

MARIEMONT PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING HELD MARCH 20, 2019

The Mariemont Planning Commission met Wednesday February 20, 2019. Mr. Vianello called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. Present were Mr. Brown, Mr. DeBlasio, Ms. Reed and Mayor Policastro. Also, in attendance was the Building Administrator Don Keyes.

Mr. DeBlasio moved, seconded by Mayor Policastro to accept the minutes as written for February 20, 2019. On roll call; five ayes, no nays.

The first request was from Joyce Monger of 3921 East Street, Mariemont, OH 45227 to subdivide parcel 527-0020-0023-00 from its current size and shape into two smaller and different shaped parcels.

Finding of the Building Commissioner: The eastern portion of the Monger property, known as number 527-0020-0023-00 has been previously consolidated into one lot 130.27 feet x 130 feet in size. This lot is proposed to be divided into two lots of irregular shape to allow two houses to occupy the space. The proposal has changed from the earlier meeting on this issue. The new layout provides the code-specified setbacks from the proposed property lines for a house design that can fit into the divided property space. Both properties would be larger than the minimum required lot size of 6750 square feet.

Mr. C. Francis Barrett, Legal Counsel for Ms. Monger, said her property is zoned Residence B which allows single family dwelling, two family dwelling, three family dwelling and four family dwelling. The acreage is enough for two four family apartment buildings. The proposal is a request to divide the lot in order to allow Ms. Monger to downsize. She has lived at this location for 35 years. Her desire is to stay in the neighborhood and to preserve the existing residence. She desires to build a new residence and sell the existing residence. What she is proposing is far less intensive than she is allowed to do. The property is currently platted as three separate lots. It may have been consolidated for purposes of tax billing but it has always been three separate lots. He showed members of the Planning Commission diagrams and drawings from the Hamilton County Engineer's Office indicating the three lots. In addition, an ariel view was displayed. As the Building Commissioner's report indicates the proposal is in full compliance with all rules and regulations of the zoning code.

Mr. Vianello said that needs to be determined but he hears his presentation on that and that Mr. Barrett says that it is in compliance. Mr. Barrett said no – he is saying that the Building Commissioner said it was in full compliance. He said he too believes it is in full compliance passed on lot size, setbacks etc. Mr. Vianello said we get into that when we have more discussion. Mr. Barrett said the minimum lot size for single family homes the "B" district is 6750 square feet. Ms. Monger has over half an acre which is mid 20,000 square feet. This far exceeds the minimal lot area for both lots.

Mr. Matt Evans, Architect for Ms. Monger, said he was retained to design the residence. He said the first time he met with Ms. Monger she told him that the most critical part of the design was the house fit within the neighborhood and that it complements the surrounding structures and that it allowed for view of the existing residence from East Street. She stressed how much she likes the house she is in right now but she needed first floor living space with a first floor master and having an attached garage which the current house does not provide. One of the first things he did when preparing the original proposal to Ms. Monger was to research the property. He reviewed the setbacks and site restrictions. He also looked at the existing residences in the neighborhood and tried to find architectural features that portrayed or would

complement all the neighboring homes. He noticed most rooflines were front to back pitches so he wanted to the design to have a front to back pitch as well. Most are a story and half type structure where the rear of the house may be two stories. He prepared sketches and they have gone through revisions. He showed the audience and members of the Planning Commission the drawing of the house they are proposing. It has a covered porch and two car garage with two doors to make it more aesthetically pleasing and on a scale of a carriage house. The drawing also provides stone on the house and a chimney on the front of the house which gives a break in the materials. They are going to maintain the setback from the existing home that is required. They also do not want to disturb a lot of the park like setting. The majority of the trees at the end are not on Ms. Monger's property. They are in the right of way. There are a few large trees on the property that will probably have to be removed. It is not something necessarily that one wants to do but one does not necessarily want their home right under a tree due to the liability of damage to the house from falling limbs. They do not anticipate removing as many trees as people may think. The lot layout meets the requirements and he has met with the Building Commissioner. They are keeping the house visible from East Street and the existing home.

