

## **August 2010 -- Minutes**

**BOROUGH OF PALMYRA  
LAND USE BOARD  
August 16, 2010  
Meeting Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chairwoman Carol Riener followed by the salute to the flag and roll call which was recorded as follows:

**PRESENT:** Beck, Jackson, Locke, Riener and Dunn-Sanders,  
Neely, Stokes and Elmes arrived after roll call

**ABSENT:** O'Kane, Norcross and Gural

Chairwoman Riener read the Open Public Meeting Statement into the record as recorded below.

Public Notice of this meeting pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act has been given by the Board Secretary in the following manner:

- A.** Posting written Notice on the Official Bulletin Board at the Palmyra Borough Hall on July 22, 2010.
- B.** Mailing written Notice to the Burlington County Times on July 22, 2010; for publication on August 2, 2010.
- C.** Notice to All Board Members.

The Boards Attorney Andrew Brewer, Board Engineer David Denton, Zoning Officer, Tracy Kilmer were all present and none were sworn-in as there were no applications on the agenda to be heard.

Mr. David Gerkens, Borough Planner was present to review the outdoor dining proposal, display proposal and signs in reference to the Master Plan. He submitted and read the following information concerning outdoor dining:

“After reviewing the proposed draft ordinance, Ms. Kilmer’s comments on same, as well as comments from Messrs. Brewer and Rosenberg, I have only minor additional comments at this time.

However, I believe in considering the calculations in Ms. Kilmer’s March 4, 2010 memo, that the existing infrastructure in the Borough’s downtown district cannot support outdoor dining. In addition, during the original streetscaping project along Broad Street, there were numerous issues with property lines and the public right-of-way. The Board or Borough engineer should review those documents prior to the introduction of an outdoor dining ordinance.

I believe there are a number of bigger picture issues that should be considered as well. These include the recent creation /designation of the Business Improvement District (BID). Until the BID has its leadership in place, and prepared to comment on this or other potentially higher priority downtown issues, it seems premature to move forward with an outdoor dining ordinance at this time.

Finally, the Borough’s Master Plan lists as a land use objective “The protection of residential areas from encroachment of commercial and industrial uses.” Establishment of outdoor dining in the downtown, could be viewed as an “encroachment” into the surrounding residential neighborhoods. If the ordinance moves forward, the Master Plan should be amended to clarify the intent.

My comments on the proposed Outdoor Eating Facilities ordinance are:

1. 2.B. – Convenience stores that sell either fresh or pre-made food items, should be not be permitted to offer outdoor seating.
2. 2.E. – Would eliminate outdoor alcohol sales within the downtown district.
3. 8.C – If activities take place within designated outdoor dining facilities, that negatively impact public safety, the Borough should have the ability to terminate the permit in 24 hours rather than 5 days.

After reading through his letter Mr. Gerken continued with the following comments. The engineer at the time of the streetscape was Pennoni & Associates who is currently the Borough’s Special Projects Engineer and suggested they along with the Borough’s Engineer

should have the opportunity to review and make comments. With the Business Improvement District (BID), he believes it's premature to place an ordinance in place before they've had the opportunity to get themselves organized and make comments.

Chairwoman Riener asked the Board if they were ready to embark on the ordinance and move it forward to Council with comments so that they (Council) could act on it. She then asked the professionals if they had any additional comments. Mrs. Kilmer had none and Mr. Brewer stated his comments were still the same as his March 9th memo. "The number one question is, is it consistent with the Master Plan and the enforcement policy."

Mr. Gerkens commented his professional opinion is it is inconsistent with the Master Plan.

Vice Chair Locke commented on Ms. Kilmer's comments concerning enforcement and stated the enforcement policy on any outdoor dining needs to be absolutely defined in no uncertain terms.

No other Board members had any comments at this time and a motion was made to open the meeting to the public on outdoor dining only by Vice Chair Locke.

Mr. Beck seconded the motion

All members of the Board approved the motion

Mr. Anthony Fratto who identified himself as a member of the EDC and the President of the BID stated he didn't want to sound adversarial but in 2006 /2007 the EDC was charged with doing a feasibility study to come up with a proposal for outdoor dining and outdoor displays. "The communities using outdoor dining and displays are thriving; we tried to be sensitive as to what things would look like and how they could work. We addressed dining and alcohol consumption, we addressed litter and looked into every little detail we could think of. This is a little frustrating! We have 11 directors for the BID and we meet monthly, we have no budget as of yet and don't know when we'll get any money. We are trying to move this town forward with respect to the town's master plan, we don't want to go against that but we need viable stores and businesses for the town, we need to move forward with this."

