

The following are minutes of the Bettendorf Planning and Zoning Commission and are a synopsis of the discussion that took place at this meeting and as such may not include the entirety of each statement made. The minutes of each meeting do not become official until approved at the next meeting.

**MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MARCH 20, 2013  
5:30 P.M.**

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting of March 20, 2013, was called to order by Wennlund at 5:30 p.m. at the City Hall Council Chambers, 1609 State Street.

1. Roll Call

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bert, Kappeler, Peters, Rafferty, Stoltenberg, Wennlund

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bennett

STAFF PRESENT: Greg Beck, City Planner; Bill Connors, Community Development Director; John Soenksen, City Planner; Lisa Fuhrman, Community Development Secretary; Greg Jager, City Attorney; Brian Fries, Assistant City Engineer

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2013.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2013 be approved as submitted.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

3. Review of Commission procedures.

Rezoning

4. Case 13-008; 2421 - 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, C-2 Community Shopping district to C-3 General Business district, submitted by Julia, LLC.

Beck reviewed the staff report. Connors added that over the years many developers have considered locating a business on the lot in question. He indicated that his impression from Commission, Board of Adjustment, and neighborhood meetings is that the residents would prefer to have a business that is open only during the day, generates a low traffic volume, and creates a minimum of disruption to the neighborhood. He explained that he believes that the list of conditions with which the applicant has agreed to comply would appear to address those issues. Connors stated that the proposed auto repair shop would have a low traffic volume and daytime hours of operation, adding that the available tenant space is very small and would likely attract low-intensity users. He indicated that the applicant has incorporated many noise-reducing measures into the actual construction of the building which will facilitate the rental of the remaining retail space. Connors stated that screening

requirements have been exceeded and that the provided lighting will be of the same height and lumens as the existing lights. Connors stated that the zoning classification would revert to C-2 if a building permit is not issued within 2 years. He indicated that in his opinion the conditional zoning procedure allows for a more flexibility which can result in a better project. He stated that the most recent request for conditional zoning is the \$22 million Geneseo Communications project at the abandoned Eagle Food Store on Devils Glen Road.

Bert asked if the tenants for the leased space have been determined and if the limited hours of operation would apply to the retail portion of the development as well as the auto repair shop. Connors stated that his interpretation is that any of permitted use listed in the C-2 section of the ordinance would be allowed and not subject to limited hours of operation. He added that no proposed tenants have been established.

Bert asked for clarification regarding the distinction between auto repair and auto body repair. Connors explained that in his experience neighbors usually would prefer than an auto body repair shop not be located near a residential neighborhood because of the odors and particulate matter that could have a negative impact. He stated that an auto repair shop would be a business that would exchange parts and make engine repairs. Wennlund asked if there would be any type of sanding, painting, or hammering of auto body parts on the premises. Connors stated that this type of activity would not occur on the site.

Ann asked if the entire lot would be rezoned or just the portion that would contain the auto repair shop. Jager explained that the rezoning request is for the entirety of Lot 1. Kappeler asked how the restrictions on the auto repair shop would be structured if the entire lot is zoned C-3. Jager explained that the conditions would specifically address any auto repair shop that is located on the lot. Connors added that Condition #2 limits the auto repair business to 6,000 square feet of the building. Kappeler asked how that condition would be enforced. Jager indicated that zoning restriction violations are prosecuted as a municipal infraction. He added that if necessary, injunctive action could be taken.

Rafferty asked why an auto repair shop is not an allowable use in the C-2 district. Connors explained that when the zoning ordinance was drafted, the C-3 district had been determined to be appropriate for the use. Rafferty commented that it would be helpful to know what types of characteristics of an auto repair shop had been considered objectionable so that the Commission could determine whether they would be ameliorated by the conditions proposed by the applicant.

Connors indicated that the proposed use is much less intense than many of the permitted uses in the C-2 district, adding that a fast food restaurant would generate much more traffic and would more onerous than an auto repair shop.

