GRAND JUNCTION BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
January 11, 2012
12:01 PM to 1:16 PM

The regularly scheduled Board of Appeals meeting was called to order at 12:01 PM by Chairman Reggie Wall. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Board of Appeals, were Reggie Wall (Chairman), Rob Burnett, Joe Carter and Loren Couch.

In attendance, representing the Public Works and Planning Department were Lisa Cox, (Planning Manager), Greg Moberg (Planning Services Supervisor) and Scott Peterson (Senior Planner). Jamie Beard (Assistant City Attorney) and Shelly Dackonish (Senior Staff Attorney) were also present. The minutes were recorded and transcribed by Leslie Ankrum.

One citizen, in addition to the applicants, was present.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR PRESCHEDULED VISITORS

Chairman Wall welcomed new members, Loren Couch, Joe Carter and Rob Burnett. Election of new officers was delayed until the February meeting due to the absence of new Board Member, Jon Buschhorn.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD

VAR-2011-1273 VARIANCE – GJ Canyon View Car Wash Sign Variance

Request approval for a Variance from the free-standing sign standards to allow for an increase in height from the required 25' to 40' on .65 +/- acres in a C-1 (Light Commercial) zone district

.

PETITIONER: Mikel and Roxanne Lewis
LOCATION: 1110 North 6th Street
CITY STAFF: Scott Peterson, Senior Planner

STAFF PRESENTATION

Scott Peterson, Public Works & Planning Department, presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding a request from applicants Mikel and Roxanne Lewis for a sign variance located at 1110 North 6th Street, from the maximum height limitation of 25' to 40' for a proposed free-standing sign.

In January 2011, the applicants purchased the property from the former owner, who was also the current owner of the adjacent lots to the south. They renovated the existing car wash and upgraded the site, which resulted in improved traffic movement, additional vacuum islands and new car wash equipment. The applicants reported they had tried to coordinate a Sign Package with the owner of the adjacent properties that abutted North Avenue for one free-standing sign on The Hanger property (604 North Avenue) which could advertise all three commercial properties, but were unsuccessful in that attempt.

Mr. Peterson presented an aerial photo of the property. He stated a sign package review by the City allowed the review and approval of signage on a developed site and/or abutting developed sites that functioned as one through the sharing of vehicular access and parking. The three properties operated in such a manner with the sharing of parking and accesses. He added sign packages tended to reduce signage clutter.

The applicants asserted that a 25' tall sign on their property was not visible from westbound traffic on North Avenue, but a 40' sign would be visible over the REI building for west bound traffic on North Avenue. The Zoning and Development Code allowed installation of a roof-mounted sign with a height limitation of 40' above grade, provided that no guy wires, braces or secondary supports were visible. The applicants asserted, however, that it would be difficult to attach and engineer such a sign from wind and snow loads without providing guy wires and braces that would be visible and that the structural integrity of the roof could be compromised. Mr. Peterson stated he had spoken to a representative of Bud's Signs who confirmed those challenges.

The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicated the property was Neighborhood Center and the corresponding zoning district was C-1, Light Commercial.

Mr. Peterson displayed two photos supplied by the applicants. They showed the proposed free-standing sign, which would be 40' in height, in relation to North Avenue traffic movements. The applicants' property was situated in a small commercial subdivision in which all the buildings were close together. The property was separated from North Avenue by only 125' feet. The property abutted two lower order streets. Ideally a sign package would serve this small commercial subdivision, but that had been proved unworkable for the property owners who could not agree. If the property were adjacent to North Avenue, the free-standing sign could be up to 40' in height.

The option of a roof sign, which could be as tall as 40' from ground level according to the Zoning and Development Code, was also not workable for this property because of the need for visible guy wires, braces and/or secondary supports.

Although those factors did not constitute a classic example of "hardship," Mr. Peterson stated he was supportive of the variance request because of the property's proximity to North Avenue and because it provided a safer alternative to a 40' roof sign.

Mr. Peterson displayed the GIS viewer for a clearer picture of how the properties operated and showed that ingress/egress did occur to the lot from the property to the south.