Chairwoman Riener replied that the first time this came before the Board collectively was in March. It can't be acted on immediately because it has to go through a very long process before a final draft is submitted. It's not that it's been sitting before us for the last couple of months or years and we haven't done anything. She continued by asking Mr. Fratto what he

envisioned and who he believed the bulk of the businesses would be using it? We have to apply the ordinance unilaterally.

Mr. Fratto reiterated that he believed “any food establishment which is not a convenient store should be able to allow outdoor dining and we (EDC) specified how much sidewalk is needed, if you can’t satisfy the conditions then you can’t do it. We want to be able to appeal to businesses and bring them into town.”

He was asked what he would propose for an establishment such as the Park Tavern which is in a residential area.

Mr. Fratto continued “being within 500 feet of a residential area would eliminate the Park Tavern. They have to be able to not impede on a residential area, but a couple of tables to eat sandwiches at should be allowed. They are supposed to submit an application, we can’t foresee every situation. Park Tavern should be able to supply tables in their parking lot and the Milmarian should be able to construct a little canopy for an outside eating area. Currans would have a problem with a sidewalk.” Currans has plantings and trees; Barista could put a small table and I would love to see the Deli have a table or two. He would like to have tables inside because he sells sandwiches.”

No members of the Board had any questions for Mr. Fratto and no other members of the public wished to comment.

A motion was made to close the public comment portion on outdoor dining by Mr. Neely Vice Chair Locke seconded the motion

An affirmative voice vote was recorded by all present

Mrs. Elmes commented “we owe it to everyone the opportunity to try something; we owe it to the people. Burlington makes it work.”

Chairwoman Riener questioned if any thought was given to the fact that the Borough is a walking school district which would inevitably mean children walking thorough at some point while someone is trying to enjoy themselves.

Mr. Neely stated his opinion of having mixing children with people outside is a bad idea, having “kids” weave in and out through customers; the area isn’t conducive for it. You have to police for alcohol outside. “I think it’s a bad idea. I can’t see a major benefit at this time.

Mrs. Elmes commented that she grew up in Medford which was a walking district also and that the kids continue to congregate in front of Bill's now.

Mr. Beck suggested each establishment could have the same type of tables and chairs because other than the Mill or the Park, who have space to work with, the downtown is limited.

There was some debate concerning the use of space. The comment was made the theory is to attract business to town.

Vice Chair Locke commented the "aesthetic appeal of the outside dining / open air dining and trying to compete with those businesses and even though the area may only accommodate one table, that one table might be appealing to the business. It has a nice appeal to it and people might think differently about wanting to stop and try a restaurant.

We're an old town and what we have sidewalk wise is what we have." She also commented that it's something that needs to be investigated, and try to help the business community bring in new businesses.

Mr. Stokes referenced the alcohol comment and stated the state governs that and it would be on the state if they can serve alcohol outside. "New Hope brings business in because of the restaurants and outdoor eating. I would think the businesses would be 'booming' later in the evening and may not be a concern for the kids. "I think our kids are a little more mature, they know who to talk to and who not to talk to." I think each business should be on an individual basis.

Mr. Neely stated he would be in a little more agreement if the board has more control over who gets to apply for outdoor eating.

Mr. Stokes suggested not 'killing' the request. "Is it a lot of work for the 'us' and the council, yes it is but Collingswood does it very well; we have a safer town than Burlington. Maybe if we do this someone would purchase the property at Broad & Leconey and make it a restaurant."

Mrs. Kilmer commented that she likes the idea of having to come before the Board and possibly an application for police input. Remember door swing needs to be taken into consideration. "We had an incident with a tarot card reader and she sold coffee and tables were placed outside which wasn't regulated." We need to come to an agreement.

Mrs. Dunn-Sanders stated there should be some sort of guidelines for people to follow. "I'm all pro for the out door eating but it could become an issue like south street,"

Ms. Jackson stated some sort of specific ordinance needs to take place; I have confusion with every piece of paper in front of me. Display of tables could literally be right next to tables, where people are eating; how is this going to come together? Visualizing what is currently here; if the deli wants to place tables out for eating and the flower shop puts out a display how is that going to benefit the town. It could potentially look like a flea market.

