



# PLANNING & ZONING ADVISORY BOARD

## Minutes of April 25, 2011

Meeting Called to order at 7:02 p.m.

### 1. ROLL CALL

P&Z Board Members

MEMBERS	4/25/11	4/4/11	3/7/11	2/7/11	1/18/11	1/3/11	12/20/10	12/6/10	11/1/10	8/16/10	6/21/10
Marianne McCoy	P	A	P	P	A	C A N C E L L E D	P	P	P	P	P
Diane Sori	P	P	P	P	P		P	A	P	P	P
Helen Cohen	P	P	***P								
Michelle Keirnan, V/Chair	P	P	P	P	P		P	A	P	P	P
Craig Konhauzer	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P
Mark Aronson, Chair	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P
Ben Schulman	P	A	P	P	P		P	A	P	A	A
David Nall	A	A	***P								
John Valenti	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P
Bart Roper	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	A	P

\* Reappointed \*\* Resigned \*\*\* New appointment

Ms. Woodward commented that she had an issue with Mr. Nall's e-mail address and apologized to him. He didn't get his e-mails and could not attend tonight because he had a previous commitment.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Matt Wood, Director  
Trevor Markley, Senior Planner  
Ro Woodward, Administrative Coordinator  
Jeanette Wofford, City Arborist

**APPLICANTS:** Mr. Julian Bryan, Centerline Homes, The Ranches at Cooper City  
Mr. Joe Keith, Centerline Homes, The Ranches at Cooper City

2. **P&Z BOARD - MINUTES - WAIVE/APPROVE – APRIL 4, 2011 MOTION TO WAIVE READING OF MINUTES OF 4/4/11:** Motion to waive the reading of the minutes made by Mr. Roper and seconded by Mr. Valenti. All ayes on voice vote. **APPROVE:** Motion to approve made by Mr. Roper and seconded by Mr. Valenti. There were all ayes on voice vote. Motion was approved.

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**  
Mr. Aronson referred to a memo that was e-mailed this afternoon that was from Matt Wood to the City Commission via the City Manager. It is regarding process for the Business Advisory Board (BAB) to review business related items that come before the P&Z Board and the City Commission. It seems the City Commission would like the BAB to have an opinion as to variances, sign waivers, sign packages and conditional uses.

Ms. McCoy asked why.

Mr. Aronson asked the Board to defer to Old Business or Board Members Concerns.

The Board agreed to discuss this later on in the meeting.

**4. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE**

**1. \* PUBLIC HEARING – REZONING PETITION # Z 1-1-11**

Mr. Wood explained that the subject site, previously known as the Estela Estates property is located at SW 50<sup>th</sup> Street and SW 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue and is 11 acres in size. A site plan and plat with 11 single family lots was approved for the property by the City Commission in 2001 however no homes were ever built. Centerline Homes now requests rezoning to the R-1-B District in order to build 20 single family dwellings. Accompanying this petition are site plan and plat amendment petitions which reflect lots ranging in size from approximately 17,000 square feet to over 25,000 square feet in area. The site plan reflects one and two story single-family homes ranging in air-conditioned floor area from 3,000 square feet to just under 4,000 square feet.

The proposed zoning change will utilize 9 flex units. The density of the development will increase from 1 unit/acre to approximately 1.8 units/acre. The underlying Future Land Use Designation of E-Estate allows up to 11 units on the subject site. However, Cooper City's Comprehensive Plan allows the utilization of flex units to be applied through a rezoning without need for a Land Use Plan Amendment as long as the density is not more than doubled on the property. The subject request therefore complies with the Comprehensive Plan Flex Rules as the number of units proposed would go from 11 to 20.

