

Golden Township Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Transcript

June 19, 2018

Jake Whelpley – Chairman (JW)

Jane Beaudoin – Member (JB)

Patti Hammond – Member (PH)

Mike Henderson – Member (MH)

Rob Draper – Golden Township (RD)

Ed McNeely – Golden Township Attorney (EM)

Tom Denman – Property Owner (TD)

Amanda Simpson – Resident (AS)

Richard Ruedi – Resident (RR)

JW: Call to order

JW: Please stand and recite Pledge please

All: I pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

JW: Read the roll call Rob

RD: I can do that

JW: Would you please

RD: Henderson

MH: Yeah

RD: Beaudoin

JB: Here

RD: Hammond

PH: Here

RD: Whelpley

JW: Here

RD: Rambo. Rambo's not here.

JW: Then we have a quorum. We can continue. Anybody have anything to add to the agenda? If not, we'll take a motion to approve the agenda.

PH: So moved

MH: Second

JW: A motion has been made and supported to approve the agenda. All those in favor of approving the agenda, signify by saying I.

JW, JB, AH, MH: I

JW: Anybody opposed same sign

JW: Agenda approved

JW: Minutes of the February 6th meeting. You all got minutes in your packet. Are there any questions? changes? Things you'd like different? If not, I'll take a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

MH: So moved

PH: Seconded

JW: The motion has been made and supported. All those in favor of approving the minutes of the February 6th 2018 meeting, signify by saying I

JW, JB, AH, MH: I

JW: All those opposed same sign

JW: Motion is carried

JW: On our agenda under new business, we have a variance request from Gander Denman. Before we start I would like to read a little preamble to the meet to the ah hearing. Golden Township Zoning Board of Appeals is a quazi judicial board. It operates as a court to hear variance requests, appeals of administrative decisions and interpretations of zoning ordinance text and manuscript. This a public hearing and the public hearing agenda will be followed. Everyone has a chance to speak at the appropriate time. All comments will be addressed to the Chairman only. Only one person speaking at a time. All comments must be based on the facts of the case and or the zoning ordinance not rumor or hearsay. A decision may or may not be made at this meeting depending on the outcome of the deliberations. The Golden Township Zoning ordinances is a land use law land use regulating law. Granting a variance is giving the applicant the ability to violate that law. Therefore variance requests are taken very seriously and given very sparingly. The zoning enabling act does not require does not allow this township to grant use variances. Only dimensional variances. Once a decision is rendered, any appeal by aggrieved party must be directed to the 27th District Court or Circuit Court. With that we will go to our public hearing agenda. And at this time I will open the public hearing for the Gander Denman variance request.

JW: The zone. Mister. Rob will you give us a presentation please?

RD: Umm. Mr. Denman gave me a call oh it's been probably 2 to 3 months ago now. Um, asking me if he could split this property that we are talking about and put two homes on it. And I explained to him that you have to have 2 acres so that you can split make one acre per lot because that's what the zoning laws are. And it would have to have 225 foot of road frontage per lot after split. We talked about that and the lot as it stands right now is .85 acres. And so I said that it wasn't possible. According to how I read all the laws of or the zoning ordinances and that it would be possible to go to the Planning commission and ask their ok to put a duplex in for the two homes on the one lot. But splitting the lot definitely was not able to happen under my watch like that so. Umm about a month later umm I received a packet in the mail from Prince and Monton Attorneys at law of Hart with this variance and so we've moved forward from there.

JW: OK. Any questions for Rob at this point?

PH: NO

JW: OK. Next is our petitioner presentation. Mr. Denman are you prepared to speak for us? OK.

