

BOONE COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
BOONE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, COMMISSION CHAMBERS
801 E. WALNUT, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
(573) 886-4330

Minutes

7:00 P.M.

Thursday, November 20, 2008

I. Chairperson Smith called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., with a quorum present.

II. Roll Call:

a. Members Present:

Pat Smith, Chairperson	Perche Township
Carl Freiling, Vice-Chairperson	Cedar Township
John Schloot	Rocky Fork Township
Paul Zullo	Rock Bridge Township
Derin Campbell	Public Works
Mike Morgan	Bourbon Township
Gregory Martin	Katy Township
Pat Fowler	Missouri Township

b. Members Absent:

Larry Oetting	Three Creeks Township
Michael Morrison	Columbia Township
Vacant Seat	Centralia Township

c. Staff Present:

Stan Shawver, Director	Uriah Mach, Planner
Bill Florea, Senior Planner	Thad Yonke, Senior Planner
Paula Evans, Staff	Georganne Bowman, Public Works

III. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes from the October 16, 2008 meeting were approved by acclamation.

IV. Chairperson Statement

Chairperson Smith read the following procedural statement:

The Boone County Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory commission to the County Commission. The Commission is made up of individuals representing each township of the County and the county engineer. The Planning and Zoning Commission makes recommendations to the County Commission on matters dealing with land use. Tonight's agenda includes one conditional use permit, one rezoning request, and two subdivision plats.

In general, the Planning and Zoning Commission tries to follow Robert's Rules of Order, however, it is authorized by the Missouri State statutes to follow its own by-laws. The by-laws provide that all members of the Commission, including the Chairperson, enjoy full privileges of the floor. The Chairperson may debate, vote upon, or even make any motion.

The following procedure will be followed:

The agenda item will be announced, followed by a report from the Planning Department staff. At that time, the applicant or their representative may make a presentation to the Commission. The Commission may request additional information at that time or later following the hearing. After the applicant's presentation, the floor will be opened for anyone wishing to speak in support of the request. We ask that any presentation made to the Commission be short and to the point.

Please give your name and mailing address when you address the Commission. We also request that you sign the sheet on the table after you testify.

Next the floor will be given over to those who may be opposed to the request. Direct all comments or questions to the Commission and please restrict your comments to the matter under discussion. Please be considerate of everyone here. We ask that you not be repetitious with your remarks. We also recognize that some issues can be quite emotional. In that regard we ask that you refrain from applause, cheers, or other signs of support or displeasure. Please afford those with a different point of view than yours the same respect and consideration you would like yourself.

After those opposed to the request have had a chance to speak the applicant will have an opportunity to respond to the concerns of those opposed to the request. Next the staff will be given an opportunity for any additional comments, as appropriate. The public hearing will then be closed and no further comments will be permitted from the audience or the applicant unless requested by the Commission. The Commission will then discuss the matter and may ask questions of anyone present during discussion. Finally, a motion will be made to either recommend the approval or denial of the request to the County Commission. Please note that the Boone County Zoning Regulations and Subdivision Regulations are considered to be a part of the record of these proceedings.

All recommendations for approval are forwarded to the County Commission. They will conduct another public hearing on Tuesday, December 2, 2008. Interested parties will again have the opportunity to comment on the request at that time. The County Commission generally follows the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission; however, they are not obligated to uphold any recommendation. Requests that have been denied will not proceed to the County Commission unless the applicant files an appeal form within three working days. Please contact the Planning office to see if a request that has been denied has filed an appeal, as there will be no further public notification due to the short time between the hearing tonight and the County Commission hearing. The County Commission hearing scheduled for Tuesday, December 2, 2008 will begin at 7:00 p.m. and will convene in this same room.

V. Conditional Use Permits

1. Request by Animal Medical Services LLC for a permit for a veterinary facility on 8.0 acres located at 14750 N Rte. U, Hallsville.

Planner Thad Yonke gave the following staff report:

The subject property comprises 2 tracts totaling approximately 8 acres located approximately 300 feet to the west of the nearest municipal limit of Hallsville, on State Route U. The property is zoned A-R (Agriculture - Residential), which is original 1973 zoning. This property is surrounded by original A-R zoning.

