

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Chair Gerard. The meeting was a virtual electronic meeting through the Zoom platform, as a result of the COVID-19 crisis.

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal
Mike Giller

Jim Lamb
Steve Gerard

Ron Schuman
Lowell Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Mathews-Leidal indicated that her last name is spelled incorrectly on pages 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Gerard noted that on page 5 it should reflect the following: *Mr. Gerard advised the applicant that they had the right to request a continuance of the Final Hearing, without penalty or prejudice to time standards, to a time when an open public hearing could be held. Mr. Gerard asked the applicant if it was their desire to waive the right to an open public hearing and proceed to a Final Hearing in virtual format? Mr. Begley stated that he wished to proceed with the Final Hearing in virtual format.* With these changes, the May 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 16, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Father Dyer Addition, 310 Wellington Road, PL-2020-0135: Mr. Kulick presented a worksession for a Development Agreement for the purpose of expanding the Church through an addition to the non-historic part of the existing building. Staff asked the following questions of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission believe the design fails Design Standards 37, 80, 88 and 144?
2. Does the Commission feel it is important that the new addition is setback from the previous addition instead of protruding out towards the street frontage?
3. Does the Commission find the proposed glazing conforms with Design Standards 95, 96 and 148?
4. Does the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design?

Commissioner questions:

Mr. Moore: No real questions. Thanks Chris. The site visit helped a lot.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: When you were talking about windows and fenestration, you talked about changing the windows for egress. Can you explain? (Mr. Kulick: On the garden level that is proposed, I believe some of the earlier feedback we had was to reduce glazing. On the lower level, it is harder to get windows that have dimensions that we would typically see in a historic application that provide egress. Additionally, coming from the intersection of Wellington Road and Harris Street to the northwest, there is 8' of elevation change and that is where the garden level comes from. The applicant can speak to the lower level windows.) I sort of doubt that the basement windows would be egress in a commercial building and so I think the windows could be modified. (Mr. Craig: We were trying to get as much light in the lower level because it is used frequently. Granted, the proposed windows are not a historic shape, perhaps we could at least go to a square window which is seen more frequently in the Historic District. We have some square windows in other areas.) I think that would be an improvement and I want to clarify that those are not egress windows. (Mr. Craig: Correct.) So the primary elevation, the front, facing south now has a doorway and a shed roof which is not a design element that is not seen anywhere else on the building. What are the thoughts behind that? (Mr. Craig: We were trying to make it a more of secondary entrance. The shed roof came from the egress requirements. The new portion of the building is similar to the proportions of the historic, just narrower and smaller.) Can you speak to the compatibility of the shed roof with the other elements? (Mr. Craig: The door itself is similar to the current configuration. We removed the arched window that was above it and got rid of the gable. The intent is to make it subordinate to the main building. We can look at making it a gable, but we would like to leave the door in the same opening if possible.)

Mrs. Mathews-Leidal: Thank you for the report and the review of the Historic District Standards. With this addition, I'm assuming additional parking is required. Are we meeting the parking

requirements on-site or is that something that needs to be included in the Development Agreement? (Mr. Kulick: It would likely need to be included in the Development Agreement, but they are still adding seven more spaces than currently exist.) You eluded to it because the structure is non-residential and within a residential character area. To help Mr. Craig and keep Planning Commission in the loop, how would setbacks and open space be assessed? (Mr. Kulick: It would be assessed as a non-residential site. With the gardens and landscaping in front and back of the building, they will likely meet the requirement. Additionally, the alley is proposed to be removed, so that will provide additional open space.) I appreciate the discussion on the glazing, but I also see the porch and door addition on the northwest elevation. I am not sure that it meets the Historic District design standards. I think this is something the applicant should look at. This is the entrance off the rear. I believe the stucco does not meet the Historic District Standards either. Please modify.

Mr. Gerard: When you look at the northern view of the structure, the ridgeline seems excessively long and the proposed addition should be setback further. (Mr. Kulick: Yes, that is similar to the concerns we have with the overall façade width that addressed under Design Standards 88 and 144.)