TD: Yeah Hi. I am Tom Denman. I am the husband of Kathy Gander who is the property owner of record. Umm basically the goal for this that she was her is that she was purchasing the property and it was paid for by me and my three siblings. The idea was to have us all potentially split it. As it is my wife and I want to build to build a summer cottage in the back in the property there in the near future within the next couple of years. And my sister also wants not immediately it might not even be in this generation necessarily where she wants the option to be able to build one there um as well. It can sort of it can start out. Ya know there are three sisters who came up here. My grandmother and her two sisters in 1915. And after taking a train from Decatur and a wagon from Mears to Silver Lake. Her mother, who refer to as granny said don't even unpack your things girls, we're not staying here. It was just too hard to get up there and then all the sand. Then the next day they woke up and saw Silver Lake and the sand dunes on the other side and ok, well we can stay here. And so they ended up having children and their children have had children and things like that. And essentially the families were just growing. Umm and we need more more space to ya know. It was fine when we were four kids and all staying in one with our siblings and now there's spouses and grandchildren and things like that. It's just it's just not the room. So essentially what we want to do is to keep the two lots keep the two lots and properties completely within in the families. I mean I assume that my grandchildren will as some point inherit it and my sister's grandchildren will inherit it. You know I have absolutely. We have a lot of ties here and not interest at all in selling at any time or anything like that. I wanted to read briefly the section 2 point 1. Some parts of it. The parts for the zoning ordinance and then I'll be reading certain parts of this. To promote and preserve the health, safety, security and general welfare, to provide for orderly development of the township, to encourage the use of lands and resources in accordance with their character and adaptability, to limit and discourage the improper use of lands buildings and other structures, to stabilize and enhance property values and to establish minimum standards of regulations applicable to open spaces, location and use of buildings and development of land for residential, commercial, recreational, institutional, public and other purposes. Umm I don't know if you all have a copy of the plat that was submitted with the application for this zoning hearing but it's a parcel that is surrounded completely by platted properties from ya know either 50 years back or potentially 25 years or so back from the Floradale Resort. It refers to the Floradale plat which is to the north, the Floradale

Condominiums which are to the east and south and the Happy Ridge acres plat with is to the west and as a result all of the properties surrounding this property are allowed to have much smaller lot size. As it is the .85 acres there is by far the largest lot in the immediate area and I can't think of anything else in the even more broad or distant area that has any lots that are that size. And its only because this particular property was not included in the plat or a subdivision but had it been owned in common with one of those other properties when they were platted most likely this would've been part of the plat and would've had either two or three different lots with two or three buildings on it. So this is requiring much larger lot size for this property only because it was not platted with the other ones. And if this were to be split up in half which is our hope, I have a thing here saying how it would showing kind of how we planned it to try and subdivide which I can give to you guys if you like. Umm. Even when split in half each lot would still be .425 of an acre and again which is still larger than most of the most of the surrounding properties and again it was only because it was not um was not platted. Ah uh he said the minimum lot size for resort residential is one acre but um if we could be allowed to subdivide it or have that portion to be as single family residential where the minimum lot size is 12 thousand square feet and the minimum lot width is 100 feet that the minimum lot size is about .27 of an acre. And our proposed lot size is .425 of an acre which not even all that close to the ah to the lower limit of what it would be in a single family residential. And then if I could read briefly the heading for chapter 6 which is the R1 single family residential zoning district. It says this zoning district has been established to accommodate high density detached single family residential development and that to me sounds like exactly what is in that area. It's more high density than the places around and the downtown section of Mears and places that I've seen. And chapter 7 of the resort residential zoning district. This zoning district has been established in recognition of the need to provide for seasonal and year-round residential development that will not be subject to by encroachment by incompatible business and commercial land uses. Umm what we are proposing here is not business or commercial or at all be incompatible with the character of what you are trying to have with the resort residential section or the character of what's already there in all of the other all of the other surrounding properties in the immediate area and then even in the broader area too. Allowing the variance here would allow it to be in more conformity to the area it's in that it is now. And it certainly wouldn't would not destabilize any of the property values because it's not any different than what's already there. I mean, for example, we kind of see it in cartoons where there is an enormous city with these great big skyscrapers everywhere and right in the middle there is sort of one little tiny cottage that hasn't sold. It's sort of that in reverse. That everywhere else is this relatively small lot size or more moderate lot sizes I should suppose and then this part is just because it wasn't included in a plat or subdivision when they were done so many years back is an anomaly. And it's not, it's not really in conformity with everything else that is around. So that's why we are seeking the variance to have expansion of our family close by. We own the property that is diagonal from it. So it would allow us to stay close to our family and have our loved ones around. So that's why we are seeking the variance.

JW: Did you say you have a proposed?

TD: Umm yeah. It's just a proposed how we would like to divide it. If it was decided for some reason. There's several there. If it was decided for some reason that it would not, I guess the vertical subdivision would be more appropriate that would be fine. Fine as well.

JB: Is Silver Lake? Can I speak now?

JW: No. let's uh. Was that all you had to say or was there anything you'd like to add?

