

Greenville County Planning Commission Minutes
October 25, 2023 at 4:30 p.m.
Council Committee Room at County Square

Commissioners Present: S. Bichel, Chair; J. Bailey, Vice Chair; M. Shockley (zoom); F. Hammond; J. Howard (zoom); J. Barbare; J. Wood

Commissioners Absent: J. Rogers

County Councilors Present: None.

Staff Present: T. Coker; H. Gamble; R. Jeffers-Campbell; T. Stone; J. Henderson; M. Staton; N. Miglionico; T. Baxley; IS Staff

1. Call to Order

Chairman Bichel called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

2. Invocation

Chairman Bichel provided the invocation.

Chairman Bichel announced Judge Metz Loopers resignation from the Planning Commission and applauded him for his years of service.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the September 27, 2023 Commission Meeting

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2023 Commission meeting, as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

4. Rezoning Requests

CZ-2023-067

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-067.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District, is located along Five Forks Road, a two to five-lane State-maintained Collector road and Parkside Drive, a two-lane County-maintained Residential road. Staff feels the design of the parking area and the relationship of the building front to the street is not consistent with the intent of the Neighborhood Commercial District. The materials indicated on the elevation drawings may also be out of place for the area. Additionally, Staff is left with unknowns as to how grading, stormwater management, and tree preservation will be handled on the site. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to NC, Neighborhood Commercial District with the Preliminary Development Plan provided does not meet the intent of the Neighborhood Commercial District.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to NC, Neighborhood Commercial District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Wood, to deny CZ-2023-067. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

CZ-2023-068

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-068.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District, is located along State Park Road, a two-lane State-maintained Collector road and Wild Orchard Road, a one-lane County-maintained Residential road. Staff is of the opinion that a successful rezoning to AG, Agricultural Preservation District is consistent with the existing character of the area and would not have an adverse impact.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to AG, Agricultural Preservation District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve CZ-2023-068. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

CZ-2023-069

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-069.

The subject parcel, zoned R-S, Residential Suburban District and S-1, Services District, is located on the northern corner of Fairview Road, a two to five-lane State-maintained arterial road and Neely Ferry Road, a two-lane State-maintained Residential Road. Staff is of the opinion that while a successful rezoning to C-3, Commercial District would not be consistent with the Plan Greenville Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Suburban Neighborhood, it would allow for less intensive uses than are currently permitted under the S-1, Services District.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to C-3, Commercial District.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Shockley, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve CZ-2023-069. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

CZ-2023-070

Mr. Henderson introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-070.

The subject parcel zoned R-15, Single-Family Residential District is located along Tulane Avenue, a two-lane County-maintained Residential road. Staff is of the opinion that the existing zoning is appropriate for this area which is mainly characterized by single-family residential uses and allowing the proposed use of farm animals could have an adverse impact on surrounding properties.

Based on these reasons, staff recommends denial of the requested rezoning to R-S, Residential Suburban.

Discussion: Mr. Wood asked why a few farm animals were considered too impactful to the surrounding area when allowable septic created a greater impact on the area. Mr. Wood asked what the deciding criteria was. Mr. Henderson explained the surrounding area was not zoned for farm animals. Mr. Henderson pointed out the east side of Highway 25 is becoming more urbanized, while the west side of Highway 25 is still considered rural and would allow for farm animals.

Mr. Wood made a motion to deny the application. Mr. Hammond seconded the motion to deny.

Mr. Barbare stated he is in favor of the application and did not believe that Highway 25 should be the point of delineation.

Mr. Bailey asked if there was a violation. Mr. Henderson stated there was a complaint and violation for the farm animals on the property.

Mr. Wood withdrew his motion to deny.

Motion: by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve CZ-2023-070. The motion carried by hand vote with four in favor (J. Barbare; J. Bailey; J. Wood; M. Shockley) and three in opposition (J. Howard; F. Hammond; S. Bichel) with one absent (J. Rogers).

CZ-2023-072

Mr. Stone introduced the staff report and presentation into the record as background information for Rezoning Docket CZ-2023-072.

The Pelham Road Commercial Corridor Overlay District is intended to encourage development and corridor design that is compatible with mixed-use commercial thoroughfares and mixed-use employment centers located along Pelham Road from Blacks Drive to SC Hwy 14. Considerations include site design of commercial properties, walkability, vehicular connectivity, beautification, and signage. The district also aims to protect investments in commercial and residential properties by ensuring new development is consistent with the visions outlined in the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan.