Terry Schenck, 2327 Lindenwood Drive, asked why the Commission doesn't impose conditions on the applicant restricting the uses allowed but without rezoning the property to C-3. Jager explained that the municipal code does not allow such an arrangement. He added that a proposed use that is not listed must be similar and compatible to the permitted uses in a district before it would be allowed. He stated that the fact that an auto repair shop is specifically listed in the C-3 district but not in the C-2 district implies that it not intended to be allowed in the C-2 district. He indicated that neither the Council nor the Commission has the authority to grant exceptions to the list of permitted uses although the Council could revise the list of permitted uses. Jager explained that if an auto repair shop were added to

the list of permitted uses in the C-2 district, the applicant would not be compelled to implement any of the conditions to which he has already agreed. He stated that city staff has attempted to strike a balance, adding that it would be up to the Commission and Council to determine if it is an appropriate one.

Schenck asked how this would be enforced, adding that he would much prefer that the auto repair shop be added as a permitted use in the C-2 district instead of allowing uses that are listed in the C-3 district. Wennlund explained that the auto repair shop will occupy 6,000 of the total 9,000 square feet of the building. He indicated that the only unknown is what businesses will lease the remaining spaces.

Bob Gallagher, attorney representing the applicant, reiterated that the applicant will construct a 9,000 square foot building of which 6,000 square feet will be occupied by the auto repair shop. He indicated that if for some reason the shop goes out of business, the zoning classification will revert to C-2 for the property. He stated that only uses permitted in the C-2 district would be allowed in the remainder of the space, adding that there are many more onerous permitted uses in the C-2 district than the use that the applicant has proposed. Gallagher indicated that the applicant would be amenable to further restrictions in order to alleviate the concerns of the neighbors. He stated that the proposed use would generate less traffic, debris, noise, and would be open fewer hours, and that the applicant will be providing additional screening in excess of what would typically be required. He stated that the proposed use would be less objectionable than many of the uses allowed in the C-2 district.

Dan Elias, the applicant, stated that he is a longtime resident and business owner in the City of Bettendorf. He explained that he would like to locate his business at the corner of 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and 18<sup>th</sup> Street in order to provide a convenient location for his customers who can also patronize the shops and restaurants in the immediate area. He indicated that there are many combinations of very divergent businesses that seem to co-exist peacefully together such as Red Crow Grille and BP, Lund's 66 Auto Service and the adjacent residential homes, Duck Creek Tire & Service and the church and condominiums nearby, and Grant Street Auto and the recreational trail and office buildings in that area.

Elias stated that currently the property tax revenue generated by the vacant lot is only \$8,000, adding that after development that revenue would increase to approximately \$60,000.

Elias commented that the nearest home to the proposed building is approximately 360 feet away, adding that Habanero's restaurant serves as a buffer between the two areas. He indicated that he is willing to meet all of the required conditions in addition to the ones he has imposed on himself. He stated that he wishes to expand his local business and become an even more integral part of the community. He reiterated that his business operates between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m.

Wennlund asked how high the proposed berm on the south side of the lot would be. Joseph Casita, architect representing the applicant, indicated that there is enough space to install a 4-foot high berm and that shrubs planted on top would add another 2-6 feet to the height.

Tyler Driever, 2536 Lindenwood Drive, stated that one of the common characteristics of permitted uses in the C-3 district is the level of noise that they typically generate. He commented that the buffer between the proposed use and the adjacent homes is mostly a

concrete driveway, adding that he feels that continually approving rezoning requests and special use permits weakens the zoning ordinance.

Elias explained that the proposed earthen berm with plantings creates a noise barrier in addition to the other measures that are being implemented during construction. He added that the walls will be engineered in order to reduce noise, the compressor will be enclosed in a separate concrete block room, and the overhead doors are designed to be quiet while being raised and lowered. Elias stated that it is also to his benefit that the noise generated will be low as he will have other tenants in the building who will expect quiet.

Kappeler asked if the overhead doors will be on the north and south sides of the building. Elias confirmed this. Kappeler asked if the building would be climate-controlled or if the doors would be left open during warm weather. Elias explained that while the area would be climate-controlled, the doors would most likely be open during nice weather depending upon the cross breezes. Rafferty commented that having the doors remain open would significantly increase the noise level. Elias stated that the compressor would generate the most noise, reiterating that it will be fully enclosed. Rafferty commented that tire guns also make a substantial amount of noise. Elias concurred, reiterating that other auto repair shops in Bettendorf operate without generating noise complaints from their residential neighbors.