Mr. Wood then explained that Policy 1.4.4 of the City's Comprehensive Plan states that City zoning as to permitted uses and densities must be in compliance with, or be more restrictive than, the requirements of the City Land Use Plan. The subject request is consistent with this policy in that the density proposed is not more than doubled for the site as allowed through the application of flex units to the site. Accordingly, the request can be considered consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wood commented the property is bound on the north and west by single family estate residential lots in the Town of Davie. The property to the south, currently a plant nursery, is designated L-3 on the Future Land Use Map which would permit single family development up to three units/acre. To the east are single-family homes designated Low (5) Residential also in Cooper City. The proposed lot sizes on the subject site will serve to transition the allowed density of development from higher in the south and east to lower in the north and west.

The general area of the site has been transitioning from predominantly agricultural uses to more low-density residential developments as proposed under the subject request. The proposed zoning is consistent with this trend and can be considered compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Mr. Wood remarked that living conditions in the surrounding area will now be adversely affected through the rezoning request. The previously approved road configuration and access point to SW 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue remain the same. Perimeter landscape buffers continue to be as approved with the original site plan. Homes will be substantially larger than the minimum requirement of the R-1-B zoning district. The home sales prices are anticipated to be equal to or greater than values of similar sized homes in the area. The additional lots will bring home prices in line with market demand while improving the overall property value of the area.

Mr. Wood commented that the subject site must meet all traffic concurrency regulations prior to permit approval. The addition of 9 single family homes under the subject request is expected to add a total of 90 daily

trips to SW 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This increase is expected to have a minimal impact on this roadway and will not otherwise adversely affect public safety.

Mr. Wood concluded that Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request to the R-1-B District based on a finding that the petition can be considered consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and compatible with the surrounding land uses. Staff finds that the proposed development of the site for 9 additional single-family homes is expected to be an asset to the community; will not be a deterrent to the improvement of surrounding properties in accord with existing regulations; and will not otherwise adversely affect public safety.

Mr. Jonathan Keith, Centerline Homes commented that they agree with the Staff Report.

Mr. Aronson opened the Public Hearing at 7:07 p.m.

Ms. Francesca Presti, 10511 Southwest 50<sup>th</sup> Street, remarked that she lives directly across the street from the proposed site. She expressed her excitement for this project, because they have been looking at this horrible, empty, and disgusting lot for many years not. She thought it was fabulous that that there is a project going in now and also thought that all the residents would be thrilled because they all hate looking at that eye-sore. She wanted to express her thoughts for this project.

Mr. Aronson, seeing no one else to speak, closed the Public Hearing at 7:09 p.m.

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE - REZONING PETITION # Z 1-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MS. KEIRNAN AND SECONDED BY MR. KONHAUZER FOR DISCUSSION.**

Ms. Sori wanted to know where the water in relation to the project was.

Mr. Keith responded that the water runs parallel to SW 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It is a canal.

Ms. Sori commented that there was no water front property.

Mr. Keith responded no there is not.

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE - REZONING PETITION # Z 1-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MS. KEIRNAN AND SECONDED BY MR. KONHAUZER. There were all ayes on roll call. Motion was approved.**

**4. A. THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE**

**2. \* PUBLIC HEARING – ABANDONMENT PETITION # AB 2-1-11**

Mr. Wood explained that this item is an Abandonment Petition for the proposed 20-unit single family subdivision of The Ranches at Cooper City. The request is to abandon the existing 20' drainage easement that straddles the lot line between lots 5 and 6 (proposed lot 10).

This easement was recorded as part of the previously approved Estela Estates Plat and is consistent with the previously approved Site Plan. The Site Plan Amendment and Plat Amendment being processed concurrently with this request will subdivide the existing 11 platted lots into a total of 20. By subdividing the lots, the existing 20' Drainage Easement is the only one that does not coincide with the new lot lines and must be vacated. New Drainage Easements coinciding with new lot lines will be dedicated with the new site plan approval.

Mr. Wood concluded that the Development Review Committee recommends approval of Abandonment Petition AB 2-1-11 subject to Central Broward Water Control District review and approval and based on the findings of fact listed in the Staff Report.

Mr. Keith remarked that they have read the Staff Report and agree with Staff.

