

**TOWN OF ELKTON  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
JANUARY 11, 2010**

**PRESENT:** David Wiseman, Chairman; Asma Manejwala; Sue Whitaker; Brad Carrillo; Commissioner Mary Jo Jablonski, Ex-Officio; Clara Campbell, Esquire; Jeanne D. Minner, Director of Planning; Brenda Humphreys, Building & Planning Department

**ABSENT:** H. Fred Thomas, II; Theresa Thomas

Mr. Wiseman called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

**ACTION:** Motion was made by Ms. Manejwala to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting. Motion was seconded by Ms. Whitaker and unanimously approved.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Michael Bayer of ERM presented an overview of the draft Comprehensive Plan. He detailed changes made in the draft plan which included the Municipal Growth Element that looks at the amount of growth anticipated within certain jurisdictions and making sure they are planned well for those issues from an infrastructure, land use and transportation standpoint. Another element on which a good deal of time was spent was the Water Resources Element that looks at the implications of growth on the water resources in the area. Specifically discussion focused on minimizing impact on key resources and how all the elements fit together.

He stated that, from the data they have worked with, a lot of growth is forecast. This anticipated growth provides opportunities and challenges in relation to smart growth, land use patterns, transit and mixed use areas. He mentioned the implications for projects being developed which will impact these issues, specifically the PUD and the growth proposed for this project.

Mr. Bayer addressed issues such as Land Use, Key Environmental Areas, Transportation Systems, Future Needs, Housing, Economic Development, the historic character of the Town and how it can be maintained. The plan provides suggestions and methods to implement this plan. The timeframe, goals and objectives are called out in the plan as well. He pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance will be reviewed in the near future and would be able to contribute to the overall neighborhood design of the Town.

Mr. Bayer noted that during the review process for the Comprehensive Plan many issues were addressed such as the direction of Town growth, future annexation areas, a continued dialog between the Town and Cecil County regarding land use and infrastructure with an emphasis on how the mixed use areas in Town and County could be linked together by transit. Additionally transportation was discussed with the possibility of a loop road to connect different areas of the Town. He pointed out that the road alignment costs would be significant and that additional planning would be required.

Ms. Minner stated that the Planning Department received letters from the public regarding potential road connections to the south through Chesapeake Boulevard. There is currently an active subdivision at the location and the property owner stated that he preferred the way it is currently described in the Comprehensive Plan to connect the Corporate Center to Maloney Road

to the west. The property owner to the south of the Corporate Center stated that they felt that it is a better and more cost effective idea for the road to connect to the south in a direct route to Frenchtown Road.

Mr. Wiseman voiced concern regarding the Planning Commission making a decision regarding these requests without proper review time. The Board Members were hesitant to send any recommendation to the Mayor & Commissioner without proper time to review the comments from DNR and other agencies. Some of the issues were regarding impervious surface limitations and Storm Water Management Ordinance. Mr. Wiseman inquired the timeframe for submission. Ms. Minner stated that they received a six month extension from the October deadline and therefore the draft would be required by April 2010. Ms. Minner added that the Town received a grant for the Comprehensive Plan update and the deadline for the grant is January 31, 2010.

Discussion ensued regarding specific comments received. It was determined that a special meeting would be held on January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in order to give the board members additional time to review the comments received today.

### **Public Comments**

Rose Brown – Ms. Brown stated that she was unable to hear all the conversation due to the microphones malfunctioning.

Mr. Jeff Nowland of Nowland Associates identified himself as the owner of one of the two parcels being discussed regarding the connector road from the Corporate Center to either Maloney or Frenchtown Road. He stated that he would be presenting a Site Plan for one of the parcels at the Corporate Center which included the connector road to Maloney Road from the Corporate Center. He stated that he hoped the Board would still consider their submittal for the road connection to the west.

Mr. John Connelly stated that Section 3.4.4 mentions extending Chesapeake Boulevard to Maloney Road and wondered if having industrial access onto a small country road would be in the best interest of the residents.