Mr. Peterson stated that a classic example of a “hardship” would be defined as something that were physically wrong with the property due to topography, lot size, existing building setbacks, etc., that prevented the applicant from meeting the current zoning code requirements on a given project. In looking at the aerial photo of the site through the City’s GIS viewer, this was a unique property.

The properties functioned as one property through the sharing of parking and access drives. In effect, this was a North Avenue property. All properties in the block, with the exception of the car wash property, could have a 40’ tall free-standing sign. Therefore, the applicants’ requested a sign variance be allowed to have what other properties were entitled to have. This was what variance requests were for. This property would also have been entitled, under our present Sign Regulation, to have up to two free-standing 25’ tall free-standing signs because it was a corner lot. However, if the Board were to grant the variance request, Mr. Peterson would request that this property be allowed to only have the one requested free-standing sign.

Mr. Peterson stated because of those reasons, in his opinion, he was supportive of the applicant’s proposed request.

The applicants had asserted the literal interpretation and strict application of the sign regulations could cause undue and unnecessary hardship because of the visibility the business depended upon from North Avenue and was afforded to other properties similarly situated that would have been able to have a sign package adjacent to a four lane street.

Mr. Peterson displayed a copy of the proposed sign face which measured 120’ sq. ft. Applicants asserted and he agreed, that the hardship was unique to the property and not self-imposed as discussed previously. Applicants asserted that they acted in good faith by trying to negotiate a sign package with the adjacent property owner. Applicants stated they had tried to operate their business with a smaller sign that could only be seen from the lower order streets, but not from North Avenue, and had found that lack of visibility significantly impaired their business. Applicants had also considered other signage options, including designing a roof sign on the building, but that type of sign would have required visible supports that the Code did not allow and could also have compromised the structural integrity of the roof.

Arguably those hardships were self-imposed. The Applicants bought the property with the car wash on it in that subdivision and had other advertising means at their disposal. However, Mr. Peterson was supportive of the variance request because of the property’s proximity to North Avenue since the properties functioned as one through the sharing of access drives and parking as previously discussed.

The applicant was also proposing to install the sign 35’ +/- from the North 6th Street right-of-way on the east side of the existing building as was shown on the

slide. The properties to the south that were adjacent to North Avenue were allowed to install free-standing signs to a maximum height of 40'. Therefore, a proposed free-standing sign height of 40' on the property would not be contrary for adjacent property values.

Since the property was a corner lot, the applicant could construct two free-standing signs, one on each street frontage per the current Zoning and Development Code (Section 21.06.070 (g) (3) vii (A)). However, in order to reduce signage clutter and to further address the sign variance review criteria, Project Manager supported the alternative of only one free-standing sign being allowed on the property to further the general objective of moderating the size, number and placement of signs on a property.

As mentioned previously, properties along North Avenue could install free-standing signs up to 40' in height. The applicants only requested a 40' sign, which would match what was allowed for a roof sign on the property and for a free-standing sign on North Avenue.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions: The requested sign variance was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan did not specifically address signage requirements on individual properties, however the Comprehensive Plan did support the preservation of existing buildings and their appropriate reuse, which was Goal 6 of the Comprehensive Plan, as the building and business sat vacant for more than a year. One could also argue that the project supported Goals 4 and 12 of the Comprehensive Plan by the continued support of the development of the City Center into a vibrant and growing area with jobs and being a regional provider of services to help sustain, develop and enhance a healthy and diverse economy.

The criteria in Sections 21.02.200 and 21.06.070 had all been met. Project Manager supported the variance because of the proximity to North Avenue and for the fact that a 40' free-standing sign was a safer alternative to the 40' roof sign allowed by Code and the properties functioned as one through the sharing of the access drives.

The applicant would also need to obtain CDOT approval. Mr. Peterson had contacted CDOT and they stated if the sign were constructed on the applicants' property, they would be okay with the sign variance as proposed.

If the variance were to be approved, as a condition of approval, only one free-standing sign could be constructed on the property.

Mr. Peterson concluded his presentation with the recommendation that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the requested variance to allow the free-standing height up to 40' from the Code requirement of 25'.

QUESTIONS

Board Member Loren Couch asked if double sided illumination meant that lights would shine on the sign.

Mr. Peterson stated that the 120' sign would be internally illuminated.

Board Member Couch asked if the sign would rotate.