Mr. Aronson opened the Public Hearing at 7:12 p.m. and seeing no one to speak closed the Public Hearing at 7:13 p.m.

**MOTION: TO APPROVE SUBJECT TO DRC COMMENTS THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE - ABANDONMENT PETITION # AB 2-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. ROPER AND SECONDED BY MS. SORI. There were all ayes on roll call vote. Motion was approved.**

**4. A. THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE**

**3. SITE PLAN AMENDMENT PETITION # SPA 1-1-11 AND PLAT AMENDMENT PETITION # PA 1-1-11**

Mr. Keith passed out to the Board the most updated elevations of the proposed models that were not in the backup.

Mr. Wood explained that this item is a Site Plan Amendment and Plat Amendment for The Ranches at Cooper City. The subject site, previously known as the Estela Estates was approved for 11 single family homes by the City Commission in 2001; however no homes were ever built. The proposed site plan amendment is to add an additional nine lots to the eleven previously approved for a total of 20 single family lots ranging in size from approximately 17,000 square feet to over 25,000 square feet in area. Access to the site is provided from SW 106 Avenue to the east. The private internal street, within a 60-foot wide access tract, will remain as previously approved and constructed and will include access gates with a visitor call box.

The proposed one and two story single family homes will range in air-conditioned floor area from 3,000 square feet to just under 4,000 square feet. All perimeter buffers will remain as previously approved but the entry feature with signage will be redesigned to more accurately reflect the neighborhood character. A temporary parking lot with sales trailer is proposed for Lot #1 with a model home on Lot#2.

No variances are necessary for approval of the site plan amendment as submitted; however the applicants are requesting a rear yard setback exception pursuant to Section 23-30(i) of the Code which allows reasonable modifications of the setback requirements in the R-1-B district where strict enforcement of the setback would be a hardship. In the subject case, relief from the rear setback is requested on four of the lots due to a platted 20' wide drainage easement

which abuts the north, west and south property lines of the project. The request would allow the setback and drainage easement to overlap in varying degrees from 2' to 10' thereby providing more buildable area for the models being offered. Floor plans and elevations are included in the site plan amendment package.

There are no recreation lands being proposed within the development. Therefore the developer will need to secure approval of a fee in lieu of the recreational land dedication requirement of six acres per thousand-population generated by the development.

The plat amendment petition involves a Delegation Request through Broward County to change the plat note restriction from 11 detached single family homes to 20 detached single family homes. The plat amendment, site plan and landscape plans have been reviewed by the DRC for conformance with the applicable zoning district regulations and are in conformance with those standards subject to the conditions listed below.

Mr. Wood concluded that the Development Review Committee recommends approval of the Site Plan and Plat Amendments subject to the conditions included in the Staff Report.

Mr. Keith remarked that they have read the Staff Report and have no comments related to that. He mentioned the hand-out he passed out and explained they have their final renderings now for their four models and he wanted to make sure the Board had the latest version of that.

**MOTION: FOR DISCUSSION THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE - SITE PLAN AMENDMENT PETITION # SPA 1-1-11 AND PLAT AMENDMENT PETITION # PA 1-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. KONHAUZER AND SECONDED BY MR. ROPER.**

Ms. McCoy wanted to know how many cars were there stacking inside the development to the gate. She noticed that the first unit, is unit #20 and it looks like the entry is half way past their property. She wanted to know off of SW 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue how many cars can stack in to the gate.

Mr. Keith responded that it is two lanes so you should be able to stack 5 to 6 cars. Three that would go through the guest and three that would be able to go through the residential side.

Mr. Roper asked if they have come up with a projected price range.

Mr. Keith responded that their smallest model which is just under 3,000 square feet would start in the \$400,000.