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to operate a veterinary clinic comprising a small animal clinic building and a companion animal building for the larger animals such as horses or non-traditional animals. The applicant currently operates a veterinary clinic on the east side of Hallsville

within the municipal limits and desires to relocate to this property. The applicants will be using an existing 2500 square feet building that was constructed as a worship hall. This existing structure will be modified under a commercial building permit to a small animal veterinary clinic. An additional 4000 square feet maximum size building will be constructed to serve as the companion animal veterinary facility on the property. There is an existing parking lot on the property to serve the use. Wastewater service for the site is provided by the central system that serves the city of Hallsville.

The property is located inside the Hallsville public school district and the Boone County Fire Protection District. The Master Plan describes this area as being suitable for agricultural and rural residential land use. A veterinary facility can be compatible with the area if properly set-up. Staff notified 76 property owners about this request.

The following criteria are the standards for approval of a conditional use permit, followed by staff analysis of how this application may meet those standards. Staff analysis of the request is based upon the application and public comments received following notification of the surrounding property owners.

(a) The establishment, maintenance, or operation of a conditional use permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort or general welfare.

If operated in conformance with existing county regulations, the use should comply with this criterion.

(b) The conditional use permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted by these regulations.

The requested use on its own has the potential to be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity. However, the provisions in the zoning ordinance that all animals be kept within a sound-proofed structure and that odor must be controlled. The facility design should be able to mitigate impacts on the use and enjoyment of the surrounding properties. Public testimony may be more indicative as to whether this criterion is met.

(c) The conditional use permit will not substantially diminish or impair property values of existing properties in the neighborhood.

The proposed use should not have a negative impact on property values in the area. Public testimony may be indicative as to whether this criterion is met.

(d) All necessary facilities will be available, including, but not limited to, utilities, roads, road access and drainage.

The site has access to all necessary facilities.

(e) The establishment of a conditional use permit will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the zoning district.

This property is zoned A-R (Agriculture-Residential), the size of the property is such that a significant distance from other properties can be maintained as a buffer even if surrounding properties develop at the allowed densities.

(f) The establishment of a conditional use permit will not hinder the flow of traffic or result in traffic congestion on the public streets. This will include the provision of points of access to the subject property.

This use will not result in traffic congestion on public streets. This use, as described by the applicants, will not result in substantial additional traffic to this site especially when compared to the volume of traffic possible to generate under the previous use as a worship facility.

(g) The conditional use permit shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the zoning district in which it is located. The County Commission shall find that there is a public necessity for the conditional use permit.

The proposal conforms to other applicable regulations of the A-R zoning district.

Based on the information presented in the application and information from the applicant, staff recommended approval.

Present representing request:

Chad Sayre, Allstate Consultants, 7401 Fall Creek, Columbia.
Dr. Michelle Schmidt, 400 Highway OO, Hallsville.

Mr. Sayre stated the applicants are in agreement with staff's list of criteria to meet a conditional use permit. The applicants would like to add a few points to item B. Dr. Schmidt has had a clinic for 10 years inside the city limits of Hallsville. That location is closer to the neighbors. This site is in a residential neighborhood but if you go and look at it, it is a more agricultural setting. There is no fence. The previous use of the proposed site was more concentrated by the use of a worship hall having multiple services every week. The adjoining 7.5 acres included in the request was used agriculturally. The existing structure will be used along with the existing utilities. The applicant has cleaned up the debris of the previous agricultural operation.

Mr. Sayre stated the current clinic is located inside the city limits of Hallsville. It is across the street from the community center and across the street from the Hallsville fair grounds. Mr. Sayre stated that Dr. Schmidt is his veterinarian and she maintains a very nice facility. If you went in to her adjacent building that is used for short term treatment, it is immaculate. It is not the goal of Dr. Schmidt to have a boarding facility. Dr. Schmidt has been in business for 10 years and there have been no complaints that the applicants are aware of. Hallsville City Clerk Cheri Reisch sent a letter in support of this request. To have the City Clerk, who is very informed in Hallsville to write a letter and back this up is significant. If and when it does become contiguous with the city limits Dr. Schmidt has already told the city she would be glad to annex.