Rose Brown asked if the Crowgey Farm was in the Critical Area. Ms. Minner stated that the area adjacent to Frenchtown Road is still in the Critical Area and that this determination is made by the State. Ms. Brown asked about the PUD and whether if the subdivision is approved they can place that many homes. Ms. Minner stated that this project would be discussed later in the evening's agenda. Ms. Brown inquired about the water issues and stated that she believed the wells of the residents in the area were being drained. Ms. Minner stated that the Town is in the process of applying for a well in that area but that no water was being pumped currently from that area.

Daria Brown inquired about the Critical Bay Area regulations and designations. Ms. Minner explained that there are three designations: Intensely Developed, Limited Development and Resource Conservation. These designations remain as originally designated unless the State approves a change. She described the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area as the area 1,000 feet from mean high tide line and any changes to those designations could be requested. They would have

to be approved by the Town and the State. Ms. Minner added that the Comprehensive Plan does not make any changes to the Critical Bay Area designations. Ms. Brown asked about the Kensington Courts Subdivision and inquired why some of the houses were so close to the Bay. Ms. Minner stated that this subdivision was presented at the same time as the designations for the Critical Area however the State required the Town to give up most of their RCA growth allocation for that subdivision. Ms. Brown stated that she believed the same developer did both Kensington Courts and the current PUD. Ms. Minner stated that the original developer of Kensington Courts and the developer of the PUD are not the same.

Joyce Collins pointed out that most of the homes in the area of the proposed PUD have well and septic and that they are concerned about the future of their water supply and what will happen if their wells are unable to serve these homes. Since their homes are in the Critical Area how will they be impacted? Will they be required to hook up to Town water and sewer? What will the cost be if they have to hook up? To whom should their questions be addressed?

Mr. Wiseman addressed Ms. Collins and stated that these questions should be presented at the time of the discussion of the PUD submission. There was discussion regarding the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan and the development of a well in that area.

Dale Collins inquired about the Town applying for a permit to do a draw down at Well #4. He stated that when tests have been done in the past that they have affected the wells in that area. He asked what the plan was if wells are lost in that area. The Comprehensive Plan presents 700,000 to 1.2 million gallons of water per day. Ms. Minner stated that the residents would be notified of a public meeting regarding any tests that would be done. Mr. Collins stated that they have had no one from the Town speak to them about this issue. He has hand delivered letters to the Commissioners, Mr. Lewis George and the Mayor with no response. Ms. Minner gave the audience her e-mail address so that she could address their questions or forward them to the appropriate person(s).

Mr. Collins stated that they would like to see contingencies placed in the plan that would address the draw downs. He pointed out that they have had no data shared with them after draw down tests.

Ms. Collins stated that if they do not let their concerns be heard now that they will be questioned later as to where they were when these decisions were being made. She stated that they received a letter from the Town which indicated that no water would be taken. They then received a letter that a draw down test would be done and they feel they have been left out of the process.

Discussion ensued regarding the authority of the Planning Commission and the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Carrillo explained the difference between the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and which document addresses what type of questions.

The residents stated that they would like a representative to speak with them about some of their issues. Ms. Minner stated that MDE will require contingency plans prior to well permits being issued.

It was determined that the Planning Commission would meet again on Monday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.

**MOTION: Motion was made by Mr. Wiseman to hold a special Planning Commission meeting on Monday, January 18, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. to review the outstanding comments received. These comments will be reviewed by the Town Planning Office, KCI Engineering and the consultant for the Comprehensive Plan prior to submittal to the Mayor & Commissioners for adoption. The motion was seconded by Ms. Manejwala and unanimously approved.**

**MCBRIDE & ZIEGLER, INC. REPRESENTING U TRI C 5, LLC, 2009 OGLETOWN ROAD, NEWARK, DELAWARE, FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN, TAX MAP 316, PARCEL 2443, ZONED BI**

Mr. Jeff Nowland of Nowland Associates and Mr. Mark Ziegler of McBride & Ziegler were in attendance to present this project. Mr. Nowland stated that they were appearing before the Board to request that a comment be rescinded made on the original resubdivision regarding the proposed right of way to the south of their property. Since that time they have come before the Planning Commission and Comprehensive Plan to discuss this right of way. He noted that they have offered a second means of egress out of the Upper Chesapeake Corporate Center to the west onto Maloney Road. Mr. Ziegler stated that the major modification to this plan was to show a simplified plan with the right of way. If this plan is approved they will submit Road Construction Plans to the Department of Public Works. They are requesting one design waiver in order to extend the existing road side swale which is currently provided throughout the Corporate Center.

