

## **MINUTES**

### **ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Meeting of December 15, 2020 – 8:00 a.m.**

#### **Zoom Webinar**

Present: Committee Chair, Councilor Shepard; Councilors Hartwell and Wilder Cross.

Also present: Town Manager, Ephrem Paraschak; Director of Community Development, Thomas Poirier; Town Planner, Carol Eyerman; Acting Fire Chief, Ken Fickett; Executive Assistant, Jessica Hughes.

1. **Consideration of the minutes of the November 17, 2020 meeting.**

A motion was MADE by Councilor Wilder Cross, SECONDED by Councilor Hartwell and VOTED to accept the minutes of the November 17, 2020 meeting. Unanimous vote.

2. **Current Business**

- A. Review Chapter 2, Section 2-1, Subsection H, Noise Abatement, of the LUDC, to provide an exemption for well drillers during a time of Severe Drought; and forward recommendations back to the Council for review and approval (referred by the Town Council on October 6, 2020).

a.

Councilor Hartwell commented that Maine had been beyond the severe drought condition category during the summer. He then referred to an incident that prompted his endorsement of this item where a Phinney Street resident's well went dry one month prior to when a new drill had begun to be drilled. After 7:00 pm, a neighbor made a complaint and Gorham PD came and made the drilling stop. Councilor Hartwell feels that when the state or area is categorized as being in a drought, the Town should waive the noise abatement requirement to allow for a new well to be drilled. Town Manager Ephrem Paraschak recommended that the committee consider how much leniency the proposed exemption should provide and staff will then draft the language.

Director of Community Development - Tom Poirier commented that well drilling does not require a permit, so the Code Enforcement Office would not be enforcing the noise abatement requirement and it would likely be enforced by Gorham PD. Mr. Poirier referred back to the committee and asked if they are looking for an exemption to allow drilling all night, or up to some threshold such as midnight. Councilor Hartwell recommends allowing drilling for one night when someone is out of water since it should not take more than one night. Councilor Wilder Cross agreed and is in support of allowing a well to be drilled for one night. She also asked if the exemption in question was already covered in the Noise Abatement ordinance under subsection 3a of Section H, which states that the Code Enforcement Officer can provide an exemption to extend work beyond daytime hours to accommodate certain activities, to which Mr. Poirier said that he would recommend adding a provision under a new section – Section K that would specify that well drillers are allowed to drill beyond the time of 7 am to 7 pm as needed during times of severe drought. Councilor Shepard referred to the committee and

asked if the exemption should be limited to one night, to which Mr. Poirier commented that since this issue has only come up once since the noise abatement ordinance has been in effect, he feels that the added language to allow well drilling for up to one night would cover most situations. Councilor Hartwell agreed that one night should be sufficient. Councilor Wilder Cross asked to clarify if the language would allow for drilling until the following day and evening, to which Councilor Shepard said “yes.” Mr. Poirier added that a well driller can continue drilling for as long as needed beyond one night if they can meet the noise abatement ordinance; if the property is large and the noise is coming from the interior, there would not likely be a noise issue at the property line for an abutting neighbor.

Town Planner Carol Eyerman suggested including more generic language that doesn’t necessarily identify well-drilling in the exemption language and to use something such as, “in emergency situations,” as there may be another situation that we haven’t taken into account. Councilor Shepard commented that he would leave the proposed language as identifying well-drillers.

A motion was MADE by Councilor Wilder Cross, SECONDED by Councilor Hartwell and VOTED to add new Section K under the Noise Abatement ordinance that specifies that a noise abatement exemption will be granted for a well to be drilled up to one night. Unanimous vote.

Mr. Poirier commented that staff will draft the language and bring it back for the committee’s review at the next meeting.

Councilor Hartwell asked if the language should be left as specifying, “during times of severe drought,” or does the committee want to add “when a well has gone dry.” Councilor Wilder Cross suggested adding, “during extenuating circumstances.” Mr. Paraschak suggested adding “when there is no access to potable/drinking water.” Councilor Shepard asked if a developer is building new houses, would they be able to drill wells all night. He then recommended leaving the proposed language as it was previously discussed.

- B. Review provisions in the LUDC that would require surveyors to identify setbacks to ensure that structures are within the required setback zone defined in the code and bring back recommendations to the Council for review and approval (referred by the Town Council on October 6, 2020).