Mr. Sayre stated he owns a house that is within 1000 feet of the property and as a property owner Mr. Sayre stated he supports the request.

Dr. Schmidt presented a copy of the proposed layout of the property. Dr. Schmidt stated it is just a drawing of what the applicants would like the exterior of the new companion animal facility where the outpatient and short term hospitalization for equines will be. The proposed building is 40' x 70' and there was some concern about that. 40' x 70' is what the applicant currently works out of now. It is a size that Dr. Schmidt is comfortable with. The applicant is looking down the road at expansion in hopes that another veterinarian will come to the area. That is why that particular size was chosen. Eventually there will be some livestock working pens, the applicants will not be keeping any livestock there overnight.

Mr. Sayre stated that Dr. Schmidt is an asset to the community. Having that service is important. There are a lot of kids that can run their dogs or cats there but in the city's overall access plan it is incorporated in that plan.

Open to public hearing.

Present speaking in favor of the request:

Harold "Shorty" Brady, 14900 N. Route U, Hallsville.

Mr. Brady stated he is two lots from the proposed site. Mr. Brady stated he works for the guy that owns the property the clinic is on now. Dr. Schmidt has always kept the property clean and nice looking and has improved the property. Dr. Schmidt would be an improvement to the neighborhood.

No one in opposition to the request.

Closed to public hearing.

Commissioner Morgan asked what type of wastewater system is on the property.

Mr. Sayre stated it is tied in to the city; there is a pump station on site, no changes will have to be made.

Commissioner Martin made and Commissioner Morgan seconded a motion to **approve the request by Animal Medical Services LLC for a conditional use permit for a veterinary facility on 8.0 acres located at 14750 N Rte. U, Hallsville.**

Pat Smith – Yes

Carl Freiling – Yes

Mike Morgan – Yes

Gregory Martin – Yes

John Schloot – Yes

Paul Zullo – Yes

Derin Campbell – Yes

Pat Fowler – Yes

Motion to approve the request carries unanimously.

Chairperson Smith informed the applicants that this request would go before the County Commission on December 2, 2008 and the applicants need to be present for the hearing.

VI. Rezoning Requests

1. Request by William B. McWilliams Revocable Living Trust and Bigsky Investments LLC to rezone .63 acres, more or less, from R-S (Single Family Residential) to M-LP (Planned Industrial) and to approve a revised Review Plan for Ivy Ridge Planned Industrial Development located at 7105 W. Henderson Rd., Columbia.

Planner, Uriah Mach gave the following staff report:

The subject property is located on Henderson Road, northwest of the Highway 40/Interstate 70 interchange. The applicant is seeking to revise an existing M-LP (Planned Light Industrial) review plan that covers 2 acres, and add an additional .51 acres of R-S zoned property, which will be rezoned to M-LP.

This rezoning has a concurrent minor subdivision plat that will create a 2.51 acre lot for the entire property being rezoned. This property was originally rezoned from R-S (Residential Single-Family) in June of 2004. It has original R-S zoning to the north & east, M-LP to the west, and original C-G (General Commercial) to the south. The M-LP to the west was rezoned in November of 2003 and the review plan was revised in June of 2005.

The purpose of this planned rezoning is to expand the existing 2 acres of M-LP to cover space for a new building to the north of the existing structure.

The Master Plan designates this property as suitable for residential land uses. The Master Plan also identifies a “sufficiency of resources” test for determining whether there are sufficient resources available for the needs of the proposal.

The resources necessary to serve the proposed development can be broken down into 3 general categories; utilities, transportation, and public safety services.

Utilities: This property is served by Consolidated Public Water District #1 & Boone Electric Cooperative. This rezoning will not noticeably increase demand on available public utilities. There is an existing hydrant on the property, and it is sufficient to meet the requirements of the Boone County Fire Protection District.

Transportation: Access to this property is via Henderson Road. The rezoning will not increase traffic to this site.