**MOTION: TO APPROVE SUBJECT TO DRC COMMENTS THE RANCHES AT COOPER CITY (fka ESTELA ESTATES) – LOCATED AT 5051 SOUTHWEST 106 AVENUE - SITE PLAN AMENDMENT PETITION # SPA 1-1-11 AND PLAT AMENDMENT PETITION # PA 1-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. ROPER AND SECONDED BY MR. VALENTI. There were all eyes on roll call vote. Motion was approved.**

## **5. OLD BUSINESS:**

Mr. Aronson brought up the memo referring to the Business Advisory Board (BAB) for further discussion.

Mr. Wood explained the request was initiated through the City Commission. There was an interest in having these business related petitions go before the BAB, as well as the P&Z Board. Staff wanted to bring it to the

Board's attention because they did not want to burden the development process with undue layers of review which would prolong the approval process. The timing of the advisory boards meetings would then need to be taken into consideration and since this Board meets twice a month on a regular basis, the BAB only regularly meets once a month on the first Wednesday of the month. It would be important to coordinate these meetings. In particular a petition that becomes ready for review by the P&Z Board for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of the month would have up to 23 days before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the BAB. Therefore, in order to avoid such delays one of the advisory boards may be requested to meet on the same night as the other board, not a joint meeting, but on the same night to try and streamline the process. Staff would review each petition to coordinate scheduling particularly in occurrences when a petition is ready for the review on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of the month. This would include requesting the BAB to meet on that night, which is the regularly scheduled night for the P&Z Board to meet. He said that the purpose of the correspondence is to alert you and this is at the request of the City Commission. He then mentioned that the first such petition would likely be next month. It would be the Le Bone conditional use and he explained what that petition was.

Mr. Markley then gave an example of how this would work and commented that the Le Bone petition was ready to go before P&Z on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of May, (May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011) and in order not to delay it the BAB would be asked to meet the same night that P&Z would meet, however, it would be at a different time since the direction was that it would not be a joint meeting.

Ms. McCoy wanted to know who were the members of the BAB and if they were residents of the City.

Mr. Markley responded that like all advisory boards members, they are all residents of the City.

Ms. McCoy wanted to know if they were trying to roll the two boards together.

Ms. Sori remarked that certain members of the Commission are very unhappy with the P&Z Board, so they are trying to usurp them and throw in the Business Advisory Board and that's the bottom line.

Mr. Aronson commented that apparently the BAB has limited involvement for items that they are going to review. The actual law is that with regard to variances and sign waivers there is a requirement to show hardship and so economic hardship alone is not something for instance that they would consider. He then commented that what concerns him is that they are bound and constrained by ordinances and how to handle a matter and vote on a matter and he wasn't sure that the Business Advisory Board was versed or interested in those ordinances. That is for the Commission to do because they made a recommendation.

Ms. Sori remarked that in other words they were being told they were not doing their job like they see that we should be doing our jobs.

Mr. Aronson expressed that he does not take any position on what the Commission thinks or not thinks.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that it just seemed redundant to him that you would have two separate parties sit and discuss the same issues and he didn't get it. He would like an explanation as to why this was formulated and what BAB power is versus the power of the P&Z and it affects the Commission.

Ms. McCoy mentioned that frankly when they did have a joint meeting it was rather unwieldy to have such a large group of people. There are already ten of them and how many people are on that Board and would that be a joint meeting.

Mr. Wood remarked that each Board would meet separately.

Mr. Aronson commented that he anticipated they would continue to have their meeting exactly as they have them now.

Mr. Konhauzer asked why our City would have two Boards.

Mr. Aronson mentioned there has always been a BAB. The BAB in the past has not been involved in the P&Z action, however, they can make a recommendation. Years ago when they had that joint meeting on the sign package and after some of the legal requirements were explained the BAB changed their minds and agreed with the P&Z Board.

Mr. Roper commented that it used to be if the BAB had an issue with something that was coming up before the P&Z Board they would make the P&Z Board aware of what they wanted or what they did not want and then the P&Z Board would take that into consideration when the matter was discussed. It seems like now they are going about it in a roundabout way in that they are going to discuss it and they will have a vote and then P&Z Board will discuss it and they will have vote. Both of those votes and the criteria will go to the Commission and then they will make the decision. Is that correct?