Mr. Brown asked if this rendering is what will actually be built or is this a representation. Mr. Evans said this is something that Ms. Monger wants to pursue as soon as possible. They are pretty much set on the elevation. All details will not be complete until all the working drawings are complete. They did not want a long narrow home going front to back which would not fit the exiting architecture of the community – it would look like a trailer structure. Mr. Brown asked if the view of the existing house is blocked if approached on Murray. Mr. Evans said even now the view is block by natural vegetation. Mr. Brown said you can see through the vegetation. Mr. Evans said the only time the house is truly visible is the winter time. Mr. Brown said one can see through vegetation but not a house. Mr. Evans said he does not believe that most homes are truly visible from all locations. This is not a street – it is a right-of way. People walking will be able to see the home but what they do not want to do is make an unattractive structure for people to look at.

Mr. Vianello asked if any of the large trees are heritage trees. Mr. Evans said that is something they have to work with the arborist on. Mr. DeBlasio said if they are a large tree it is likely a heritage tree. Ms. Reed said heritage trees are allowed to be taken down for construction purposes. Mr. Keyes said if they are removing a tree for construction they are allowed to take down the tree. A heritage tree is 25" in diameter. Once it is that size then the only way to take it down is either with some indication from an arborist that it is dangerous or it interferes with construction. Mr. Vianello said his experience is that the homeowner would come to the Planning Commission about the heritage tree. Ms. Reed said that is not a variance. She personally had a heritage tree taken down in her yard and one of the boxes that was approved is that there was construction. It is approved by the Building Commissioner. Mr. Vianello said we will look into that aspect and if permission is required we will let them know. Mr. Vianello said whatever decision is made by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the full Council. Mr. Evans said ideally he would recommend removing any tree within 20' of the house mainly because there is an over-dig of 6-7' and construction equipment rips root systems. The last thing you want is to build a home and two years later have the tree die. It is then really expensive to remove.

Mr. Brown said the setback on the existing house would fall within the 18-30' height restriction and asked if Mr. Evans was aware that a house of that height with its original frontage would have a 14' setback. Mr. Evans asked versus 25'? Mr. Brown said a minimum one yard side yard setback of 14'. Mr. Evans said it is because it now has a different frontage. Mr. Brown said cutting the side yard setback on the existing house to almost in half from an aesthetic point of view he cannot imagine how that is

going to look like. Mr. Evans said he understands the point but it is a large home and there are a lot of large homes on narrow lots in the community. This is an odd lot for this community for one of such size. Mr. Brown said we are taking away the existing side yard setback for the existing house. Mr. Evans said the side yard is actually not a setback distance. A yard is the distance between a home and the property line.

Mr. Vianello said what he is hearing is Mr. Brown is concerned that the existing house will not have the proper setback for the new seller. Mr. Evans said yes it does. Mr. Brown said only because the frontage has been cut in half. Mr. Evans said it is the right of the property owner. Mr. Brown said he understood but it seems to him to take that away from the house is not right. Ms. Reed said it is Ms. Monger's choice and her value. Mr. Brown said how the house is going to be situated in there will affect all the neighboring residents. It will appear to them that this is a tight fit. Mr. Evans disagreed saying there are plenty of large residential structures that are close to the property line. The property is being reduced in conformance with the code that has been established and conforms with the homeowner's rights.

Mr. Vianello said he is confused because when this was started there was discussion about the property facing Murray and the owner insisted at that time that Murray was the front and now the proposal shows East Street would be the front of the new property. He asked if this was the homeowner's new position. Mr. Evans said it is the position that was put on the homeowner in the last meeting because it was required that we meet the front yard setback of the existing residence before the additional property was divided. Mr. Vianello said we are now taking three lots and building a home across two of the lots. Mr. Barrett said they were originally platted with frontage on Murray Avenue even though it is a paper street. There are three separate lots with three separate building sites that could hold three separate single family homes right now the way things stand. It is the goal of the homeowner to re-plat the property using East Street as the frontage which she has the right to do. East Street is more proper for the frontage of this development because it is an existing street. Mr. Brown asked if it is considered a corner lot. Mr. Barrett said they were originally platted with Murray Avenue considered the frontage. Murray Avenue is a paper street thus it is not a corner lot. Mr. Evans said the building code defines a corner lot by not easements or right-of way but by street. Murray Avenue ends no different than the house that is directly east of this street across East Street which has a side yard to Murray Avenue. This would be a side yard to an easement that is currently a walk way and grassy area. There is no street in this location. Mr. Brown said this is different than what was proposed at the last meeting. Mr. Evans said it is in response to issues raised at the last meeting by members of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Brown said normally when one comes in with set of architectural plans the fronts of the houses would normally line up would they not? Mr. Evans said if there is an average setback to maintain on the street called streetscape. Streetscaping... depending on the community, the houses ideally align. In an ideal scenario we have alignment. In this case an alignment is not required because there are no houses to the north or south that require an average alignment. It is not required in the zoning code in this particular circumstance. Most homes on the street conform to a 25' setback. The current house sits so far back that he believes the current proposal will be more in conformance to the streetscape that is currently on East Street. The owner is placing the new home in the proposed location to conform to the streetscape on East Street and to conform to the setback of 25'. The other reason was to make the house feel it was in Mariemont. The more the house is pushed west of the property the more it does not feel like it is in Mariemont which has a lot to do with this investment. This location removes it farther from the multi-family locations and light commercial business. He feels very strongly about the 25' setback. The existing house was established long before the setbacks were required.

