and therefore the front appears to be setback more than other properties. He noted that setback is not met either because the setback is calculated from the right-of-way. He stated that if the road were to be expanded in the future it would be logical to expand to the south because the road is off center. He noted that 60 foot of right-of-way while relatively standard in most neighborhoods, it is unique in the Independence Beach area as some of those streets have 40-foot right-of-ways. He stated that the deck expansion would not increase the nonconformance of the property, it would simply add to the linear calculation. He stated that if the Commission finds that the variance criteria are met, staff suggested a number of conditions of approval. He stated that the hardcover for the lot is not in conformance and noted that the deck would be built over some existing plastic material. He noted that the plastic material could be removed in order to reduce the hardcover of the site.

Williams asked for additional information on the dimensions of the deck.

Finke provided the additional calculations for the deck. He clarified that neither the house, nor the deck meets the setback requirement along Balsam and advised that the setback along Lakeshore Avenue is met.

Murrin received confirmation that the deck would simply be made longer.

Brian Etzel, the applicant, stated that he was present to address any questions. He stated that he purchased the home in 1986 and there was a three-season porch, which he remodeled into a four-season porch. He stated that he would be amenable to working with City staff to reduce the hardcover if needed.

Murrin questioned if the homeowner would get rid of the existing deck or keep the existing deck.

Etzel stated that he would keep the existing deck, although replacing the lumber, and would simply be extending the deck to wrap around.

Motion by Foote, seconded by Williams, to recommend approval of the 30-foot setback variance request for Brian Etzel for the property located at 2942 Lakeshore Avenue based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to the conditions recommended by staff. Motion approved unanimously. (Absent: Nolan)

White rejoined the Commission.

8. **Public Hearing – Ordinance Amendment to Chapter 8 of the City Code Related to Setbacks from Upland Wetland Buffers**

Finke stated that this proposed amendment was considered before the Commission the previous month, which would reduce the setback to a wetland for a deck from 15 feet to five feet and the Commission recommended denial. He stated that the residents were interested in

alternate options and one of those options would be to reduce the setback from 15 feet to ten feet rather than five feet. He asked if the Commission would be in support of this proposal.

Reid stated that when the 15-foot setback was set she believed that staff reviewed the requirements of other cities.

Finke stated that staff did review the requirements of another city that used a wetland specialist that determined that more of a setback assisted the wetland.

Reid opened the public hearing 8:38 p.m.

Charles Morse stated that he lives in the Enclave development and submitted the original proposal. He stated that many of the homes in that development are laid out in a manner, which would make it very difficult to construct a deck because of the location of the wetlands. He stated that many of the residents would like a little more leniency, noting that he would simply need two additional feet for the deck he would like to build. He stated that the homeowners are not attempting to construct grandiose decks but simply a deck that attaches to their home and their families could enjoy. He stated that for his property the relation to the wetland is angled and if he had an additional two feet he could make the deck more of a square and could simply fit his grill, patio set and some space for eight to ten people.

White asked how the issue of decks was related to the homeowner when they purchased their home.

Morse stated that Lennar did not go into the building requirements and deferred to the City for any specifics regarding to building code conformance. He stated that the only requirement from Lennar was that the deck would be submitted to them for aesthetic review.

Reid asked if the builder normally builds the deck as well.

Morse replied that it not the case.

Reid asked if all the homeowners then build their own decks.

Morse stated that he could not speak for everyone but noted that he did not receive an offer or option for them to build his deck.

Reid stated that she did look at the development and some of them had decks.

Morse stated that he purchased his home two years ago and there was no option to include a deck. He stated that the builder was not even willing to place the strip on the home to start the deck. He noted that he was told that he would have to submit an application to Lennar showing what he proposed to ensure that the deck would fit the design guidance and that the permit process would go through the City.

Foote questioned how far the setback would be if the homeowner were to build the deck as he desired.

Morse stated that the setback from his deck would be 13 feet as desired. He stated that ten feet would be sufficient for himself, but noted that will not correct the issue of all the homeowners in the development as the setback to the wetland is different for the different homes. He stated that perhaps the residents and City can work together to find a setback that

would work for both the City and those in the development that would like to have a deck to fully enjoy their property.

Kristin Chapman, 1910 Iroquois Drive, stated that one of the benefits of Medina is its natural resources. She stated that she called the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District to find out additional information on setbacks, noting that there are minimal and optimal requirements. She stated that the City has done a lot to be minimal rather than optimal and those changes erode the natural resources that they are attempting to protect. She stated that while this may not be in the interest of some homeowners, it is important to protect the natural resources.

Williams asked what the optimal setbacks would be.

Chapman stated that she did not receive that information as the staff person was going to get back to her the following day.

Footte stated that he was not present at the meeting the previous month and questioned what the Commission had decided.

Reid stated that the Commission recommended denial of the request. She stated that this setback issue was discussed when the Enclave development was reviewed and that the Commission was concerned about this potential problem.

Murrin stated that when the Commission spoke with Kyle the previous month he had stated that Lennar did tell him about the setback requirement noting that while some homeowners were not informed, others were.

Chapman stated that it is the responsibility of the buyer to know their rights beforehand if they plan to build a deck onto a property when they are buying the home.

Reid closed the public hearing at 8:49 p.m.

White stated that enforceability would also be an issue as an open deck could then transition into a three season or four-season porch.

Albers stated that if the setback is reduced then the concern would be that builders would build the homes even further towards the setback.

Reid stated that perhaps these homes were priced the way they were because of the knowledge that it would be difficult to construct decks.

Finke provided additional information on the vegetative wetland buffer requirements of the City, which range in 20 to 50 feet, and noted that there is an additional five-foot setback for accessory structures and 15 feet for the principle structure.

Williams asked the rationale to allow a patio to go into the setback but not a deck.

Finke stated that the thought was that the purpose of the setback, not the buffer, is to reduce the likelihood that there would be a violation in the buffer area. He stated that the wetland buffer easement is fairly restrictive on what can be done.

Reid asked and received confirmation that you do not have to pull a permit for a patio while you do need a permit to construct a deck.

Albers asked and received confirmation that a permit would be necessary to change a deck to a three-season porch.

Williams stated that while the setback is an arbitrary line that the City draws, they considered the issues of the line at 15 feet, and residents of Lennar should have been made aware of the issue when they purchased their home. He stated that if they were not told, they should take that up with Lennar.

Murrin stated that she also feels that it is important to preserve the greenspace in Medina as there is more and more pressure for development. She stated that the Commission has only heard from two people, the applicant has one person the previous month, so perhaps the issue is not as important as it is being made to seem to those other people. She stated that perhaps a variance request should be made by the residents so that a decision could be made on a case by case basis rather than applying a standard across the board.

Reid stated that perhaps she would be willing to decrease the setback by a few feet, but she definitely would not want covered decks.

Albers stated that he would be more comfortable with each individual coming forward rather than applying a lesser standard across the board.

Reid asked how residents would even gain a variance for a deck.

Finke agreed that it would be difficult to obtain a variance for a deck.

Motion by Williams, seconded by Murrin, to recommend denial of an Ordinance amendment to Chapter 8 of the City Code related to setbacks from upland wetland buffers. Motion approved 5-1 (Reid opposed). (Absent: Nolan)

Reid stated that she would be comfortable with a 12 or 13-foot setback and thinks it would be difficult for residents to obtain a variance for a deck, which is why she opposed the vote.

9. **Council Meeting Schedule**

Finke advised that the Council will be meeting on August 18th and Williams volunteered to attend.

10. **Adjourn**

Motion by White, seconded by Murrin, to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.