Mr. Wood responded that was correct.

Mr. Aronson remarked that this is an advisory board and the Commission has the prerogative to accept or reject our recommendations and many times they have rejected them.

Mr. Wood reiterated that this Board's role would continue, and would continue to be the formal recommendation. This is the only Board that is recognized formally in the zoning code of ordinances and that will continue. He thought that there was an interest in bringing business related items and allowing the BAB to have a say.

Ms. Sori remarked that she was at the meeting where this happened and feels this is a political (uninterrupted) by the Commissioners who are throwing their weight around and to discredit the P&Z Board and that was the bottom line. The BAB and the items that come before P&Z that they are concerned about are the signs, etc and don't you think the P&Z Board can handle that. Do they need someone watching over their shoulders when they do something like that. No they don't. A lot of them have been on the P&Z Board for a number of years and a lot of them have training in these issues. So certain Commissioners are doing or saying is that we don't care anymore what P&Z says, and that we are going to have our friends on the BAB usurp you and over vote you and that's just too bad. She thought that was wrong.

Mr. Aronson commented that that P&Z Board is an advisory board which is in our ordinances. The Commission has always had the right to ignore or accept what we do at their pleasure. If they choose to do that, there is little they can do about that. He said that we have the right to resign and they can appoint other people.

Ms. McCoy wanted to know what the ramification of the sunshine law was when there are 10 or however many people on the other board that are voting on the same items that the P&Z Board is voting and bringing recommendations before the City Commission. She expressed that she would feel very uncomfortable talking with any of those people period.

Mr. Aronson remarked that we have no obligation and they have no obligation to talk to P&Z Board about any of these points. They simply are now being asked by the Commission to also review certain petitions that come before this Board.

Ms. McCoy again reiterated that there will not be any joint meetings.

Mr. Aronson responded that he did not anticipate that.

Ms. Sori thought that what is selective enforcement on what is going to be decided is going to go between two boards and what stays as separate boards.

Mr. Aronson responded that it was not selective enforcement.

Ms. Cohen interjected that it was items of mutual concern.

Mr. Konhauzer wanted to know if signage would be one of those items.

Mr. Aronson responded there are four of them.

Mr. Konhauzer then commented that how do you vote without prejudice. He would not vote on an issue on an issue that was something that would affect me and is that correct.

Mr. Aronson remarked that if you were a business owner in the City and a sign owner and a sign variance came up he would think you would want to vote yes to it because you may want to come up in the future with it.

Ms. Sori remarked that you would then recuse yourself because it could come back and bite you down the road. If you are voting on something and you would use that same thing.

Mr. Aronson commented that may be, but it is not the issue of this Board. That may be your opinion on what the BAB's particular conflict or ethical problems are, but that does not impact on how this Board handles it.

Ms. Sori commented this has been decided for us.

Ms. McCoy explained that at one time there used to be a lot of issues that weren't brought before this Board because there were going before the Community Appearance Board and asked Ms. Wofford what those issues were.

Ms. Wofford responded that it was mostly landscaping.

Ms. McCoy then asked if there was any signage they voted on.

Ms. Wofford responded that there were signage issues that came before that Board.

Mr. Aronson remarked that Board was more for discussion to work out things before it came to the P&Z Board. He commented that they are being told this is what was going to happen and it is your prerogative is to stay on the Board or resign.

Mr. Roper agreed with Mr. Aronson and he commented that he knows this didn't come from Staff and didn't want to put any blame on Staff and wanted Mr. Wood to know that.

Mr. Aronson commented that they should just be aware that when some wild amendments to site plans or sign waivers get passed and it starts looking like 441 then this Board will be blamed.

Ms. Sori agreed and said that this is the problem. We will get the flack down the road and the point is that the City that ends up suffering.

Mr. Aronson commented that was correct and thought that the larger issue was the people on the Commission.