Chairwoman Riener commented the biggest issue is the professional planner has stated we have the opportunity to adjust the master plan, which is there for a reason. I believe you'll have a large contingent of neighbors that live upstairs and their quality of life. She then asked Mrs. Kilmer what would happen if someone came in tomorrow and requested to place tables out front of their business.

Mrs. Kilmer replied technically it's considered a change of use; therefore they would need to come before the board.

Mr. Brewer suggested making it an accessory use; they would need to come before the board for an accessory use and have a site plan the board would review. That way it's not just a permit. This board has a lot of opportunity to give variances, waivers, etc. on standards. They would come before the Board and say I meet all the requirements or ask for a variance for one thing or another. Specific to the eating facilities, they're not going to be able to give a blanket for all.

Chairwoman Riener questioned Mrs. Elmes' as to the reason for the EDC to propose a town wide ordinance.

Mrs. Elmes replied they wanted to encourage the whole process.

Chairwoman Riener asked if the businesses knew there is currently a mechanism in place to ask for outside eating.

Vice Chair Locke suggested making it known to them to come before the board to ask for the variance.

Mr. Brewer suggested the businesses might be looking at it saying it's never been done before and won't ask for it because of the cost process. The business' can ask for an

accessory with specific set backs and the board can in advance give them the specific criteria they would need to meet like any other accessory use.

Ms. Jackson questioned the liability of the Borough allowing outdoor eating and a car comes through and wipes diners out.

Mr. Brewer replied as a general manner no the Borough would not be liable for a general land use ordinance. As a general manner, no; but that doesn't mean you wouldn't be sued.

Chairwoman Riener questioned if this would be setting precedence if the master plan was amended.

Mr. Gerkens replied no, he didn't believe so; to update the plan you insert the ordinance.

Mrs. Elmes stated many years ago when Ward Welsh was president the EDC was given the project to review. If we already had it in place why did they ask us to review it again?

Chairwoman Riener suggested it's a good idea overall but a more rigid policy needs to be in place.

Mr. brewer suggested the board take the time to review the policy and ordinance and make sure everything is met, i.e. variance under certain circumstances, site plan, set back etc. prior to sending it to council for review.

Chairwoman Riener requested Mr. Brewer to write a draft ordinance and return it to the board for review and if we need to "tweek" it we can do so possibly in September.

Signs & Outdoor Display –

Mr. Gerkens stated it is currently allowed for special events like Palmyra Safety Day, Palmyra Day, Elections, etc.

Chairwoman Riener commented in her personal opinion it's trashy.

Vice Chair Locke commented it looks like a constant sidewalk sale.

Mrs. Dunn-Sanders agreed and suggested only for an event day, like outdoor dining would need a display.

Most members of the board seemed a little confused with what was supposed to be reviewed and how to proceed.

Mr. Brewer stated the proposed amendment is to amend the accessory uses.

Mrs. Elmes stated the purpose of the proposal is to allow for permits, which was again directed to the EDC from the Council.

Mr. Denton commented outdoor eating says 4 ft clear for outside eating and the outdoor display doesn't give a specific area; 4 ft would be consistent with ADA.

Mr. Neely questioned how wide the side walk is in front of Curran's and guessed about 20 ft. There's a minimum of 2/3 the right of way a place like Curran's would need 8 ft of right away.

Mrs. Kilmer stated it's more like 15 to 16 feet

Mr. Beck commented there are buffers like trees and trash cans

Mrs. Elmes again commented she grew up in a town where there was always something on the street and it was always kept nice.

Chairwoman Riener questioned the thrift shops and the like. She also commented that she would love for the Borough to morph into a Medford or Haddonfield; "it's what I've been working towards for 35 years."

Comments were made you can't stipulate old or new.

Mr. Brewer stated you can't do anything that's listed. It can't be in the right of way.

Mr. Neely commented "you keep making comparison of the Palmyra downtown and Collingswood and they aren't the same; they are as completely different as you can possibly imagine." When you have businesses on one side of the street it's different.

Mrs. Elmes replied but that is what we're trying to get to.

Chairwoman Riener commented it's the overall vision of the community.

