

Commissioners of Leonardtown  
**Leonardtown Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**  
*July 16, 2007 ~ 2:30 p.m.*

Attendees: Jean Moulds, Chairperson  
Frank Fearn, Vice Chair  
Dave Frock, Member

Absent: Dan Burris, Member  
Jack Candela, Member

Also in attendance were: Laschelle Miller, Town Administrator; DeAnn Adler, Plans Reviewer; Teri Dimsey, Recording Secretary; Jackie Post, Fiscal Clerk; Paul Dougherty, Attorney, McKee/Design Builders; Tom McKee, Design Builders; Thomas Reinecker, Architect; Dr. Herbert Winnik, Resident; Mike Pierce, Leonard's Grant; Ann Combs, Resident; Chip Norris, Resident/Mayor; Mock Mattingly, Resident/Council Member; Tom Collier, Resident/Council Member; Leslie Roberts, Resident/Council Member; John Wharton, Enterprise, Bob Combs, Resident/Council Member; Bob D'Esposito, Resident. A complete list is available on file at the Leonardtown Town Office.

Chairperson Moulds called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. and remarked that there is a sign-up sheet out front for those who wish to speak at the Public Hearing.

The meeting minutes for the June 18, 2007 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting are presented for approval.

**Chairperson Moulds entertained a motion to approve the June 18, 2007 meeting minutes, Member Burris moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Member Fearn, no further discussion; motion passed unanimously.**

**Town Administrator's Report – Laschelle Miller**

Ms. Miller reported that at the July 9<sup>th</sup> Town Council meeting, Council recommended that the **Request for PIRD designation for McKee Property** be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission to hold a public hearing to begin the process which is happening at today's meeting. Mr. Tom McKee is requesting a zoning change and a PIRD designation for two parcels, lot 500 and lot 316, that he proposes to develop with a mixed use of retail on the first floor and town homes on the second level. The proposal also shows underground parking for the site. We will hear from Mr. McKee shortly.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**CASE # 64-04 – Leonard’s Grant Plat Approval – Phase I – Rt. 245**

**Case # 64-04: Leonard’s Grant Plat Approval – Phase I**

Applicant: Quality Built Homes  
Engineer: Loiederman Soltesz Associates, Inc.  
Location: Rt. 245  
Zoning: Planned Unit Development – PUD-M

The applicant received final site plan approval on May 21, 2007. At this time the applicant is requesting final plat approval for Phase I of the homes. Phase I includes 76 single family lots and the town green. Included in your packet is the Final Plat Plan for Phase I.

\*If approved, the motion should include approval pending signed developer agreements being received by staff.

**The applicant is requesting Final Plat Approval for Phase I at this time. The Planning and Zoning Commission can approve, approve with conditions, or deny.**

**Member Fearn moved to approve Phase I Final Plat Approval with the condition that we receive the signed Developer Agreements before proceeding; Member Frock seconded, no further discussion, motion passed unanimously.**

**Case # 70-06: Community Bank of Tri-County – Plat Adjustment Approval**

Applicant: Community Bank of Tri-County  
Location: 25395 Point Lookout Road  
Engineer: Bolton and Associates

The applicant received final site plan approval on March 19, 2007. At this time the applicant is requesting a plat adjustment approval for this site. Enclosed in your packet is a copy of the Plat plan showing the consolidation of Parcels 281 and 282 which is the old Tri-County Savings and Loan Site and the old 7/Seven site. The only change is to correct the Case # on the plat.

**The applicant is requesting Final Plat Approval for Community Bank of Tri-County at this time. The Planning and Zoning Commission can approve, approve with conditions, or deny.**

**Member Frock moved on Case #70-06 to approve Final Plat Approval for the request; seconded by Member Fearn, no further discussion, motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Miller remarked that she will provide some background information on the rezoning and PIRD requests before today’s 3:00 p.m. and 3:15 p.m. scheduled Public Hearings. This Board will then send forward a recommendation to Town Council who will hold another Public Hearing before a final decision is made.

The purpose of the Planned Infill and Re-development District (PIRD) is to encourage re-development of sites and buildings in situations where buildings or properties are located within the Town's designated PIRD Area, and are in deteriorated or dilapidated condition, or are surrounded by residential or other incompatible uses.