Public Safety: The Boone County Fire Protection District operates a station approximately 350 feet from this property. The rezoning will not increase the current public safety needs of the property.

Zoning Analysis: This rezoning request is consistent with the overall goal of the zoning regulations. The nature of the planned zoning districts is to limit development as described on the approved plan. When those limits have been reached and the property owner wishes to expand beyond that plan, revising the review plan and the final plan is the correct action.

Staff recommends approval of the request.

Present representing request:

Bill McWilliams, 7105 Henderson Rd., Columbia.

Mr. McWilliams stated he owns Columbia Turf; they are expanding and building an addition to house additional equipment that is now being stored outside. Mr. McWilliams stated he owns the property to the other side so the applicant is basically selling the property to himself.

Open to public hearing.

No one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the request:

Closed to public hearing.

Commissioner Schloot stated he was at the site and believes this is the right thing to do.

Commissioner Morgan stated it is a good location.

Commissioner Schloot made and Commissioner Martin seconded a motion to **approve** the request by William B. McWilliams Revocable Living Trust and Bigsky Investments LLC to rezone .63 acres, more or less, from R-S (Single Family Residential) to M-LP (Planned Industrial) for Ivy Ridge Planned Industrial Development located at 7105 W. Henderson Rd., Columbia.

Pat Smith – Yes	Carl Freiling – Yes
Mike Morgan – Yes	Gregory Martin – Yes
John Schloot – Yes	Paul Zullo – Yes
Derin Campbell – Yes	Pat Fowler – Yes

Motion to approve the request carries unanimously.

Commissioner Freiling made and Commissioner Schloot seconded a motion to **approve** the request by William B. McWilliams Revocable Living Trust and Bigsky Investments LLC for a revised Review Plan for Ivy Ridge Planned Industrial Development located at 7105 W. Henderson Rd., Columbia.

Pat Smith – Yes	Carl Freiling – Yes
Mike Morgan – Yes	Gregory Martin – Yes
John Schloot – Yes	Paul Zullo – Yes
Derin Campbell – Yes	Pat Fowler – Yes

Motion to approve the request carries unanimously.

Chairperson Smith informed the applicants that these requests would go before the County Commission on December 2, 2008 and the applicants need to be present for the hearing.



VII. Planned Developments

None.

VIII. Plats

1. Glendale Estate. S28-T49N-R11W. A-1P. Glen Family Trust and Glendale Stables LLC, owners. Nathanael E. Kohl, surveyor.

No one present to represent plat.

The following staff report was entered in to the record:

The subject property is located on Glendale Drive, north of Mexico Gravel Road, east of Route Z. The proposed 10.32 acres is being cut from a 141.5 acre piece and a 10 acre piece of property. It is currently zoned A-1 (Agriculture), with a pending A-1P (Planned Agriculture) final plan. The property is

surrounded by A-1 zoning, all of which is original 1973 zoning. That final plan will permit the division of this property as described in this plat. The two lots, one at 2.50 acres and the other at 7.50 acres are limited in their development by the proposed plan. The 2.5 acre lot (Lot 2) has agricultural and residential uses approved by the plan. The 7.5 acre lot (Lot 1) has only agricultural uses approved by the plan.

Access to this property is via Glendale Drive, publicly maintained road.

This property is served by Public Water Service District #9, Boone County Fire Protection District, & Boone Electric Cooperative. There will be no noticeable increase in utility service due to this development.

The City/County Health Department has approved of the on-site wastewater situation between the revised administrative survey lot to the south of this property and this lot. The identified easement and location of the wastewater systems will be compliant with their regulations once the wastewater easement is recorded.

The property scored 17 points on the rating system.

Staff recommends approval of this plat.

Commissioner Freiling made and Commissioner Schloot seconded a motion to **approve** Glendale Estate.

Pat Smith – Yes

Carl Freiling – Yes

Mike Morgan – Yes

Gregory Martin – Yes

John Schloot – Yes

Paul Zullo – Yes

Derin Campbell – Yes

Pat Fowler – Yes

Motion to approve the plat carries unanimously.