Mr. Craig: The reason is because we don't want the addition to dominate and the existing non-historic portion would become more of a link between the two. (Mr. Kulick: We have to avoid making the roofline overly complicated by break it up too much. On the Casey Residence, we steered the architect to simplify the roof design of the addition because the initial design was too complicated. The ridgeline is long and the façade is wide, but if we try add breaks to it, we might run into issues with it being too complicated.)

Mr. Schuman: When St. Mary's Church was renovated, they added additional kitchen area and it ended up being used more than anticipated. How would staff remedy that issue on this site? They do not want to lose one curb cut in the parking lot but if Engineering wants to see that curb cut removed, is that a done deal? (Mr. Kulick: I think it will be an ongoing discussion with Engineering. They have the authority to say yes or no, but it may be able to be addressed within the Development Agreement.)

Mr. Craig: Our biggest issue or what we are trying to do is to give the congregation enough of an indicator that they could move forward with fundraising. We are the only non-residential building in this area, and we would like input, mostly on the density. Other comments make sense, but those are things that would typically be handled with the site plan or Class A. That process might be a year or two away.

Mr. Kulick: I ran the parking calculations and it looks like right now, they would be slightly deficient for the new addition portion so that is something that would likely need to be included in the Development Agreement.

The Work Session was opened to public comment and there was none.

Commissioner Comments:

Mr. Moore: This project is close to Priority Design Standards 37, 88, and 144. With some tweaking, I think they will get there. I agree with some of the glazing and architectural comments that have been made by other Commissioners.

Mr. Lamb: I do not have any questions. I think it is going to be a good-looking building. I think what they are doing is going to be good for the congregation and the Town.

Mr. Giller: I think this is a good project. I think it is a beautiful and important building. I think it fails Priority Design Standards 37, 80, 88, and 144 but this is a worksession and we can get there. I think the new elevation should be set back more than it is. Regarding glazing, there are really too many different kinds of windows on the western elevation. It is not technically the primary facade, but it kind of acts like it. I ask that staff check on the door on the connector type of element and the shed roof. I talked a bit about making the connector more separate from the historic building. I think landscaping and plant materials could be added to further separate the massing of the historic church and the massing of the connector.

Mr. Schuman: I do believe the design fails Priority Design Standards 37, 80, 88, and 144. I think I would like to see the new addition set back a little more. I echo Mike on the concerns of the shed roof. I also agree with Mike and Christie on the glazing, but we are able to overcome those issues in the future. My biggest concern with this effort is the increased activity and intensity on the site. I think by losing the northern alley and potentially losing a curb cut, they are boxing themselves into a hole. More activity and less mobility is not somewhere you want. This is a large congregation and we are not addressing the potential problems at that corner. I think it is a good project and will help but I think we are setting ourselves up for future challenges with the increased activity.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I agree with Ron, if you build it, they will come. I agree with staff and believe the design fails Priority Design Standards 37, 80, 88, and 144. I think it is important that

the new addition be set back from the existing addition and make it more of a differentiation. I do have concerns with that porch, double doors, and transom windows above them. I know that Mr. Craig will massage this to better meet the Historic Standards. The stucco needs to be changed. I do agree with Mike and Ron on the western façade windows and patterns. Chris, on the Milne project, we added a finding for parking separation off of the alley and that is another policy to keep on the radar.

Mr. Gerard: I think this is an important building for the Town and has an important use. We have to correct some things noted by staff. I agree it fails all four standards. I believe the addition needs to be setback further. It occurs to me that if you slid the whole design back, due to the length of the chapel, it would just disappear from the view. You might be able to lower it a foot or two because of the topographic changes and also reduce the ridge lengths. Glazing can be reduced and changes to the secondary entrance can be made to make it more like the primary entrance.

2. Highlands Filing #2, Lot 67 Building Envelope Modification, 20 Rounds Road, PL-2020-0157: Mr. LaChance presented a modification to the platted Building Envelope on this property. Staff asked the following questions of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission find the proposed Envelope modification to comply with Subdivision Standards 9-2-4-5: Lot Dimensions, Improvements and Configurations regarding tree preservation?