Mr. Wiseman inquired whether they received all the comment letters and whether they had any issues. Mr. Ziegler stated that they can address all comments received. Mr. Nowland noted that they would be correcting the street name in one section from Chesapeake Boulevard to Konica Drive as it had been placed in error.

Mr. Wiseman asked if the comments from the Department of Public Works had been received. Mr. Ziegler was provided a copy of the comments and stated that they had no issues with the comments.

Ms. Manejwala inquired about KCI's comment #12 regarding a traffic impact study. Ms. Watson stated that at a previous meeting it was understood that a traffic impact study would be required at the development of this parcel. Mr. Wiseman inquired whether this comment had been addressed. Mr. Ziegler stated that they are currently working with Gary Davis of the State Highway Administration on the traffic impact study.

Mr. Carrillo questioned the access road. Mr. Nowland presented a visual to show where they are proposing their right of way to Maloney Road. Discussion ensued regarding the letter received from Ms. Catherine Blansfield regarding a right of way to the south to connect the Corporate Center to Frenchtown Road through her property.

Mr. Wiseman entertained additional questions from the Board or the audience.

John Connelley questioned the right of way that would connect to Maloney Road. He reviewed the plan as presented by Mr. Nowland.

There were no additional questions regarding this project.

**MOTION: Motion was made by Mr. Carrillo to approve the Final Resubdivision Plat for U TRI C 5, LLC contingent upon addressing all outstanding comments from the Town and KCI. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whitaker and unanimously approved.**

**MCBRIDE & ZIEGLER, INC. REPRESENTING U TRI C 5, LLC, 2009 OGLETOWN ROAD, NEWARK, DELAWARE, FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN, TAX MAP 316, PARCEL 2443, ZONED BI**

The discussion continued for this project with regard to the Final Major Site Plan. Mr. Ziegler stated that they were requesting design waivers: 1) Type 'C' Bufferyard at Chesapeake Boulevard would be 15' wide and would also incorporate part of the swale that currently exists at this location. The bufferyard for the current building will be located directly in front of the parking lot. They also requested that the required Bufferyard 'C' for the remaining undeveloped areas be provided once the loop road is installed and these areas are developed; 2) Type 'E' Bufferyard required at the rear property line to be installed when the parcels in that area are developed.

Mr. Ziegler added that they would like to utilize the existing swale which picks up the drainage and runoff from the Estes property and redirect the runoff around the perimeter as part of the bufferyard.

Ms. Minner questioned how the landscaping can be provided if they are using the swale as part of the bufferyard. Mr. Ziegler stated that he had spoken with their landscape architect and he did not feel it would be an issue since he is planning to place landscaping along the top of the swale. He stated that the swale would be approximately four feet high and there will be plenty of room above that point. Ms. Minner asked if there was enough room for the landscaping outside of the swale. Mr. Ziegler explained that they would be incorporating landscape areas both inside and outside the swale. Ms. Minner voiced her concern about the stormwater conveyance. Mr. Ziegler provided a copy of the landscape plan to show how they intend to meet all the requirements.

There was discussion regarding relaxation of curb, gutter and sidewalk to be consistent with what currently exists at the Corporate Center.

Mr. Ziegler stated that there was a comment regarding the ratio of landscape islands to parking spaces. He stated that they added a few islands and that they have five islands with 34 parking spaces and they believe this is sufficient. Ms. Minner asked if the shading percentages met the Town's minimum requirements. Mr. Ziegler stated that they do meet the minimums.

Mr. Wiseman asked if there were any issues with outstanding comments. Ms. Minner stated that she had some outstanding comments. Mr. Ziegler stated that they had no issue with addressing the outstanding comments.

Mr. Wiseman entertained additional comments from either the Board or the audience. There were none.

**MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Manejwala to approve the Final Major Site Plan for U TRI C 5, LLC contingent upon addressing all outstanding comments from the Town and KCI and allowing for the following design waivers: 1) Relaxation of curb, gutter and sidewalk consistent with what currently exists at the Corporate Center; 2) submittal and approval of landscaping plan; 3) relaxation of bufferyard at front of property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carrillo and unanimously approved.**

**MCCRONE, INC. REPRESENTING ELKTON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, 219 EAST MAIN STREET, ELKTON, MARYLAND, FINAL RESUBDIVISION PLAT, TAX MAP 311, PARCELS 1003, 1005 & 1006, ZONED R-2; TAX MAP 311, PARCELS 1007, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1085, 1183 & 1645, ZONED R-3; TAX MAP 311, PARCEL 1058, ZONED RO**

Mr. David Strouss of McCrone, Inc., Mr. Joe Tanner of the Elkton United Methodist Church and Mr. Mark Clark of Clark Design Group were in attendance to present this project. Mr. Strouss stated that they are proposing to combine parcels zoned RO, R-2 & R-3 belonging to the Elkton United Methodist Church. He pointed out that the only parcel left outside of the resubdivision is the house on the corner of the property which will remain a residential parcel.

Mr. Strouss stated that they request that during the comprehensive rezoning the Town would determine one zoning for these combined parcels. Mr. Strouss stated that they are granting an additional right of way on both High Street and East Main Street at the front of the church in order to allow the right of way to continue to be the same as it is along the street. He noted that a right of way had never been granted to the Town for these two areas and they felt this should be remedied.

Mr. Wiseman entertained additional questions from the Board and any comment from the audience. There were none.

**MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Whitaker to approve the Final Resubdivision Plat for Elkton United Methodist Church contingent upon addressing all outstanding comments from the Town and KCI. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carrillo and unanimously approved.**

**MCCRONE, INC. REPRESENTING ELKTON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, 219 EAST MAIN STREET, ELKTON, MARYLAND, FINAL SITE PLAN, TAX MAP 311, PARCELS 1003, 1005 & 1006, ZONED R-2; TAX MAP 311, PARCELS 1007, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1085, 1183, 1645 & 1060, ZONED R-3; TAX MAP 311, PARCEL 1058, ZONED RO; (OWNED BY ELKTON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH) AND TAX MAP 311, PARCEL 1065, ZONED R-3 (OWNED BY ELKTON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH)**

Discussion continued regarding this project specific to the Final Site Plan. Mr. Strouss stated that one of the issues discussed in length at the previous submittal was access at the rear of the

property for neighboring parcels. He stated that a meeting was held between the church and adjoining property owners and a compromise was reached. The building was moved five feet to the north with a landscape area at the rear of the building. He added that they widened the pavement to 15' and tied the pavement into the parking lot at Mr. Pavlik's property. They provided landscaping behind Mr. Willis' property as well. Mr. Pavlik asked that they widen the turn around the building toward his parking lot so they removed a parking space in order to accommodate his request. They therefore need to request a waiver of that parking space.

Mr. Wiseman asked any property owners in attendance if they were satisfied with the changes. Mr. Pavlik was in attendance and stated that he was satisfied.

Mr. Wiseman asked if they would require any additional variances. Mr. Strauss noted comment #30 on the Site Plan notes items a-i which were design waivers approved with the Preliminary Plan. They have added items j, k & l. Item j is parking lot curbing and they would like to limit curbing to areas where drainage is needed in order to direct the drainage. Ms. Minner inquired how they would protect the landscape plant material in the areas where there is no curbing. Mr. Strauss stated that they would try to find a cost effective way to address her concerns.

Item k addressed sidewalk on Locust Lane. Mr. Strauss pointed out that there is a three foot bank along Locust Lane which contains a fire hydrant and signage. The right of way on Locust Lane is 30' wide with 22' of pavement which leaves very little room for a sidewalk. The house on the corner of Main Street and Locust Lane sits on the right of way and there is no room to continue the sidewalk should it be placed where it is being requested. They are requesting a waiver of the sidewalk requirement because of the cost of grading, utilities, and granting an additional right of way. The houses on either side of their property would not allow for continuation of the sidewalk.