Therefore, staff is requesting approval by resolution of the Pelham Road Commercial Corridor Overlay District standards as an amendment to the Greenville County Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion: Mr. Hammond asked what conditions would cause the new criteria to be required for a business. Mr. Stone stated the criteria are set out in the current Zoning Ordinance under non-conforming use and the overlay would not impact existing structures. Mr. Henderson explained current businesses would not be affected unless the business closes for six months or more or the business changes use.

Mr. Hammond expressed concern about the buffer requirements. Mr. Stone explained the intent is to reduce the setback and include a planting buffer. Mr. Hammond stated that was not clearly stated.

Mr. Hammond expressed concern about the sidewalk requirements.

Mr. Hammond expressed concern about requirements of 70% transparent glass fronting roadways. Mr. Hammond stated it is unclear that the requirement was only for the main corridor.

Mr. Hammond was unsure why the industrial area was included and suggested they table the plan to acquire additional input. Mr. Henderson stated the Planning Commission was required to make a recommendation to County Council. Mr. Hammond stated there is a lot of ambiguous language in the text amendment.

Discussion ensued on what requirements would be triggered depending on the subarea delineations.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to deny CZ-2023-072. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

5. Preliminary Subdivision Applications

PP-2023-148 Milestone Village

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Milestone Village, a previously approved Group Development in the C-2, Commercial zoning district, under application PP-2020-169. Being a Group Development, this application was previously approved by staff. The new application, which is simply for a change of use on site, is being brought to Planning Commission due to advertising the plan as going to Planning Commission for review. Otherwise, this application would not typically require Planning Commission Review.

The subject property is designated as Suburban Mixed Use in the Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan. Suburban Mixed-Use place types include a variety of single-family (detached and attached) and multi-family building types. Housing types should be designed as a cohesive, connected neighborhood, rather than isolated subareas. Buildings should be of a high-quality design, and developments should include common neighborhood amenities and open space connections. This is a commercial development, and primary uses listed for these areas include regional and neighborhood commercial.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the plan with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. Prior to submitting for a Land Disturbance Permit, please provide a letter from SCDOT noting any recommendations for mitigation based on the revised TIS. If additional requirements are provided by SCDOT, these must be met prior to any additional permitting phases.
2. Prior to submitting for a Land Disturbance Permit, please provide a letter from Metro that current flows have been confirmed with Metro.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Barbare, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve with applicable conditions PP-2023-148. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

PP-2023-150 Aetna Springs Phase II

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Aetna Springs Phase II, a Cluster Option 1 Open Space Development located north of the intersection of Stallings Road and Rutherford Rd. The applicant is requesting 46 lots at a density of 3.02 units/acre. Access is provided off Stallings Road which is a state road.

The project site is located within the Suburban Neighborhood and Floodplain character area of the Comprehensive Plan. Suburban Neighborhoods are generally shaped by residential subdivisions of medium-lot homes with relatively uniform housing types and densities. New single-family subdivisions should be designed with sidewalks, street trees, neighborhood parks, and community open space connections. The recommended density is 3-5 dwellings/acre. Aetna Springs Phase II proposes 3.02 dwellings/acre.

VA-2023-154 was submitted to request a variance from LDR 8.8.1, which requires a secondary access for any subdivision of more than 30 lots or 50 single family attached dwellings. The applicant states that a secondary access is not feasible, and that the main entrance has been widened to 26 feet with a 48-foot-wide ROW to the main intersection as suggested by LDR 8.8.1A.

VA-2023-155 was submitted to request a variance from LDR 8.21, which requires a 20-foot landscape buffer around the exterior of the development. The Applicant states that they are requesting a variance to waive this requirement at two sections of the property: (1) the first area would be reduced to 10 feet do to a curve in the road and to avoid the adjacent floodplain and creek buffer; and (2) areas adjacent to the existing creek crossing are not able to achieve and maintain the required undisturbed buffer.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the plan with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. Prior to submitting for a Land Disturbance Permit, submit a revised Preliminary Capacity Request to Subdivision Administration that has been signed and approved by ReWa and Metro.
2. Provide a left turn lane for this phase as outlined in the Traffic Impact Study recommendations.
3. Traffic improvements warranted as a result of the required Traffic Impact Study must be installed once 40 lots have been recorded.