Commissioner questions:

Mr. Moore: I don't really have any questions. I went to the site and observed the trees. I think I understand where the Envelope was. Some of the line markers were knocked down, but on the north boundary, one of the Building Envelope lines that had tape between stakes, that's the Envelope, right? (Mr. LaChance: The proposed Envelope would have had caution tape between the stakes, and the existing Envelope boundary would have been marked with stakes labeled "old Envelope".) Now I understand. Thank you.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: No questions.

Mr. Schuman: No questions.

Mrs. Mathews-Leidal: No questions.

Ms. Suzanne Allen-Sabo, Applicant, Presented:

First, regarding the 25' front setback, we will fix that. We will follow up with the Corps of Engineers on the wetlands too. On the six remaining trees between the existing Envelope and the southern property line, the new Envelope would maximize the width of the building on this property. If the building is anywhere near the current Envelope those trees are gone due to fire mitigation. I do not think they are pertinent to the argument. In August of 2019, the owners purchased this lot. At one point, the neighbor on Lot 65 came onto the lot and illegally cut dozens of mature spruce trees for their view. This probably wiped out the wetlands as well. According to the Highlands Subdivision, the owners of Lot 65 agreed to plant new spruce trees on their lot and Lot 67. There are dozens of them. The watering system is connected back to Lot 65. We worked very hard with the Highlands Design Review Board and the adjacent neighbors to get their approval of the modified building Envelope. Regarding the new Envelope, there are still some remaining trees on the eastern side of the property. By moving the Envelope to the South, you actually are going to preserve and save more trees than the few remaining trees to the South.

Tim Sabo, Applicant, Presented:

(Mr. Sabo showed Google Earth images showing the tree removal progression over time.) Trees on the southern portions of the property in the area of the wetlands were cut down in between 2010 and 2011. On the most recent images, you can see the trees are taking root and getting bigger. To the north, the house is built along with the topography. We want to build the house similar and across the topography and not up the hill. With the existing Envelope, you end up cutting higher quality trees because of defensible space. With the new Envelope, we can save some of the larger existing trees. The positive of this brings the eastern line to the west and preserves some of the trees. It's not much of an increase east to west, but this proposed Envelope is what we were able to negotiate.

Commissioner Questions:

Mr. Moore: No questions.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: No questions.

Mrs. Mathews-Leidal: No questions.

Mr. Gerard: Where would the driveway be? (Mr. Sabo: It curves from the roadway to the north, you can see it in orange on the plans.)

The Work Session was opened to public comment but none was heard.

Mr. LaChance: I would like to add one thing to the presentation: Within the staff report, I included pictures of large evergreens. I drew a line on the images to show the proposed Envelope, and you can see that at least three significant trees are just within the proposed Envelope modification. There has been some cutting and wildfire mitigation done on this property and there are several stumps. Staff finds at least three significant specimen trees are to be located within the proposed Envelope as staked by the surveyor.

Commissioner Comments:

Mr. Moore: The design standards that try to protect view sheds is very important. Regarding tree preservation, it appears to me that there are some new trees in the area of disturbance. I understand they want to get as wide of an Envelope as possible but I agree with staff. The modification does not comply with the Subdivision Standards.

Mr. Lamb: I am a tree hugger, but I am okay with cutting trees as long as you revegetate. In the Highlands, they drew a lot of these Envelopes without putting as much thought into them as they should have. If they are going to revegetate, I am fine with the modification.

Mr. Giller: I agree with staff that we should not do this and should not modify this Envelope because it wouldn't meet the subdivision standards.

Mr. Schuman: I agree with staff and the Envelope needs to remain.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I agree with staff's summary and find that the application does not comply with the subdivision standards.