This district is to be used as a floating zone classification to promote re-development and infill development where those buildings or properties have traditionally been used for residential, commercial or limited industrial purposes and in those circumstances where it is no longer economically or otherwise feasible to use those buildings or properties for the purposes for which they were intended, when constructed. PIRD is intended to allow the adaptive re-use of the site and buildings, and orderly and controlled expansion of commercial or residential uses within such buildings and upon such properties, including the construction of "in-fill" structures and additions to existing structures. It is also the purpose of this district to accommodate re-development of residential uses, and accommodate a mix of residential dwelling types, while protecting and preserving the residential character of any surrounding residential neighborhoods.

As found on page 2 of the PIRD Ordinance, in order to be eligible for consideration for PIRD classification there must be a finding by the Town Council that:

- a. the development or re-development proposed for the subject property is consistent with the purpose and intent of this district;
- b. the proposed development or re-development of the subject property(s) would be compatible with, and not adversely impact, the surrounding neighborhoods, including impacts from traffic, noise, light and glare, parking, and signs;
- c. the services and infrastructure for the site will be sufficient to accommodate the type and intensity of the proposed development;
- d. the proposed development would provide needed housing opportunities, services, jobs, or amenities and/or would improve or enhance the character of the site;
- e. the general performance standards and limitation established in 155.34.6 subparagraph f can be met on the subject property, and;
- f. the granting of the Planned Infill and Redevelopment District classification will promote the general welfare of the Town and will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of Town residents.

Permitted uses shall be limited to those allowed in the underlying zone except as follows:

- a. The Town Council may permit a mix of uses including residential, small-scale commercial service and retail establishments.
- b. The Town Council may permit the redevelopment, including tear down and rebuild, of any residential unit or units provided such residential unit or units existed prior to the adoption of this section regardless of whether or not the units constitute a non-conforming use.

#### Application Information and Process

- (1) Notice

- (a) Property or properties proposed for development or re-development under the terms of this Article shall be posted by the applicant. This sign will advise the public of the purpose, time, place and date of the hearing. Such posting shall appear on the site at least fifteen (15) days prior to the application being considered by the Planning Commission. At the time of posting, all required application information, as outlined herein, shall be present and available for review in the Town Office.
  - (b) The applicant shall notify all property owners adjacent to and within 300 feet of subject property by registered or certified mail at the last known address as reflected on the tax records. Such notice shall be sent out at least fifteen (15) days prior to the Planning Commission meeting at which the application is to be considered for the first time.
- (2) The applicant has the full burden of proof to demonstrate the proposed infill or redevelopment proposal meets or exceeds the development standards in Section 155.34.6 herein.

**Case#: 113-06: Tom McKee Property – Rezoning and PIRD Overlay:**

Applicant: Design Builders & Assoc., Inc.  
 Location: Parcels 316 & 500–Fronting on Lawrence Ave. & Washington St.  
 Present Zoning: Single Family Residential  
 Zoning Change Requested: Commercial Business District with PIRD Overlay  
 Acreage: 1.5 Acres

Mr. Tom McKee is requesting a zoning change from Single Family Residential to Commercial Business and a PIRD designation for two parcels, Lot 500 and 316, that he proposes to develop with a mixed use of retail on the first floor and town homes on the second level. The proposal also shows underground parking for the site.

As per State of Maryland procedures for re-zoning, an applicant must show proof that “there has been a change in the neighborhood of the property since the adoption of the Zoning Ordinance and maps in May, 1974, or that the Ordinance or maps were in error regarding the applicant’s property.” Mr. McKee will try to show a change in the neighborhood as a reason for rezoning. (Please see entire rules, included in your packet, for more information)

As per the PIRD Article of the Leonardtown Zoning Ordinance the applicant must show that all items listed in 155.34.3 have been met to be granted a PIRD designation. Section 155.34.5 spells out the permitted uses in the PIRD district.

Enclosed in your packets you will find:

- Minutes from January 16, 2007 Planning and Zoning meeting
- PIRD guidelines
- Rezoning process

- Set of plans for proposal
- Application for rezoning and PIRD designation
- Correspondence received for public hearing
  - Petition signed by approximately 30 residents
  - Three letters from residents
  - Letter from the Critical Area Commission
- Map showing the two different parcels and their location.