2. Ivy Ridge. S1-T48N-R14W. M-LP. William B. McWilliams Revocable Living Trust and Bigsky Investments LLC, owners. J. Daniel Brush, surveyor.

No one present to represent plat.

The subject property is located on Henderson Road, northwest of the Highway 40/Interstate 70 interchange. It is currently split zoned; with 2 acres zoned M-LP and .51 acres zoned R-S. The property is undergoing a concurrent M-LP review plan revision and rezoning to expand the M-LP zoning to cover the entire proposed lot. This property was originally rezoned from R-S (Residential Single-Family) in June of 2004. It has original R-S zoning to the north & east, M-LP to the west, and original C-G (General Commercial) to the south. The M-LP to the west was rezoned in November of 2003 and the review plan was revised in June of 2005.

This property has an existing access on to Henderson Road, and this subdivision is not expected to increase access needs beyond those currently identified.

This property is served by Consolidated Public Water Service District #1 for water service, Boone Electric Cooperative for electric service, and the Boone County Fire Protection District. These needs are adequately provided for in the current configuration of the property and are sufficient for the new configuration of the property.

An existing on-site wastewater system serves this property. There will be no need for additional capacity after this land division.

The platting process for this property is being sought after this property was illegally divided by deed from the parent parcel in 2005. By completing the platting process, the dubious nature of this parcel's creation will be resolved.

The property scored 63 points on the rating system.

Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Freiling made and Commissioner Schloot seconded a motion to **approve** Ivy Ridge:

Pat Smith – Yes	Carl Freiling – Yes
Mike Morgan – Yes	Gregory Martin – Yes
John Schloot – Yes	Paul Zullo – Yes
Derin Campbell – Yes	Pat Fowler – Yes

Motion to approve the plat carries unanimously.



IX. Old Business

1. Update on County Commission Decisions

The Glendale rezoning request was approved as recommended.

The Bechtold rezoning request was approved as recommended.

Most plats from last month have gone forward to the County Commission.



2. Proposed Stream Buffer Ordinance

Mr. Florea stated he has compiled public comments and staff has made recommendations as to whether or not to adopt the comments. Mr. Florea stated he is looking for direction from the Commission as to whether or not they want the suggestions incorporated in to the ordinance.

8.1.4 Applicability

- Clarify sub-section H that the owner of an existing structure may submit a stream buffer plan that utilizes the stream buffer averaging provisions in Section 8.5 F in order to make existing structures compliant. *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt. The ordinance, as written, allows stream buffer averaging for existing structures. But, public comment has indicated that the process to approve such a plan is not clear.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Adopted by acclamation

- Amend sub-section H that such structures may be rebuilt, if destroyed, and may be added on to as long as the addition is away from the stream buffer or vertical. *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt. This will ease the impact to owners of existing structures that may be negatively impacted by the regulations. This could be addressed by including additional language in the buffer averaging section (discussed above). Adoption of this recommendation will be contrary to existing County Regulations dealing with non-conforming structures.*

Mr. Florea stated this is a change from existing county policy. Under the Zoning Regulations, when a non-conforming structure is destroyed by any means to the extent greater than 75% of its market value, it can not be replaced except in compliance with the regulations. The commenter has asked that this be changed for the stream buffer ordinance.

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Adopted by acclamation

8.2.5.2 Variances

- Create an administrative variance to allow construction of a single family dwelling within the outer zone of the stream buffer subject to prescriptive standards that will protect water quality. This will be allowed only when there is no compliant building site on the subject tract or parcel. This will not be allowed on lots created after the adoption of these regulations. *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Do not adopt. There is an existing variance process (Board of Adjustment) in place. Creation of an administrative variance will require creation of a set of prescriptive standards that if met, would allow the property owner to obtain a variance. Long term maintenance of the prescriptive standards would not be guaranteed and would be difficult to monitor.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Not adopted by acclamation.