Mr. Gerard: Are these three trees specimen trees? Yes, but whether that can be mitigated is another issue. Whether they will get cut down anyway for fire mitigation is also another issue. The thing we cannot do anything about is the setback issue. If you just apply the legal standard and move the line, they are impacted. Staff would decide if there is a mitigation issue on this.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Alexander Residence, 468 Peerless Dr., PL-2020-0137

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I traded emails with Mr. Sponable about this earlier and thought additional information would be provided. I would like to call it up so we can discuss with the Architect.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal made a motion for a call up, seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed unanimously. Luke Sponable presented the project, a 11,056 single-family residence at 468 Peerless Drive.

1. Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I think it is important for the Public Record that this new condition be read into the record. (Mr. Sponable: New condition added to read: The plans shall be revised to locate the window well and its rock faced walls to be inside the disturbance envelope and show the total combined area of all lawns to be no more than 500 square feet total. The grass type will be revised to show fescue and hairgrass mix. The applicant has agreed to this.)

Commissioner Questions:

Mr. Moore: No questions.

Mr. Lamb: No questions.

Mr. Giller: No questions.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: No questions.

Mr. Truckey: Mr. Sponable mentioned sod in his presentation, which is not necessarily prohibited. But if anyone proposes any sod areas over 500 square feet it is subject to negative points.

Mr. Don Eggers: I do not think there is anything further to add. The client is okay with reducing the sod so we do not need to mitigate additional negative points.

Mr. Gerard: My question is why it is necessary to have the drive that goes the length of the entire lot, most of it outside of the Envelope? It seems like there is an easier way. (Mr. Eggers: The client wanted to have an accessible home with the garage on the main level of the house. If we placed the driveway on the southern side of the house, there would be no screening to the adjacent property. With the driveway in its location, it is adjacent to the neighbor's drive on the north and we can provide screening between the two.)

Mr. Gerard opened the meeting for public comment but there was none and the comment period was closed.

Commissioner Comments:

Mr. Moore: No comments.
Mr. Lamb: No comments. I think it is a good looking house.
Mr. Giller: The house marginally meets the design code. I echo the concern about the driveway and the amount of fill and retaining walls. This is a big house for this site.
Mr. Schuman: No comments.
Ms. Mathews-Leidal: No additional comments.
Mr. Gerard: I have great concern about this driveway and the impact it makes on the existing landscaping. There are 14 trees being removed and when looking at the supporting documentation for positive four points, I do not think this landscaping plan is up to a positive four points when you consider the effect of the hardscape combined with the amount of trees lost.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve the project with the new condition read into the record and point analysis attached but rescinded his motion due to landscaping concerns by others.

Mr. Moore: I agree with the fellow Commissioners on the amount of landscaping proposed.
Mr. Lamb: No further questions or comments.
Mr. Giller: Can we discuss the retaining wall along the boundary of the property line? How closely did you look at that? There is roughly 60 feet of retaining wall and much of it is along the property line. (Mr. Sponable: This is an earlier disturbance envelope and the plat note specifically allows driveways and related retaining walls outside of the envelopes. Trees are allowed to be removed for those items as well. This project is assessed negative four points under Policy 7/R due to the amount of site grading.)
Mr. Schuman: Considering Luke's response, I think the point analysis is appropriate and I think it is a go based on staff's analysis.
Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I am struggling with this one and I know this policy came into effect in February 2018. The precedent shows positive points for landscaping but did the same projects receive negative four points for site disturbance? (Mr. Sponable: At least one of the precedent projects received negative points for site disturbance as listed in the staff report). (Mr. LaChance: The Chalissima Residence did not receive negative four points for site disturbance).
Mr. Gerard: This landscaping proposed does not seem to me that it meets four points due to the amount of trees being removed for the driveway.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to amend the point analysis that the landscaping plan receive only two points (policy 22R) and not four. Mr. Schuman seconded.