Chairperson Moulds entertained a motion to take a break until 3:00 p.m. to begin the Public Hearing.

**Member Fearn moved to close the regular meeting; seconded by member Frock, motion passed unanimously.**

**3:00 p.m. - PUBLIC HEARING ~ REZONING REQUEST**

At 3:00 p.m. Chairperson Moulds opened the meeting for the Public Hearing. She noted that two people had signed up to speak before the Board and would call them after the applicant's presentation.

Mr. Paul Dougherty introduced himself as representing Mr. Tom McKee. Mr. Reinecker, Architect for Design Builder is also here today.

Mr. Dougherty noted that Ms. Miller's comments about the case were entirely accurate. The standard that we are trying to meet for this re-zoning and PIRD Overlay are really part and parcel, the same conversation, but the standards are different as Ms. Miller set out for everyone.

We do not think that the original single family residential zoning classification was a mistake; rather, we are arguing that there has been a change in the neighborhood significant enough to support the rezoning particularly with the PIRD Overlay. How do we establish that there has been that change? As Ms. Miller stated, we need to define that neighborhood and we argue that the neighborhood is Leonardtown to the north, the bottom of Washington Street to the south, Courthouse Drive to the east and Lawrence Avenue to the west. We have to deal with Tudor Hall and consider all of Tudor Hall to the west to be part of the neighborhood that needs to be considered when addressing what kinds of changes have been made to warrant the rezoning request and PIRD Overlay. Within that neighborhood, and in addition to the history of Tudor Hall, we have maps showing five re-zonings within that area, two of which are along Washington St.. In 2003, Town Council approved a residential single family and rezoned to commercial marine and along Courthouse Drive, the Weiner building that was commercial office re-zoned to commercial general by Town Council. Then, Washington St., Courthouse Square building that went from commercial office to commercial general and sent to Town Council in November of 2001. Then Church Street residential multi-family to commercial office which was approved and sent to Town Council in July 2003. Finally Church Street from multi-family to commercial office and sent to Town Council October 2000. Going back about five years, these re-zonings show a common thread particularly in the Church Street re-zoning that this was the core of the district. Coming up from the Washington St corridor, there is development that has

been happening for a number of years and we are simply asking for a continuation of that corridor.

Mr. Dougherty asked the Board members if they would prefer to hear more about what they are requesting and plan to build from Mr. Reinecker or continue with the legal details?

Member Fearn responded that Mr. Dougherty should continue with the presentation about the plans for the property.

Mr. Reinecker introduced himself as the Design Architect for this project and explained that when he and Mr. McKee walked the property it presented itself as an opportunity. It was evident that there had been commercial use of the property before and evident that it is on the fringe of a well established residential community in the heart of Leonardtown. We needed to determine what is the highest and best use for this property, what can be done on it that would offer an economic return and not be an eyesore to the community? We tried to respect the residential character of Washington Street and allow the development that would occur along Lawrence Avenue to react to and incorporate the commercial development that appears to already be ensconced on Lawrence Avenue. Another issue was the property had been previously occupied by an oil company and there is concern about the possibility of contaminated soil and related costs.

That discussion basically led to the idea that this kind of development is going to generate a pretty high parking requirement and the best way to handle it would be to bury it. We could take the eyesore of a public parking lot and put it out of sight. This would provide us the opportunity to remove the contaminated soils and in that void we would provide the required parking for a mixed use development. Therefore, our plan shows how we can incorporate two levels of parking that will generate in the neighborhood of 120 to 130 parking spaces. The streetscape along Lawrence Avenue is where we would propose to provide roughly 1,500 sq. ft. of commercial space that could either be offices or small retail, broken down to two 7,500 sq. foot components. It would be set back from the curb but we would bring a brick façade forward and we would punch through that brick façade with a series of arches so that this colonnade would be a protected walkway, it would reduce the impact of the store front and we feel it would be an opportunity to set the tone for Lawrence Avenue. On the second level above that is where we would provide a denser residential development, we would be putting in a mix of one and two bedroom units some with loft space, some without, we would be looking for a mix of 50/50 of how that gets laid out. The pedestrian level for the residential units would be one-story up above Lawrence Avenue and that would be the promenade which would be directly above the retail walkway. There would be an elevator tower that would be located between the two components of this project that would access the street level and access the parking garage below. On the Washington Street side, our attempt there would be to respond to the very strong residential character of the street. This is where we would propose to provide almost a muse kind of character to the development. There would be ten town homes located there on the downhill side of the property and we would provide access to a residential use parking garage only. All of the off street parking would be provided below these units. We have made every attempt to break the mass of the structures down so they correspond rather nicely to the Victorian residential development you already find along this street. The major material at street level we are proposing is to be brick with some stone accents and then the residential portion of the project would be hardy plank with steeply sloped roofs so that the small town character will be carried