Mr. Vianello said at the last meeting Ms. Monger indicated that she has prior permission from the Planning Commission. We have searched and cannot find this issue and asked if the homeowner had information on that to be shared it would be helpful. Mr. Barrett provided what information he had and Mr. Vianello said the Village will share it with the Solicitor. His understanding is that she can institute that approval at any time by taking the documents to the courthouse without coming back before Planning Commission. He is assuming that what Ms. Monger has she no longer wants. Mr. Evans said Ms. Monger could go to the Court House and it transferred to three separate lots. He said this homeowner is coming to the Planning Commission as a resident and for help establishing what the Planning Commission would like to see and a house that fits in the community. Mr. Vianello said Ms. Monger said that was her main goal at the last meeting. The Planning Commission's dilemma is the house sits way out and is not in conformity with the house next to it. We also need to get a legal opinion from our Solicitor as to the prior agreement. The Planning Commission is not trying to be difficult just trying to protect the image of the Village.

Ms. Joyce Monger, 3921 East Street, said tonight's meeting of the Mariemont Planning Commission is a continuation of a process that began a month ago, with her request to subdivide her property on East Street. As requested, she has submitted a drawing of what the front of the house will look like and, after she receives further information from a preliminary survey, she will submit a revised lot plan as well. With this plan, all properties and structures will meet all zoning regulations, the old house will be as visible as it is now and the many trees currently on the property will remain. She would like to address some comments brought up at the meeting. Mr. Joe Stoner, MPF President, told this group in February that she was going to destroy her existing home and that her home was historical. In making this comment, Mr. Stoner put his own inaccurate assumptions into the record. She would never do anything to harm the home she raised her family in for the last 35 years. Her house is old but, not an historic home. In the 35 years she has lived in the home, the MPF has never once suggested that it should be. She loves old homes and architecture and it is her goal to preserve and protect her much loved home. Her 1993 addition where the size of the house was increased by 50% was done with such attention to the older part of the home that most people do not know there is an addition.

The first thing she told Matt Evans, her current architect, was that the old house needed to be honored in the new plan. She would like to add that she is not making, nor does she need to make, an Architectural Review Board request as her property is not subject to a review that evaluates how it looks. This is a zoning issue and all requirements have been met. There was mention of losing trees and a beautiful view. She wants to assure that there will be as many trees as possible left and more planted. Most of the trees you can see when you stand on East Street are actually in the tree lawn or setback so they will not be affected by the change. Many of the trees you all love were actually planted and nurtured by her late husband. She loves the secluded and private feel of her home and she does not see ever giving that up. Her new home plan includes more trees, not fewer. Currently you can see more of my house than you have in a long time. A few years ago we lost some trees to bad storms. We have since replanted. In 5 years, the trees should once again be tall enough that the only view of the house will be from the driveway opening. The lot subdivision will not affect that. Her 35 year history with this property confirms for all concerned her commitment to keeping this property a real asset to my neighborhood and to the village. The last topic she would like to mention is one of property value. Some have expressed an unfounded fear that there could be a decrease in property values. She believes just the opposite will occur. She would encourage you to research how property