Vice Chairwoman Locke replied to Mr. Neely that is his way to look at it, but you have to take that all into consideration, which I'm sure Collingwood did.

Vice Chair Locke, Mr. Stokes and Mr. Beck stated they need to give it more thought, but it's something the town could grow into.



Mrs. Dunn-Sanders commented the people who are doing it now aren't being told not to, businesses and retailers have to learn to help each other.

Ms. Jackson commented what we're doing is giving more "meat" for the Zoning Officer to enforce. She stated she agrees something needs to be done but not necessarily this (proposed ordinance from the EDC). "Anyone has the potential to put anything out there and there's a whole lot more work and direction that needs to go into the ordinance."

Chairwoman Riener stated she is wholly opposed to it, the amount of garbage and debris that's out there right now can't even be policed, how can you, control what goes outside. She stated she's not even in favor of perusing it any further until we at least test run the outdoor dining.

Vice Chair Locke moved a motion to open the meeting to the public for comment on this agenda item only.

Mrs. Elmes seconded the motion.

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance.

Mr. Anthony Fratto asked if displays are allowed currently, to which Mrs. Kilmer replied it is complaint driven.

Mr. Fratto continued "it would give Tracy some control; I don't have an answer you can't control everything. You could say mannequin and not racks which would limit what goes out." The trash has nothing to do with displays; the trash I see is from the public. If I have something on sale I'm not leaving it outside. A business person wouldn't leave his merchandise outside.

Chairwoman Riener commented there are multiple issues with policing; we're trying to look at the overall picture. I was initially opposed to the outdoor dining also but I'm willing to look at it, I believe the landscape has to change first.

Mr. Stokes commented route # 130 took away a lot of the foot traffic to the downtown areas to shop and that's why the riverline is here to bring it back. Display should come back later after outdoor eating. Trash will need to be regulated and the businesses would need to help, if the trash could go behind the buildings it could help. All the towns have the same thing. How many business owners actually come out and power wash their sidewalks everyday?

Mr. Rich Rosen stated he didn't come to talk about this particular topic but recently he had an opportunity to take a train trip where Main Street was on one side of the tracks and boarded up and abandoned properties on the other. The economy is bad right now 30 years ago Collingswood was a dead zone; Palmyra needs to try something it may not be perfect or your going to have a total dead area a place where the train doesn't want to stop.

Vice Chair Locke agreed and commented she had just taken a train to Richmond and could believe all the boarded up towns.

Chairwoman Riener commented as President of the historical society "I think adding this on top to the SID BID and outdoor dining will just be too much at one time."

Mr. Fratto stood to reply to Mr. Stokes and commented that Curran's has a maintenance person who sweeps outside of his place and street everyday.

No other public wished to comment.

Vice Chair Locke moved to close the public portion.

Mr. Beck seconded the motion

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance.

Chairwoman Riener asked the board their wish to explore, move forward or table the proposal.

Vice Chair Locke suggested the proposal be tabled until the outdoor dining could be perfected and get a chance to move forward.

Mrs. Elmes requested the board just don't "throw it away totally" good point with the BID and get the ball rolling. It could be something the BID could self regulate and make sure every business is doing what Curran's is doing everyday.

Mr. Neely, Mr. Beck, Mrs. Dunn-Sanders and Ms. Jackson were all in agreement to table.

Chairwoman Riener commented that Mrs. Kilmer will continue to regulate as she is currently and thanked Mr. Gerkens for coming. She then turned to Mr. Denton and suggested he address the board with what he is trying to accomplish for the signage.

Mr. Denton stated Cumberland Farms is the first application since the signage updates came into effect; my questions involve the area of height, number of signs. We're talking basic stuff and one is a typo.

Mr. Brewer informed the Board they can't address it it's now a council ordinance the sign ordinance as currently exist is two, three four fold to the extent that there is a reasonable interpretation; he's going to have to give his review letter to the Board based on what is in the ordinance now. He can't make it up he has to go by what is specifically there.

Chairwoman Riener commented her concern is that a professional is asking for an interpretation.

Nothing was decided and a 5 minute break was requested by the board.

Mrs. Kevin Besica re introduced her self to the board and commented she had worked for the board about 11 years ago. She is a professional planner and civil engineer

Vice Chair Locke commenced over this portion of the meeting.