over into this project. Mechanical equipment will all be concealed. With the amount of excavation, it would give us the opportunity to handle a very sophisticated stormwater management system, all concealed. There would be roughly three areas of development, town homes along Washington Street, the two commercial structures located along Lawrence Avenue and the connecting link would be the below grade parking.

Mr. Paul Doherty stated that he wanted to go back to make something clear. When he referred to the northern boundary to define the purpose of meeting the statutory requirements for rezoning, he said Leonardtown and meant Leonardtown Road.

In addition to the re-zoning, in the last five years within that neighborhood, there were some other significant actions taken by the Commission. I point out the plan approvals for Courthouse Square in May of 2006, the Sterling House, that went through a course of concepts to revise and modify the plan approval and that eventually received final site approval in March of this year, as well as a 1,000 sq. ft addition in June of 2004. This contributes to the change that we are discussing and is behind our request. Perhaps most importantly, although it is within a different zoning classification on Lawrence Avenue itself on Pope Street, there was PIRD approval.

### **3:15 p.m. – PUBLIC HEARING ~ PIRD APPLICATION REQUEST**

Chairperson Moulds interrupted Mr. Dougherty to open the 3:15 p.m. Public Hearing for the PIRD Application Request and noted that she will run the two open hearings simultaneously as they are talking about the same piece of property, the commercial activity happening there and it would be helpful to discuss them both at the same time.

### **Chairperson Moulds opened the Public Hearing for Case #113-06, Tom McKee Property Rezoning and PIRD Requests, Lot #316 and #500 fronting on Lawrence Avenue and Washington Street.**

Mr. Dougherty continued and stated that he agreed they are part of the same conversation. Within that neighborhood and over the last five years there have been five separate re-zonings, three significant plan approvals and a PIRD right on one of the streets which border our parcels. This gives the Commission a sense of the changes that have taken place. The most important change which we think effects the changes in the neighborhood is Tudor Hall which is similar to ours and planned for zero lot line, single-family homes which bolsters our position. The Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Leonardtown, in so far as it is a factual consideration for the rezoning, is a nice transition to discuss the PIRD.

The PIRD has what I would term “soft requirements” and those are the requirements of Section 155.34.1 of the PIRD Statute, as well as, what I would term “hard requirements” which are the findings that the Town Council must be able to find and of course the Commission must approve to get it back to them. Hard requirements are what Town Council has to find in Section 1655.34.6 of the Statute. I want to address some of these points and let you know how we believe this becomes an excellent candidate for the PIRD overlay in the re-zoning and some of the soft requirements that I think we meet. First, is the design of the colonnade facing Lawrence Avenue with a brick façade and walk-way. One of the points in the statue regarding intent is that we have to encourage compact pedestrian scaled development and this is exactly what we are talking about here, commercial uses on a small scale retail which by design encourages