Item i is regarding impervious surface limitation requirements. The Ordinance has a limit of 65% and they currently have 66.5%. Mr. Strauss stated that he wanted to speak with the Zoning Administrator concerning whether or not this requirement applies to churches. KCI suggested placement of a one way loop at the east of the building, angle the parking and decrease the aisle widths in order to allow for more landscaping which would help reduce the impervious surface. Ms. Minner asked if they would need to lose additional parking if they incorporated these suggestions. Mr. Strauss stated that they would try to avoid removing any additional parking. They have lost eight spaces in moving the building so they now have a total of 139 parking spaces.

Ms. Minner stated that comments had recently been received from the Critical Area and that some changes may need to be made. Mr. Strauss stated that he did not believe the Critical Area had received their storm water management report because it would have answered some of their questions. He stated that they would be addressing that with the Critical Area.

Mr. Wiseman entertained additional questions from the Board and/or comment from the audience.

Ms. Pat Beyer stated that her property is on two sides of the church property and she has not seen the proposed changes to the church property. Mr. Strauss presented the plan for her review and

she voiced her concern about drainage onto her property. Mr. Strouss pointed out on the plan where the storm water would be directed and stated that it would not affect her property.

There were no additional comments regarding this project.

**MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Whitaker to approve the Final Site Plan for Elkton United Methodist Church contingent upon addressing all outstanding comments from the Town and KCI and allowing for the following: 1) Parking lot impervious surface requirements being reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator; 2) Waiver of the sidewalk requirements along Locust Lane and 3) parking lot curbing being reviewed and approved by the Planning Department. The motion was seconded by Ms. Manejwala and unanimously approved.**

**DISCUSSION ITEM – DAVID H. PARRACK, ESQUIRE REPRESENTING SOUTHFIELDS, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, 1990 RESIDENTIAL UNITS & COMMERCIAL AREAS, ROUTE 213 & FRENCHTOWN ROAD, TAX MAP 316, PARCEL 169, ZONED R-2, TAX MAP 319, PARCEL 2450, ZONED R-2, TAX MAP 320, PARCEL 2369, ZONED R-3, TAX MAP 320, PARCEL 2371, ZONED R-1, TAX MAP 320, PARCEL 2390, ZONED C-2, TAX MAP 323, PARCEL 79, ZONED R-2, TAX MAP 323, PARCEL 91, ZONED RP, TAX MAP 323, PARCEL 454, ZONED RP AND TAX MAP 324, PARCEL 2394, ZONED R-1**

Mr. David Parrack, Esquire, Mr. David Strouss of McCrone, Inc. and Mr. Bruce Schneider, Principal of Southside, LLC were in attendance to discuss this project. Mr. Parrack stated that they are trying to follow up on their appearance in November of 2009 before the Board. He apologized for his delay in reviewing the minutes from that meeting. The minutes and motion stated that the Board wished to see greater detail in the general development plat. The general development plan was presented and Mr. Parrack addressed some of the comments presented at the previous meeting. The plan shows a snapshot of a portion of the project which incorporates greater detail. Ms. Minner interjected that since the Board is seeing this information for the first time any comments made would be knee jerk and would require more time in order to comment fully. Mr. Parrack stated that they are not requesting a decision just additional input on what the Board wants to see incorporated into the plan at the next submission.

Mr. Parrack stated that this snap shot shows integration of recreational space and a blending of commercial and residential areas. He stated that the Planned Unit Development (PUD) is one that requires an integration of residential, commercial, civic and recreational areas in order to provide centrality to the community.

Mr. Parrack added that potential developers have expressed concern that commercial areas placed in the center of the community would not survive. He gave the example of 'Kent Isles' near Washington D.C.

There was discussion concerning where the commercial areas might be located. Ms. Campbell stated that she felt the Board was clear on what they expected on the plans submitted. She felt that the entire project should be submitted as a whole. She stated that she did not feel this was an appropriate forum for additional submittals. Mr. Parrack stated that they did not receive anything

in writing to let them know what was expected. He had received a copy of the minutes but did not feel they were sufficient to resubmit a plan and therefore they requested to be heard as a discussion item only.