Mr. Poirier shared that the Code Office and Zoning Board of Appeals are seeing a number of appeals regarding construction, in which developers are not meeting the setback zone requirement by a couple feet up to six feet. If the Code Office holds new construction up the variance requirement, construction that is beyond the setback area would need to be torn down and redone. The Zoning Board of Appeals has felt that they are in a hard position as they have to adhere to the ordinance, but also want to be fair. Additionally, the Board felt that many appeals could be addressed if a provision could be added to the LUDC under the building permit section that would say something to the effect that “all applicants for building permits would be required to have a foundation pinned by a professional surveyor. This requirement may be waived by the building inspector.” For instances where there is a small lot that is being built close to the road, if the setback was questionable – a surveyor could then mark the boundary before the foundation was dug to make sure the construction was located outside of the setback zone, which could be waived by the Code Office should they say that there is no concern of the new construction being within the setback zone. Councilor Shepard said that this additional provision would also cover

the construction of any new additions – for example, when someone has a tight lot and they want to add a two-car garage, but they are encroaching five feet into the setback zone and ask for a special exception. Councilor Wilder Cross asked Town Planner Carol Eyerman if other Towns follow a similar process, to which Ms. Eyerman said – yes - it is exactly what other Towns do. Most Towns have a provision that requires a professional survey. Councilor Hartwell commented that someone could move surveying pins, which is illegal to do. He sees a need for the survey requirement and gave an example of a legal dispute regarding property that he previously owned; the builder subcontracted to have foundation poured and found out that the foundation was laid within the setback. The builder then demolished part of the foundation and brought it back outside of the setback zone, which created cold joints in the foundation and led to other problems with the house. All of which described could have been avoided if a survey had been done prior to the work starting. Councilor Hartwell gave another example of a property that his mother owned that was moved in Standish Village over by the boat launch to allow road frontage. After being moved, the house sat vacant for a few years and then burned as a result of arson. Recently, a developer was hired to draw plans, at which time they realized the existing foundation was in the setback zone, so they submitted an appeal for a variance, which was granted. Councilor Hartwell wants to make sure that the provision does not require that the land be surveyed when it is not necessary. He does not want to see Code Enforcement failing to use judgement when there really isn't an issue. Councilor Shepard agreed that a survey should be done when/where appropriate and that good judgement on behalf of Code Enforcement would go a long way when a survey is not needed. Mr. Paraschak commented that he does not want to put Gorham Code Enforcement Officers in a position where they are getting harassed frequently for requiring a professional survey and the language not being in the LUDC to substantiate the requirement. He agreed that the new proposed provision should not identify a distance, but would recommend including firm language that they can fall back on. Mr. Poirier suggested that the provision should only apply to certain districts such as where the lots are bigger, or just give the building inspector the ability to waive a setback area. Mr. Poirier recommends that the provision gives the Code Office the general ability to waive setbacks and see how that goes, which can be adjusted later if needed. He said that staff will draft and bring back language at the next meeting for the Committee's review.

Councilor Wilder Cross asked if a homeowner decides to extend a wall in their house and they hire a builder to do the work, does the builder then have the responsibility to notify the homeowner if any part of the existing and/or new construction is in the setback, to which Mr. Poirier said that if someone is going to add on five or 10 feet to their home, or another room on their house, they would hire a builder and the builder would pull their plot plan; if the property was in the urban residential district where they have a 10,000 or 15,000 square-foot lot, the builder would then pull their plot plan, locate their house and identify the best location for the room addition that will not encroach on required the setbacks. If a proposed construction is close to a setback, the Code Office would require the builder to pin the property, so the property line is clearly defined before a foundation is poured.

Councilor Hartwell added that he believed Councilor Wilder Cross was asking who is ultimately responsible when a mistake is made and a construction has been built in a setback zone. As far as the Town is concerned, hopefully the homeowner is responsible, but there are also contractual obligations between the builder and homeowner. He shared his experience as an agricultural fence contractor and that he used to encourage people to get a survey and some people did, others not. For those that didn't get a survey, he would state in the contract that property owners

were responsible if the fencing was installed outside of what is later determined to not be the property owner's property. Councilor Shepard asked if someone is applying for a permit for an addition, would there be some way that the Code Office can inform the person/contractor that they should make sure that the plans are within the required setbacks, so that they don't build something that is in violation of Town code, to which Mr. Poirier said that when someone applies for a building permit, they typically have a survey; other times, conceptual plans are just drawn on a piece of paper. Regarding conceptual drawings, the Code Office will then say that they need to have the foundation pinned when it is poured, so the Town knows that it is outside setbacks. It will also be noted on the building card that will go out with the building permit that the foundation needs to be pinned. The building permit is issued before the foundation is poured.