Discussion: There were four speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, John Blue, expressed concern about the variance request (VA-2023-154) stating granting the variance will impact his privacy and property value. The second speaker in opposition, Brenda Buchik, pointed out missing information on the preliminary plat and stated the site was currently under study for a historical site. Ms. Buchik expressed concern about ordinance violations in regard to setbacks, parking and floodplain management. The third speaker in opposition, Jan Willis, explained they have been working with Greenville County Long Range planners on a Mountain Creek Area Plan to preserve the historical and recreational character of the area. Ms. Willis stated additional infill development jeopardizes the character of the area. The final speaker in opposition, Sandra Richards, expressed concern for her safety with the proposed road running directly behind her home.

There were three speakers in favor of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker, Stephanie Gates, project engineer, provided a brief overview of the project and variance requests. Ms. Gates stated they utilized the undevelopable floodplain as a large accessible open space for recreation.

Chairman Bichel asked for clarification on the cluster development requirements in multi-phased developments per LDR 11.7. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell asked the engineer if this phase would have separate HOA covenants from the other phases. Ms. Gates stated yes due to the disconnected detention ponds. Ms. Jeffers-Campbell stated this is a separate subdivision due to a unique case number, covenants and HOA.

Chairman Bichel asked where lots 1-11 were on the required plat tables. Ms. Gates stated they submitted a corrected plat to staff.

Chairman Bichel stated the LDR defines developable land as land you can build buildings on. Chairman Bichel pointed out land noted as developable that he believed was undevelopable.

Chairman Bichel quoted LDR 11.1 "The Planning Commission shall determine if the preliminary plan(s) is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance related to cluster development and open space...", LDR 11.3.2 "The Planning Commission shall determine the appropriateness of the dimensions of the required open space." And LDR 11.4 "The required open space must be directly accessible to the largest practical number of lots within the development." Chairman Bichel did not believe the proposed subdivision had enough lots directly adjacent to the useable open space. Chairman Bichel stated you cannot count the buffer space as useable open space. Ms. Gates explained they counted 31 lots utilizing lots directly across the street or with path access.

Chairman Bichel stated R-12 zoning with 3,000 square foot lots is an abomination and he cannot support it.

Mr. Bailey stated he appreciates the development and Greenville County needs more housing but would appreciate if this application was cleaned up. Mr. Bailey stated he was not a fan of variance requests. Mr. Bailey explained he believed there were many ways to clean up the design to make it much more amenable to the community. Mr. Bailey stated new homeowners should be a benefit to the area, not a detriment and the current plan does not fit that. Ms. Gates asked what design would better fit what the Planning Commission was looking for. Mr. Bailey stated Chairman Bichel pointed out the immediate factors and the surrounding community does not want a cluster development. Ms. Gates stated making the design with 12,000 square foot lots does not fit the land available.

The second speaker in favor, Nikolya Serdyuk, the developer, stated the current design was created to preserve large amounts of open space. Mr. Serdyuk asked the Planning Commission for guidance on how to move forward.

Chairman Bichel pointed out that the other phases were approved with 12,000 square foot lots. Chairman Bichel stated there needed to be larger lots with more directly accessible play area. Mr. Serdyuk explained at 12,000 square foot lots he would only have 8-12 lots, which would require a housing cost to be over one and a half million dollars due to unique

infrastructure costs with the land. Mr. Serdyuk asked how many homes trigger the turn lane requirement because if he can eliminate the turn lane his costs will be reduced to help accommodate the larger lots.

Mr. Barbare stated he had concern with the developer debating with the Planning Commission Chairman on how to improve his application.

Mr. Bailey stated he believed the application needed to be cleaned up and the developer should try to meet in the middle of the resident's desire for the area.

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell explained the TIS was completed based on the master plan for the area and once 40 lots are met, the improvements must be met.

Mr. Wood made a motion to deny based on LDR article 11.1, 11.3.2, 11.4 and Zoning Ordinance article 7:2.4-6.

Motion: by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Howard, to deny PP-2023-150. The motion carried by hand vote with four in favor (J. Wood; J. Howard; S. Bichel; J. Bailey) and three in opposition (J. Barbare; F. Hammond; M. Shockley) with one absent (J. Rogers).

PP-2023-152 Abington Manor

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Abington Manor, a Conventional Development in the R-R1, Rural Residential District located south of the intersection of Reedy Fork Rd and Garrison Rd. The applicant is requesting 7 lots on 10.10 acres for a density of 0.69 units/acre. Each lot is at least an acre in size to comply with the R-R1 zoning requirements. Access is provided off Reedy Fork Road which is a state road.