Mr. Parrack stated that he had spoken to the School Board and the Police Department. The School Board's policy is that they do not plan for school buildings unless the need is visualized. Ms. Minner stated that the Chief of Police stated that if the police station was relocated or a new substation was placed they would prefer direct access to major roads.

Discussion ensued regarding the density of the project. Ms. Manejwala stated that the issues were not just the residential and commercial issues but also that there was no layout, no sidewalks, curbs, etc. and just a potential number for density. She also pointed out that no open space areas are shown. Ms. Minner agreed and noted that size of lots and setbacks, etc. are part of the negotiation process for a planned unit development.

It was determined that both sides of the project need to be presented as a whole and that more details need to be given. The majority of the Board Members voiced that they needed to see the project on a larger scale with specific details which include the lot sizes, setbacks, residential and commercial areas, open space, etc.

Ms. Campbell suggested that the Board desires the whole picture with a break down of each section. Mr. Parrack wondered at what scale the submittal should be submitted. Ms. Minner added that the submittal needs to be more detailed than regular subdivision plans. They should incorporate large and small scale plans. She suggested that they use a public forum to specifically review this project due to the size to include wetlands and critical area requirements along with open space and natural areas.

Ms. Manejwala suggested that they might look at other PUD's to see how their submission was done. Mr. Wiseman stated that without seeing the entire project he does not believe that a concept plan has been received.

Mr. Parrack stated that given the strictures of the current Zoning Ordinance they believe they have provided what was necessary.

There was a great deal of discussion regarding what the Zoning Ordinance allows for PUD submittal, the maximum allowable density, etc. Mr. Parrack stated that he did not realize that the Planning Commission wanted to see both sides of the project. Mr. Schneider apologized for taking the Board's time but they just wanted to understand what was required of them.

Mr. Wiseman stated that the Mayor & Commissioners are the ultimate approving authority and they will need to see the entire project in order to make that determination. There are still a number of approvals before the final approval.

There was additional discussion concerning why they chose to submit plans for a PUD. Mr. Carrillo wondered why they would apply for a PUD if they could get more density without applying for a PUD. Mr. Parrack agreed that maximum density is rarely achieved. They discussed how much density would be allowed between PUD and subdivision regulations.

Mr. Wiseman inquired about flexibility of the number of units on the east side of the project and that they were trying to limit impact on the 'wet' side due to the Critical Area issues because he was unaware of any constraints that may be placed on them from the Critical Area Commission. Mr. Parrack stated that they have not spoken to the Critical Area regarding what may be permitted within the Critical Area portion of this site. He stated that they have not spoken to Critical Area staff since the last meeting.

Mr. Parrack concluded by stating that after the previous meeting they did not feel they had concrete remarks from the Board regarding how they should move forward with the project.

**OLD BUSINESS** – Ms. Minner stated that the Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals members were forwarded an e-mail regarding education requirements that must be completed by June of 2010. The credits can be taken online with a test at the completion of each section.

Ms. Minner addressed the Board concerning a forum sponsored by the Eastern Shore Land Conservancy on January 21<sup>st</sup> from 6:30-8:30 p.m. at Chesapeake College.

Ms. Minner informed the Board of a possible request from a company wishing to amend the Ordinance in order to allow electric fencing in certain zones. She asked for a consensus from the Planning Commission regarding an amendment to the Ordinance. After some discussion the general consensus was negative.

**NEW BUSINESS** – Mr. Wiseman initiated discussion regarding a request to remove a structure on Clinton Street and place a parking lot. He stated that this was directly related to the Senior Apartments and he inquired whether they would need to come back before this Board. Ms. Minner stated that a parking lot is a principal use and is not allowed in a residential zone. Discussion ensued regarding what would be required to place a parking lot at that location. Ms. Minner stated that approval would need to be given to place a parking lot at that location. Discussion continued regarding whether an Ordinance amendment would need to be done in order to allow a stand alone parking lot for an offsite use.

There was specific discussion regarding design standards for PUD's and what the Board felt was essential and vital for a PUD within Town limits.

There being no further items for discussion Mr. Wiseman adjourned the meeting at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Humphreys