TD: Yeah. I think that cover's things, ya know.

JW: Ok

TD: Ya know and I could get. I could. To my understanding one of the property owners wrote a letter. I could get more from the property owners on three sides. I don't know the ones on the south but. The ones to the east, to the north and to the west I'm sure would have no issue with subdividing it for putting single family homes on each of the two lots.

JW: Ok

TD: And that's all I have. I don't know if you have questions or anything like that.

JW: There will be chance for us to interact with you on that. Thank you. Ok thank you.

JW: Ok. Next is public input. Did you get any correspondence Rob?

RD: I have two correspondence. Both pro.

JW: Both pro? Ok. Would you read those please?

RD: Yes. We will not be at Silver Lake on June 19 so I wanted to send our email. We have no objections to Kathleen Gander and Tom Denman dividing their parcel into two. If I was on the committee, I would be concerned about several things. Number one. Two structures might mean more boats on an already crowded lake. However, this family including aunt have other cottages and already have boats on the lake. Number 2. Use of services. Again, this family is already on the lake and using services. Number 3. What happens if they sell to someone else? They won't. The family's first cottage was purchased in 1915. Thanks. Mary Lee and Tim Strange

Golden Township Zoning Board, I am Mary Simpson, Sedan, Kansas. I have two properties in Golden Township. 9099 West Silver Lake Road and 690 Locust Road. The numbers. States their property numbers. I am writing about the board meeting on June 19. The lot in question is behind my property on Silver Lake. I looked into buying it myself at one point and never was there any mention of building restrictions. My family has had property on Silver Lake for over a hundred years. And looking at the area in proximity of the other cabins to each other these restruictions would never had occurred to me. I see no reason why this lot cannot be divided into two building locations. I am very agreeable to granting this request. Sincerely Mary Simpson

JW: Ok. So you didn't have opposed?

RD: I do not.

JW: Ok. Alright. We have a very small public here but uh is there public comment in favor of the division?

AS: I'm in favor if that is what you're asking

JW: I bet you are.

RD: Can you state your name?

AS: I am Amanda Simpson. So, I'm Mary Simpson's daughter-in-law.

JW: Ok. You're just. You're in favor of it. You don't have any?

AS: Well, I agree with Tom. I mean. I actually think the first letter you got was um, was very interesting. Because it approached the concerns about the extra families. You know an additional family being and building and bringing more people to the lake. As you know, it's kinda crowded but we're already there. We're just busting at the seams. In the cottages that we're living in. So, um, I married into this. I cannot tell you how wonderful it's been to maintain this level of intergenerational interaction with people. And just the fact that we could probably get another hundred years or ya know, my grandkids are coming up this summer. Another hundred years of this gen this family continuing to take care of the property that we take a lot of pride in. We just would really appreciate your approval.

JW: Is there any public comment opposed? Oh, sir?

RR: I would like to address the board.

JW: Sure

RR: My name is Richard Ruedi. I am cousin to both of them. Uh, we have. My grandmother was Bess Hold who bought the property that we still have in 1917 from Mac and Doc Ferwerda and we certainly have no objection to their to their. Their two generations down from me. I'm in the same boat they are. I have 4 kids and 6 grandkids and 1 great grandkid. We're trying to keep enough bed space for all of them to come and enjoy the lake the way that we have for 103 years now. Thank you.

RD: I just wanna say one thing. You said something about anybody opposed. You're in favor, correct?

JW: He's in favor.

RR: Not opposed

JW: Ok. Anything further from the zoning administrator?

RD: Umm. Not. I went out at looked at it. I would be concerned about the footage for driveways to go in there but other than that, everything else I stated earlier.

JW: OK. There was a place for you to rebut any con comments but there weren't any con comments. So I can skip that. Ok. Then at this point I will close the public hearing portion of this meeting and we will go to deliberation and discussion amongst the board members. Alright. Now Jane you had some questions?

JB: Yeah. The format that you gave us here for the division. Is Silver Lake at the top of this? Is that the way we are looking at that?

TD: Yeah. I kind of. I always think this was of it because that's how we walk in. Technically, North is at the bottom. So there's cabins here and Silver Lake down below on here so it's about here.

JB: So Silver Lake is down here?

TD: Do North is down.

JB: Ok Gotcha.

TD: I didn't do that very well.