Wennlund indicated that he had made a visit to the site during the afternoon and had observed that the industrial exhaust fans at Habanero's run constantly and will provide some noise mitigation. He added that there are also exhaust fans constantly in operation at the strip mall adjacent to the residences. He stated that for the most part, the Habanero's building blocks most of what will be able to be seen of the proposed building from the residences excepting the view from two-story homes.

Bert asked for clarification regarding the dates on which the properties in the area were originally rezoned as it appears as though the commercial zoning classifications in the area were assigned prior to the residential ones. Beck confirmed this, adding that the properties where residences are now located were rezoned in the early 1990s.

Shawn Meyer, 2459 Lindenwood Drive, asked for an explanation of the changes that had been made to the rezoning request application since the previous meeting. Connors reiterated that the current request is for a conditional zoning, reiterating that the auto repair shop will be allowed to occupy only 6,000 square feet of the proposed building.

Meyer asked if there are other properties in the city where a C-3 zoning district classification was granted with conditions. Connors confirmed this, adding that the GeoCOMM project which occupies the formerly vacant Eagle Food Store on Devils Glen Road is very similar to the proposed one. Meyer asked what restrictions had been placed on the applicant in that case. Connors reiterated that the case was very similar to the current one in that the entire lot was rezoned to C-3, one building is allowed to contain a permitted use listed in the C-3 district, and any future development must adhere to the restrictions of the C-2 district.

Meyer asked for clarification regarding the enforcement process if a business which is not allowed in the C-2 district locates in the remainder of the applicant's proposed building. Connors explained that the city has procedures which include interaction with the business license department in order to ensure that a proposed business is allowed in a certain zoning district classification. Wennlund commented that there is a comprehensive code enforcement

process with regard to local businesses, adding that if a resident became aware of a non-compliant business owner he or she could report it to city staff. Meyer stated that he does not believe that the neighbors should have to monitor incoming businesses to ensure that they are code-compliant. He asked if the city's position with regard to spot zoning has changed as it had seemed as though the Commission had been opposed to it at a previous meeting. Jager explained that 'spot zoning' is not illegal, adding that the city must ensure that a proposed zoning classification conforms to the land use plan. He indicated that the lot in question has a land use designation of commercial which would allow C-1, C-2, and C-3 zoning district classifications. Meyer asked what the intent had been according to the land use plan for the area in question. Jager explained again that the land use plan indicates that it would develop as commercial. He stated that he feels that rather than discussing spot zoning, it is more productive to discuss the merits of the project.

Meyer asked what issues the Commission members consider when deciding whether to allow a conditional zoning and if factors such as reduced property values or increased tax base are included. Jager explained that the Commission is a recommending body only, adding that compliance with the comprehensive plan combined with input from the community and the applicant and personal experience are taken into consideration. Meyer commented that he believes that the Commission members give more weight to generation of revenue than the wishes of the residents. Jager stated that applicants, or course, will make their case based on the benefits to the city and that residents will argue that a particular use will negatively impact their children. He indicated that the members are responsible for weighing each factor when making a recommendation.

Meyer stated that he does not believe that Wennlund's comments with regard to the externalities of the proposed project are relevant as he did not enter the second story of the homes during the summer when the windows are open to make his observations.

Michelle Dunlavy, 2580 Lindenwood Drive, commented that she believes that the applicant should find another location that is already zoned C-3. She expressed concern about the uncertainty of not knowing what will eventually be built on undeveloped lots and outlots. She reminded the Commission members that she and her neighbors have had to disrupt their lives many times over the past nearly 20 years to attend meetings with regard to the disposition of the properties in the area.

Kappeler explained that the land use plan is not specific as to zoning district classification, reiterating that the area in question is designated as commercial. She explained that the city's comprehensive plan was produced by a collaboration of city staff, Commission and Board of Adjustment members, and citizens. She added that the comprehensive plan was ultimately approved by the City Council. Kappeler stated that a zoning district classification is an entirely different concept than a land use designation.