Staff will draft language and bring it back for the committee's review at the next meeting.

- C. Review mixed-use in the area of Mosher's Corner as called for by the Comprehensive Plan and provide recommendations to the Town Council (referred by the Town Council on November 10, 2020).

Mr. Poirier referred to his memo/attachment C, in which he said that the red area identified on the attachment was the proposed Mosher Corner Mixed-Use area. The Commercial Office District identified in blue on the attachment is the area that the Mosher Corner mixed-use area is proposed to change - with changes to the uses, density, and development standards, and it encompasses an area currently zoned in two separate districts. The Town would be adding some property and new area to a mixed-use district. The changes would include a wide range of residential uses, business professional offices, business personal services and other community uses. The density would increase and mimic the Village Expansion area as proposed, which would be set at two units per net acre with public sewer, and one unit per net acre with onsite sewer disposal. This area most likely has the ability to be sewer, and would be gravity-fed toward Main Street or along Mosher Road. The minimum lot size would be 20,000 square feet. Currently under that zone, it would go under the Suburban Residential district, which is 60,000 square feet - increasing the number of residential units allowed. Mr. Poirier looked at the permitted uses in the Commercial Office district; the two permitted uses that are in question as to whether they would remain in the Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District are retail stores and shopping centers, which are currently allowed in the Commercial Office District. A question for the committee is whether shopping centers should be allowed in the Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District since it is not clear in the Comprehensive Plan - restaurants could be allowed and maybe retail stores, but not shopping centers since it is not clearly specified in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Poirier commented that the memo was provided as a general overview and that staff can start drafting the language for it. Since many new parcels are being added, Mr. Poirier asked the committee what they want staff to do regarding communicating changes to permitted uses - do they want staff to send out a mailing notifying parcel owners that states that "the council is working on drafting a new district in which your lot is located - if you have feedback, please provide comments." Councilor Wilder Cross was in support of notifying the property owners of the proposed district and changes, and Councilor Shepard agreed. Councilor Shepard asked if sewer ran down Mosher Road, to which Mr. Poirier said there are two different kinds of sewer systems; one being a pressure sewer that runs from Little Falls down Mosher Road that is part of the Little Falls sewer conveyance that cannot be gravity fed; the other being a gravity sewer system that runs up somewhere on the south eastern border of the map shown on page one of

the memo provided. There is no sewer north of the area described, so a sewer line would have to be extended along Mosher Road north of the area previously described.

Town Planner Carol Eyerman asked the committee to share any background on discussions that occurred regarding the Mosher's Corner area from when the Comprehensive Plan was last updated, because there are a lot of uses in this area that make it more like a Village District. There is a public park, doctor's office, ice cream stand, restaurant and partial sidewalk that make it more like a Village District, but the proposed changes make it less like a village. Councilor Hartwell commented that before there were any discussions leading up to the last Comprehensive Plan update, staff worked with the consultant Mark Eyerman to come up with the best approach for the new plan, which then went to the council for changes and then to the committee that was formed for further changes. He believes that the last updates to this area were created in the earlier phase between staff and the consultant. Mr. Poirier said that the council wanted to look at more mixed-use areas to identify the mixes of uses - he referred to the Commercial Office District and that it is very limited in size, so little development has been done to that area. Mr. Poirier believes that when the last changes to the Comprehensive Plan were moving forward, discussions may have been around how to make the district serve more of what the Town wanted to accomplish, which explains why the area within the box on page one of the provided memo was redefined, instead of leaving the district as a 1,000 square foot strip along Main Street. There are very limited amounts of commercial growth along Main Street, so discussions were on how to make the Mosher's Corner area function better to meet the requirements of a mixed-use area. Ms. Eyerman shared that the Industrial Park Steering Committee have discussed expanding on traditional industrial manufacturing uses in the Industrial Park and allowing more retail-use, which is also an allowed use in the proposed Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District. Councilor Hartwell added that he feels that it has been a failure in the past with how a mixed-use concept is proposed, but then everything is still being developed lot-by-lot with no master plan in the area. He shared that a successful mixed use master plan is the "The Downs" in Rock Row in Westbrook – it was a big parcel and managed by a large developer, but it wasn't planned through small lot decisions by multiple developers. The lack of direction has hindered mixed-use development in Gorham.