JB: Silver Lake's here.

JW: You have the arrow press range here

PH: And then the lake

JB: I just wanted to make sure where Silver Lake is.

PH: Do we have to give you any questions that we have?

JW: No. You can go ahead and ask him

PH: Rob mentioned that he recommended that you take this to the planning commission. Did you do that?

TD: We have not. We really don't. Frankly in the interest in familial harmony I would much prefer not to share a duplex with my sister. She's great and all that but I think that would just cause a lot of troubles. I realize that isn't an option to get a use permit for that. That's something that we prefer not to do.

PH: Before you bought the property, did you check about the laws?

TD: We did not. We did not. We didn't even conceive that we couldn't put that we couldn't subdivide that.

PH: Do we have any idea why it wasn't platted the same as the other lots?

JW: Because Mr. Bower wanted to keep that one piece.

JB: At the time when they were platting the rest of them?

JW: When he sold Floradale, he kept certain parcels of property. I've been out there to look at this a lot of times over the years. When he thought he wanted to sell, he just kept some of the pieces and that one of the ones he kept. So it didn't go with the Floradale Resort when he sold it.

PH: Rob happened to mention that a driveway. Do you have some idea on here where you would put access to that back portion?

TD: Well, if you look at it. Here is an existing ya know kind of fences and poles. Not a real fence but trees and things like that here there's a way in here but the road that goes down to Silver Lake Drive. Was used and purchased with part of this parcel. That road goes here. Turns this way and also continues straight this way. We'd most likely come into here for the lower property and probably up along here for the I would guess for the upper property here. We could certainly work with any concerns about the driveway. It could go around back here but it seems like some extra work for not much benefit. We could certainly work with any concerns that you might have.

JW: Did that answer your question?

RR: Also the road that comes in here

MH: Where that barn sits on there?

TD: Yeah that's an existing structure that was there. It's on a concrete slab that used for storage by Mr. Bower. We're using as winter storage for Sea-doo and some of the lawn furniture and things like that right now. Our intent is not to take that down at this point but.

MH: The lot line is to the west of that then.

TD: Yes

MH: How far is that off the lot line?

TD: I would say not a whole lot. Maybe less than 10 feet.

MH: That's what I thought. Cause I was out there today and I looked at it and I thought that when you're standing there looking at it you can see that fence in the back. Back there behind it. It's not. It don't compute when I pace the lot from here from the there's a light pole just back of that barn just a little bit. If you're looking through there, there's a post with a can on it and the two of em joined up the light pole is right on that line. And you're only about 8 foot maybe off the line.

TD: I don't know what's all

MH: It don't go back where those two boats are lined up, right?

TD: Wait, pardon me. I think I miss understood you.

MH: Ok. There's two boats laying back there behind that line. Your property don't go back that far does it?

TD: No. Those boats aren't on our on our property.

MH: They're not on it. No.

TD: The line is pretty. Again this is a freehand drawing but I think it's fairly closely approximates how close the barn is to the lot line. But I don't know what the setback requirements are but the line is not far from the corner.

JW: I imagine that barn has been there since a long time. At least since the ordinance has been place.

MH: Oh yeah. I know but I'm trying to get a feel for where this property line is. Cause there's no stakes, no marks or stakes anywhere. You've got the drawing here from Hepworth but without a translet you're not going to be able to find em

RR: There's a row of power poles right behind their existing cottage that runs down the road that runs east toward 22nd street. And the poles are all on the north side of that road there. The one pole that is down behind the garage is not in line with the other poles.

TD: And as far as looking at the uh I'm looking at the uh

MH: The average person is not going to know that though. Ya know.

RR: This is my 84th summer up here.

TD: Looking it's the sunken post but coming from here there is a straight line of posts with green thing around it

MH: Green can

TD: So that will so where the umm lot line is. The west lot line. If that is what you were talking about. There's similar post on the straight line here. There's a fence that as you saw is the association's fence.

MH: There's quite a distance between that light pole and that other board fence to the left there, right?

PH: Wasn't that in there?

JW: It could be. Cause stuff was built

PH: But on the inside. That means this line then

TD: You mean the fence on the

MH: The Lot. No no behind the barn

TD: I have not examined that light pole that closely

MH: The barn to that fence line there that runs over on to the other lot. I thought it belonged to your lot but it don't.