Mr. Konhauzer thought that resigning was the wrong thing to do and thought they all had to stand strong and together watch out for our City's best interest and he would be staying on the Board to make sure that happens.

Mr. Roper wanted to know when Monterra was going to accept the responsibility that they are supposed to fill, grade, irrigate and sod the 27 acres. This has been going on for a long time and if it is going to be used for soccer in the coming year something must be done pretty soon. He remarked that he fought long and hard for that property when Monterra came in and would really like to see it developed as it was supposed to be and didn't know what the problem is.

Mr. Wood responded that it is environmental permitting. The developers and the CDD for Monterra are well aware of their obligation. They are meeting their obligation. They are not holding it up. There is a lot of engineering and environmental issues and as you know there were some wetland conditions that have to be mitigated on site. They are through every agency, except the drainage district. He remarked that they are in the final few weeks of that approval process.

Mr. Aronson wanted to know if it gets approved in a month or so is there a timeline for construction and how long it will take to complete it.

Mr. Wood responded they are going to get right on it and right now all they will be doing is the clearing, de-mucking, site layout and grading.

Mr. Valenti commented that one of the reasons they were looking at it is for soccer because it is just grass and they can also play football. He would love to see the city take down the roller hockey rinks that are at the sports complex, because no one uses them. They could certainly use it for parking at the Sports Complex. There is no place to park at the Sports Complex. It could also be used for basketball practice. He mentioned that now they use the high school and it costs a lot to use that facility. He remarked that they average about 6,000 sign ups each year and they are going to need that property on Flamingo Road and would like to use it soon.

Ms. Sori pointed out that Mr. Valenti has a very good point with regard to the roller hockey rink because it is never used. She thought that all those cars that could be in that space are now parked along the entrance to Embassy Lakes off of Stirling Road. She said that there were days when residents are trying to get in and cars for the Sports Complex are trying to park along Embassy Road. There are days when the you can't park on the side of the road or in the Sports Complex.

Mr. Aronson asked if this was something the Recreation Director should be looking at.

Mr. Wood responded yes, and that he had already heard some of these issues already.

Mr. Valenti wanted to know if the roller hockey rink was built by grant money and if so, does it have to stay there for a number of years before it can be taken down.

Mr. Aronson mentioned that if it was built with grant money specifically for a roller hockey rink, or was it just for recreation.

Mr. Valenti responded that he didn't know. At one time roller hockey was the greatest thing going, and now, everything is on ice hockey.

Mr. Aronson thought that if you took the hockey rink out then you could do to it what you wanted too.

Mr. Valenti thought it would be pretty simple to remove and mentioned that the basketball courts are used all the time. He remarked that he didn't think the players were just Cooper City residents, but from other areas as well.

Mr. Aronson commented that the basketball courts are used all the time in Embassy Lakes.

**6. GROWTH MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

Mr. Wood advised the Board that he is in the process of beginning the once every seven years process of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) of our Comprehensive Plan. He commented that State Statute requires that every municipality needs to update and evaluate its Comprehensive Plan to make sure that we are meeting our goals to evaluate whether we need to change our Goals, Objectives and Policies to address any changes in either the State plan or changes in the conditions of Cooper City. He said that Staff will be starting the EAR process shortly and he will have more information at the next meeting relative scheduling a joint workshop with the City Commission and with the public to initiate this issues identification process. He would like community input and get this process started. This would be in the next four to six weeks.

Mr. Aronson wanted to know if the workshop would be a part of the regularly scheduled meeting date.

Mr. Wood responded that he was not sure at this point, but plans to look at the calendar to look at dates and will probably be after the May 16<sup>th</sup> P&Z Board meeting.

Mr. Markley commented that they are looking at not needing the meeting on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. However, there are items that are already advertised for the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. He commented that with the various scheduling coming up and looking further thought that June might be similar to May in that there would be at least one meeting in June which would fall on 6/6, or 6/20.

**7. BOARD MEMBERS' CONCERNS:**

None

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

The Meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.