Mike Porter, 2558 Lindenwood Drive, stated that prior to purchasing his home in 1991 he had consulted with realtors and city staff who had told him that the Crow Ridge Plaza area would develop with either single-family homes, condominiums, or offices. He expressed concern about the possibility that the vacant lot adjacent to the homes along Lindenwood Drive would be rezoned to C-3 in the future if the current request is approved. He stated that this would result in reduced property values, adding that one of the commercial uses in the area already generates noise and trash and is very disruptive.

Gallagher explained that the property in question was rezoned to C-2 in 1987 several years before any residential homes were built on Lindenwood Drive. He indicated that regardless of whether the rezoning request is approved, some sort of commercial use will eventually be located on the property. He stated that in his opinion the proposed use with its attendant restrictions is much more favorable to the neighbors than many of the permitted uses in the C-2 district. He indicated that Lot 1 is located at the intersection of two major streets, is across the street from a C-3 zoning district, and is embedded within a commercial zoning district and is therefore significantly different than Lot 3 about which the residents have expressed so much concern.

Kelly Meyer, 2459 Lindenwood Drive, asked for an explanation of how the compressors could be isolated. Casita explained that the compressors would be placed inside a concrete block room with a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating high enough that people in the adjacent rest rooms will be unable to hear them. He added that the STC rating of the overhead doors is 32. He explained that for every 100 feet of distance, decibels are reduced by half. Casita indicated that the berm will add both vertical and horizontal distance, adding that sound from a different direction and source in addition to the buffer of the existing buildings also degrades noise.

Wennlund asked for an estimate of the level of sound at a home that is approximately 350 feet from the proposed structure that was originally 100 decibels. Casita explained that it would be approximately 25 decibels without taking into account the berm, the buildings, wind direction, and the other existing noise.

Meyer asked if the sound from the business would funnel out the overhead doors if they are open. Casita confirmed this, adding that the noise level would be dependent upon which door is open. She asked if the berm would actually direct noise upward to the second floor of the houses. Casita explained that both the berm and buildings would bounce the sound waves upward, but that sound would also have to travel further to reach a second floor. He added that because wind movement is more rapid the higher above ground it gets, it would also degrade the sound. Casita explained that every two square feet of the berm can also absorb one Sabin unit of sound.

Meyer stated that the building where Habanero's is located is empty more often than not, and therefore the residents cannot rely on the white noise from that location to obscure the noise from the proposed use. She indicated that Commission members should also consider the property value reduction that may be a result of the auto repair shop.

Meyer expressed her appreciation for the applicant's commitment to the community and the way his businesses are run, but indicated that because her earlier suggestion that the rezoning request be approved only as long as Elias is involved is not feasible, she believes that the property should not be rezoned. Jager explained that at a previous meeting he had indicated that a recommendation for approval should be based not on the applicant, but on the actual use of the property as it is able to be monitored for compliance.

Chris Bries, 2492 Lindenwood Drive, asked if the entire lot would be zoned C-3. Jager confirmed this, adding that there is a caveat that approval would be based on the list of conditions that the applicant has proposed which restrict the C-3 use to 6,000 square feet of the 9,000 square foot building. Bries commented that she would much rather have the proposed auto repair shop which would be open from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. than a use that

would be permitted in the C-2 district that could be open until 2:30 a.m. She asked who would monitor the operation of any business which locates in the remainder of the building. She stated that The Clubhouse, which is allowed in the C-2 district, is not a good neighbor and the residents have had to call the Police Department numerous times because of the behavior of their customers. Jager explained that there would be no restrictions on hours of operation or the actual use if a permitted use in the C-2 district locates on the site. He reiterated that a business license is required of all new business owners wishing to locate in the city which triggers a check of zoning compliance. He indicated that the adverse impacts of a use on the neighbors that are illegal will likely be handled by the Police Department as they are available 24 hours per day. He added that if customers of a particular business consistently behave in a raucous manner that is a violation of the ordinance, the owner of the business could be prosecuted which would be handled by city staff. Connors stated that the size of the retail spaces in the building will dictate to some extent what type of use is located there. Jager indicated that while this may be the case, any of the uses that are listed as permitted would be allowed to locate in the retail spaces available. Wennlund reiterated that the property in question is not adjacent to residential homes, adding that it seems as though the neighbors are more concerned about Lot 3 which abuts the homes.