Mr. Peterson stated that a rotating sign was being proposed by the applicants and was allowed by Code.

Board Member Couch asked if the sign would be on all night.

The applicants stated that it would be on all night for advertising and Mr. Peterson added that it would be allowed to be on all night because the zoning district was C-1, which was the basic commercial retail zone district for most of the commercial properties in town. Twenty four hour operation was allowed in a C-1 zone district.

Board Member Joe Carter asked how and if the North Avenue Corridor Plan and North Avenue West Corridor Plan related to the variance request.

Mr. Peterson stated that City Council had recently approved the North Avenue West Corridor Plan; however the next step in the process would be to develop design guidelines. The City would hold neighborhood meetings this coming year, but at this point there had not been recommendations for signage or design guidelines that had been implemented or approved.

Board Member Carter stated that the plan recommended changes to signage west of 12th Street.

Mr. Peterson stated guidelines had not been finalized for the City's proposal or what the neighbors or community would want for that corridor plan.

Board Member Carter stated that the plans recommended changes to signage both west and east of 12th Street.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

David Chase of 1054 North 4th Street with Sharper Engineering represented the applicants Mike and Roxanne Lewis. Mr. Chase commended Mr. Peterson on his presentation and added a couple of main concerns and issues. The subdivision was platted in the early 80's as a three lot subdivision. Two of the lots on North Avenue were platted around existing buildings. The third lot, which was the largest and also the car wash lot was at the rear and the three lots did act as one, sharing the access off of 6th Street into an access easement that provided access for all three lots. The developer originally constructed and operated the car wash. It was closed due to financial difficulties and the building was vacant for over a year. The applicants felt this was a good opportunity to expand their operations and purchased the car wash. They had made extensive improvements to the site. They redesigned the main access point off of 6th

Street, used the length of the building to provide storage and improved parking. The applicants tried to contact the owners of the dry cleaning business on the corner to inquire about incorporating a sign package for all three businesses. No response was received and they didn't seem to want to participate in any kind of combined signage. The applicants felt they had no other options except to request the variance for the sign. The 25' sign was limited in both directions because of trees and existing buildings. The 40' sign was the only way to get any kind of visibility down North Avenue from 6th Street. The proposed 40 'sign would be placed on the east side of the building in order to hide the majority of the pole. From most angles looking at the business, the sign would almost mirror that of a sign mounted on a roof. The applicants felt the sign location was very appropriate for their request. The applicants would not be opposed to removing the 40' sign at a later date if the owners of the two other businesses decided to participate in a combined sign package as the Code would prefer.

Board Member Carter asked if the building pad identified on the site plan as 40' x 40' were for a future separate use.

Mr. Chase stated they did not need the entire site for the car wash operation. The applicants were looking into the possibility of a future business there but there were not any current plans.

Board Member Couch asked if that was where the tank had been removed.

Mr. Chase stated the tank had been further down on the actual lot of 604.

Board Member Rob Burnett asked how tall the existing REI sign was on the corner of 7th Street and North Avenue.

Mr. Peterson stated it was approximately 30' to 35'.

Chairman Wall asked how tall the REI building was.

Mr. Chase stated he did not have the exact height but he thought it was around 15' to 20'. He stated a 25' sign at the car wash would be hidden from the angle of view.

Applicant Mikel Lewis, property owner of 1110 North 6th Street, Grand Junction Canyon Car Wash Express thanked the Board for listening to their request. He stated as a small business owner, they were just trying to survive in part of an area of town that was kind of dying. To be competitive, they needed advertising. They had tried radio and television but it was too costly. They were looking for something more visible to attract attention to their business. They thought this would be a viable business. They had worked with the police department and the City to eliminate parking from high school students along 6th Street. Martin Mortuary located to the west, could cover the new "No Parking" signs when they had a funeral to allow for more parking for their customers. This had cleaned up the area from loitering. They would like to stay in business and they felt this variance was their best hope. They put up a temporary sign, with Martin Mortuary's permission on Martin Mortuary's property, but later found that the

Code stated they could not have a sign on someone else's property. While that sign was in place, their business did very well.

Chairman Wall asked how much the proposed sign would improve their business.

Mr. Lewis stated that statistics showed between 20% and 50%.