pedestrian access. We are talking about creating a high quality neighborhood. Mr. McKee can speak directly to what his building and development practices are when he deals with other builders. Going to the heart of the PIRD Statute, accommodating growth in the Town of Leonardtown by encouraging new development on underutilized land where such development is compatible with the existing neighborhood. If you accept our definition of what that neighborhood is and the changes that have taken place there, Mr. McKee would not be trying to develop it if he didn't think it wasn't underutilized and something that could be a good fit for that neighborhood, both with commercial and residential. We think it is an efficient use of the land; it could be seen as stimulating redevelopment in an established neighborhood and gives us flexibility to achieve high quality design in infill projects. Mr. McKee is not just the developer, he is the owner. The purpose of the PIRD statute is to give this flexibility and this project is what was in mind when the PIRD statute was adopted to allow flexibility for developers to build something that made sense within that defined neighborhood. One of the requirements in the PIRD statute is that we meet and implement the goals of the comprehensive plan. I think this project fits that plan, downtown revitalization, allows for expansion of the commercial business district, flexibility in mixed used development, community character is maintained and one of the smaller comments in the comprehensive plan is the type of housing available to Leonardtown residents and part of that discussion is lower to middle priced housing is at least abundant. There is a need for higher priced residential units. Mr. McKee plans on putting in a mix of different price points but high quality. This will attract a high quality homeowner. With regard to the "hard points" that we think the Town Council has to be able to make to approve the PIRD Overlay for our rezoning if you were to recommend it, I will run through those. The plan meets the purpose and objectives of the minimum standards of the overlay conditions. The plan is compatible with the existing and planned uses in the area. We are only riding the wave that has been established in the last five years of rezoning in this particular geographic area that makes sense for the revitalization of mixed used, flexible zoning classifications in the Town. Existing or planned public facilities are adequate to service the proposed development and I do not believe the level of build-out will tax town services. I think it is entirely good for the projected uses for water, sewer and public safety. Development staging is adequate in relation to public facilities and private amenities, whatever staging the Town Council, if this is recommended, eventually feels is appropriate, we will work with them within the time frames that they provide if reasonable and the plan meets their requirements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairperson Moulds opened the floor for comments.

Dr. Winnik remarked that the Commissioners have received the petition signed by 31 residents in the neighborhood. The neighborhood is Washington Street, Landing Way, Camilier, Key Way and Tudor Hall. It is interesting that they have to define the neighborhood which includes most of Leonardtown, that is a very novel interpretation of neighborhood. Neighborhood is the immediate surrounding area of where they want to build, but obviously they recognize that this is a strong residential area, so they have to go beyond the existing neighborhood to claim that it is allowed. Their definition of neighborhood is highly suspicious in my mind. The petition clearly makes reference to the fact that in order to grant this rezoning as commercial you have to have a significant change. But we note that the significant change in Washington Street, which is the immediate neighborhood has been improvement as opposed to change. Significant improvement opposed to new buildings and we listed the ones that have the most immediate improvement. We are talking about thousands of dollars to improve the quality of homes on Washington Street. I can speak of my own house, what we have done, putting in central air conditioning within the



last ten years, new windows, new siding, new kitchen counters and new furnace. I am sure many of the other neighbors can speak to improvements they have made. To cut to the heart of the matter, there has been a change in Washington Street, but the changes are at the bottom of the hill. I remember in 1985 there was a fire which burned down the restaurant there. The neighborhood decayed right at the bottom of the hill, there were burnt out posts, nothing was done. The neighbors supported Ron Russo's plan to put town houses in and to redevelop that and we allowed the two houses that were in disrepair to be rebuilt as light commercial, there was reason for that and after twenty years it was a positive step. This is not the case in the rest of Washington Street. We have a new Victorian and across the street we have a larger Victorian presently being built. There is no indication that there has been a change in the neighborhood, the realistic neighborhood not Church Street and other streets they claim that deserves a commercial rezoning. We think that is highly unlikely. Furthermore, looking at the Critical Areas Commission letter, I doubt any of this will be permissible. There is no indication that this huge mass which they are trying to put in will be allowed in this area so they can draw all they want but we need to realize this is no longer permissible in critical areas zoning. I looked at that letter and I think you will find that letter clearly does not allow this huge mass to be built. Therefore, we feel this is a type of proposal that defies reality. They are trying to put in, as they put it, to get the highest investor use. But, we all have neighborhoods. If this is allowed to go through, then any neighborhood could be allowed to be rezoned commercial. Because there is no reason that any significant change that has occurred allowed this to happen. This is something that would not be possible and should not be allowed.

Mr. Doherty remarked in response that Critical Area Commission letter says that their overlays prevent this, in fact, they spell out the different development districts that would in fact allow it to happen.

Dr. Winnik stated that this is Mr. Doherty's interpretation.

Ms. Miller commented that the information from this letter will come into play when they look at the specifics of the plan itself, what can be allowed and what won't be allowed.

Member Fearn clarified that there is an extensive number of critical areas issues that will need to be addressed but they do not state any specifics at this time.

Chairperson Moulds asked if anyone else had any comments.

Ms. Kay D'Esposito, resident of the surrounding neighborhood, stated that she will be most affected by this as it surrounds her property. Because it impacts us we have to wonder what will happen to our property?