Shawn Meyer stated that it seems silly to him to rezone the property to C-3 and then restrict its use. Jager explained that while the process may seem contrived, the purpose of the conditional zoning in this instance is so that the more objectionable uses in the C-3 district are not allowed to locate on the property in question. Meyer stated that he does not understand why the auto repair shop use is not added to the list of permitted uses in the C-2 district. Jager reiterated that the purpose of the conditional zoning in this case is to attempt to accommodate both the applicant and the residents in specific situations. He stated that if the ordinance was changed to include an auto repair shop as an allowable use in the C-2 district, other uses which could be considered similar and compatible and which residents might find objectionable would also be allowed. Meyer stated that it seems to him that staff only seems interested in doing whatever is necessary so that the applicant can locate his business on the property in question. Jager explained that what staff is attempting to do is find a development that has the least objectionable use for the adjoining property owners. He indicated that it would be perfectly legal to rezone the property to a C-3 zoning district classification and allow any of the permitted uses in that district. He indicated that this would not constitute spot zoning as there is a property directly across 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue which is already zoned C-3. Jager added that the neighbors would likely find many of the permitted uses in the C-3 district far more objectionable than the proposed auto repair shop which is the reason for staff's attempt to accommodate the applicant while restricting the use of the property. He explained that staff will generally support a request for rezoning as long as it is compliant with the comprehensive plan. He indicated that in this case, the neighbors have constantly expressed concern about the noise and traffic that the auto repair shop will generate. Because an auto repair shop is not allowed in the C-2 district, the applicant is willing to restrict the hours of operation, the noise, and other adverse impacts of the business on the neighborhood. Meyer stated that he is surprised that the applicant has submitted another rezoning request when it seemed that staff and Commission members were opposed to the original request. Connors stated that he is much more comfortable presenting the current request which has low traffic volume, restricted hours of operation, and an owner who is willing to work to ameliorate the concerns of the neighbors than one for a fast food restaurant which is an allowable use in the C-2 district. He added that none of the restrictions to which the applicant has agreed could be imposed on a fast food restaurant.

Wennlund commented that the Commission members do not have preconceived notions about how they will vote on a particular project, adding that the dialogue is helpful when making a recommendation to Council. He indicated that the impact of more objectionable uses in the C-2 district such as a fast food restaurant cannot be understated. He stated that while he understands that perhaps the proposed use is not ideal, it is far more favorable to the neighborhood than a permitted use that cannot be restricted.

Schenck asked if a special use permit or variance could be granted rather than a rezoning. Stoltenberg explained that what the residents might be missing is that the applicant has expressed a willingness to place conditions on the development that are more restrictive than if a developer chose to open a business similar to The Clubhouse. Schenck commented that the conditions only restrict the current applicant. Stoltenberg explained that the restrictions would apply to Elias and any other owner or lessor who wishes to locate there in the future.

Dunlavy stated that the neighbors are also concerned about Lot 3 in the development. Kappeler reiterated that the only property currently under consideration is Lot 1. Dunlavy stated that the residents are concerned that the other vacant lots could be rezoned to whatever the Commission members want. Stoltenberg explained that while he is not in favor of spot zoning, he does support conditional zoning because of the flexibility it allows in restricting a proposed use. He indicated that none of the questions with regard to Lot 3 can be answered because no proposal has been submitted. He added that he would not be opposed to recommending the rezoning of the lot to C-3 if the proposal is restricted in such a manner as to make the use less intense than those allowed in a C-2 district and that the property would revert to C-2 if the business no longer existed. Wennlund commented that there is a material difference between Lot 1 and Lot 3 in that Lot 1 is not adjacent to residential homes.

Stoltenberg stated that he had been opposed to the initial request, adding that because of the conditions proposed and the limitation of the building size to 9,000 square feet he supports recommending approval. He indicated that in his opinion the proposed development is much more restrictive than other permitted uses in the C-2 district. Stoltenberg commented that the residents must understand that eventually the vacant lots will be developed, and it will be advantageous to control the development as much as possible.