values both from the Auditor and a sales appraisal are calculated. When you add an expensive new house and landscaping to a neighborhood, property values go up, not down. History has repeatedly shown this to be the situation. She hopes she can help all be comfortable with the change. She is happy to share more plan details with you, if you would like. We as property owners have the right to use our property in full compliance of all laws, and she is in full compliance with all Mariemont laws. If Mariemont is allowed to change, arbitrarily, the laws as written, the citizens of Mariemont will lose their constitutional rights as guaranteed by the 5th and 14th amendments of the Constitution. And the desirability of our community and thus our property values will decrease. She has met all of the legal requirements for the Mariemont Planning Commission to grant her request. She is not asking for any special consideration. 39 years ago today on, March 20, 1980, she moved to Mariemont. A lot has changed since then. But what she hopes never changes is mutual respect for our neighbors and the law.

Ms. Reed said she believes this proposal is so much better because it does not block the house.

Mr. Brown asked Ms. Monger if she would concede that there are other people in the neighborhood who do not see it the same as she does. Ms. Monger said she respects their opinion and she would hope that they respect hers. If someone wants to buy the property and do what they want with it – it is for sale for the right price. She has property rights and is exercising them in the best interest of the Village.

Ms. Gail Cooley, 6709 Hammerstone Way, said she has known Joyce Monger for the past 25 years. Over those years she has come to know her as a Mariemont supporter and conscientious citizen. Over all those years she has lived in the same home on East Street. Although her home has never been identified as historic, she and her past husband Tom, always loved and spent much energy and money preserving and enhancing the historic value of their home. She does not believe that reducing the quantity of land surrounding this home diminishes its historic value. The Ferris House on Plainville Road, which was integrated into John Nolen's plans, still remains one of the oldest brick buildings in Hamilton County and a treasure to Mariemont. She also knows that the 'tree hugging' Joyce, who plans to continue to reside on east street, will strive to preserve and protect, wherever possible, the beauty of the street. As a resident she has witnessed a great deal of 'progress' in the village which was always promoted 'good for the village'. Mary Emery was a very progressive thinker. She would not have expected the village she planned to remain static. She believes Joyce's petition is not only legal but consistent with past precedent.

Mr. Ken White, 3829 Settle Road, said he would like to compliment the effort that has been made to comply and conform to all the rules of the Village. It may have exposed a need in terms of planning/zoning. He has a house that has a lot and one half. His neighbor has a lot and one half. He was approached ten years ago by someone who wants to take the combined extra lots and make one buildable lot. This is different. He is not sure why Murray Avenue does not go all the way through. He believes it is a complicated issue and may expose the need by the Village to do some additional planning. From what he can see it conforms but it may not be the vision.

Ms. Janet Setchell, 3749 Harvard Acres, said she has known Joyce Monger for 35 years. She and her family have been longtime residents of Mariemont. Our children were best of friends and spent much time playing at the Monger home. She is very familiar with the house and the property. Mrs. Monger was ecstatic when she and her husband acquired the house. They made it their home, raising

their two sons who she knows have the fondest memories of their childhood growing up in the "old house". Over the years she and Tom have tenderly cared for their home. They have thoughtfully decorated the interior and maintained the exterior, retaining and enhancing the architectural details both inside and outside. The mechanics have been constantly updated. Without the Mongers caring for this house over the 35+ years they have owned it we might not have this beautiful old home in our village today. The Village is fortunate to have someone like Joyce Monger who still continues to care for this house. There is no doubt in her mind that anything she will do to her property will be done with the best interest of the house in mind. In 1992 they put an addition on the house to extend the interior living spaces. They carefully chose an architect who designed the addition to complement the original architecture of the house. Special woodwork was milled and architectural details from the existing home were mimicked on the addition. Joyce was most insistent that the historic character of the house was not compromised. She is very cognizant of aesthetics and cares about the details and how things look. Mrs. Monger was widowed two years ago. Her husband spent his time maintaining the house and now the house has become too large for her to comfortably maintain. To move out of the house has been a very hard decision for her. She loves that home and would never jeopardize the historical integrity of the house. She has always considered that in any decision she has made. Lastly she would like to add that she understands Joyce has followed every Village regulation in her plan. What she is proposing to do in no way affects the original house which will remain on the larger portion of the lot. Her house is not in the historic district, it is not threatened by her plans, and her request is in full compliance with the zoning code. The Village should grant this request.