Chairman Wall asked if they were losing 20% of their business because the west bound traffic didn't see the car wash.

Mr. Lewis stated it was both west and east bound traffic that was affected. During the summer the foliage from the mortuary camouflages the car wash. During the spring and summer, it was not visible at all. The buildings to the north blocked the visibility from North Avenue. The previous car wash owners parked an old red car on the corner to advertise their business but he wasn't sure how much it helped their business.

Chairman Wall asked what the purpose was for a rotating sign.

Mr. Lewis stated it was to attract attention. The cars that were stopped at the traffic light of 7th Street and North Avenue and headed north or west would hopefully see the sign rotating over the REI building.

Chairman Wall inquired about meeting the criteria regarding undue and unnecessary hardship. He asked Mr. Lewis how this was an undue and unnecessary hardship.

Mr. Lewis stated they didn't have a visibility advantage to let people know their business was there. The hardship portion was that they had invested a substantial amount of money with the purchase and improvements to the property including removal of an underground drum that had been left on the property. The contaminated soil, that was in the right of way, had to be removed and taken to Utah for safe disposal. He stated they were not generating enough traffic volume to sustain their business and they were hoping this would attract some attention and keep their business afloat.

Chairman Wall asked if the sign didn't work, what was next.

Mr. Lewis stated the worst case scenario would be to let the business go but he didn't like thinking about that scenario; but it was a possibility. He stated he thought they had a good business and offered a good service and he wasn't afraid to compete with other businesses in town. He thought with the City's plan to try and revive North Avenue and 12th Street by Colorado Mesa University, more traffic could be generated into the center of Grand Junction instead of down by Highway 6 & 50.

Board Member Rob Burnett asked what their thoughts were when they first purchased the property regarding visibility and signage.

Mr. Lewis stated they had a verbal commitment from the Boggs' that they were receptive to a sign on their corner marketing all three businesses.

Mrs. Roxanne Lewis stated they would have never gone into the business without the commitment to the sign on the corner of the Boggs' property. Mrs. Lewis showed a picture to the Board of the sign they had proposed to the Boggs' and Angel Boggs had said that would be great. Angel stated that she and her sister would be running the business. After the purchase of the car wash, the Lewis' discovered that Angel had quit the business with her sister and they felt like Terry, the previous owner of the car wash, had dictated to the daughter who remained, that the sign would not happen on the property. Mrs. Lewis stated they had acted in good faith with their neighbors at every opportunity. They had replaced all the aggregate asphalt behind the business and striped the asphalt. They had offered to stripe a portion of their neighbor's parking lot for both of the businesses. The Lewis' offered them parking on their property behind 616 North Avenue.

The Lewis' brought in a dump truck to remove some dirt in order to pour cement to the east of the building and their truck sunk into a 1500 gallon underground drum that was full of oil. They mitigated it, removed all the contaminated soils, carted them to a site in Utah that would accept them and replaced the soil at no cost to the Boggs. They did not bring it up to the Boggs' and hoped the Boggs' would allow them to put up a sign to benefit all three businesses. Mrs. Lewis stated there was a nice community in the area trying to work together to nurture the blighted area.

When the Lewis' had placed the sign on the Martin Mortuary corner of North Avenue, their business had doubled what it currently was today. They were not breaking even and would have never entered into the purchase had they known Terry Boggs would back out on the offer the Lewis' had proposed and Angel had accepted. She stated they had invested almost one million dollars into the property and if they failed, as the previous owner had failed, any future reinvestment into the North Avenue Corridor would be in question by any developer. They had watched 1st Street from Grand to City Market lose businesses. She stated they were faced with a double problem. One of which was a lot of businesses allowed mobile detailers to go to their businesses, which was illegal, because they had no permit to operate and they could not dispose of waste water into the storm sewer. She had contacted Mr. Spears with the City about the problem. The company they purchased the property from allowed the mobile detailers to come in three times a week to their three businesses. The second problem was the Lewis' were held to regulations that others weren't and they were fighting a tough road. Through all the marketing studies they had viewed, they felt the sign was the most important advertising option. The sign variance would be their last attempt to revive the property; they were all out of options. They had tried radio, television and newspaper advertising.