Councilor Shepard commented that he wants to avoid "big block" housing like Spring Street in Westbrook across from the golf course for the planned residential-use in the Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District. Councilor Hartwell said that he believes that is the exact concept that has been proposed. Ms. Eyerman commented that without standards to direct the character, it would be difficult to direct anyone – we would need to identify some architectural standards like the Narragansett District. Councilor Shepard commented that he is not opposed to residential housing in this proposed district, he just wants to make sure that the master plan for the area is not predominantly residential-use.

Mr. Paraschak said that in looking at the district and the way that the land is used, some parcels could be developed fairly easily and other parcels have single-family homes on them and would not be changed for a long time. Mr. Poirier said that is a good assumption, especially along Mosher Road since many of those parcels are zoned residential. Some of the bigger lots would be easier to change. The natural features of the topography for that area would make it difficult to change the use and CMP's lines cut the whole district in half. A developer is looking to increase the density for a development behind Maine Optometry, adding more apartment-style uses there. Dolloff Road, which has the largest parcel in the area, is an unknown – it could be zoned commercial or residential. Ms. Eyerman asked if the Council or the Ordinance Committee have ever considered

using Form Based Code, to which Councilor Hartwell said that he had a motion for an item to push for as much Form Based Code as possible with regard to design standards when he was the Town Council Chairman several years ago. It was a stretch for the council to consider it at that time, but he is still convinced that Form Based Code is something to continue to pursue. Ms. Eyerman said that architectural plans submitted to the Planning Board and issues with traffic in Town are the biggest challenges that the Planning Board faces, so having standards such as Form Based Code would help streamline processes for the Planning Board.

Mr. Paraschak said that in looking at the density and uses in the Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District area, there is not a lot of public infrastructure. If the Town is looking for a Village-feel, developers are not going to put it in for free. If the Town requires the developer to put it in, then they will not invest in the properties. He asked what would it take to plan and develop the area and corner to have sidewalks and make it more walkable and to get the investment in the public infrastructure with sewer – what does staff need to make that cost effective for the developer and for the Town to be able to require it. Mr. Paraschak further said it has been a struggle for staff as you don't want to drag a developer through the process; you want the developer to make some money and for the Town to have infrastructure installed that is thoroughly planned that doesn't end up being a sidewalk to nowhere. This has been a goal of Town staff, for example with the Cherry Hill Farm parcel. In order to make the proposed Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District area have a more walkable, Village-feel, we need to install crosswalks and traffic signals with pedestrian controls, all of which are only attainable with renewed development in the area. Ms. Eyerman said that there is a sidewalk from Beal's Ice Cream down across to where the Thai restaurant and Dunkin Donuts are. Mr. Poirier shared his screen and referred to the blue water lines and green sewer lines on the GIS map. He explained that anyone developing the parcel numbers 31-6 and 31-6-202 and 31-5-5 would need to bring in a gravity sewer up Mosher's Road to serve them. There is no sewer serving the large parcel on Dolloff Road, so a sewer line would need to be either brought down Main Street to go towards Gateway Commons, or a line would need to come from Mosher's Corner towards the parcel. The cost to bring sewer to the large parcel is unknown at this time – a water line is already serving the parcel. Councilor Shepard asked if the cost to bring a sewer line to this parcel would change with the new Industrial Park development across the street, to which Mr. Poirier said that a sewer line could be brought in from the Main Street along the boundary on parcel number 30-1, but he is not certain that the grade would be right to serve both; it would depend on how high the slope is to bring the gravity line down to serve the Industrial Park as well. Mr. Paraschak asked if Gateway Commons has to pump sewer across the street, to which Mr. Poirier said that is correct - there is a sewer pump station in Gateway Commons that pumps down to Shamrock Road, then pumps up to Libby Avenue and gravities back to the sewer conveyance. Mr. Poirier said that installing sidewalks is less of a cost. The existing sidewalk ends at Gateway Commons, so if there was a big development, a sidewalk would need to be ran west up Main Street; he believes that the street is already curbed for sidewalks – if it isn't, the curbing would need to be closed in, which is a less of a cost. Once/if new sewer infrastructure is laid, the road would need to be torn up anyway. The bigger issue is installing sidewalks. Another big unknown cost is that of installing pedestrian controls at the Mosher's Road and Main Street intersection once/if sidewalks are installed there. Councilor Shepard commented that we will want to allow pedestrian controls to allow folks to get across to the Cherry Hill trail, to which Mr. Poirier said that the Gorham Conservation Commission at their meeting held last evening – December 14<sup>th</sup> discussed putting in a trail connection from Cross Town Trail over to Cherry Hill. Mr. Paraschak commented that it is an attractive area for people to live and work in - to be able to walk down to Cherry Hill Farm or Sebago Brewing. In terms of cost, Ms.