Mr. Peter McBride, 6709 Hammerstone, read the following on behalf of Linda Rogowski, 7028 Hiawatha Avenue: March 19, 2019 To the Planning Commission Members: I am not able to attend Wednesday evening's meeting, but would like to express my opinion regarding the proposed subdivision of 3921 East St. I have known Joyce Monger since our sons were in Boy Scouts together in Jr. High (20+ years). She has always been a great resident of Mariemont and positive contributor to the village. Her home and property are very important to her and she has been a great steward of it. I know she will proceed with her new house project in a sensitive manner that respects the character of the neighborhood and the old house. It is my understanding that Joyce is in full compliance with all zoning regulations and laws and that she has property rights which allow her to do what she is proposing. I feel the planning commission should follow the laws and ordinances that are already in place. If our officials have the right to arbitrarily disregard the law, then this hurts the whole village. Property values will decrease if we become known as a place where the laws are disregarded. I ask the Mariemont Planning Commission to grant this request, not just for Joyce, but for all Mariemont residents.

Bruce Trapnell, 3906 East Street, said he has worked as a physician at Children's Hospital for 22 years. He chose to live in Mariemont because of its charm and a perceived sense of community. He is very familiar with the property where Joyce lives. Joyce is a great neighbor and cares about Mariemont. She has been an outstanding steward of this property for many years and has taken great care to preserve it. For example, when she expanded the house by 50 percent of its original size, she preserved its appearance making it difficult to notice it had been modified. She has been sensitive to the environment and had preserved and replaced trees. What she now proposes will be done in the same first-class fashion to protect and preserve the property and neighborhood and is in full compliance with Mariemont laws. She has the right to lay this property out legally in a number of different ways. Not only is she doing it legally, she's doing it in a sensitive manner that preserves the character of the neighborhood and which respects the neighbors. He thinks it's very important that the

Planning Commission approve her development, because it's in full compliance with our laws and will be done in a sensitive and positive way. If Village officials have the ability to arbitrarily change the rules based on their personal beliefs or the whims of other people when a proposal in full compliance with the law, this will hurt the village as a whole. Citizens of Mariemont would not be sure what they can do with their own property. It would put everything at risk, make planning speculative, and would lower property values. It's very important that the Village follow its own laws. When they find a proposal is in full compliance, they should approve it. So, therefore, there is really no choice but to approve this.

Mr. Rob Bartlett, 3611 Mound Way, said Ms. Monger is taking the feedback from the Planning Commission. She came seeking input and has incorporated a lot of the input. There has been discussion that she has made changes – of course she has made changes because she has listened to what the Planning Commission has said. She is doing the best she can to make the property to fit naturally within the environment and 25' setback. He finds it interesting that Planning Commission is having all these issues and she is complying with all the laws. He does not know legally how the Planning Commission can say no if it meets all the zoning requirements. He is encouraged that Planning Commission is going to engage the Solicitor and he would also encourage members to listen more to Ms. Reed who seems to understand a lot of this stuff such as heritage trees. She is very knowledgeable about what is and what is not fitting in with the law.

Ms. Linda Bartlett, 3611 Mound Way, said Mr. Brown lives in a home that predates Mariemont and lots of houses were built up around that and she does not believe the value has decreased in the least. The Brown's have done a beautiful job maintaining the house. Having another house or subdividing a lot is not a good reason aesthetically to automatically say no to the project. She believes what Ms. Monger has put together with the care and the detail and touches she has tried to appease some of the concerns needs to be listened to. What she is planning is a really great way to meet everyone's needs in this situation. Mayor Policastro asked if the letter she sent was null and void. Ms. Bartlett said yes – she sent a second email.

Ms. Reed asked if it is her understanding if Ms. Monger went with the first plan that was proposed at the last meeting because of the three plats that she does not need any approval. Mr. Barrett said right now there are three separate building sites. If built within each of the lots there is no approval needed. Ms. Reed said if Ms. Monger did it the way she wanted originally it would be blocking the house more. It would not be as desirable. What she is asking for approval for is more desirable in her opinion. She wants what is best for the Village and of all the choices the one she can do without any approval is the worst choice for the Village. She wants to understand legally what choices she has. She feels because Ms. Monger took such good care of the property if someone else owned it they may not have taken as good care of it. She feels she is being punished because she took such great care of the property.