TD: No

RR: Is he talking about our lot?

TD: The fence that Harvey left there. No that's a completely different lot.

MH: Yeah yeah

PH: I'm concerned about emergency services. How are they going to get back in there?

JB: Yeah. There's no road that is typical road width. Now this parcel C, from what I'm understanding is 15 feet wide?

TD: The deepest

PH: 16.12 feet

JB: 16.12, Am I following that?

TD: There's nothing on either side of that that would obscure any vehicle that was wider than that. Nothing that would obstruct a larger vehicle from going by.

JW: Ok. I have several concerns with this project. Umm, first of all, we didn't receive an accurate depiction of what you are trying to accomplish here. Umm, in most of our cases at the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning commission, a site plan is required so that we know what you're gonna do. Because when we grant you a variance, that variance is good forever. So we wanna make sure that everybody understands what we're doing here. We can't just say here go ahead split the lot. That's not the decision we should come to. We should come to a decision that you can. We will grant you a variance to divide this lot under the conditions that it's divided this way with these sizes with square footages, what the accesses are and that meets all the requirements and other requirements of the zoning ordinances before we give you the variance to split the lot. Because we are looking at several

variances here. Access is a question. Lot size is a question. How the property is laid out is a question. There's a whole lot of things that we don't have to be able to make an accurate decision to grant you the variance.

TD: Well, we couldn't really plan on what we were going to be building without knowing if could be split. I mean we would be perfectly happy for it to be split with certain conditions or if we could have more time to submit. I'm sure exactly if talking about architectural plans of what the homes would be. I mean I'd be glad to provide you with more if will help you make a decision.

JW: Just. When you. If we were to grant you this variance, you would need to supply the zoning administrator with a plot plan of how the property is going to be divided. Before he can send the land division approval to the township board. We don't even have that. So we can't grant you the variance because we don't know what you're gonna do. The other concern I have is section 18.7 of the zoning ordinance says the ZBA, the zoning board of appeals, may grant variance when the literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in practical difficulties or cause unnecessary hardships created by the lay of the land or buildings and structures built before the ordinance was put in place. So far I've not heard much about practical difficulties or hardships. That's something that you need to look into a little closer because we can't even go through the 5 points if you don't meet the first part of the head of this section. Because it says we may, we may grant variances based on these two issues. Then if we find that it meets those two issues, then we go down to the 5 points of approval and detail those to make sure that your request meets all five of those conditions.

TD: I think the hardship is that the lot size required here is so much larger than the lot size required of all of the other surrounding properties. It's not such that it's a swamp and we can't build on it. The hardship is being required to have a much larger lot, much huger lot, much larger lot than everybody else in the surrounding area. I means it's more of an unequal treatment. We're arguing unfairness argument because a single dwelling on that would be out of wouldn't be conforming to the rest of lots around it. When Floradale was split up and sold, the lots were just tiny. Even the lots that are older to the north of it with the narrow side on the bottom, even those are significantly smaller. And the ones on the. And there's vacant land mainly to the west of it but that's a smaller lot as well. The hardship is being required to have a much larger property for a single family home than everybody else in the vicinity.

JW: Lot sizes have changed. Over the years. When we first started the lot sizes were a lot smaller than they are now. The Planning Commission and the Township Board decided that a few years ago that when we divide property out of residential resort zone that we needed to increase the size of the lots that's why they increased it up to one acre. So.

TD: Well, this is still an increase to the average lot size for lots with a house. Let's say they were split equal with each one being .425 percent of an acre. That's still an increase of the lot size compared to most of the ones around it. I mean it would still be larger than most of the ones around it.

JW: Most of the lots around there are legal non-conforming lots because they were platted before we had zoning. That's why they are so small.

TD: Right. Yeah. They were certainly there earlier.

JW: Like 1917 or something, so.

RR: The previous owner

JW: Sir, the public hearing comment portion of this meeting is over. This is deliberation between us and the applicant. I personally feel we need to have a better depiction of how property is going to be divided, what the accesses are, how things are going to be positioned. You don't have to tell us how big the houses are going to be. You can give us a tentative place of where things are going to be put. But there are concerns about access. There's rules in the ordinance about accesses and frontages being on roads. That sort of thing. I think you need to work with Rob on a plan and bring it to him and see how that meshes with the rest of the ordinance.