Eyerman suggested that the Town could focus the sidewalk to a quarter-mile walking distance to start, and as more area is developed, the developers could then install sidewalk connections to that quarter-mile, to which Mr. Poirier suggested working on the district framework first. He and Carol will create a draft of what the density will look like and how to get to the design standards that are outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, and then the committee can discuss pedestrian circulation after. Then staff can reach out to the lot owners about what the proposed Mosher's Corner Mixed-Use District will look like, so they can provide feedback. Staff can then refine things from there. Councilor Hartwell agreed, and Councilor Wilder Cross agreed and said that it would help to see ideas about the proposed vision and whether Form Based Code would be the better approach to then predetermine what the area will look like.

Staff will work on and bring back language that the committee can review at the next meeting, which will help make it more productive since they will then have material to react to and provide feedback.

Councilor Shepard emphasized that he wants to avoid huge box-style residential housing in the residential-zoned areas, to which Mr. Poirier said we can consult with Michael Richman, who used to serve on the Gorham Planning Board, and tap into other resources to craft good performance standards specific to multi-family housing to address those concerns. Councilor Hartwell commented that he is not opposed to multi-family housing as long as it is mixed in with other businesses, including retail, restaurants, services, etc. Councilor Hartwell shared his screen to help illustrate the different businesses in mixed-use areas. He showed that Walmart and Home Depot had scaled down to fit into mixed-use areas where there isn't a big box multi-retail shopping center. Instead, the examples shown were of scaled down retail stores that have a showroom where customers would order for items to then be delivered. He wanted to show that there are ways for traditional big box stores to scale down and fit into mixed-use urban areas. Councilor Shepard was receptive to what Councilor Hartwell shared, but reiterated that he wanted to prevent big white square multi-family housing like he previously described.

Regarding when someone has property in a transfer overlay district and did not have water or sewer connected and they have density for water, sewer and transfer development, Councilor Hartwell asked would the minimum lot size still be 6,000 square feet, or would it be 6,000 square feet on top of an allowance for water and sewer line connections to be brought in. Mr. Poirier said that if there isn't already sewer, you cannot do development transfer. Councilor Hartwell said that there has not been much utilization of the development transfer overlay and some developers are fundamentally opposed to it. It may help if there was a section on the Town website with an infographic illustrating how the development transfer overlay district works and shows the economics that essentially allows a developer to build more on a property. Although a developer would pay something to be able to do that, the return is greater. To provide information on the website would help more people see the value and take advantage of it. Mr. Poirier said that staff could definitely work on that, and that of all the Towns who have development transfer, Gorham has been limited, but also most successful. There are maybe five developments in the development transfer, and Chase Homes just resubmitted 119 lots for development transfer review, so staff are starting the process of reviewing that again. He further said that there are a few people that strongly oppose paying for density, but they may not be fully aware that they are getting a lot for free at the nominal cost for the development transfer. The council may even at some point in the future want to look at the development transfer fee as it is very low and hasn't been reviewed or adjusted since the Development Transfer Overlay District was formed.