Mr. Moore: I agree with you Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Lamb: I think this project meets the development code.
Mr. Giller: It bothers me that there has to be so much retaining wall in order to make this driveway work. I think there are much better ways to solve that. I would support the motion.
Mr. Schuman: I agree with the staff's analysis and do not support the change in point analysis.
Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Mr. Gerard, is there a number of trees that you would support to get the project to positive four points? (Mr. Gerard: I think they can get there if they match precedent but I am not sure where the trees will go because the driveway is taking up most of the open space on the lot. If the point analysis is amended and the project fails, it is up to the applicant to save the project some other way. I would support additional trees but I am not sure where they will go.) (Mr. Lamb: It would be a lot of trees, and it could eventually be over landscaped. We have that problem with some projects in the Historic District. I do not know if there is a specific number.)
Mr. Schuman: I think we are trying to solve the problem, but in our mind it either passes or it does not. And if we don't think it passes, it is up to staff and applicant to address it. (Mr. Gerard: I agree.)
Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Should we let the applicant speak? (Mr. Eggers: If you look at the drive immediately to the north, you see retaining wall that is the entire length of the driveway within a similar site. It seems that a number of driveways require retaining walls in order to put the driveway in. I do not know if the amount here is excessive to these lots. If you look at the precedent, those three houses each had 14-18 evergreens and we are only a couple of evergreen trees and 10 or so aspens away from the same numbers. I think those trees could easily be placed along the east side of the residence and along the south side of the property if that is required.)
Mr. Sponable: I was able to pull the Chalissima plans that shows 25-30 trees were to be removed before the residence was built. (Mr. Gerard: How many were removed for the driveway?) I am counting about six for this.
Mr. Giller: May I speak to a clarification to the retaining wall comment made by Mr. Eggers. Obviously, there is a retaining wall on the north property, but it looks like it is 10-20 feet long and runs right along the driveway, rather than being closer to the property line. Could you describe the construction of the walls and why they do not they follow

- the drive closer? What is the face of the wall? (Mr. Eggers: The wall is siloam stone that is dry stacked. We pushed to property line to we can landscape along drive and have better snow storage.)
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I do not want to deny the project because they would have to resubmit. Should we consider a continuance? (Mr. Gerard: If a continuance is requested, I would remove my motion.)
- Mr. Eggers: Could we add a condition that we add additional landscaping in lieu of continuance. (Mr. Truckey: That is a good gesture by the applicant, but my concern is that we need to work that through a little bit so that the landscaping is enhancing the buffering along the lot boundaries. Maybe a continuance is the best way to deal with that and we can come back in a couple of weeks.) (Ms. Puester: Mr. Eggers, would you be supportive of a continuance?) (Mr. Eggers: Yes, a continuance is better than a denial.)
- Mr. Gerard: I will withdraw my motion to amend my point analysis because the applicant is requesting a continuance.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to continue the Alexander Residence and seconded by Mr. Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Cobb Residence Demolition and New Single Family Residence, 105 North Gold Flake Terrace, PL-2020-0136

- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I would like to call up this project for discussion. I have concerns in relation to the accessory dwelling unit standards.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal made a motion for a call up, seconded by Mr. Giller. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Sponable presented the project to demolish an existing structure and construct a 6,452 sq. ft. residence. We are adding an additional condition that no washer and dryer will be added to the second floor.

Commissioner Questions:

- Mr. Moore: No questions.
- Mr. Lamb: No questions.
- Mr. Giller: This site is visible from much of town. When I look at trees that were added, was there concern about screening the massing of the house. (Mr. Sponable: This site has seen a lot of disturbance and has no trees now. Ideally the trees would be closer to the house but it was not a requirement that the trees placed right by the house. The defensible space perimeter prohibits trees from being placed up against the house.)
- Mr. Florio: It is true, if you are on Ski Hill Road, you can see the existing yellow house. There are almost no trees on the western side of the property right now. I think a request to put the trees closer to the house jeopardizes fire safety and impacts the views dramatically. I think it is more than what the adjacent properties have. We are adding a lot of trees, all of them along that western edge. We are not removing any trees in the process to construct this house and we are actually relocating one tree. We are trying to be the best neighbor as possible and improve this property. It has looked this way since Gold Flake Terrace was built.
- Mr. Schuman: No questions.
- Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Thanks for the willingness to remove the washer on the upper level. I still have concerns due to the design. This can be cut off from the rest of the house. Additions to existing homes are to have a separate connection but this is not an addition. I think it is easy to get around the accessory dwelling unit standards by labeling everything a wet bar. I do not understand why there is a separate entrance if it isn't an accessory unit.
- Mr. Gerard: I am going to follow Christie on this. When I look at this, I see a lock off two-bedroom apartment. The area has all the things a separate lock off has.
- Mr. Mickey Florio: The owners have adult children and they would like to have separation from them. That is the reason the door is separating the areas. There is a pathway that goes to downtown and they want to keep this path and connect an entrance to it on this part of this house. This wet bar is intended to provide separation and have a place for water. It complies with the 300 square foot code requirement of wet bars in public areas. This is not intended to be a separate apartment or accessory dwelling unit.
- Mr. Gerard: Is there gas or 220 outlet proposed in this area? (Mr. Sponable: I do not have those plans submitted to me, but we can add it as a condition.) We should add it as no gas, no 220 volt outlet, and no short term rentals. (Ms. Puester: Rather than a condition of approval, I suggest a Finding stating this is not an accessory apartment and detailing out that no 220 or gas be allowed. This clarifies the area for the owners and puts future buyers on notice and it makes it easier to enforce.)
- Mr. Giller: You mentioned the 300 square feet and the wet bar. Does that mean it has to be in a space smaller than 300 square feet? (Mr. Sponable: It is the opposite. Wet bars shall be in common rooms larger than 300 square feet and hallways are not counted in this

calculation.)
Mr. Schuman: I think we are trying to skin the code here mid-hearing. I think the applicant has met the standard of the new ADU code and we are trying to raise the bar, which might be inappropriate at this point.
Mr. Lamb: I like the idea of saying no 220 volt outlet as well as no gas. It is fair enough.
Ms. Puester: I have a new finding #6: "There is no Accessory Apartment approved with this project. No 220 Volt, gas, clothes washer or dryer shall be installed on the second floor living area with separate entrance. Should an Accessory Apartment be desired in the future, a new application for such, shall be submitted and must be approved by the Town under the then current code regulations." Also, a new Condition #12 "Sheet A1.4 shall show the Washer and Dryer removed from the second floor living area." The remaining conditions will be renumbered.

Mr. Giller made a motion to approve the Cobb Residence with the both the newly added finding and condition that Ms. Puester read into the record, which was seconded by Mr. Lamb. The project passed unanimously.

3. **Guthrie Residence Demolition and New Single Family Residence, 131 South Gold Flake Terrace, PL-2020-0114.** Without a call up, this item was approved as presented.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Update: A written summary was provided in the packet.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Moore: What happened to the tents on Main Street? (Mr. Truckey: At one time Breckenridge Tourism Office was thinking about providing tents but decided not to. We told restaurants they could provide a tent if they wanted to, subject to review for wind loads by Red, White, and Blue Fire District.)

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: On Parkway Center, it says that Council does not want to see a loss of workforce housing. What does that mean? (Mr. Truckey: I think there was confusion on this and the statement is out of context. The site is designated for commercial uses and the applicant can propose workforce housing if they choose.)

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Can we revisit the ADU policy? (Mr. Truckey: Maybe we can schedule it as an agenda item on an upcoming meeting.)

Mr. Moore: I agree. We are having the same issues in the County.

Mr. Schuman: I think tonight's items can be training items for the staff.

Mr. Giller: Is there any sort of best practices in other jurisdictions? (Mark: We have not found any. Maybe it is something we need to work more with the STR staff for enforcement.)

Mr. Lott: We looked at some municipality and county regulations but can look even further, if need be.

Mr. Kulick: For wet bars, we looked at the Summit County's rules. In many houses, there are larger common areas where a wet bar of limited scale that the county allows is inadequate and also very unlikely to be divided into a STR. Also, secondary washers and dryers are pretty common in larger homes. It does not always make sense to have the laundry consolidated in one area of a large house. Houses above a certain square footage will likely need more than a single washer and dryer to be functional.

Ms. Puester: We just finished interviewing applicants for the recently vacated seat by Dan Schroder and we will be taking forward a recommendation to the Town Council. If everything goes well, their first meeting will be July 7.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.

Steve Gerard, Chair