TD: Yeah. If I can find out more specifically what you're gonna want to save your fears about this, I'd be glad to provide more information.

JW: Cause like you said I know you don't plan on selling the property, your kids don't plan on selling the property but you're not gonna live forever and neither are they. This variance is good forever. So we want to make sure it's done properly if it's granted. Not just yeah ok, split the property and be done with it. I hope you understand.

TD: Sure, sure. Like I said I'd be glad to provide you with more.

JW: I would entertain a motion to table this until our July meeting. We do have another hearing coming up in July. That would be the 17th, I believe it is.

RD: I think so. That would be the same third Tuesday?

JW: Yep, yep

JB: I so move that we table this motion

EM: Is that agreeable that it's tabled?

JW: Pardon me?

EM: With them?

JW: Is that agreeable? Sir, is that agreeable to you that it's tabled for further discussion and you can get us more information?

TD: Yeah, that'd be great.

JW: OK

JB: I so move that we table this discussion til our July 17th meeting.

JW: Ok. Is there support for that motion?

MH: I'll support

JW: The motion has been made and supported to table this discussion to our July 17 meeting for more information.

MH: I have one question to that.

JW: Yes, sir. What is it?

MH: I might not be on the table before that and I might not be able to get her for that.

JW: Well, we'll have to work around that. Because you will need to be here and you will need to be here. Because substitutes cannot fill in for a hearing that's already started. So it may be next month or it may not be. But we'll get it on as soon as we can. Because of his health and that.

TD: And may I ask a little bit more what your concerns about access are because people have been storing boat trailers and things like that. And there are vehicles that are not convenient and small. So I guess I'm not sure what the access concern is.

JW: Alright. The zoning ordinance has access requirements, ok? And if we are to grant this variance, that would have to be taken into consideration. Now I don't know, I can't speak to what's happened before or what's going on now. That's Rob's job. Not mine. But before we look at this variance, we need to know that every condition in the zoning ordinance has been addressed. So there may be more things that come up that you may have to ask for a variance for. I don't know. That's why we're putting this on hold. Cause like I said so when we do it, whichever way we do it. Pro or con. It's done correctly.

TD: Ok

JW: Ok? Any other questions on this motion?

JB: No

RD: I'll take roll call on that

JW: Go ahead, Mike

MH: You know you've got that 16 foot driveway going in there. Trees grow into it. OK? Fire Departments go out there to a fire. They look at that and say we're not taking our truck in there. All they do is stand there and watch it burn. I've seen it. Not here but down state.

TD: There's another, ya know. There's another access along Walleye Road that goes through the Floradale Resort. And it's a much, much bigger area too. So there's a bigger road that's gravel and it's more finished. And then going along the back there's nothing there too. So there's really the two accesses to the property. There's the one road that came with the property and one that kind of goes around through the Floradale Resort, the condo association, that is much more open. So there's really two ways to get in there.

JW: You would need permission from the condo association to use that access.

PH: Yeah. It's private, isn't it?

JW: It's private. So that's another issue you'd have to look into.

JW: Anything else before call roll?

JB: I'm not sure about this but I have a question concerning the certificate of survey. The first one that shows Silver Lake on it. At the bottom here, I've highlighted, it says furthermore if the surveyor

signature is not in purple color, the plan is a copy and should be assumed to contain unauthorized alterations. Ok? Do we or have you provided us with a original purple colored signature with the survey?

TD: Umm, this is what we got when we purchased the property. We have not gotten a new survey.

JB: Ok

TD: Since then I believe the one who made this. The company has gone out of business. I think he's deceased.

JB: Ok.

JW: Of course we could get another survey. But again we were trying not to spend a great deal of money before getting the general feeling of the board and the zoning commission. Again, that is something we would be happy to provide.

JW: That's not necessary.

JB: No? Ok.

JW: Ok. Any other thoughts, questions, comments, concerns? Rob would you call roll, please.

RD: I would.

MH: To vote?

JW: To table this

JW: The vote is to table this for more information until our next available meeting.

RD: Hammond

PH: Yes

RD: Henderson

MH: Yeah

RD: Whelpley

JW: Yes

RD: Beaudoin

JB: Yes

JW: There being no opposition, the motion is carried. 4 votes for it which the required amount. Ok. We don't have any old business on the agenda. Is there any other public comment before we close? If not, I'm going to adjourn the meeting.