Mrs. Besica explained she first started with what is in place currently and searched other municipalities in Burlington County and what had been addressed as far as parking and pervious and impervious coverage. Moorestown has an off street parking ordinance and Medford has a section for off street parking, loading and unloading. They were the only two municipalities in Burlington County specifically that had definitions she could "fall back on". In Camden County only Voorhees and Cherry Hill had anything to which she tried to reach out so she wouldn't have to "re-invent the wheel." Mrs. Kilmer sent back a "slew" of comments and more comments from Mr. Brewer to which I tried to basically put into this ordinance and organize it in a way that the resident could follow and the construction and zoning officer could enforce. It's been organized with headings. Mrs. Besica went through the summary stating the limiting the areas where parking would be eliminated. In order to describe where to park it was limited to the 3 ft side yard, limiting the driveway to the rear yard set back seem logical. No matter what zone you're in, the driveway shouldn't be closer than 3 ft; the size of the vehicle is something Tracy is having a problem with. What we're trying to limit is commercial vehicles in residential areas. The limit of a commercial vehicle is 26,000punds and not 20,000. As and Engineer driveways should have driveway aprons. Burlington County does have standards for drive way options. Burlington County has a standard of 25 ft you also have another ordinance from the width of the street and then narrows into the driveways. The flare for Palmyra is 22 ft and Burlington County is 25 ft. We

would either have to go with the County detail or insert the Borough's own standards. You have to hand out detailed information no words to the contractor. The next problem is driveways on grass. Andy Brewer questioned what to do with a driveway that's 95% grass; you don't want a portion of the driveway to be not maintained. You can have a drive way with two strips for driveway and the center as grass. You can't have designated aggregate with grass growing in it.

Vice Chair Locke at this point questioned if a stone driveways, is not acceptable or if a stone driveway with grass growing through out it isn't acceptable.

Mrs. Besica replied as long as it's being maintained. There are some driveways where it's just not maintained, in other words it's clearly a stone driveway but not being maintained. Maintained and approved should be defined; at this point you are putting a lot on the shoulders of your zoning officer.

Number 7 on summary page 6 being very clear not to ask for a specific escrow for plans, you should be able to tell if the driveway is causing flooding on the neighbor. What you don't want is for it to cause a burden on the applicant; this change should make it clear that there are options.

Chairwoman Riener asked her to explain the burden that's being placed on the applicant in or current ordinance.

Mrs. Besica stated other townships require a grading plan be submitted along with an escrow fee. You shouldn't take a stone driveway and fully pave it if it's going to cause a drainage problem for the neighbor. You should know that and be able to determine that from looking at it and knowing the town and drainage.

Vice Chair Locke commented if it became that much of a concern it could be looked at on a case by case for drainage plan.

Mrs. Besica continued with #8 on summary residential and commercial material can be porous a hard surface material that allows water to drain through. Residential driveways #9 dense grated aggregate could be what is used, stone driveways must be maintained. Tracy and I talked about what would hold the stone so it doesn't disappear into the soil underneath. Mrs. Besica explained that is the ordinance in summary and then explained what the colors meant while the board reviewed the ordinance draft given.

Mrs. Besica stated milling should not be included as dense grated aggregate.

Mr. Denton stated he agreed "It's nice, stable and looks good but would cause more run off." He also suggested to bring the statute up to date; Section 907 instead of 301.

Mrs. Besica referred to page #3 100% grass needs to be worked on a little more. 6B concerning the utility line; does that mean you couldn't place a hard surface where it would have to be ripped out for access to an underground utility.

Ms. Jackson questioned what you would do in that case; it's a catch 22 so what if you put down concrete or asphalt. How can you impose a restriction on existing property where there is a clean out and has an appropriate clean out.

Mrs. Besica stated if the sewer line is in the right of way, ten feet back is the property line the borough owns to about 10 ft out.

Mr. Stokes commented the Borough owns from the center of the street to 15 feet from the curb to property.

Ms. Jackson questioned the homes that don't have that 10 ft setback, where the apron is there's the 2 ft sidewalk. If it's been that way for years especially in the much older homes they're in a catch 22 they can't do it; and what if they don't want to do anything.

Mrs. Besica replied residential option for surface driveways in this draft ordinance you have the option of porous pavement

Chairwoman Riener commented technically as of right now you aren't able to have a grass driveway.