Councilor Hartwell added that he is interested in pushing this on the Village Expansion District and since the Mosher's Mixed-Use District refers to Village Expansion, it may be appropriate to consider in the areas that we are allowing for more density, to push for a traditional grid street system and prohibit cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets when possible. He doesn't believe there is anything in the Comprehensive Plan that is against that. Councilor Shepard asked how that would fit in with the current layout in the area, to which Councilor Hartwell said there are a few cul-de-sacs, and as you get closer to the center of the Village, there is a grid system. Ms. Eyerman said that many newer developments have several cul-de-sacs. In one case, a cul de sac has a dead-end, because there is a wetland. In another dead-end, there is a ravine with a stream at the bottom of it, so there are natural resource impediments that have played a factor in a couple of instances of dead-ends. Maybe one would need a bridge to cross a dead-end, which would be awesome if possible to make connections around the two main street lights. Councilor Hartwell said that when terrain makes things impractical or a vehicle easement is not possible or is cost-prohibitive, it would be beneficial to find some pedestrian or bike-friendly way for connections through dead-ends. Mr. Poirier said that when staff drafts language for Mosher's Corner, they can start looking at a grid system and add it to performance standards, especially for the Dolloff Road parcel and add some provisions for that. Ms. Eyerman added that it is interesting that the Town allows private roads or private driveways in the Village under road standards; she can understand allowing them in rural areas, but where we are talking about a grid system and public works maintaining them, it would be helpful if public works could just go around the block. She suggested having a future discussion regarding where we allow private driveways and private roads. Councilor Hartwell said there are a lot of technicalities under private roads and private driveways – the Town does not allow backlots in Gorham, so private driveways are not allowed in order to get to something; private ways by statute are public easements, so public works could use them. Private ways are not referring to private-use, rather it refers to who is responsible for the maintenance.

3. **Items Referred by Town Council to Committee for Future Meetings/Action**

- A. Review expansion of the village areas as called for by the Comprehensive Plan and provide recommendations to the Town Council (referred by the Town Council on November 10, 2020).
- B. Review requirements and restrictions in place for the installation of commercial and residential solar systems and bring back recommendations to the Council for revisions in ordinances to help encourage installation of such systems (referred by the Town Council on December 1, 2020).
- C. Review requirements and restrictions in place for the installation of commercial and residential solar systems and bring back recommendations to the Council for revisions in ordinances to help encourage installation of such systems (referred by the Town Council on December 1, 2020).

4. **Other Business**

Mr. Poirier shared that the Village mixed-density item is coming back from the Planning Board, and the private roads standards and street acceptance item is also coming back from the Planning Board, so they should be ready for review on the January 5<sup>th</sup> Town Council Meeting agenda. Regarding the private road item, the Planning Board proposed many changes and tried to make it consistent. There were not many changes to the Village mixed-use density item.



5. **Schedule next meeting and discuss agenda items for next meeting.**

The next meeting of the committee is scheduled for Tuesday, January 19, 2020 at 8:00 a.m. The following items will be discussed at the next meeting:

- A. Review Chapter 2, Section 2-1, Subsection H, Noise Abatement, of the LUDC, to provide an exemption for well drillers during a time of Severe Drought; and forward recommendations back to the Council for review and approval (referred by the Town Council on October 6, 2020).
- B. Review provisions in the LUDC that would require surveyors to identify setbacks to ensure that structures are within the required setback zone defined in the code and bring back recommendations to the Council for review and approval (referred by the Town Council on October 6, 2020).
- C. Review mixed-use in the area of Mosher's Corner as called for by the Comprehensive Plan and provide recommendations to the Town Council (referred by the Town Council on November 10, 2020).

6. **Recent Items Sent to Town Council with Committee Recommendations**

- A. Public hearing to hear comment on the proposed amendments to the Land Use and Development Code to allow for varied density for mixed-use developments in the Gorham Village and Urban Commercial zoning districts. (Ordinance Committee Spon.)

There were no comments from the public and the hearing was closed. The item was then VOTED 6 yeas (Councilor Wilder Cross was absent).

- B. Public hearing to hear comment on the proposed amendments to the Land Use and Development Code to add new private way standards that would allow up to 25 lots or residential units. (Ordinance Committee Spon.)

There were no comments from the public and the hearing was closed. The item was then VOTED 6 yeas (Councilor Wilder Cross was absent).

7. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, a motion was MADE by Councilor Wilder Cross and SECONDED by Councilor Hartwell and VOTED to adjourn. Time of adjournment: 9:13am.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica R. Hughes, Executive Assistant