She stated the drive-by numbers at 7th Street and North Avenue were around 45,000 and the drive-by numbers at 6th Street and North Avenue were 26,000. Car wash statistics stated one-half of one percent was a typical number expected to drop in. They were currently getting one-eighth of one percent. Their other

car wash captured three quarters of one percent. If they could double their numbers to one-quarter of one percent, they would be successful.

QUESTIONS

Board Member Carter asked how the sign square footage was calculated.

Mr. Peterson stated it was a corner lot and there was frontage off of Tiger Way and North 6th Street. He figured the maximum square footage that would be allowed for the property, building and free-standing, per the Code. Since there was already building signage on the property, 120 square feet was roughly what remained for the North 6th Street side.

Board Member Carter asked if there could be up to three 40' signs on the three different properties.

Mr. Peterson stated that the car wash property was only allowed the 25' height because of the two lane road but because it was a corner lot, they could have two free standing signs and remove some building signage. 604 and 616 North Avenue could each have a free-standing sign but they could be 40' in height because they were adjacent to a four lane street. The REI property was adjacent to North Avenue and North 7th Street which enabled them to have two 40' free-standing signs. The car wash property was the only property within the block not allowed to have a 40' sign.

Board Member Carter asked if 604 North Avenue could have two free-standing signs since it was a corner lot.

Mr. Peterson stated they could have two free-standing signs. He added that the City would encourage a sign package for multiple properties to reduce signage clutter. When he met with the Lewis' originally, they tried to do a sign package for all three properties, which would have benefitted all three properties and the City. However, the owner of 604 was not interested.

Board Member Couch stated it sounded like other neighbors in the area were willing to cooperate, but not the two neighbors at 604 and 616 North Avenue.

Chairman Wall referred to the picture of the proposed sign and asked if the sign at the front of the picture was the sign on top of the coffee shop in the REI Plaza.

Mr. Peterson stated it was the sign on the coffee shop and he pointed out the REI sign and also the proposed car wash sign rendering right above the peak of the REI roof.

Chairman Wall asked if that would be a rotating sign.

Mr. Peterson stated it would, as proposed.

Board Member Couch stated he appreciated the packet prepared by staff.

DISCUSSION

Board Member Carter stated he had two reservations with the variance. One was regarding the adopted North Avenue Corridor Plan by City Council in 2007 which initiated lower heights of signs than now permitted. Previous documentation, a previous process and previous Council adoption of a plan, all set the stage for decisions like these along North Avenue. The second reservation was regarding an illuminating sign that rotated at night. There needed to be some sensitivity to the neighborhood adjacent to the property. The staff report referenced a need to advertise using a sign, but he had reservations regarding an illuminated, rotating sign, particularly at night.

Board Member Burnett was concerned the previous owner may put up a 40' sign out of spite on his property once the Lewis' had installed their sign. There could be cluster of signs in the area.

Board Member Couch stated the lot had a unique location, size and shape and was stuck behind the REI building. He added he had never been on Tiger Way and it was not a street commonly used by people. He appreciated the difficulty of having a viable business in a location that was not ideal. He stated that he would probably default to going with the recommendation of the planner and that the city needed more businesses.

Chairman Wall stated it was a difficult decision and he had similar reservations as stated earlier as far as the 2007 and 2011 North Avenue Plans and the numerous other documents used in the City of Grand Junction regarding signage. It was a huge issue and disagreement as far as what we would want that sign to look like in our city. He was empathetic about the amount of time and money that had been put into the project, but he was not sure what the undue hardship was. The environment, atmosphere and surroundings of the lot had not changed from the time it was purchased until now that would have made it a hardship. A 40' lighted, rotating sign would stick out like a sore thumb and would go against recommendations that had been made in the last four or five years regarding signage and the direction the public and planners across the nation intended to go to reduce signage pollution. He stated their other business was phenomenal and he used it all the time. Based on numerous documents and recommendations from the public and planners regarding the direction signage should be headed in the future, he would not be supportive of the project.

Board Member Carter asked if it would be more favorable if the sign were not rotating and illuminating at night.

Board Member Couch asked if he was saying the sign could turn in the daylight hours and illuminate.