The Plan Greenville County Comprehensive Plan designates this site with a Future Land Use of *Rural Living*. Rural Living place types are transitional areas that offer opportunities for low-intensity development that is well-integrated with the natural landscape and agricultural uses. Residential development may occur as individual single-family structures on large lots, or clusters of homes designed to preserve large amounts of interconnected open space. Hobby farms on large lots with residential homesteads are common land uses. The Rural Living future land use recommends a density of 1 dwelling per two or more acres. This application proposes a density of 0.69 units per acre.

VAR2023-110 was submitted by the applicant to request a variance from LDR 8.21, which states in part that the required 20-foot buffer be "owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association." The applicant states that they would like to request that the buffer be relieved of ownership by the Homeowners Association while retaining the maintenance by the Homeowners Association. The buffer would belong to the homeowner, but the maintenance would remain with the Homeowners.

The applicant also states that the subdivided properties would be subject to a Landscape Buffer Easement along all exterior property lines for the subdivision; the easement would be 25 feet in width to provide the typical requirements of a 20-foot buffer and a 5-foot building setback; and covenant and deed restrictions as well as an easement agreement would disallow the homeowner to disturb within the easement at all. According to the applicant, no fencing, accessory structures, or primary structures would be allowed within the easement. The easement would allow the Homeowners Association to enter the easement and maintain the easement.

The applicant states that the variance is necessary due to the following hardships that they have identified: (1) there is 1.39 acres of unusable property caused by stream crossing and access “flag” area; (2) 556 linear feet of road and sidewalk that would not be required without the odd shape and location of the stream; and (3) loss of at least one lot with the existing R-R1 zoning district.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the plan with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. Provide a revised Preliminary Plan by November 1, 2023, labelling the proposed Landscape Buffer Easement along all exterior property lines for the subdivision. This Buffer Easement should be 25 feet in width.
2. Prior to Final Plat, submit the recorded covenant and deed restrictions, as well as the easement agreement with the appropriate language disallowing the homeowner to disturb within the easement area and allowing the Homeowners Association to enter the easement to provide maintenance.
3. Prior to submitting for a Land Disturbance Permit, please provide additional documentation from SCDOT that sight distance has been met.

Discussion: There were no speakers in opposition of the proposed subdivision.

There was one speaker in favor of the proposed subdivision, Jay Martin, the project engineer. Mr. Martin explained the variance request and stated the community would have very nice homes. Mr. Martin read a letter in support from the neighboring property owner.

Chairman Bichel stated the buffer should be owned and maintained by the HOA, it cannot be part of the lot. Mr. Martin stated the easement is owned and maintained by the HOA.

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Barbare, to approve with conditions PP-2023-152. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

Motion: by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Barbare, to approve VAR2023-110. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

PP-2023-160 Laurel Grove Ph. 3

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a preliminary subdivision application for Laurel Grove Phase III, a proposed third phase of a conventional subdivision located southwest of the intersection of Anderson Ridge Road and South Bennetts Bridge Road near Five Forks. The applicant is requesting 10 lots at a density of 1.09 units/acre in R-S, Single-Family Residential zoning district.

The project site is located within the Suburban Neighborhood character area of the Comprehensive Plan. Suburban Neighborhoods are generally shaped by residential subdivisions of medium-lot homes with relatively uniform housing types and densities. New single-family subdivisions should be designed with sidewalks, street trees, neighborhood parks, and community open space connections. The recommended density is 3-5 dwellings/acre. Laurel Grove Phase III proposes 1.09 units/acre.

VAR2023-111 was submitted to request a variance from the undisturbed buffer required by Article 8.21 of the Greenville County Land Development Regulations. The applicant is requesting the following:

- Removal of the buffer along the northern side of Laurel Bluff Court to meet the minimum 25,000 square foot lot size required by septic lots to the south of Laurel Bluff Court;
- Complete removal of the buffer along the Lot 1's South property lines and to keep the eastern 20' buffer on private property to be maintained by the individual homeowners of the property, but under a restrictive easement governed by the HOA.
- For Lots 2-9, to the keep the 20-foot buffer on individual lots to be maintained by individual homeowners, but under restrictive easement governed by the HOA; and
- Removal of the north and south buffer along Lot 10's exterior property lines, due to the narrow lots size; and to keep the eastern 20' buffer on private property to be maintained by the individual property owners, but under a restrictive easement governed by the HOA.

The applicant states that this will provide for a uniform look with the previous development phases, which were developed prior to the adoption of this requirement.