Mrs. Besica commented two strips with grass, totally paved, porous asphalt or pavers such as EP Henry. I'm here to only give you options trying to come up with something that will work for you that will solve the issues you're having.

Mr. Brewer stated to satisfy Tracy and the board your not restricting access, the property owner is responsible any way.

Mrs. Kilmer stated this was brought up because residents were constantly saying they couldn't pave because of the sewer line.

Vice Chair Locke questioned if you are giving the option to do stone.

Mrs. Kilmer stated currently the ordinance says you have to have a hard surface coverage.

Mrs. Besica referred back to page 3 and 4 restricted to 1400 A talked about changing how to number the ordinance for commercial driveways and can't have any type of grass and can't have the split runners.

Mrs. Kilmer stated there are still a couple of things she isn't comfortable with, such as the wording "good condition" and with Burlington County run off. She commented that she's not an engineer and there could be more measurements, surface drainage run off. "It's a lot for me to have to police without me knowing what these standards are for Palmyra.

Vice Chair Locke questioned "short of going to an engineer is there any way for the property owner to prove the runoff."

Mrs. Besica stated a certification from who the resident is purchasing from.

Mr. Beck again questioned the definition of "good condition"

Mr. Neely commented a standard would have to be set for "good condition"

After much discussion about the definition for "good condition" it was determined a few phone calls would be made to other municipalities for zoning officers for how they use or define judgment. It was also discussed the possibly include pictures / example of what to do and not to do be incorporated in the ordinance.

Mrs. Kilmer commented that even though the concrete may look good, but how do you know it's been installed properly. She stated a lot of towns have resale property maintenance codes and we're taking something out of that and trying to make it fit.

The board members all agreed it's headed in the right direction but still more research needs to be done.

Vice Chair Locke had a question on item #2 which limits parking spaces and driveways and the side lot line.

Mrs. Besica replied not for shared driveways.

Discussion and clarification about driveways that abut to each other not using the same curb cut vs. those who use the same curb cut then split into separate driveways.

Mrs. Elmes suggested the check with Medford on some of their ordinances concerning puddling issues. Mrs. Elmes also commented that she is concerned with those living close to

the river and the use of the chemicals used to kill the grass to keep the driveways in “good condition”; she then commented she is worried that it could penetrate the water table.

Mrs. Besica stated that Medford is a merge of the Pine Lands and therefore under different rules.

Vice Chair Locke asked for a motion to open the meeting to the public on this agenda item

Mrs. Elmes moved a motion to open the meeting to the public

Mr. Neely seconded the motion

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance.

Mr. Rosenfeld asked to be recognized. He submitted information for Andy to review prior to handing copies to the board members. Mr. Rosenfeld commented that he and Mrs. Kilmer have been in discussion for some time. He continued that after doing some research he has the following understanding about a nonconforming use and the continuance of the property (hand out). “To my understanding of the ordinance, my driveway can stay just as it is.”

Mr. Brewer at that time injected that this meeting has a very limited agenda and informed Mr. Rosenfeld he could present his information but that could no tact on it and that no enactment would take place.

Mr. Rosenfeld asked if there was a specific procedure to apply for a non conforming pre-existing use; and requested a pre-existing certificate.

Mr. Brewer explained what needed to be done in general.

Mrs. Kilmer commented that she has never had to give a pre-existing certificate before and explained the procedure to come before the board.

Chairwoman Riener commented that no grandfather clauses are given and that it still requires acknowledgement of the condition.

Mr. Daniel Martin addressed the board and commented in regards to driveways and “good conditions” and stated it’s hard to regulate aesthetics.

No other public wished to comment

Mr. Beck moved a motion to close the floor to the public

Mr. Neely seconded the motion

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance.

The question arose what should Mrs. Kilmer do and she was told to lay low concerning driveways and the everyone who has been cited has had the opportunity to come before the board.

Mrs. Besica was thanked for her time and research.

Mr. Beck moved a motion to open the meeting to the public for any comments

Mr. Stokes seconded the motion

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance.

No public wished to comment

Mr. Beck moved a motion to open the meeting to the public for any comments

Mr. Neely seconded the motion

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance.

Mr. Beck moved a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 pm

Mrs. Elmes seconded the motion

The motion was verbally approved unanimously by all in attendance and the meeting adjourned at 9:08 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Scott-Forman

LUB Secretary