Ms. Ann Combs, resident of Washington Street, remarked that she would have to agree with Dr. Winnik that this would be in the best interest of Tudor Hall. "I would like to see progress but I'm not sure if this is what we need in this area."

Ms. Miller stated that for the record, included in the Board Members packet are copies of three letters received prior to the hearing and the signed petition, along with the Critical Areas Commission letter received today.

Chairperson Moulds asked if anyone would like to make any additional comments.

Member Fearn remarked that he has a home with development going on around him and one of the concerns in regard to the neighborhood is where is the line defined and everyone defines that line differently. When I look at the west side of Washington Street and the west side of Lawrence Avenue what I see is predominantly single family residential. A lot of things will be weighed here today but there are double-edged swords, you encourage efficient use of land and public services but in the context of the existing neighborhoods and to stimulate economic development and re-development in older established neighborhoods, in such that re-developments improves the neighborhood character to create high quality neighborhoods compability with the community environment. There are two sides of each of these. I am inclined to look at this as something that is compatible with the neighborhood. I want to define the neighborhood as the residential core down in Tudor Hall and everything to the west of Lawrence Avenue and Washington Street. At some point you have to define neighborhood where development is going to stop and the residential begins which is where we are at right now on the line.

Chairperson Moulds stated that if there are no further comments, we will close the Public Hearing and will re-open the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and continue discussion on the rezoning requests and PIRD application request.

Chairperson Moulds remarked that this piece of property has been used as a special use for a good many years as commercial use and to come in and try to rezone this, we have a lot of things to think about before we make a decision. We have heard a lot of comments from both the owner and the residents; I would find it hard to digest all of this in a very short time. We have had a lot of information presented to us, in addition to the fact that we have the letters that were included our packets some of which just came in today. We also have two Board members absent today and because this is such a critical decision for the Town we would like them to review these proceedings and minutes.

Ms. D'Esposito interjected to ask a question. If you change the zoning from residential to commercial does that mean if it is commercial this is what must go there. Once you change the zoning that is not a commitment, down the road, suppose it might not be feasible later if the owner decided on other plans. This could open up a can worms to anything.

Mr. Doherty replied that this is why we are doing the rezoning with the PIRD Overlay which gives the option of mixed use and not just commercial only.

Ms. Miller stated that the PIRD Overlay would be very specific to that project and defines the type of uses.

Dr. Winnik remarked that as he understands it, this is now zoned single family and already has a PIRD Overlay.

Ms. Miller stated that it is in the district that allows the PIRD Overlay but they are still required to get approval to apply the PIRD Overlay.

Dr. Winnik indicated that they do not need to have rezoning for commercial. They are going two hands at the same time. This ought to be refused as commercial which is not clearly in the

neighborhood and then rediscuss this PIRD Overlay as within single family and see if such a massive project would be permitted.

Ms. Miller remarked that one reason we taped the meeting today is so that if the Board members wanted to hear the testimony they would be able to do so.

Chairperson Moulds stated that if this was approved for commercial then there was no reason why they would have to stick to that or if for some reason he would have to sell the property the next person who came in would not have to put in that type of building. The PIRD Overlay may come under that request and they would have to bring in a very specific plan of what they wanted to do.

**I recommend we table this decision until August because of the amount of public testimony today and given the rest of the Board would have the opportunity to review the tape and minutes of this meeting and we would be better prepared to make a decision at the August meeting.**

**Member Fearn moved on Case #113-06 to agree to Chairperson Moulds recommendation to table the decision until the August meeting to review the information and testimonies and to provide the absent Board members, Member Candela and Member Burris, an opportunity to do the same and review the minutes and videotape; Member Frock seconded, no further discussion, motion passed unanimously.**

**Monthly In-House Permits – No Questions**

**Town Council Minutes – No Questions**

**Member Fearn moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:42 p.m., seconded by Member Frock, no further discussion, motion passed unanimously.**

Respectfully Submitted:

---

Teri Dimsey, Recording Secretary

Approved:

---

Jean Moulds, Chairperson

---

Frank Fearn, Vice Chair

---

Absent  
Dan Burris, Commission Member

---

Absent  
Jack Candela, Commission Member

---

Dave Frock, Commission Member