Board Member Carter stated that given what they had discussed and staff's recommendation for approval, he still had reservations regarding the neighborhood impact with the sign illuminated and rotating at night. He would be in favor of making a recommendation for approval if the sign did not rotate and illuminate at night.

Chairman Wall asked Board Member Carter if he would be satisfied with the project at a 40' height if it were not lit up or did not rotate.

Board Member Carter stated he did not mind the illumination during business hours or even in the evening. He did not like it illuminating or rotating all night long.

Board Member Burnett asked if a certain time would be set to turn off the sign.

Mr. Lewis stated the sign could probably be put on a timer.

Chairman Wall asked if the reservations were the illumination and rotating of the sign or the height of the sign. He stated that the height of the sign was the issue for him and he had not considered the lighting or rotating of the sign. If he had been okay with the height of the sign, he would have looked more at the rotating and the lighting.

Board Member Burnett asked if this would set a president if it were to be approved. He added that around the country, signage requirements were going down and becoming more eye-appealing.

Board Member Couch stated he supported the proposal and that signs were currently allowed on North Avenue. He added that discouraging profitable businesses was not good for the City.

Board Member Carter asked staff if a 40' sign would be allowed on the corner of Tiger Avenue and 7th Street.

Mr. Peterson stated it would because it was adjacent to a four lane street.

Board Member Carter stated he was not in favor of rotating and he would prefer it not be lit all night.

Mr. Lewis asked if their recommendation was that it could only run during operating hours.

Board Member Carter stated he still had reservations about it rotating at all and being lit all night.

Board Member Burnett asked what the current hours of operating were.

Mrs. Lewis stated they were opened 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM. She added that the reason it needed to be illuminated at night was to attract the attention of people driving around. There would not be a need to have it illuminated during the day.

Jamie Beard, Assistant City Attorney, stated that the audience members who were speaking from their seats were not being picked up on the microphones and they needed to step up to the podium and speak into the microphone in order to be heard.

Chairman Wall stated if more information was needed from the applicants, they would be asked to come to the podium to speak.

He added if a sign were to be allowed, it would put an undue hardship on a business if they were unable to have a lighted sign.

Mrs. Lewis stated they would be willing to eliminate the rotating portion of the sign. She added they would like to have their business seen from traffic traveling west on North Avenue. She stated that even though the North Avenue Plan had been adopted, the funding was minuscule. The grant amount was around $800,000 to make improvements from 12th Street to 1st Street.

Chairman Wall asked if the sign did not rotate, did they prefer the sign to face east and west.

Mrs. Lewis said yes to the east and west direction and asked that it be allowed to be lit. She stated that Bud with Bud's Signs had suggested a rotating sign to cause people to avert their eyes toward the sign but they were willing to not rotate the sign.

Chairman Wall asked Ms. Beard for direction in making the correct motion.

Ms. Beard stated the motion that was included in the packet best reflected staff's opinion as to what the request was of the applicant. She advised the Board to make the motion that was included in the staff report first. If that motion was not approved, go onto a second motion. She stated the motion provided was always in the affirmative and all motions should be made in the affirmative. If the applicant were to appeal the decision, it would be easier to understand exactly what was being appealed. The motion in the report did not have to be used, however the motion could be made and if it weren't approved, a second motion could be made. If the motion in the staff report were approved, that would be the ruling for the day.

Chairman Wall clarified there were two ways the staff motion could fail. First, the motion could be made and not seconded or second, the motion could be made, seconded and voted down.

Ms. Beard concurred and added that a second motion could be made at that time.

MOTION #1: (Board Member Couch) "Mr. Chairman, on variance request, VAR-2011-1273, I move that the Board of Appeals approve the request to increase the height of a free-standing sign from 25' to 40' with the findings of facts, conclusions and conditions listed in the staff report."

The motion was not seconded and the motion failed. A second motion was made once Board Member Couch verified that the plan number remained the same.

MOTION #2: (Board Member Carter) "Mr. Chairman, on variance request, VAR-2011-1273, I move that the Board of Appeals approve the request to

increase the height of a free-standing sign from 25' to 40' without rotating with the findings of facts, conclusions and conditions listed in the staff report."

Board Member Couch seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion was approved by a vote of 3-1 with Chairman Wall in opposition.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 1:16 PM.