Stoltenberg commented that he believes that the doors on the south side of the building should remain closed except when vehicles are entering or exiting the structure. Rafferty concurred, adding that it seems as though the proposed restrictions are geared more toward the building except for the hours of operation.

Elias requested that the Commission take into consideration when voting the fact that he is a reputable business owner who will abide by the restrictions placed on his business. He indicated that the list of conditions was developed based on the concerns of the neighbors, reiterating that his business would have far less of a negative impact on the neighborhood than a fast food restaurant. Shawn Meyer stated that the applicant's reputation is not relevant, adding that a decision should be based only on the use.

Jeff Miller, developer representing the applicant, stated that the lot is deed restricted to a 9,000 square foot building no more than 16 feet in height even though the lot could support a 15,000 square foot building. Miller explained that if a new owner purchased the shopping

center which has recently gone through foreclosure in addition to the lot in question that deed restriction would no longer be binding. He indicated that the applicant's request to remove the deed restriction had been denied by the current owner of the shopping center.

Myron Bries, 2492 Lindenwood Drive, expressed support for the applicant's proposed business. He asked if the restrictions applied to the proposed auto repair shop would apply to any future owner of the property who wished to open a different business which is allowed in the C-3 district. Jager confirmed this, adding that the list of conditions restricts the use of 6,000 square feet of the building to an auto repair shop with the balance of the building to used only for uses permitted in the C-2 district.

A brief discussion was held regarding the revision of the verbiage of Condition #2 in order to clarify the intent.

Driever indicated that he would be in support of the proposal if the condition regarding the southern doors being closed is added.

Connors suggested that perhaps the rezoning request could be approved on a contingent basis. He indicated that the Commission could review in the future whether the southern doors being open has had a negative impact on the neighborhood. He explained that in the past the Board of Adjustment has approved special use permits for uses for one year and has reviewed the operation of the use at that time to determine if it should be continued. Jager indicated that revoking approval of a rezoning request would be very difficult because the owner has investment-backed expectations. He explained that the Board of Adjustment has the authority to impose such a condition because it has quasi-judicial power while the Commission is only an advisory body. Jager stated that conditions can only be imposed on a rezoning request when they have been written and agreed upon and by the developer prior to the close of the public hearing before the City Council. He added that the Commission can recommend that the Council add the condition or not, but indicated that if the developer does not agree the Council does not have the authority to impose it.

Bert commented that the developer has already agreed to many conditions meant to substantially reduce the amount of noise that is generated by the business, adding that he is hesitant to regulate the operation of the business to the point of requiring that the doors be kept closed. He indicated that it is likely that if the noise is a problem, the neighbors would approach the applicant to notify him.

Rafferty commented that because there is no way to know if Elias will be the owner of the business in the future, the issue of noise should be addressed as specifically as possible. He stated that he does not believe it an unreasonable request to require that the doors be kept close at all times except when a vehicle is entering or exiting.

Rafferty stated that conditional zoning has rarely been used in the past, adding that the purpose for approving the request is to reduce the impact of the use as much as possible. He indicated that in his opinion the condition regarding the doors should be added.

Elias explained that approximately 7 months of the year the doors will be closed because of weather conditions. He indicated that he is more than willing to try to minimize the noise by attempting to limit the number of times the doors are opened and closed during the day and by partially closing the doors most times. He suggested that Commission members visit his

store at which the quiet doors have been installed to verify that the air tools cannot be heard from a distance of 375 feet. He questioned what would happen if an employee accidentally forgets to close the door if the condition is imposed.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Bert, that the rezoning of 2521 - 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue from C-2 to C-3 be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations and the revision of Condition #2 to more clearly specify the limitation of the auto repair shop to 6,000 square feet of the lot.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION

AYE: Bert, Kappeler, Stoltenberg, Wennlund  
NAY: Rafferty  
ABSTAIN: Peters

Motion carried.

**Final Plat**

- 5. Case 13-009; The Lodges at Beaver Meadows First Addition, submitted by Beaver Development, Inc.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Kappeler, that the final plat of The Lodges at Beaver Meadows First Addition be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:50 p.m.

These minutes approved \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory W. Beck, City Planner