VAR2023-112 was submitted to request a variance to remove the requirement of a secondary emergency access. This request was filed after residents along Anderson Ridge Road that would be adjacent to the emergency access noted their concerns at the August 2023 Planning Commission Meeting. The applicant states that the entrance to Laurel Grove has a width of 26.5 feet, which if confirmed, would meet requirements of LDR 8.8.1, which requires that the entrance be widened to 26 feet to the first intersection in lieu of a secondary or emergency entrance.

Staff recommends approval with conditions of the preliminary plan and variance request with the standard and specific requirements.

The approval conditions are as follows:

1. At Final Plat, provide restrictive covenants and recorded easement ensuring the protection of the undisturbed buffer on the individual lots for any lot where the buffer is proposed to be on an individual owned lot under a restrictive easement governed by the HOA.
2. Please confirm with Roads and Bridges regarding the width of Laurel Grove Drive. If Laurel Grove Drive is not at least 26 feet wide, prior to final plat, it should be widened to meet this requirement.

Discussion: There were seven speakers in opposition to the proposed subdivision. The first speaker in opposition, Scott Stone, represented Carson's Pond Subdivision residents. Mr. Stone stated he was in opposition to the buffer variance and did not believe the request was necessary to develop the property. The second speaker in opposition, Gary Schaner, expressed concern about water runoff impacting his backyard and neighborhood detention pond. The third speaker in opposition, Scott Lanterman, was in opposition of the buffer variance and stated homeowners would not follow the requirements of the easement. The fourth speaker in opposition, Douglas Stewart, stated the Planning Commission should stand by the buffer requirement laws. The fifth speaker in opposition, Don Palandech, stated potential residents depend on Greenville County to enforce buffer restrictions. The sixth speaker in opposition, Gerard Moore, was in opposition of the buffer variance. Mr. Moore explained the variance would eliminate his family's privacy. The final speaker in opposition, Jonelle Phillips, is in opposition of the buffer variance, explaining that approving the variance would set a bad precedent.

There was one speaker in favor of the proposed subdivision. The first speaker in favor, Wendell Hawkins, a representative for Laurel Grove Phase III, provided an overview of the requested variances and stated drainage issues would be mitigated as the land is developed.

Mr. Bailey asked why the home couldn't be built without the buffer variance. Alex Converse, project engineer, stated the property geometry and denial of a sewer easement from Carson's Pond neighborhood. Mr. Bailey stated Greenville County needs homes and these are good homes but they need to find a way to put the buffers back into the proposal.

Discussion ensued on why the buffers couldn't be added back into the plan.

Chairman Bichel stated the buffers are needed. Chairman Bichel stated he is okay with the emergency access variance.

Motion: by Mr. Wood seconded by Mr. Barbare, to approve VAR2023-112. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

Motion: by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Howard, to deny VAR2023-111. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

Chairman Bichel and the applicant agreed to hold PP-2023-160 until the January Planning Commission meeting.

VA-2023-172 Sawblade Ridge – Setback Variance Application (LDR 8.7)

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR 8.7, Table 8.1 Building Setbacks in Unzoned Areas, which requires a 20-foot setback on any residential subcollector and access road. The applicant states that the home, which was constructed within the last year, encroaches 5 feet into the setback on the north side. Since the home sits at an angle, the south side sits the appropriate 20 feet from the road. The applicant states that the variance is necessary because it would be difficult and costly for the home to be moved back 5 feet. If approved, the north corner of the house would be set back a total of 15 feet.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve VA-2023-172. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

VA-2023-157 Kennington Family Winery – Front Building Setback Variance

Ms. Staton addressed the Commission members with a variance from LDR Table 8.1, which requires a 40-foot front setback on a minor arterial, major collector or minor collector road. The variance is required due to Subdivision Administration's interpretation that a front setback is to be measured from the edge of the Right-of-Way, which is shown on the recorded plat as being 33 feet from the centerline of Beaver Dam Rd, which is also shown as being the sites front property line. The applicant states that the reason for the variance is to allow for a 450 square foot enclosed addition that, under staff's interpretation, would encroach into the 40-foot setback. In May of 2021, an original project was approved that did encroach into this area, but with a wood trellis rather than a full enclosure. That

trellis was never built, but the concrete pad was, and that is the area that is being proposed to be enclosed at this time.

Staff recommends approval of the variance as requested.

Discussion: None.

Motion: by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Bailey, to approve VA-2023-157. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote with one absent (J. Rogers).

8. Planning Report

Ms. Jeffers-Campbell presented the October Planning Report.

9. Old Business

None.

10. New Business

None.

11. Adjourn

Without objection, Chairman Bichel adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Miglionico

Nicole Miglionico

Recording Secretary