Mr. DeBlasio said if Ms. Monger were to sell the property there could be something built that the Village really did not like.

Ms. Denise Evans said for a very long time she lived at 3910 East Street. She no longer lives in the Village. She has known Ms. Monger for 40 plus years. She is not sure many knew of the house before Joyce and Tom bought the house. Mr. Monger years ago would knock on the door of the house when an elderly lady lived there and said when she was ready to sell it to call him. They bought the house after the lady had a stroke. The house was a mess and was not anything anyone

would want to live in. The Mongers have stuck with the house all that time. They put an addition on the house. She remembers Mr. Monger digging and planting all the trees. When she lived on the street she asked for a variance and was told no because she was told her neighbors did not want it yet we tore down all the apartment buildings and built condos. She has not always agreed with Ms. Monger's decisions but this is her property and has no plans to leave the property but she cannot stay in the enormous house. It is within her rights to subdivide. She has advised her to just sell it all and the Village might get more apartments or condos.

Mr. Vianello said several members of the Planning Commission have received multiple emails in a negative manner. He does not feel it is proper to read them. If someone has something to say he believes they should show up and speak up. He does not believe we are punishing Ms. Monger. He believes it started out as a very simple decision and it changed very quickly when it became known that she had prior approval and does not need approval now. A document showed a diagonal through that one section and then it proceeds so the front of the house is Murray not East Street even though the address is east Street. The document showed using the Murray setback. It has now changed. He thanked Ms. Monger for getting the Planning Commission a sketch. He believes it is because of those types of changes that members started questioning what is going on and what the property would eventually look like. The documents that have been given by Mr. Barrett will be given to the Solicitor by the end of the week and we will get a decision from him as soon as we can. If Ms. Monger has the document showing the diagonal across the property that would be helpful for the Solicitor to have all the facts so he can make the best decision available. By asking questions is not punishment but Planning Commission's responsibility to make sure what is being proposed meets the ordinances. The comments that Planning Commission is breaking the law by not following the legal requirements – no decision has been made yet – we are just gathering facts. He finds that to be disconcerting.

Mr. DeBlasio said we have to look at the legality and we need the opinion of the Village Solicitor. He asked if the Solicitor comes back with an opinion that what the applicant is saying is correct can we vote on it now conditioned on the opinion of the Solicitor in lieu of having a third meeting. It was unclear if that was proper protocol.

Mr. Brown moved to table the matter pending an opinion from the Solicitor. Ms. Reed asked if we are tabling it based on the 2006 ruling. Mr. Vianello said Planning Commission does not know if there is even a need to grant this if that ruling is good.

Ms. Monger said at the February 20, 2019 meeting it was discussed that the Planning Commission was going to contact the Solicitor about this exact point. Mr. Vianello said we tried that via searching for the information. We could not come up with any of the information in our files. He is trying to determine whether the Planning Commission is locked into an approval from the Planning Commission that said here are the three plots. If that is the case does it need to be officially rescinded by Ms. Monger? Do the changes in design in the new proposal and structure of the lot meet all the criteria? Many people have commented it does and many have said it does not. He personally believes she has a right to do with her property as she sees fit but he has a responsibility to the Village to protect the Village from a lawsuit that we do not know may or may not exist. He wants the Solicitor to evaluate it and decide whether this is right or wrong information. Speaking personally he does not want to grant approval only to find out that it was the wrong course of action.

Mr. Evans said he sits on a zoning commission and there have been multiple times where the Board has reviewed matters and then applied conditions upon the approval. In his opinion, there is no reason the Planning Commission cannot take it to a vote and put a condition on it such as the Solicitor review the documents. With respects to the different shapes lots developers can come to zoning commissions multiple times with multiple way to divide and subdivide lots of which the board can or cannot approve. Until it is acted on and recorded by the Hamilton County Recorder it is a null point. It does not exist.

Mr. DeBlasio would like to vote and if the Solicitor says no it nullifies the vote. The vote would be conditioned on the opinion of the Solicitor.

Mr. Brown moved, seconded by Mayor Policastro to table the matter in order to obtain a legal opinion from Village Solicitor McTigue. On roll call; three ayes, two abstain (Ms. Reed and Mr. Vianello).

A future meeting will be held once the legal opinion is received.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shelly Reed, Secretary