8.3 Definitions

- Strike the words lake or reservoir from the definition of "Buffer." *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt. There was no intent to require a buffer around lakes or reservoirs.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Adopted by acclamation

8.4 Stream Buffer Plan Requirements

- Clarify that single-family dwelling, two-family dwelling and Administrative Surveys do not require plans prepared by a Professional Engineer or Professional Surveyor. *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt. This is consistent with the intent of the regulations.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Adopted by acclamation

8.5 Design Standards for Stream Buffers

- Buffer Averaging. Clarify how this section can be used to make an existing structure or structures compliant with the regulations and not subject to Section 8.1.4 H. *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt. Additional clarification would be helpful.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Adopted by acclamation

8.7 Stream Buffer Management and Maintenance

- Provide exemptions from Subsection F. for
 - propane tanks up to 1000 gallons
 - gasoline, diesel fuel or heating oil tanks up to 500 gallons
 - up to 20 gallons of liquid pesticides
 - up to 100 pounds of granular fertilizer. *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt. These items are commonly incidental to residential uses.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Adopted by acclamation

Allow a one acre exemption. This would in effect allow up to one acre of a required stream buffer to be cleared. The commenter suggests that this level of disturbance within the buffer would be insignificant *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Do not adopt. The proposed exemption would allow 435 linear feet of stream buffer to be cleared adjacent to a Type 1 stream, 871 feet adjacent to a Type 2 stream and 1,452 feet adjacent to a Type 3 stream. This would eliminate the benefits provided by the buffer for those areas which, is contrary to the intent and purpose of the stream buffer regulations as stated in Section 8.1.1.*

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Not adopted by acclamation.

Bluff top Applicability:

Insert the following language: “Where steep slopes (in excess of 25%) are located within 25 feet of a designated watercourse, the combined minimum stream buffer width and modification to stream buffer width based on slope (Tables I and II) shall extend the entire distance of this sloped area. If the distance of this sloped area is greater than 75 feet, there will be no additional width for the outer zone. If the distance is less than 75 feet, the total buffer width will be 75 feet maximum measured up the slope.” *STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Do not adopt. There has been no justification provided for the requested change. The requested change was taken out of context from stream buffer regulations from a different jurisdiction. Lacking its original context the language is ambiguous as is the intent of the commenter. The County’s ordinance language was developed by the Columbia/Boone County Stormwater Task Force after considerable discussion. The Columbia Stream Buffer Ordinance has language similar to the County’s draft language. There is significant benefit to the community to have similarity between City and County regulations unless there is a clear and substantial reason to do otherwise.*

Commissioner Freiling asked whether this was an attempt to address bluff top development. Staff responded that was probably true judging from a previous discussion with the person who made the comment. Commissioner Freiling asked whether there was a better way to address bluff top development. Staff replied that the idea that vertical separation from the stream provides the same water quality benefits as horizontal separation from the stream is false. Stream buffers rely on natural processes to treat stormwater. These processes occur over time as water slowly flows across the ground and the water is either absorbed by soil and/or plants or, pollutants are removed from the water through contact with the soil and/or plants. In order for this treatment to occur the water must slowly sheet flow through the buffer. Stormwater flowing over a bluff tends to channelize and flow rapidly into the stream so there is no time for the natural cleansing processes to occur. There is no technical justification for reducing the buffer width for development on bluff tops. Existing structures, whether on a bluff top or not, would be allowed to remain, rebuilt or expanded through buffer averaging or other amendments discussed previously that will allow non-conforming structures to be rebuilt if destroyed or damaged and added onto as long as the addition was vertical or did not reduce the distance from the stream.

The Commission agreed with staff recommendation. Not adopted by acclamation.

The question as to whether Boone County is required to develop a stormwater program that includes areas outside of the urbanized area is moot. The state regulations are clear that all of unincorporated Boone County is a regulated MS4, which has been confirmed in a letter from Doyle Childers, Director of the Department of Natural Resources to Commissioner Karen Miller dated June 20, 2006. A follow up letter was received from Doyle Childers dated October 20, 2008. That letter states that DNR intends to schedule a regulation change that will include the density factor of 1,000 people per square mile. Until that regulatory change is complete the county is required by State Regulations to develop a stormwater program for the county that includes areas outside of the Urbanized Area.



X. New Business

None.

XI. Adjourn

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary
Pat Fowler

Minutes approved on this 18th day of December, 2008